

hung up. Representative Bean had to spend campaign funds informing voters she had not made that call.

In a Maryland race, voters in a conservative area received a middle-of-the-night robocall from the nonexistent "Gay and Lesbian Push," urging them to support one of the candidates. That candidate lost the election, in part because of the false, late-night call.

Quantity is an added problem. Voters frequently receive multiple robocall calls a day from the same group or candidate in the days leading up to an election.

The National Do Not Call Network—a nonprofit focused on this issue—has indicated that 40 percent of its membership says they received between 5 and 9 calls a day during the election season. Some frustrated voters reported receiving as many as 37 calls in a day.

This is just counterproductive. The goal of political speech is to inform and engage voters, not to mislead them or turn them off of the democratic process.

I am a strong supporter of the First Amendment and its protection for political speech, but these robocalls have become a problem. Something must be done.

I believe this bill presents the right solution—it imposes clear time, place, and manner restrictions, but it also allows campaigns and groups to use robocalls to inform voters of issues and their positions.

I think it is time for us to find a reasonable solution to these calls that are intruding on the privacy of the American home and misleading voters.

I want to thank Senators SNOWE and DURBIN for co-sponsoring this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the Robocall Privacy Act of 2009.

Mr. President, 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. 1077

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 "Robocall Privacy Act of 2009".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Abusive political robocalls harass voters and discourage them from participating in the political process.

(2) Abusive political robocalls infringe on the privacy rights of individuals by disturbing them in their homes.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this Act—

(1) **POLITICAL ROBOCALL.**—The term "political robocall" means any outbound telephone call—

(A) in which a person is not available to speak with the person answering the call, and the call instead plays a recorded message; and

(B) which promotes, supports, attacks, or opposes a candidate for Federal office.

(2) **IDENTITY.**—The term "identity" means, with respect to any individual making a political robocall or causing a political robocall to be made, the name of the sponsor or originator of the call.

(3) **SPECIFIED PERIOD.**—The term "specified period" means, with respect to any candidate for Federal office who is promoted, supported, attacked, or opposed in a political robocall—

(A) the 60-day period ending on the date of any general, special, or run-off election for the office sought by such candidate; and

(B) the 30-day period ending on the date of any primary or preference election, or any convention or caucus of a political party that has authority to nominate a candidate, for the office sought by such candidate.

(4) **OTHER DEFINITIONS.**—The terms "candidate" and "Federal office" have the respective meanings given such terms under section 301 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 431).

SEC. 4. REGULATION OF POLITICAL ROBOCALLS.

It shall be unlawful for any person during the specified period to make a political robocall or to cause a political robocall to be made—

(1) to any person during the period beginning at 9 p.m. and ending at 8 a.m. in the place which the call is directed;

(2) to the same telephone number more than twice on the same day;

(3) without disclosing, at the beginning of the call—

(A) that the call is a recorded message; and

(B) the identity of the person making the call or causing the call to be made; or

(4) without transmitting the telephone number and the name of the person making the political robocall or causing the political robocall to be made to the caller identification service of the recipient.

SEC. 5. ENFORCEMENT.

(a) **ENFORCEMENT BY FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Any person aggrieved by a violation of section 4 may file a complaint with the Federal Election Commission under rules similar to the rules under section 309(a) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 437g(a)).

(2) **CIVIL PENALTY.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—If the Federal Election Commission or any court determines that there has been a violation of section 4, there shall be imposed a civil penalty of not more than \$1,000 per violation.

(B) **WILLFUL VIOLATIONS.**—In the case the Federal Election Commission or any court determines that there has been a knowing or willful violation of section 4, the amount of any civil penalty under subparagraph (A) for such violation may be increased to not more than 300 percent of the amount under subparagraph (A).

(b) **PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION.**—Any person may bring in an appropriate district court of the United States an action based on a violation of section 4 to enjoin such violation without regard to whether such person has filed a complaint with the Federal Election Commission.

By Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. KYL):

S. 1080. A bill to clarify the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior with respect to the C.C. Cragin Dam and Reservoir, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I am pleased to be joined by my colleague, Senator KYL, in introducing a bill that would clarify the jurisdiction of the

Bureau of Reclamation over program activities associated with the C.C. Cragin Project in northern Arizona. A companion measure was introduced last month by Congresswoman ANN KIRKPATRICK from Arizona.

