

S. 2747

At the request of Mr. BINGAMAN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2747, a bill to enhance energy efficiency and conserve oil and natural gas, and for other purposes.

S. 3238

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BOND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3238, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the establishment of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the Jet Propulsion Laboratory.

S. 3654

At the request of Mr. JEFFORDS, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3654, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to allow a credit against income tax, or, in the alternative, a special depreciation allowance, for reuse and recycling property, to provide for tax-exempt financing of recycling equipment, and for other purposes.

S. 3696

At the request of Mr. BROWNBACK, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3696, a bill to amend the Revised Statutes of the United States to prevent the use of the legal system in a manner that extorts money from State and local governments, and the Federal Government, and inhibits such governments' constitutional actions under the first, tenth, and fourteenth amendments.

S. 3718

At the request of Mr. ALLEN, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3718, a bill to increase the safety of swimming pools and spas by requiring the use of proper anti-entrapment drain covers and pool and spa drainage systems, by establishing a swimming pool safety grant program administered by the Consumer Product Safety Commission to encourage States to improve their pool and spa safety laws and to educate the public about pool and spa safety, and for other purposes.

S. 3744

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HAGEL) were added as cosponsors of S. 3744, a bill to establish the Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Program.

S. 3791

At the request of Mrs. HUTCHISON, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. DAYTON) and the Senator from New York (Mrs. CLINTON) were added as cosponsors of S. 3791, a bill to require the provision of information to parents and adults concerning bacterial meningitis and the availability of a vaccination with respect to such disease.

S. 3795

At the request of Mr. SMITH, the name of the Senator from South Da-

kota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3795, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for a two-year moratorium on certain Medicare physician payment reductions for imaging services.

S. 3910

At the request of Mrs. CLINTON, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY), the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 3910, a bill to direct the Joint Committee on the Library to accept the donation of a bust depicting Sojourner Truth and to display the bust in a suitable location in the Capitol.

S. 3913

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. FEINGOLD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3913, a bill to amend title XXI of the Social Security Act to eliminate funding shortfalls for the State Children's Health Insurance Program (SCHIP) for fiscal year 2007.

S. 3991

At the request of Mr. CONRAD, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3991, a bill to provide emergency agricultural disaster assistance, and for other purposes.

S. 4014

At the request of Mr. LUGAR, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mrs. HUTCHISON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4014, a bill to endorse further enlargement of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and to facilitate the timely admission of Albania, Croatia, Georgia, and Macedonia to NATO, and for other purposes.

S. 4042

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HAGEL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4042, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit disruptions of funerals of members or former members of the Armed Forces.

S. 4046

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. GREGG), the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) and the Senator from New York (Mrs. CLINTON) were added as cosponsors of S. 4046, a bill to extend oversight and accountability related to United States reconstruction funds and efforts in Iraq by extending the termination date of the Office of the Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction.

S. CON. RES. 101

At the request of Mr. REID, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 101, a concurrent resolution condemning the repression of the Iranian Baha'i community and calling for the emancipation of Iranian Baha'is.

AMENDMENT NO. 5123

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the names of the Senator from Arizona

(Mr. MCCAIN), the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. GREGG), the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) and the Senator from New York (Mrs. CLINTON) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 5123 proposed to H.R. 5385, an act making appropriations for Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 5124

At the request of Mr. REID, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. ENSIGN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 5124 intended to be proposed to H.R. 5385, an act making appropriations for Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 5126

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, her name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 5126 proposed to H.R. 5385, an act making appropriations for Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 5128

At the request of Mr. AKAKA, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 5128 proposed to H.R. 5385, an act making appropriations for Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 5135

At the request of Mrs. HUTCHISON, the names of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAIG) and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLARD) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 5135 proposed to H.R. 5385, an act making appropriations for Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. INHOFE:

S. 4048. A bill to prohibit Federal funding for the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, the Paris-based Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, which receives 25 percent of its budget from the U.S., has used U.S. taxpayer money in turn to encourage and support higher taxes on the U.S. taxpayer, in addition to its support of U.N. global tax schemes.

