

member received immediately before receiving the wound or injury, to continue the combat zone tax exclusion for the member during the recovery period, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. SNOWE:

S. 462. A bill to deauthorize the project for navigation, Tenants Harbor, Maine; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Ms. SNOWE:

S. 463. A bill to deauthorize the project for navigation, Northeast Harbor, Maine; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Ms. SNOWE:

S. 464. A bill to modify the project for navigation, Union River, Maine; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Ms. SNOWE:

S. 465. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to carry out a project for the mitigation of shore damage attributable to the project for navigation, Saco River, Maine; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Ms. SNOWE:

S. 466. A bill to deauthorize a certain portion of the project for navigation, Rockland Harbor, Maine; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. DODD (for himself, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. CORZINE, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. REED, Mr. LUGAR, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. NELSON of Nebraska, Mr. CARPER, Mrs. DOLE, Mr. CHAMBLISS, and Mr. LAUTENBERG):

S. 467. A bill to extend the applicability of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

#### ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 8

At the request of Mr. ENSIGN, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. MARTINEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 8, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit taking minors across State lines in circumvention of laws requiring the involvement of parents in abortion decisions.

S. 147

At the request of Mr. AKAKA, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 147, a bill to express the policy of the United States regarding the United States relationship with Native Hawaiians and to provide a process for the recognition by the United States of the Native Hawaiian governing entity.

S. 241

At the request of Ms. SNOWE, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. CHAFEE), the Senator from New York (Mrs. CLINTON) and the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. DAYTON) were added as cosponsors of S. 241, a bill to amend section 254 of the Communications Act of 1934 to provide that funds received as universal service contributions and the universal service support programs established pursuant to that section are not subject to certain provisions of title 31, United States Code, commonly known as the Antideficiency Act.

S. 285

At the request of Mr. BOND, the names of the Senator from California

(Mrs. FEINSTEIN) and the Senator from New York (Mrs. CLINTON) were added as cosponsors of S. 285, a bill to reauthorize the Children's Hospitals Graduate Medical Education Program.

S. 328

At the request of Mr. CRAIG, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. BROWNBACK), the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. JEFFORDS) were added as cosponsors of S. 328, a bill to facilitate the sale of United States agricultural products to Cuba, as authorized by the Trade Sanctions Reform and Export Enhancement Act of 2000.

S. 360

At the request of Ms. SNOWE, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 360, a bill to amend the Coastal Zone Management Act.

S. 361

At the request of Ms. SNOWE, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 361, a bill to develop and maintain an integrated system of ocean and coastal observations for the Nation's coasts, oceans and Great Lakes, improve warnings of tsunamis and other natural hazards, enhance homeland security, support maritime operations, and for other purposes.

S. 454

At the request of Mr. PRYOR, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mrs. LINCOLN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 454, a bill to release to the State of Arkansas a reversionary interest in Camp Joseph T. Robinson.

S. RES. 63

At the request of Mr. HAGEL, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 63, a resolution calling for an investigation into the assassination of Prime Minister Rafiq Hariri and urging steps to pressure the Government of Syria to withdraw from Lebanon.

At the request of Mr. BIDEN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. COLEMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 63, *supra*.

#### STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. FEINGOLD):

S. 457. A bill to require the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to issue guidance for, and provide oversight of, the management of micropurchases made with Governmentwide commercial purchase cards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise today with my colleague, Senator RUSS FEINGOLD, to introduce the "Purchase Card Waste Elimination Act of 2005," to help eliminate wasteful spending that can occur when the Government neglects to pay attention to where it makes its purchases.

Last year, the Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs, now the Com-

mittee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, explored the Government's use of purchase cards and we learned about ways to save an estimated \$300 million annually through better management of purchase cards. Purchase cards are, in essence, credit cards that agencies give to its employees for the purpose of obtaining goods and services for the Federal Government. In fact, under Federal acquisition law, purchase cards are the Government's preferred method for making what are known as "micropurchases"—that is items costing \$2,500 or less. Although Government employees spend billions of dollars with purchase cards each year, Federal agencies do very little to analyze the items obtained with purchase cards in an attempt to get a better price for the Government.

The American people have the right to expect the Federal Government to spend their tax dollars carefully and wisely. While this is true at all times, it is never more so than today when the Government is running large budget deficits. The Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs has a special role to play in reducing wasteful spending, and I have made this role a priority at the Committee. This legislation is one aspect of our committee's efforts to reduce waste, fraud and abuse in Government spending.

Purchase cards came into Federal Government-wide use in 1989. They allow Government employees to easily and efficiently purchase routine items such as office supplies, computers and copying machines. While they are generally used for small purchases, they accounted for more than \$16 billion in Federal spending in 2003. In 1994, they accounted for only \$1 billion.

This increase in use is good news because it means that more Government spending is being executed in an expeditious manner that reduces red tape and saves on administrative costs. At the same time, the use of purchase cards should enable us to conduct comprehensive analysis of how this \$16 billion is spent and where. This information could be analyzed and used to further reduce the Federal Government's costs. At present, however, this is not being done.

