the Sea, done at Montego Bay, Jamaica, December 10, 1982, and are therefore bound to honor article 65 of that Convention, which declares that ''States shall cooperate with a view to the conservation of marine mammals and in the case of cetaceans shall in particular work through the appropriate international organizations for their conservation, management, and study'';

Whereas in 1946, 14 nations adopted the International Convention for the Regulation of Whaling with schedule of whaling regulations, signed at Washington December 2, 1946 (TIAS 1849), which established the International Whaling Commission to provide for the proper conservation of whales stocks; and

Whereas the International Whaling Commission on numerous occasions has called into question the slaughter by member nations of small cetaceans, has asked for the reduction of the number of animals killed, and has in certain instances urged for the halt of the slaughter altogether, including by passing resolutions condemning drive hunts of striped dolphins in 1992 and 1993 and resolutions criticizing exploitation of Dall's porpoises in 1990, 1999, and 2001: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the United States strongly condemns the slaughter of small cetaceans in drive fisheries and urges nations that participate in small cetacean slaughter to end commercial hunts;

(2) at the 57th Annual Meeting of the International Whaling Commission in Korea, the United States should—

(A) negotiate regional and international agreements to decrease catch and bycatch of all cetaceans;

(B) advocate for clarification that the mandate of the International Whaling Commission includes small cetaceans;

(C) call on nations that participate in small cetacean slaughter to stop their commercial hunts;

(D) seek the inclusion of an agenda item in the Working Group on Whale Killing Methods and Associated Welfare Issues on killing methods for small cetaceans and implications for the welfare of small cetaceans;

(E) strongly urge all nations that engage in small cetacean hunts—

(i) to provide detailed information to the International Whaling Commission on primary and secondary killing methods used for each species of small cetacean killed, the method used to measure insensibility or death, and times of death; and

(ii) to share with the International Whaling Commission data on the sustainability of small cetacean populations; and

(F) initiate and support efforts—

(i) to firmly support the role and authority of the newly created Conservation Committee; and

(ii) to ensure an ambitious conservation agenda for all future meetings of the Committee; and

(3) the United States should make full use of all appropriate diplomatic mechanisms, relevant international laws and agreements, Federal laws, including the Fishermen's Protective Act of 1967 (commonly known as the Pelly Amendment) (22 U.S.C. 1971 et seq.), and other appropriate means to implement these goals.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I rise to submit a resolution to condemn the inhumane and unnecessary slaughter of dolphins, porpoises, and small whales that occurs in certain nations around the world.

This resolution would send the U.S. delegation to this year's International Whaling Commission meeting with the message that the slaughter of these marine mammals must be stopped, and that the commission must protect them. I am pleased to be joined by my cosponsors, Senators LEVIN, SARBANES, and LIEBERMAN.

Each year, more than 20,000 dolphins, porpoises, and small whales, which are collectively called small cetaceans, are slaughtered by methods that are beyond inhumane.

These mammals are intelligent, they live in family groups, and they feel pain. In many cases, they are herded together into small coves, where they are confined with nets. Once they are trapped, the slaughter begins.

The first step is often to slice their throats with knives, causing them to bleed to death. This slow and painful method is used because cetaceans are hard to kill, due to their natural protective layer of blubber.

Very often, processing of these mammals begins before they are even dead. They are wrenched from the water with cranes, loaded while in a state of shock into trucks, and taken to warehouses where their flesh is removed to be sold as meat. All of this can occur while the animals are still alive.

Dolphins, porpoises, and small whales are some of the most advanced animals in the world, on land or at sea. They can feel pain the same way and to the same extent humans can.

I find this treatment of these remarkable animals abhorrent and inhumane. However, the process I have described is also objectionable for several other reasons.

The meat of these animals is sold as food, often mislabeled as ''whale meat,'' which to many people suggests open-ocean large whales that are still hunted by several nations despite a worldwide moratorium.

However, the meat of small cetaceans is not large whale meat. Small cetacean meat can be very unhealthy. These small animals are more likely than large whales to live along the coast, and they are higher up in the food chain, so their bodies are often contaminated with mercury and other pollutants. Levels of contaminants in some of this meat are often much higher than what is recommended by the nations where it is sold.

Another problem is that many of these small cetacean populations are being threatened by the loss of large numbers of animals. Over-exploitation of small cetaceans has resulted in the serious decline and even the commercial extinction of some populations.

Unfortunately, it is difficult to track the take and the populations of these animals, as the people who slaughter them don't allow full, and in some cases any, documentation of the killing. Their failure to keep accurate information indicates that they lack a commitment to maintaining sustainable populations.

The International Whaling Commission (IWC) has passed at least 5 resolutions condemning these types of small cetacean slaughters. Our resolution will send the United States delegation to the next IWC meeting with the message that this issue is not forgotten.

It will also ensure that the U.S. delegation works to clarify the IWC's mission to manage and protect small cetaceans.

SENATE RESOLUTION 100—DISAPPROVING THE REQUEST OF THE PRESIDENT FOR EXTENSION UNDER SECTION 2103(C)(1)(B)(I) OF THE BIPARTISAN TRADE PROMOTION AUTHORITY ACT OF 2002, OF THE TRADE PROMOTION AUTHORITIES UNDER THAT ACT

Mr. DORGAN (for himself and Mr. BYRD) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

S. RES. 100

Resolved, That the Senate disapproves the request of the President for the extension, under section 2103(c)(1)(B)(i) of the Bipartisan Trade Promotion Authority Act of 2002, of the trade authorities procedures under that Act to any implementing bill submitted with respect to any trade agreement entered into under section 2103(b) of that Act after June 30, 2005.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, today I am submitting a resolution to disapprove of the extension of ''trade promotion authority,'' better known as ''fast track,'' for trade agreements.