The OECD has endorsed and encouraged higher taxes, new taxes, and global taxes no fewer than 24 times in reports with titles such as "Towards Global Tax Cooperation," in which the OECD identifies 35 nations guilty of "harmful tax competition."

They have advocated that the U.S. adopt a costly and bureaucratic value added tax, a 40-cent increase in the gas tax, a carbon tax, a fertilizer tax, ending the deductibility of State and local taxes from Federal taxes, new taxes at the State level, and a host of other new and innovative taxes on U.S. citizens.

It is not only the recommending of higher taxes which concerns us; the ultimate concern is the movement towards undermining U.S. sovereignty. Ecogroups such as the Friends of the Earth want the OECD to declare that dam-building for flood control and electronic power is unacceptable as "sustainable energy." In May, 2005 the OECD ministers endorsed a proposal at the U.N. to create a system of global taxes.

The OECD has stated explicitly that low-tax policies "unfairly erode the tax bases of other countries and distort the location of capital and services." What we have here are Paris-based bureaucrats seeking to protect high-tax welfare states from the free market.

That is why the OECD goes on to say that free-market tax competition "may hamper the application of progressive tax rates and the achievement of redistributive goals." Clearly, free market tax competition makes it harder to implement socialistic welfare states. The free market evidently hasn't been fair to socialistic welfare states. Well, it's a good thing that they have the OECD and nearly \$100 million in U.S. taxpayer money to protect them.

Noted economist Walter Williams clearly sees the direction in which this is headed when he says that "the bottom line agenda for the OECD is to establish a tax cartel where nations get together and collude on taxes." Treasury Secretary Paul O'Neill seconded that when he said that he was "troubled by the underlying premise that low tax rates are somehow suspect and by the notion that any country should interfere in any other country's" tax policy. And John Bolton argues that the OECD's approach "represents a kind of worldwide centralization of governments and interest groups." Who do you think bears the costs for all this? Mr. Bolton answers and you probably guessed it—the United States.

America's proud history of independence was driven in no small part by the desire for sovereignty over taxation powers. In this context, it makes no sense to relegate our sovereignty over tax policy, in any way, to international bureaucrats.

It is very simple. U.S. taxpayers are being forced to fund a bunch of international bureaucrats who write, speak, organize, and advocate in support of higher taxes, global taxes, and the gradual erosion of American sovereignty over its domestic fiscal policies. I think that most Americans would be outraged to learn that they are forced to subsidize these types of activities with their tax dollars. I think that they shouldn't have to any

longer. That's why I am introducing legislation today to remove the United State's contributions to the OECD. I ask you to join me in doing so, as the following individuals and their respective organizations have joined in helping us to combat un-American policies emanating from the OECD in the past: Andrew F. Quinlan, President, Center for Freedom and Prosperity Foundation; Daniel J. Mitchell, Senior Fellow, The Heritage Foundation; Veronique de Rugy, Research Fellow, American Enterprise Institute; John Berthoud, President, National Taxpayers Union; Grover Norquist, President, Americans for Tax Reform; Tom Giovanetti, President, Institute for Policy Innovation; Karen Kerrigan, President and CEO, Small Business and Entrepreneurship Council; Doug Bandow, Vice President of Policy, Citizen Outreach; Roland Boucher, Chairman, United Californians for Tax Reform; Daniel Clifton, Executive Director, American Shareholders Association; Rick Durham, President, Tennessee Tax Revolt, Inc.; Richard Falknor, Executive Vice President, Maryland Taxpayers Association; Kerri Houston, Vice President of Policy, Frontiers of Freedom; David A. Keene, Chairman, American Conservative Union; Matt Kibbe, President and CEO, FreedomWorks; Thomas P. Kilgannon, President, Freedom Alliance; Michelle Korsmo, Vice President, Americans for Prosperity Foundation; Charles W. Jarvis, Chairman, USA Next; James L. Martin, President, 60 Plus Association; Chuck Muth, President, Citizen Outreach; Karl Peterjohn, Executive Director, Kansas Taxpayers Network; George Pieler, Senior Fellow, Institute for Policy Innovation; John Pugsley, Chairman, The Sovereign Society; Don Racheter, President, Public Interest Institute; Amy Ridenour, President, The National Center for Public Policy Research; Terrence Scanlon, President, Capital Research Center; Thomas Schatz, President, Council for Citizens Against Government Waste; Bill Sizemore, Executive Director, Oregon Taxpayers United; David M. Stanley, Chairman, Iowans for Tax Relief; David M. Strom, President, Taxpayers League of Minnesota; Henry L. Thaxton, Director, West Virginians Against Government Waste; Pat Toomey, President, Club for Growth; Lewis K. Uhler, President, National Tax Limitation Committee; and Paul M. Weyrich, National Chairman, Coalitions for America.