Last year, Senator FEINGOLD, Representative SCHAKOWSKY and I released a report by the Government Accountability Office identifying missed opportunities for savings. According to that report the missed savings were due to both a lack of training and a lack of management attention and oversight. According to GAO, too many purchase cardholders failed to obtain readily available discounts on purchase cards buys. Even where the Government and the vendor had negotiated a discounted price for items through the General Services Administration schedules, Federal employees with purchase cards failed to take advantage of the discounted prices and their managers were completely unaware of those lost

opportunities to save. One example of a repeated lost opportunity to save was the Department of the Interior's purchases of printer toner cartridges. One GSA schedule vendor offered the toner for only \$24.99. Yet, of the Department's 791 toner cartridge purchases, only two were at or below that price. Some cartridges were purchased for \$34.99, which is about 40 percent higher than the GSA schedule price.

In addition to failing to use available schedule prices, GAO found that agencies failed to negotiate lower prices with vendors with whom they frequently used purchase cards. In the private sector, most companies that use the same vendor for a lot of purchases would negotiate some sort of volume discount. But before they would attempt to negotiate savings the company would first need to understand its spending patterns. Because Federal agencies lack a comprehensive understanding of where its employees are using Government purchase cards, Federal agencies are unable to replicate this practice.

At my request, GAO analyzed purchase card use at the six Federal agencies that account for 85 percent of Government purchase card usage. As a result of that analysis, GAO estimated that \$300 million per year could be saved if agencies improved their purchase card buying practices.

Under our legislation, the Office of Management and Budget, OMB, would direct agencies to better train their cardholders and more effectively analyze their spending data. It would also direct the GSA to increase its efforts to improve its efforts to secure discounts with vendors and provide agencies with more guidance to reduce wasteful spending.

The American people have the right to expect the Federal Government to spend their tax dollars wisely. I urge our colleagues to cosponsor and support this legislation.

By Ms. SNOWE (for herself, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. JEFFORDS, and Mr. ROCKEFELLER):

S. 458. A bill to amend part A of title IV of the Social Security Act to give States the option to create a program that allows individuals receiving temporary assistance to needy families to obtain post-secondary or longer duration vocational education; to the Committee on Finance.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce "The Pathways to Self-Sufficiency Act of 2003." I am pleased to be joined in introducing this important legislation by my colleagues Senators BAUCUS, BINGAMAN, JEFFORDS and ROCKEFELLER.

This legislation is based upon the highly esteemed Maine program called "Parents as Scholars". This program, which uses State Maintenance of Effort, MOE, dollars to pay TANF-like benefits to those participating in post-secondary education, is a proven suc-

cess in my State and is a wonderful foundation for a national effort.

We all agree that the 1996 welfare reform effort changed the face of this Nation's welfare system to focus it on work. To that end, I believe that this legislation bolsters the emphasis on "work first". Like many of my colleagues, I agree that the shift in the focus from welfare to work was the right decision, and that work should be the top priority. However, for those TANF recipients who cannot find a good job that will put them on the road toward financial independence, education might well be the key to a successful future of self-sufficiency.

As we have seen in Maine, education has played a significant role in breaking the cycle of welfare and has given parents the skills necessary to find better paying jobs. And we all know that higher wages are the light at the end of the tunnel of public assistance.

"The Pathways to Self-Sufficiency Act of 2003" provides States with the option to allow individuals receiving Federal TANF assistance to obtain post-secondary or vocational education. This legislation would give States the ability to use Federal TANF dollars to give those who are participating in vocational or post-secondary education the same assistance as they would receive if they were working.

We all know that supports like income supplements, child care subsidies, and transportation assistance among others, are essential to a TANF recipient's ability to make a successful transition to work. The same is true for those engaged in longer term educational endeavors. This assistance is especially necessary for those who are undertaking the challenge and the financial responsibility of post-secondary education, in the hopes of increasing their earning potential and employability. The goal of this program is to give participants the tools necessary to succeed into the future so that they can become, and remain, self-sufficient.

Choosing to go to college requires motivation, and graduating from college requires a great deal of commitment and work—even for someone who isn't raising children and sustaining a family. These are significant challenges, and that's even before taking into consideration the cost associated with obtaining a Bachelor's degree. This legislation would provide those TANF recipients who have the ability and the will to go to college the assistance they need to sustain their families while they get a degree.

The value of promoting access to education in this manner to get people off public assistance is proven by the success of Maine's "Parents as Scholars", PaS, program. Maine's PaS graduates earn a median wage of \$11.71 per hour after graduation up from a median of \$8.00 per hour prior to entering college. When compared to the \$7.50 median hourly wage of welfare leavers in Maine who have not received a post-

secondary degree, PaS graduates are earning, on average, \$160 more per week. That translates into more than \$8,000 per year—a significant difference.

Furthermore, the median grade point average for PaS participants while in college was 3.4 percent, and a full 90 percent of PaS participants' GPA was over 3.0. These parents are giving their all to pull their families out of the cycle of welfare.

Recognizing that work is a priority under TANF, and building upon the successful Maine model, the "Pathways to Self-Sufficiency Act" requires that participants in post-secondary and vocational education also participate in work. During the first 2 years of their participation in these education programs, students must participate in a combination of study time, employment or work experience for at least 24 hours per week—the same hourly requirement that the President proposes in his welfare reauthorization proposal.