Pursuant to the Arizona Water Settlements Act of 2004, AWSA, Congress authorized the Secretary of the Interior to accept from the Salt River Project, SRP, title of the C.C. Cragin Dam and Reservoir for the express use of the Salt River Federal Reclamation Project. While it's clear that Congress intended to transfer jurisdiction of the Cragin Project to the Department of Interior, and in particular, the Bureau of Reclamation, the lands underlying the Project are technically located within the Coconino National Forest and the Tonto National Forest. This has resulted in a disagreement between the Bureau of Reclamation and the National Forest Service concerning jurisdiction over the operation and management activities of the Cragin Project.

For more than two years, SRP and Reclamation have attempted to reach an agreement with the Forest Service that recognizes Reclamation's paramount jurisdiction over the Cragin Project. Unfortunately, the Forest Service maintains that this technical ambiguity under the AWSA implies they have a regulatory role in approving Cragin Project operations and maintenance.

Speedy resolution of this jurisdictional issue is urgently needed in order to address repairs and other operational needs of the Cragin Project, including planning for the future water needs of the City of Payson and other northern Arizona communities. This clarification would simply provide Reclamation with the oversight responsibility that Congress originally intended. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 152—TO AMEND S. RES. 73 TO INCREASE FUNDING FOR THE SPECIAL RESERVE

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

S. RES. 152

Resolved,

SECTION 1. SPECIAL RESERVE FUNDING.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 20(a) of S. Res. 73 (111th Congress) is amended by striking "\$4,375,000" and inserting "\$4,875,000".

(b) **AGGREGATES.**—The additional funds provided by the amendment made by subsection (a) shall not be considered to be subject to the 89 percent limitation on Special Reserves found on page 2 of Committee Report 111-14, accompanying S. Res. 73.

SENATE RESOLUTION 153—EX-PRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE ON THE RESTITUTION OF OR COMPENSATION FOR PROPERTY SEIZED DURING THE NAZI AND COMMUNIST ERAS

Mr. NELSON of Florida (for himself and Mr. CARDIN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 153

Whereas many Eastern European countries were dominated for parts of the last century by Nazi or Communist regimes, without the consent of their people;

Whereas victims under the Nazi regime included individuals persecuted or targeted for persecution by the Nazi or Nazi-allied governments based on their religious, ethnic, or cultural identity, as well as their political beliefs, sexual orientation, or disability;

Whereas the Nazi regime and the authoritarian and totalitarian regimes that emerged in Eastern Europe after World War II perpetuated the wrongful and unjust confiscation of property belonging to the victims of Nazi persecution, including real property, personal property, and financial assets;

Whereas communal and religious property was an early target of the Nazi regime and, by expropriating churches, synagogues and other community-controlled property, the Nazis denied religious communities the temporal facilities that held those communities together;

Whereas after World War II, Communist regimes expanded the systematic expropriation of communal and religious property in an effort to eliminate the influence of religion;

Whereas many insurance companies that issued policies in pre-World War II Eastern Europe were nationalized or had their subsidiary assets nationalized by Communist regimes;

Whereas such nationalized companies and those with nationalized subsidiaries have generally not paid the proceeds or compensation due on pre-war policies, because control of those companies or their Eastern European subsidiaries had passed to their respective governments;

Whereas Eastern European countries involved in these nationalizations have not participated in a compensation process for Holocaust-era insurance policies for victims of Nazi persecution;

Whereas the protection of and respect for private property rights is a basic principle for all democratic governments that operate according to the rule of law;

Whereas the rule of law and democratic norms require that the activity of governments and their administrative agencies be exercised in accordance with the laws passed by their parliaments or legislatures, and such laws themselves must be consistent with international human rights standards;

Whereas in July 2001, the Paris Declaration of the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) Parliamentary Assembly noted that the process of restitution, compensation, and material reparations of victims of Nazi persecution has not been pursued with the same degree of comprehensiveness by all of the OSCE participating states;

Whereas the OSCE participating states have agreed to achieve or maintain full recognition and protection of all types of property, including private property and the right to prompt, just, and effective compensation for private property that is taken for public use;

Whereas the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly has called on the participating states to ensure that they implement appropriate legislation to secure the restitution of or compensation for property losses of victims of Nazi persecution, including communal organizations and institutions, irrespective of the current citizenship or place of residence of the victims, their heirs, or the relevant successors to communal property;

Whereas Congress passed resolutions in the 104th and 105th Congresses that emphasized the longstanding support of the United States for the restitution of or compensation for property wrongly confiscated during the Nazi and Communist eras;