By Mr. SPECTER:

S. 4051. A bill to provide sufficient resources to permit electronic surveillance of United States persons for foreign intelligence purposes to be conducted pursuant to individualized court-based orders for calls originating in the United States, to provide additional resources to enhance oversight and streamline the procedures of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978, to ensure review of the Terrorist Surveillance Program by the

United States Supreme Court, and for other purposes; read the first time.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I have sought recognition to introduce legislation which I have captioned as the "Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Oversight and Resource Enactment Act of 2006." This is a modification of legislation which had been introduced by the Senator from California, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and myself and passed out of the Judiciary Committee.

If it is in accordance with the rules, I ask that this bill be held at the desk.

The purpose of this legislation is to provide for oversight on the administration's electronic surveillance program which has been in effect for many years and which was publicly disclosed in mid-December last year. We now are at a state where the provisions of earlier legislation which I introduced, which would call for judicial review by the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court, are no longer necessary. Events have overtaken the situation, with litigation having been started in a number of district courts, and a decision has come out of the U.S. district court in Detroit. The issue is now on appeal to the Sixth Circuit, and there is no longer any need to provide for a referral to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court because the matter is now in litigation and will be carried through on the appellate process.

The legislation which I am introducing tracks the Feinstein-Specter bill in that it provides additional resources to the administration. It expands the time when the administration can get approval for an electronic surveillance that has already been accomplished. With these additional resources, I am advised that the NSA will be in a position to have individual warrants for all calls which originate in the United States and go overseas. The bill does not touch the calls which originate overseas and come through checkpoints or transmission in the United States and go back overseas, where both the point of origin and the point of conclusion is overseas. And, we do not deal with calls which originate overseas and come into the United States.

The President has contended that notwithstanding the provisions of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act that it is the exclusive way to get a wiretap warrant, he has article II power. And, there will be a test of that in the court system, which is now underway. That test will involve what the courts have said is the balancing test: the invasion of privacy versus the value for law enforcement and for national security. So that as to calls to repeat—when they originate overseas and come into the United States, that will be the issue which will remain to be tested.

This proposal does not deal with the existing language that the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act is the exclusive remedy, nor does it deal with any assertion about the article II power of the President.

It has been my view, expressed on the floor on a number of occasions, that the article II power is what it is, congressional power is what it is, and if there is genuine article II power, then it supersedes an act of Congress because the Constitution trumps an act of Congress. This legislation does not deal with those issues which had created what I thought was a needless controversy.

The bill further provides that there will be review by the Supreme Court of the United States. I think there doubtless would be review by the Supreme Court as a matter of course, but in order not to take any chance on that, Congress has the authority to mandate review with the Supreme Court, and this bill does that.

In addition, the legislation provides for expedited review so that there will be a judicial determination as to the constitutionality of what the President has done with respect to the calls originating overseas and ending in the United States. I think this bill is a significant advance in protecting civil liberties by having individualized warrants on calls which originate in the United States and which go overseas.