During the second 2 years—for those enrolled in a four year program—the participant must work at least 15 hours in addition to class and study time, or engage in a combination activities, including study time work or work experience, and training, for an average of 30 hours per week. And all the while, participants must maintain satisfactory academic progress as defined by their academic institution.

The bottom line is that if we expect parents to move from welfare to work and stay in the work force, we must give them the tools to find good jobs. For some people that means job training, for others that could mean dealing with a barrier like substance abuse or domestic violence, and for others, that might mean access to education that will secure them a good job and that will get them off and, importantly, keep them off of welfare.

The experience of several "Parents as Scholar" graduates were captured in a publication published by the Maine Equal Justice Partners, and their experiences are testament to the fact that this program is a critically important step in moving towards self-sufficiency. In this report one graduate said of her experience, "If it weren't for 'Parents as Scholars' I would never have been able to attend college, afford child care, or put food on the table. Today, I would most likely be stuck in a low-wage job I hated barely getting by . . . I can now give my children the future they deserve."

Another said, "By earning my Bachelor's degree, I have become self-sufficient. I was a waitress previously and would never have been able to support my daughter. I would encourage anyone to better their education if possible."

These are but a few comments from those who have benefited from access to post-secondary education. Giving States the option use Federal dollars to support these participants will make a tremendous difference in their ability

to sustain these programs which have proven results. In Maine, nearly 90 percent of working graduates have left TANF permanently and isn't that our ultimate goal?

I look forward to working with my colleagues to include this legislation in the upcoming welfare reauthorization. It is a critical piece of the effort to move people from welfare to work permanently and it has been missing from the federal program for too long.

By Mr. CHAMBLISS (for himself, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. LOTT, and Mr. COCHRAN):

S. 459. A bill to require a study and report regarding the designations and construction of a new interstate route from Savannah, Georgia to Knoxville, Tennessee; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, today we are introducing legislation, two bills that I hope will pave the way to correct a half a century of transportation inequity in the Southern United States.

First, I am introducing a bill, supported by Senators ISAKSON, LOTT, and COCHRAN, that proposes a new interstate highway, Interstate 14 or "I-14," linking Augusta, Macon and Columbus, GA connecting through Montgomery, AL and going all the way to Natchez, MS.

Second, my colleague from Georgia, Senator ISAKSON and I are proposing the creation of Interstate 3 or "I-3", linking Savannah and Augusta, GA to Knoxville, TN.

In the 108th Congress, Senator Miller and I introduced these bills. If passed, they would require the Secretary of Transportation to study and report to the appropriate committees of Congress, before December 31, 2005, the steps and estimated funding necessary to designate and construct these new interstate highways.

These proposals are multi-purpose plans. They would naturally improve the interconnectivity and highway safety for those in the Deep South. Also, they would help provide the badly needed economic development to areas of the South ignored by our current interstate grid, and improve the national defense highway linkage for which our interstate system was originally designed. In addition, they could help provide critical environmental improvements for the entire Sunbelt region by reducing the air pollution and traffic congestion in some of our major gridlocked southern cities.

The honorary name of the "I-14" plan helps to provide symbolic recognition to the promise of economic parity to freed slaves which was implied with the passage of the 14th Amendment in 1868. As the South struggled to overcome four years of devastating war and find a way to integrate the newly emancipated slaves into the full benefits of citizenship, Congress passed this amendment, guaranteeing equal rights for all Americans.

I am convinced that this area remains largely isolated from the economic expansion that transformed much of the rest of the South starting in the 60s. Many in this region still suffer from the lack of economic parity with America. Eighty percent of jobs in America are located within 10 miles of an interstate. In this case, there are regions where there is no interstate. It is my hope that the addition of I-14 will help bring and provide the promising economic development and much needed jobs to this region.

The 3rd Infantry Division Highway Initiative Act is named for the U.S. Army 3rd Infantry Division of Fort Stewart—division that served as the "Tip of the Spear" in the War on Terror in Iraq and whose soldiers conquered Najaf, seized Saddam International Airport and Saddam Hussein's palaces, and led the fighting on the day of Baghdad's historic liberation. The proposed route for "I-3" would provide a highway link between strategic defense interests in our region including Fort Gordon, Eisenhower Army Regional Medical Center, the Augusta Veterans Administration Hospitals, Fort Stewart, Hunter Army Airfield, and the Port of Savannah among others. In the process, we will provide long-needed North-South interstate access for Augusta, which happens to be Georgia's second largest city. It will also provide a direct interstate link between Fort Gordon in Augusta and Fort Stewart and Hunter Army Airfield in Savannah, which would serve both facilities well in warding off base closures now and in the future.

It may take a decade to bring these projects to full completion. They are not a quick or easy fix, however they are the necessary, equitable and common sense solution.

By Mr. KERRY:

S. 460. A bill to expand and enhance benefits for members of the Armed Forces and their families, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I recently returned from Iraq where I am proud to report that the men and women of the American military continue to perform magnificently. They are the best of America, and we owe them and their families a special debt of honor and gratitude.

Today, I am introducing legislation to strengthen our military and enact a "Military Family Bill of Rights." My hope is that Congress will act quickly to build the military ready to meet the challenges of this century. That requires a larger Army, a larger Marine Corps, and better policies for Americans in uniform and their families.