Whereas certain post-Communist countries in Europe have taken steps toward compensating victims of Nazi persecution whose property was confiscated by the Nazis or their allies and collaborators during World War II or subsequently seized by Communist governments;

Whereas at the 1998 Washington Conference on Holocaust-Era Assets, 44 countries adopted the Principles on Nazi-Confiscated Art to guide the restitution of looted artwork and cultural property;

Whereas the Government of Lithuania has promised to adopt an effective legal framework to provide for the restitution of or compensation for wrongly confiscated communal property, but so far has not done so;

Whereas successive governments in Poland have promised to adopt an effective general property compensation law, but the current government has yet to adopt one;

Whereas the legislation providing for the restitution of or compensation for wrongly confiscated property in Europe has, in various instances, not always been implemented in an effective, transparent, and timely manner;

Whereas such legislation is of the utmost importance in returning or compensating property wrongfully seized by totalitarian or authoritarian governments to its rightful owners;

Whereas compensation and restitution programs can never bring back to Holocaust survivors what was taken from them, or in any way make up for their suffering; and

Whereas there are Holocaust survivors, now in the twilight of their lives, who are impoverished and in urgent need of assistance, lacking the resources to support basic needs, including adequate shelter, food, or medical care: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) appreciates the efforts of those European countries that have enacted legislation for the restitution of or compensation for private, communal, and religious property wrongly confiscated during the Nazi or Communist eras, and urges each of those countries to ensure that the legislation is effectively and justly implemented;

(2) welcomes the efforts of many post-Communist countries to address the complex and difficult question of the status of confiscated properties, and urges those countries to ensure that their restitution or compensation programs are implemented in a timely, non-discriminatory manner;

(3) urges the Government of Poland and the governments of other countries in Europe that have not already done so to immediately enact fair, comprehensive, non-discriminatory, and just legislation so that victims of Nazi persecution (or the heirs or successors of such persons) who had their private property looted and wrongly confiscated by the Nazis during World War II and subsequently seized by a Communist government are able to obtain either restitution of their property or, where restitution is not possible, fair compensation;

(4) urges the Government of Lithuania and the governments of other countries in Europe that have not already done so to immediately enact fair, comprehensive, non-discriminatory, and just legislation so that communities that had communal and religious property looted and wrongly confiscated by the Nazis during World War II and subsequently seized by a Communist government (or the relevant successors to such property or the relevant foundations) are able to obtain either restitution of their property or, where restitution is not possible, fair compensation;

(5) urges the countries of Europe which have not already done so to ensure that all such restitution and compensation legislation is established in accordance with principles of justice and provides a simple, transparent, and prompt process, so that it results in a tangible benefit to those surviving victims of Nazi persecution who suffered from the unjust confiscation of their property, many of whom are well into their senior years;

(6) calls on the President and the Secretary of State to engage in an open dialogue with leaders of those countries that have not already enacted such legislation to support the adoption of legislation requiring the fair, comprehensive, and nondiscriminatory restitution of or compensation for private, communal, and religious property that was seized and confiscated during the Nazi and Communist eras; and

(7) welcomes the decision by the Government of the Czech Republic to host in June 2009 an international conference for governments and non-governmental organizations to continue the work done at the 1998 Washington Conference on Holocaust-Era Assets, which will—

(A) address the issues of restitution of or compensation for real property, personal property (including art and cultural property), and financial assets wrongfully confiscated by the Nazis or their allies and collaborators and subsequently wrongfully confiscated by Communist regimes;

(B) review issues related to the opening of archives and the work of historical commissions, review progress made, and focus on the next steps required on these issues; and

(C) examine social welfare issues related to the needs of Holocaust survivors, and identify methods and resources to meet to such needs.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, next month, to mark the conclusion of its term in the presidency of the European Union, the Czech Republic will host what will be an historic gathering in Prague: the International Conference on Holocaust Era Assets. The Prague Conference will build on the important work done more than 10 years ago at the Conference on Holocaust Era Assets held here in Washington. The Washington Conference laid the foundation for important agreements entered into by countries and private companies that resulted in a number of restitution and compensation programs throughout Western Europe that have paid hundreds of millions of dollars to Holocaust victims and their heirs.

The Prague Conference hopefully will serve as a catalyst for the next, and probably final, phase of restitution and compensation programs for Holocaust survivors and their heirs. One of the Prague Conference's main focuses will be how to advance restitution for real