We have had this electronic surveillance in existence for a long time. The effort which I have made has been to have it subjected to judicial review, and it is my hope that this stripped-down legislation, which does enhance civil liberties by providing for individual warrants on calls originating in the United States and expedited review in the Federal courts and expedited review by the Supreme Court, would be acceptable.

We have time yet in this session this year to legislate on this important subject.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SPECTER. I yield.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Through the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I was trying, as the Senator from Pennsylvania spoke, to figure out exactly what bill it is he is speaking of. I gather this is his bill, not our bill, on which he is adding some of our bill's provisions, but he leaves out the critical part, which is reinforcing the exclusive authority of FISA; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, the exclusive authority of FISA remains. This bill does not touch that. FISA is now the law of the land, and FISA says that it is the exclusive remedy for wiretapping. This legislation which I am introducing does not alter that, so it remains as provided in FISA that the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act is the exclusive remedy for wiretapping.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. If I may, a second question: Will this bill allow the President to use his plenary authority to wiretap outside of FISA, first, and sec-

ondly, will it allow for program authority for wiretaps?

Mr. SPECTER. It does not deal with program authority at all. That was in the original legislation that I introduced as a way of getting the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court to review the program. But this does not deal with that, and it does not give the President any enhanced authority at all to conduct warrantless wiretaps. The bill doesn't deal with that.

Whatever authority the President has under article II, he has. What this bill does is submit for expedited review by the Supreme Court a determination as to whether the President has article II power to have a warrantless wiretap with a call that originates overseas and ends in the United States.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Again, through the Chair, if the Senator will put up with this for a moment more, is that to handle the switching issue, or would this apply to all calls coming in from outside the United States are exempt?

Mr. SPECTER. To repeat, the bill I am introducing does not touch that point. The bill I am introducing leaves the status quo on that point, and that is where some contend that it is illegal to have a wiretap where the call originates outside the United States and comes inside. The contention is made that it's governed by the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act and is, therefore, illegal. The President has a different argument. He is asserting article II power as Commander in Chief, and he says that his article II power, constitutional power, supersedes or trumps a statute. Whether he is right or wrong depends upon a judicial interpretation. Only the court can weigh, as the existing law is in this area, whether the importance of national security outweighs the invasion of privacy, and that determination is reserved for the Federal courts.

We are now having that determination in the Detroit case, *ACLU v. NSA*, where the district judge says it is unconstitutional and the Sixth Circuit now has taken the case. They have issued a stay, in effect, but they will take up the case on the merits.

Once the litigation is this far advanced, we are not now in the situation we were in last December when the Judiciary Committee, as the Senator from California knows, had four hearings and I had a bill to submit to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court. That is bypassed now. Events have overtaken it.

This will provide for judicial review. It is my thought—and the Senator from California and I have talked about this again and again and have worked on her bill which I supported, voted out of committee 10 to 8 with 2 Republicans and 8 Democrats—this will expedite a determination as to whether all those calls originating overseas and coming in are or are not constitutionally tapped. And, it will help out with what the Senator from California has been the leader on—and that is to

have individualized warrants for calls originating in the United States. That is a big advance on civil liberties if those calls are not tapped without a warrant.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I thank the Senator. He has been a very distinguished chairman of the committee. This is an issue in which, as a member of the Intelligence Committee and Judiciary Committee, I have had an intense interest. The Senator from Pennsylvania recognizes that. I appreciate that.

I am unsure whether this bill is for the purpose of judicial review of the President's article II authority—I think I understand what the Senator is doing. He is essentially exempting all those calls which come into the United States, not calls from point A to point B in the United States. I think that bears further discussion, but I trust no action will be taken on this bill in this session but that the Senator from Pennsylvania is submitting it as a marker for next year.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, it would be my hope that we could act on it this session. I say that, subject to review by the Senator from California and by other Members and by the House of Representatives. The Senator from California and I and others have thought about this issue long and hard. This bill is a real effort to try to accommodate all of the concerns the Senator from California has raised. That is to maintain the status of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act as the exclusive way to wiretap. That stands.