We must begin by building a military sized and shaped for the challenges of the future. The military today, in particular the Army and the Marine Corps, is too small for the missions it faces. The evidence is everywhere.

In the past, the Army gave units 2 years to reset, re-train, and prepare be-

tween combat deployments. Instead the 3rd Infantry Division is headed back to Iraq after only one year. The 101st Airborne and the 4th Infantry Divisions are headed back later this year after less than 2 years. The First Marine Expeditionary Force is already in the middle of its second deployment to Iraq.

Even with this timetable, we have made ends meet only through large contributions from the National Guard and Reserve. But in planning the next rotation of U.S. forces, we are running out of Guard and Reserve units to call on because they've already been deployed. Fourteen of the National Guard's 15 most combat-ready units are either in Iraq now, recently demobilized, or on alert for duty in the coming year. Of the 205,000 Army Reservists, only about 37,000 remain available for deployment for the types of missions needed in Iraq. Last year the Army dipped into the Individual Ready Reserve. More recently, the Army has even begun to call back military retirees, ranging in age from their mid-40s to their late 60s.

The situation is so grave that Lt. General James Helmly, chief of the Army Reserve, recently warned that the reserves are "rapidly degenerating into a broken force"—and cautioned that at this rate we will not be able to meet the needs of "future missions."

The war on terror—which we know requires a comprehensive approach—will have a military component. Surprises happen and our armed forces must be ready to meet those challenges, wherever and whenever they occur.

Since the end of the Cold War, every major commitment of American military power, including the "Air War" in Kosovo, has required a sizeable commitment of American ground forces, at the very least to provide post-conflict security and stability. There's no technological substitute for boots on the ground, and we must always plan for the worst, so we never expose our troops to the unintended consequences of wishful thinking.

The CIA's internal think-tank, the National Intelligence Council, recently drew an important conclusion about conflict over the next 15 years: "Weak governments, lagging economies, religious extremism, and youth bulges will align to create a perfect storm for internal conflict in certain regions." That's a warning about the danger of failed states—and this should be a wake-up call for American strategy.

Failed states can become havens for terrorists. It was a failed state in Afghanistan that provided a training ground for al-Qaida. It was a failed state where al-Qaida made its plans, grew its forces, and emerged to threaten our national security.

We need a comprehensive foreign policy strategy to deal with failed states, but we must also have a military ready to act if necessary. For the foreseeable future, the United States will need a

larger ground force. Failure to build one now will only diminish our national security in the future.

The war in Iraq proved that a lightning-fast, high-tech force can smash an opposing Army and drive to Baghdad in three weeks. But there is no substitute for a well-trained and equipped infantry to win the peace or secure a failed state. Those missions require an investment in the men and women of the American military—to expand their number, and to increase the number of forces that specialize in certain skills.

To meet these needs, this legislation will expand the Active Duty Army by 30,000 and the Marines by 10,000 personnel.

The men and women of the American military are sustained by the bonds they share within their unit, and by the love and strength they draw from home—from their families, their spouses, their children, their parents. Military families are unsung heroes who receive neither medals nor parades—giving everything they can to the men and women they love, men and women who have been called to war. They answered the call. And so must we—with a new commitment to smarter defense policies, like those I outlined earlier, and better care for military families.

So the legislation I offer today also includes a Military Family Bill of Rights, a set of policies enshrined in law, to provide assistance to the families of the American military.

Investing in military families isn't just an act of compassion—it's a smart investment in America's military. Good commanders know that while you may recruit an individual soldier or Marine, you "retain" a family. Nearly 50 percent of America's service members are married today. If we want to retain our most experienced service members, especially the non-commissioned officers that are the backbone of the Army and Marine Corps, we have to keep faith with their families. If we don't, and those experienced, enlisted leaders begin to leave, America will have a broken, "hollow" military.

We can begin by increasing the financial support military families receive. We can help them meet the increased expenses every military family faces when a loved-one is deployed. Thousands of reservists, for example, take a cut in pay when called to active duty. Some employers make up the difference in lost wages. We should reward those patriotic business leaders. And since small businesses don't have the workforces that make it possible to spread such costs, we should offer a Small Business Tax Credit to those who make up the difference between a reservist's civilian and military pay. This legislation would also establish Military Reservist Economic Injury Disaster Grants to buttress existing loan programs that help small-businesses survive when a vital employee, or even the owner, is mobilized. It also creates the Reservists Enterprise Tran-

sition and Sustainability Task Force to help small businesses prepare for and cope with the mobilization of reservist-employees and owners. For all service members, this legislation permits penalty free withdrawals from Individual Retirement Accounts for deployment-related expenses, such as increased child-care and other costs.

As many as one-in-five members of the National Guard and Reserves don't have health insurance. That is bad policy and bad for our national security. When units are mobilized, they count on all their personnel. But when a member of the National Guard or Reserve is mobilized, and unit members fail physicals because they haven't seen a doctor in 2 years, that's bad for readiness and that's bad for unit effectiveness. As part of the Military Family Bill of Rights, we will extend military health insurance eligibility to all members of the National Guard and Reserve, whether mobilized or not.

One of the unfortunate truths about war is that it takes lives—and mostly young lives. For their survivors, much of life remains, and we must be generous in our efforts to help them put their lives back together. Almost a year ago, I proposed increasing the military's death benefit to \$250,000. When combined with the Servicemembers Group Life Insurance, a family would receive \$500,000 when a loved-one dies in the service of our nation. No one can ever put a price on a life, but we ought to do what we can to help families coping with the worst of news. The President recently embraced a formula to reach the \$500,000 threshold, and I'm glad he has joined this effort.

Our generosity must not stop there. At present, survivors of those killed in action have 180 days to move out of military housing. But for those with young children in school, 180 days may mean starting a school year in one State, and finishing it in another. With all the disruption the loss of a parent will bring to their lives, survivors should have the flexibility to stay in their homes for one year after the death of a service member. It's the least we can do for those who have paid the ultimate price.

But let's be honest: No piece of legislation will ever anticipate all the needs of America's military families. Someone will always fall through the cracks. And the legislation I intend to offer will try to fix that. Take the case of Jay Briseno. Jay was wounded in Iraq and left paralyzed from the neck down. The law authorizes the VA to provide \$11,000 to modify a disabled veteran's vehicle, but it doesn't provide the resources a family needs to buy the specially out-fitted vehicle Jay needed. In his case, a generous member of the community donated the van the Briseno's now use to drive Jay to doctors appointments and hospital visits. And we are all grateful for that act of generosity. But no family should ever have to be so dependent on charity to meet a basic need.

Americans will do everything in our power to help military families. But not all Americans can afford to buy modified minivans for wounded veterans, and not all military families have the same needs. So as part of my Military Family Bill of Rights, we will establish a Military Family Relief Fund. Every American who pays taxes will be able to contribute by checking a box on their income tax returns. Just as we let Americans donate a few dollars to finance our presidential elections on their tax forms, we should give them this opportunity to say thank you to our troops. The program will meet the needs we can't expect with the flexibility and responsiveness our service members, veterans, and their families deserve.

Supporting military families must also extend beyond service in uniform—with programs across government to help with jobs, VA benefits, healthcare, and education.

Veterans possess great leadership and technical skills, but they often lack the financial resources to turn that potential into a viable enterprise. A recent report by the Small Business Administration stated that 22 percent of veterans plan to start or are starting a business when they leave the military. For service-disabled veterans, this number rises to 28 percent. So the legislation I introduce today will create a new program, administered by the Small Business Administration, to provide very-low interest loans, up to \$100,000, to help veterans start new small businesses.

But in this time of war, we have another obligation to meet the needs of those suffering with the experience of war.

The Pentagon believes that as many as 100,000 new combat veterans across the country will need some level of mental health care. The New England Journal of Medicine has reported as many as 1 in 6 soldiers returning from Iraq show symptoms of post-traumatic stress disorder. Fewer than 40 percent of those sought help. Military officials and mental health providers predict that up to 30 percent of returning soldiers will require psychiatric services associated with their experience in war. Through July of last year, 31,000 veterans of Operation Iraqi Freedom had applied for disability benefits for injuries—and 20 percent of those claims were for psychological conditions. These are levels not seen since the Vietnam War.

Our VA medical facilities are not ready for increased demands for the treatment of Post Traumatic Stress Disorder. In fact only 86 of 163 VA Medical Centers have PTSD treatment centers. We must do better. The wounds of war are not always visible, and we cannot sit back and wait for people to ask for help. We have to be proactive.

Soldiers and Marines returning from war want to go home. They don't want to do anything that could jeopardize

their homecoming. That's what happened to Jeffrey Lucey, a Marine Reservist from Belchertown, MA. When he was leaving Iraq, his first instinct was to report traumatic memories of things he had seen in the war. But someone told him it might delay his return home, so Jeff kept quiet. But the safety, security, and joy of homecoming eluded Jeff. Haunted by the war and what he had seen, he began to drink heavily. He was plagued by recurring nightmares, and began talking about suicide. Last summer, Jeff took his own life. Jeff's story is a preventable tragedy, and a call to action. As part of the legislation I plan, keeping faith with Jeff's family who have become committed advocates in his memory, we will expand PTSD programs within the VA and require outreach efforts to find the veterans who need the care.

Our obligation is to keep faith with the men and women of the American military and their families—whether they are on active duty, in the National Guard or Reserves, or veterans.

Those who have stood for us should know that we stand with them, today and always. Each of us can do something to ease their burden—but truly supporting our troops requires that we act not just as individuals, but as a nation. We owe our troops the opportunity to serve in the best-planned, best-equipped, and best-led military force in the world, and we owe them the peace of mind that comes from knowing that they and their families will be taken care of if they sacrifice life, limb or the ability to sleep without war's nightmares. We owe them not just thanks and best wishes, but action here in Congress. In today's ever-changing and perilous world, there is not a moment to lose.

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 461. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to require that a member of the uniformed services who is wounded or otherwise injured while serving in a combat zone continue to be paid monthly military pay and allowances, while the member recovers from the wound or injury, at least equal to the monthly military pay and allowances the member received immediately before receiving the wound or injury, to continue the combat zone tax exclusion for the member during the recovery period, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I rise today with my colleague, Senator KENNEDY, to introduce the Senate companion to the Crosby-Puller Combat Wounds Compensation Act.