There is no statement about the authority of the President under article II, which had been objected to before. As I say, whatever the constitutional authority is, it is, regardless of what the bill says, but this bill says nothing about that. It says nothing.

The Senator from California and I have wanted to have individualized warrants wherever we could get them, and now the Senator from California took the lead on this. She has had access to this program, where I have not, because she is on the Intelligence Committee. It is anomalous that the chairman of the Judiciary Committee would not know the program, but I respect the division which gives that intelligence to the oversight committee. But she and I both wanted to have individualized warrants everywhere if we could get them. And, now we know we can get them on calls originating in the United States if we add the resources that were in the legislation crafted initially by the Senator from California, which I joined, which passed out of committee and onto the floor. And it does not deal with the ones overseas into the United States. Whatever authority the President has on that, he is going to have to assert in Federal court and satisfy ultimately the Supreme Court that he has that article II power. My view is the sooner we have this determination, the better off we are.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I thank the chairman. I would like to look very closely

at this bill. I am very reluctant to move right now. You have mentioned the case percolating up through the courts now. I am really unsure why passage of this bill now would achieve anything. It seems to me it would be better to wait and see what the court does. I would appreciate your response to that.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I am glad to respond, and I thank the Senator from California for the question. It would achieve individualized review of warrants on calls originating in the United States, and there are a lot of them. How many there are, I don't know, but the NSA officials have told us that if we give them the additional resources, which was suggested originally by the Senator from California and which I concur in on the Feinstein-Specter bill, that they could have individualized warrants. And, I think that would be a big step forward on civil rights.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Except what you are doing is effectively exempting, then, a call from outside into the United States because of the change in technology.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, my bill does not exempt them. My bill just doesn't deal with them. Some say that FISA controls them and, therefore, they are illegal. The President says: No, he has article II power. And the only way that controversy can be resolved is in a Federal court, which will weigh them. And the Federal court in Detroit weighed them and said it was unconstitutional. And the Sixth Circuit has said they will review it. In the meantime, the program stands. But as the program stands, all of these warrantless wiretaps are going on and on and on. And we go one step further. We make sure the Supreme Court will take the case. We also have power in the Congress to expedite the review, set a timetable to get it done faster.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I will be very interested to look at the bill, and I thank you very much for this dialog. And this completes my questions. Thank you.

Mr. SPECTER. I thank the Senator from California for the colloquy which has further explained the bill.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 612—DESIGNATING THE WEEK OF FEBRUARY 5 THROUGH FEBRUARY 9, 2007, AS “NATIONAL TEEN DATING VIOLENCE AWARENESS AND PREVENTION WEEK”

Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, and Mr. MENENDEZ) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 612

Whereas 1 in 3 female teens in a dating relationship have feared for their physical safety;

Whereas 1 in 2 teens in serious relationships have compromised their beliefs to please their partner;

Whereas nearly 1 in 5 teens who have been in a serious relationship said their boyfriend or girlfriend would threaten to hurt themselves or their partner if there was a break-up;

Whereas 1 in 5 teens in a serious relationship report they have been hit, slapped, or pushed by a partner;

Whereas more than 1 in 4 teens have been in a relationship where their partner verbally abuses them;

Whereas 13 percent of Hispanic teens reported that hitting a partner was permissible;

Whereas 29 percent of girls who have been in a relationship said they have been pressured to have sex or engage in sex they did not want;

Whereas nearly 50 percent of girls worry that their partner would break up with them if they did not agree to engage in sex;

Whereas Native American women experience higher rates of interpersonal violence than any other population group;

Whereas violent relationships in adolescence can have serious ramifications for victims who are at higher risk for substance abuse, eating disorders, risky sexual behavior, suicide, and adult revictimization;

Whereas the severity of violence among intimate partners has been shown to increase if the pattern has been established in adolescence;

Whereas 81 percent of parents surveyed either believe dating violence is not an issue or admit they do not know if it is an issue; and

Whereas the establishment of the National Teen Dating Violence Awareness and Prevention Week will benefit schools, communities, and families regardless of socio-economic status, race, or sex; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the week of February 5 through February 9, 2007, as “National Teen Dating Violence Awareness and Prevention Week”; and

(2) calls upon the people of the United States, high schools, law enforcement, State and local officials, and interested groups, to observe National Teen Dating Violence Awareness and Prevention Week with appropriate programs and activities that promote awareness and prevention of the crime of teen dating violence in their communities.

SENATE RESOLUTION 613—HONORING THE LIFE AND WORK OF WILLIAM WILBERFORCE AND COMMEMORATING THE 200TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ABOLITION OF THE SLAVE TRADE IN GREAT BRITAIN

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

Whereas William Wilberforce, born August 25, 1759, used his position as a Member of Parliament in the House of Commons to stop the slave trade in Great Britain, proclaiming, “I [will] never rest until I have effected [slavery’s] abolition.”;

Whereas William Wilberforce displayed remarkable perseverance in answering the call of social justice and fought the slave trade in Great Britain and slavery itself for 46 years, despite the national and personal financial interests aligned against him, the public criticism and slander he endured, and the stress and pain placed on his family;

Whereas William Wilberforce rested his political career on the ideals of stewardship, respect for the rights of others, advancing the views of others, and promoting the hap-

piness of others, and proclaimed, “Let every one . . . regulate his conduct by the golden rule . . . and the path of duty will be clear before him.”;

Whereas William Wilberforce defended the rights of slaves who had no voice in the legislature of Great Britain and committed himself to sweeping social reform in his country;

Whereas William Wilberforce joined with Sir Thomas Fowell Buxton, Thomas Clarkson, Olaudah Equiano, Harriet Martineau, Hannah More, and other great abolitionists in Great Britain;

Whereas William Wilberforce inspired abolitionists in the United States, including William Lloyd Garrison, John Greenleaf Whittier, Ralph Waldo Emerson, Henry David Thoreau, and Harriet Beecher Stowe;

Whereas William Wilberforce also influenced John Quincy Adams, James Monroe, John Jay, Abraham Lincoln, and Benjamin Franklin, along with many leaders in the African-American community, among them William Wells Brown, Paul Cuffe, and Benjamin Hughes;

Whereas Frederick Douglass said, “it was the faithful, persistent and enduring enthusiasm of . . . William Wilberforce . . . and [his] noble co-workers, that finally thawed the British heart into sympathy for the slave, and moved the strong arm of the government in mercy to put an end to his bondage.”; and

Whereas March 25, 2007 marks the 200th anniversary of the abolition of the slave trade in Great Britain: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) honors the life and work of William Wilberforce; and

(2) commemorates the 200th anniversary of the abolition of the slave trade in Great Britain and its impact on similar efforts in the United States.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 5137. Mr. OBAMA (for himself, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mrs. BOXER, and Ms. LANDRIEU) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 5385, making appropriations for Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5138. Mr. OBAMA (for himself, Ms. MIKULSKI, and Ms. LANDRIEU) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 5385, *supra*.

SA 5139. Mr. OBAMA (for himself, Ms. MIKULSKI, and Ms. LANDRIEU) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 5385, *supra*; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5140. Mr. FEINGOLD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 5385, *supra*; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5141. Mrs. HUTCHISON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 5385, *supra*.

SA 5142. Mr. KERRY (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. AKAKA, Mrs. BOXER, and Mr. JEFFORDS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 5385, *supra*.

SA 5143. Mr. ALLEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 5385, *supra*.

SA 5144. Mr. CONRAD (for himself, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. NELSON, of Nebraska, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. THUNE, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. ENZI, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. REID, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. OBAMA, Mr.