This legislation is designed to help our soldiers who are returning from combat with serious wounds to maintain their pay during their recovery. Too often, young wounded soldiers are struggling to recover from wounds of combat and, simultaneously struggling financially as well.

A soldier's pay may be cut in half just as they are sent to the hospital. This adds to their stress and worries. It also can mean that family, including wives and children, cannot afford travel to the hospital to be nearby and support in the recovery.

Congressman MARKEY introduced this bill during the last Congress, and he has introduced it this year. This legislation will maintain the full pay that the soldier received immediately prior to their injury, until they are discharged or regain active duty status.

Over 5,700 soldiers have been seriously wounded in Iraq, and there have been others in combat areas around the globe, and sadly we must acknowledge that there will be more. Recovering soldiers and their families deserve our admiration and respect, and our full support. As they cope with the loss of a limb, or vision or mobility, they should not have to cope with bill collector or financial hardship. In my view, caring for our wounded soldiers and their families is a moral obligation and part of the cost of combat.

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

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

S. 461

*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 "Crosby-Puller Combat Wounds Compensation Act".

**SEC. 2. NO REDUCTION IN MONTHLY MILITARY PAY AND ALLOWANCES FOR MEMBERS OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES WOUNDED OR INJURED IN COMBAT ZONES.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (b) of section 310 of title 37, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(b) NO REDUCTION IN MONTHLY MILITARY PAY FOR WOUNDED OR INJURED MEMBERS.—

“(1) EFFECT OF WOUND OR INJURY IN COMBAT ZONE.—For each month during the period specified in paragraph (2), the total amount of monthly military pay paid to a member who was wounded or otherwise injured while assigned to duty in an area for which special pay was available under this section at the time the member was wounded or otherwise injured shall not be less than the total amount of military pay paid to the member for the month during which the member was wounded or otherwise injured.

“(2) DURATION.—Paragraph (1) shall apply with respect to a wounded or injured member until the end of the first month during which any of the following occurs:

“(A) The member is found to be physically able to perform the duties of the member's office, grade, rank, or rating.

“(B) The member is discharged or separated from the uniformed services.

“(C) The member dies.

“(3) MILITARY PAY DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ‘military pay’ has the meaning given the term ‘pay’ in section 101(21) of this title, except that the term includes allowances under chapter 7 of this title.”.

(b) RETROACTIVE EFFECTIVE DATE.—Subsection (b) of section 310 of title 37, United States Code, as amended by this section, shall apply with respect to any pay period

ending on or after September 11, 2001, for members of the uniformed services described in paragraph (1) of such subsection who were wounded or otherwise injured on or after that date.

**SEC. 3. REPEAL OF TIME LIMITATION ON EXCLUSION OF COMBAT ZONE COMPENSATION BY REASON OF HOSPITALIZATION.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsections (a)(2) and (b)(2) of section 112 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 are each amended by striking “; but this paragraph shall not apply for any month beginning more than 2 years after the date of the termination of combatant activities in such zone”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Subsections (a)(2) and (b)(2) of section 112 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended by this section, shall apply to compensation received for months ending after September 11, 2001, for members of the uniformed services described in such subsections who were wounded or otherwise injured on or after that date.

By Ms. SNOWE:

S. 462. A bill to deauthorize the project for navigation, Tenants Harbor, Maine; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Ms. SNOWE:

S. 463. A bill to deauthorize the project for navigation, Northeast Harbor, Maine; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Ms. SNOWE:

S. 464. A bill to modify the project for navigation, Union River, Maine; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Ms. SNOWE:

S. 465. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to carry out a project for the mitigation of shore damage attributable to the project for navigation, Saco River, Maine; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Ms. SNOWE:

S. 466. A bill to deauthorize a certain portion of the project for navigation, Rockland Harbor, Maine; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Ms. SNOWE. I rise today to reintroduce five different bills important to my State of Maine that were included in the Water Resources Development Act, WRDA, last year. Unfortunately, that larger Corps of Engineers reauthorization legislation did not see action before the Senate adjourned the 108th Congress, but I am pleased that the Chairman of the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee recently stated that WRDA is on the committee's agenda for consideration soon. My hope is that all five bills will once again be included in the WRDA legislation in the 109th Congress.

All of my bills are non-controversial, and, importantly, are supported by the various townspeople and their officials, and State officials, who view these harbor deauthorizations and river improvements as engines for economic development. The bills also have the support of the New England District of the Corps of Engineers.

The first bill, S. 462, pertains to Tenants Harbor, St. George, Maine. Deauthorizing the Federal Navigation Channel, FNC, would be of great help to the town in appropriately managing the Harbor to maximize mooring areas. Over the years there have been mounting problems with the Army Corps of Engineers' mooring permit process as people seeking permits for moorings that have existed for 30 years continue to be notified that the mooring locations are prohibited because they fall within the federal navigational channel.

My second bill, S. 463, concerns Northeast Harbor in Mt. Desert, Maine. The language will not only allow for more recreational moorages and commercial activities, it will also be an economic boost to Northeast Harbor, which is surrounded by Acadia National Park, one of the nation's most visited parks—both by land and by water. The removal of the harbor from the FNC will allow the town to adapt to the high demand for moorings and will allow residents to obtain moorings in a more timely manner. The Harbor has now reached capacity for both moorings and shoreside facilities and has a waiting list of over sixty people, along with commercial operators who have been waiting for years to obtain a mooring for their commercial vessels.

My third bill, S. 464, addresses the Union River in Ellsworth, Maine. The bill supports the City of Ellsworth's efforts to revitalize the Union River navigation channel, harbor, and shoreline. The modification called for in my legislation will redesignate a portion of the Union River as an anchorage area. This redesignation will allow for a greater number of moorings in the harbor without interfering with navigation and will further improve the City's revitalization efforts for the harbor area.

My fourth bill, S. 465, will carry out a project for the mitigation of shore damage at Camp Ellis, Maine, attributable to the Saco River navigation project. The bill authorizes the Secretary of the Army to carry out the project, under the River and Harbor Act of 1968, to mitigate shore damage attributable to the Saco River project, waiving the funding cap requirement for congressional authorization set forth in that Act. The legislation is needed to complete the project as it will cost more than authorized under current law, and is the preferred project by non-Federal interests.

My fifth bill, S. 466, will make the mooring of an historic windjammer fleet in Rockland Harbor a reality. Originally a strong fishing port, Rockland retains its rich marine heritage, and it is one of the fastest growing cities in the Midcoast area. Like many of the port cities on the eastern seaboard, Rockland has been forced to confront an assortment of financial and environmental changes, but happily, the city has been able to respond to these challenges in positive and productive ways.

The City of Rockland has hosted the Windjammer fleet since 1955, earning a well deserved reputation as the Windjammer Capital of the World. Rockland's Windjammers are now National Historic Landmarks, and as such, are vitally important to both the City and the State. The image of The Victory Chimes, one of five vessels slated to be berthed at the new wharf and a vessel whose historical designation I supported, graces the Maine quarter. This beautiful fleet of windjammers symbolizes the great seagoing history of Maine as well as the sense of adventure that we have come to associate so closely with the American experience.

Lermond Cove is perfectly situated in the Rockland Harbor to be the new and permanent home for these cherished vessels. The proposed Windjammer Wharf will also provide a safe harbor from storms, as it is tucked nicely near the Maine State Ferry and Department of Marine Resources piers.

The State of Maine capitalizes on the visual impact of the Windjammers to promote tourism, working waterfronts and the natural beauty that distinguishes our landscape. Over \$300,000 is spent yearly by the Maine Windjammer Association to advertise and promote these businesses. Deauthorizing that part of the federal navigational channel will clearly trigger significant and unrealized economic benefits for the region, providing many beneficial dollars to the local area and the State of Maine. According to the Longwood study, which uses a multiplier of 1.5, the economic impact of this spending is \$3.8 million a year. Conservatively, the Windjammers spend over \$2.5 million a year in the state.

I want to thank the New England Corps of Engineers for their help in drafting the language and working with the Maine Department of Transportation, which runs the ferry line, and also the Rockland city officials, the Rockland Port District, and the Captains of the Windjammer vessels—Mainers and businesspeople with the vision and commitment we need to complete Windjammer Wharf and create a permanent home for this historic fleet of windjammers in Rockland Harbor.

By Mr. DODD (for himself, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. CORZINE, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. REED, Mr. LUGAR, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. NELSON of Nebraska, Mr. CARPER, Mrs. DOLE, Mr. CHAMBLISS, and Mr. LAUTENBERG):

S. 467. A bill to extend the applicability of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill regarding terrorism Risk Insurance be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 467

*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 "Terrorism Risk Insurance Extension Act of 2005."

**SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF TERRORISM RISK INSURANCE PROGRAM.**

(a) EXTENSION OF PROGRAM YEARS.—Section 108(a) of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 6701 note, 116 Stat. 2336) is amended by striking "2005" and inserting "2007".

(b) CONTINUING AUTHORITY OF THE SECRETARY.—Section 108(b) of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 6701 note, 116 Stat. 2336) is amended by striking "arising out of" and all that follows through "this title".

**SEC. 3. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**

(a) DEFINITIONS.—

(1) PROGRAM YEARS.—Section 102(11) of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 6701 note, 116 Stat. 2326) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(E) PROGRAM YEAR 4.—The term 'Program Year 4' means the period beginning on January 1, 2006 and ending on December 31, 2006.

"(F) PROGRAM YEAR 5.—The term 'Program Year 5' means the period beginning on January 1, 2007 and ending on December 31, 2007.

"(G) OTHER PROGRAM YEARS.—Except when used as provided in subparagraphs (B) through (F), the term 'Program Year' means, as the context requires, any of Program Year 1, Program Year 2, Program Year 3, Program Year 4, or Program Year 5."

(2) INSURED LOSSES.—Section 102(5) of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 6701 note, 116 Stat. 2324) is amended—

(A) by inserting "on or before December 31, 2007, as required by this title," before "if such loss";

(B) by striking "(A) occurs within" and inserting the following:

"(A) occurs on or before the earlier of the expiration date of the insurance policy or December 31, 2008; and

"(B) occurs—

"(i) within"; and

(C) by striking "occurs to an air carrier" and inserting the following:

"(ii) to an air carrier".

(3) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 102 of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 6701 note, 116 Stat. 2323) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1)(A)(iii)(I), by striking "(5)(B)" and inserting "(5)(B)(ii)"; and

(B) in paragraph (4), by striking "subparagraphs (A) and (B)" and inserting "subparagraph (B)".

(b) APPLICABLE INSURER DEDUCTIBLES.—Section 102(7) of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 6701 note, 116 Stat. 2325) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (D)—

(A) by inserting "and each Program Year thereafter" before "the value"; and

(B) by striking "preceding Program Year 3" and inserting "preceding that Program Year"; and

(2) in subparagraph (E), by striking "for the Transition" and all that follows through "Program Year 3" and inserting the following: "for the Transition Period or any Program Year".

(c) CONTINUATION OF MANDATORY AVAILABILITY.—Section 103(c)(1) of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 6701 note, 116 Stat. 2327) is amended—

(1) by striking "last day of Program Year 2" and inserting "termination date established under section 108(a)"; and

(2) by striking the paragraph heading and inserting "IN GENERAL.—".

(d) DURATION OF POLICIES.—Section 103(c) of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 6701 note, 116 Stat. 2327) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (3); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

“(2) MANDATORY DURATION.—Coverage for insured losses required by paragraph (1) under a policy issued at any time during Program Year 5 shall remain in effect for not less than 1 year following the date of issuance of the policy, except that no loss occurring after the earlier of the expiration date of the subject insurance policy or December 31, 2008, shall be considered to be an insured loss for purposes of this title.”

(e) INSURED LOSS SHARED COMPENSATION.—Section 103(e) of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 6701 note, 116 Stat. 2328) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)(A), by striking “ending on” and all that follows through “Program Year 3” and inserting “ending on the termination date established under section 108(a)”; and

(2) in paragraph (3), by striking “ending on” and all that follows through “Program Year 3” and inserting “ending on the termination date established under section 108(a)”.

(f) AGGREGATE RETENTION AMOUNT.—Section 103(e)(6) of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 6701 note, 116 Stat. 2328) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (C), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(D) for Program Year 4, the lesser of—

“(i) \$17,500,000,000; and

“(ii) the aggregate amount, for all insurers, of insured losses during such Program Year; and

“(E) for Program Year 5, the lesser of—

“(i) \$20,000,000,000; and

“(ii) the aggregate amount, for all insurers, of insured losses during such Program Year.”

#### SEC. 4. COVERAGE OF GROUP LIFE INSURANCE.

Section 103 of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 6701 note, 116 Stat. 2327) is amended by striking subsection (h) and inserting the following:

“(h) APPLICABILITY TO GROUP LIFE INSURANCE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall, by rule, apply the provisions of this title to providers of group life insurance, in the manner determined appropriate by the Secretary, consistent with the purposes of this title.

“(2) CONSISTENT APPLICATION.—The rules of the Secretary under this subsection shall, to the extent practicable, apply the provisions of this title to providers of group life insurance in a similar manner as those provisions apply to an insurer otherwise under this title.

“(3) CONSIDERATIONS.—In determining the applicability of this title to providers of group life insurance, and the manner of such application, the Secretary shall consider the overall group life insurance market size, and shall consider the establishment of separate retention amounts for such providers.

“(4) RULEMAKING REQUIRED.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Extension Act of 2005, the Secretary shall issue final regulations to carry out this subsection.

“(5) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection may be construed to affect or otherwise alter the applicability of this title to any insurer, as defined in section 102.

“(6) DEFINITION.—As used in this subsection, the term ‘group life insurance’ means an insurance contract that provides term life insurance coverage, accidental death coverage, or a combination thereof, for a number of persons under a single contract, on the basis of a group selection of risks.”

#### SEC. 5. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR LONG-TERM SOLUTIONS.

Section 108 of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 6701 note, 116 Stat. 2328) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(e) RECOMMENDATIONS FOR LONG-TERM SOLUTIONS.—The Presidential Working Group on Financial Markets shall, in consultation with the NAIC, representatives of the insurance industry, and representatives of policy

holders, not later than June 30, 2006, submit a report to Congress containing recommendations for legislation to address the long-term availability and affordability of insurance for terrorism risk.”

#### MEASURE PLACED ON CALENDAR

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that H.R. 310, which is due for its second reading today, be considered as having been read the second time and that the bill be placed on the Calendar under General Orders.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 2 P.M. MONDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 2005

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned pursuant to the provisions of H. Con. Res. 66 until 2 p.m. on Monday, February 28, 2005.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 10:54 a.m., adjourned until Monday, February 28, 2005, at 2 p.m.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 18, 2005:

##### DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

JONATHAN BRIAN PERLIN, OF MARYLAND, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY FOR HEALTH OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS FOR A TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE ROBERT H. ROSWELL.

##### DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

MICHAEL JACKSON, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF HOMELAND SECURITY, VICE JAMES M. LOY, RESIGNED.

##### DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

PATRICIA LYNN SCARLETT, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR, VICE J. STEVEN GRILES, RESIGNED.