In 2002, the U.S. Congress decided to tie its hands behind its back when it comes to international trade.

The Constitution, at Article I, Section 8, gives the Congress the power to regulate foreign commerce. But in 2002 we handed that authority to the President, and effectively gave him a blank check. We gave the President the authority to negotiate trade agreements in secret, and to bring those agreements back to the Senate for a vote, without the possibility of a single amendment being offered.

What was the result? We saw the signing of agreements like the Central American Free Trade Agreement, or CAFTA. This is an agreement that would integrate our economy with those of Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, and the Dominican Republic.

Do the American people think this is a good idea? Not on your life, certainly not after what they've seen with the NAFTA deal with Mexico. CAFTA promises more of the same: U.S. jobs going overseas, as companies try to take advantage of low-wage labor in countries with no environmental controls.

If we were able to offer amendments to CAFTA, we could, for instance, have meaningful prohibitions on child or sweatshop labor, or pollution by overseas factories. Provisions that would protect American workers from having to compete with children working in filthy factories for pennies a day.

But that's not the kind of CAFTA agreement that big business wants.

They want to pole vault over basic labor and environmental laws in our country, and just move their factories to countries like Guatemala or Honduras.

I am going to lead the fight against CAFTA in the U.S. Senate. But I want to make sure that we get rid of this fast track authority that helped create this awful agreement in the first place.

Well, the legislation that gave fast track authority to the president in 2002 said that Congress would get to decide in 2005 whether to extend fast track. Any Senator can come to the floor of the Senate and offer a resolution saying that we should not extend fast track. And I am availing myself of that opportunity today.

But there is a catch. The supporters of fast track authority buried a provision in the 2002 bill, which says that the Senate does not get to vote on this resolution unless the Finance Committee first approves it. And the staff of Chairman of the Finance Committee has indicated that there is no way they are going to allow the Senate to vote on such a resolution.

I don't want to see any more agreements like CAFTA being negotiated in secret, and then brought to the U.S. Senate without the possibility of even a single amendment. So I am offering today a resolution of disapproval for extension of fast track, in accordance with the law.

And I am going to do everything I can to see to it that the Senate gets a chance to vote on this resolution, one way or another.

SENATE RESOLUTION 101—RECOGNIZING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE SALK POLIO VACCINE AND ITS IMPORTANCE IN ERADICATING THE INCIDENCE OF POLIO

Mr. SANTORUM (for himself and Mr. SPECTER, and Mr. LAUTENBERG) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 101

Whereas the epidemic of polio struck the citizens of the United States in the early 1950s, causing thousands of cases of lingering paralysis and death;

Whereas the epidemic of polio peaked in 1952, having affected nearly 58,000 people, mainly children and young adults;

Whereas many of those affected by polio needed the assistance of mechanical ventilators in order to breathe, while others were crippled and dependent upon crutches for mobility;

Whereas University of Pittsburgh faculty member Dr. Jonas Salk and his team of researchers developed the first vaccine against polio;

Whereas, in April 1955, the results of an unprecedented and successful nationwide clinical trial of the polio vaccine were announced;

Whereas the Salk polio vaccine was approved for widespread public use at that time; and

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the pioneering achievement of Dr. Jonas Salk and his team of researchers at the University of Pittsburgh in the development of the Salk polio vaccine;

(2) expresses its appreciation to—

(A) the family of Dr. Salk for the elimination of polio, a disease that caused countless deaths and disabling consequences;

(B) the members of Dr. Salk's research team; and

(C) the individuals who generously agreed to participate in clinical trials to validate the efficacy of the polio vaccine; and

(3) celebrates with the University of Pittsburgh on the 50th anniversary of the approval and use of the Salk polio vaccine.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS—APRIL 4, 2005

SA 265. Mr. NELSON of Florida submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1268, making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2005, to establish and rapidly implement regulations for State driver's license and identification document security standards, to prevent terrorists from abusing the asylum laws of the United States, to unify terrorism-related grounds for inadmissibility and removal, to ensure expeditious construction of the San Diego border fence, and for other purposes; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. PROHIBITION ON REDUCTION IN NUMBER OF OPERATIONAL AIRCRAFT CARRIERS OF THE NAVY.

(a) PROHIBITION.—No funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act, or by any other Act, for fiscal year 2005 may be obligated or expended to reduce the number of operational aircraft carriers of the Navy from 12 operational aircraft carriers to 11 operational aircraft carriers.

(b) OPERATIONAL AIRCRAFT CARRIER.—In this section, the term ''operational aircraft carrier'' includes an aircraft carrier that is unavailable due to maintenance or repair.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 292. Mr. SANTORUM (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 600, to authorize appropriations for the Department of State and international broadcasting activities for fiscal years 2006 and 2007, for the Peace Corps for fiscal years 2006 and 2007, for foreign assistance programs for fiscal years 2006 and 2007, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 293. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 600, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 294. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 600, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 295. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 600, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 296. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 600, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 297. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 600, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 298. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 600, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 299. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 600, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 300. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 600, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 301. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 600, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 302. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 600, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 303. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 600, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 304. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 600, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 305. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 600, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 306. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 600, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 307. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 600, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 308. Mr. SALAZAR proposed an amendment to the bill S. 600, supra.

SA 309. Mr. SCHUMER (for himself, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. BAYH, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. DODD, Mrs. DOLE, Mr. FEINGOLD, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. KOHL, Mr. REID, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. BURR, Mr. JOHNSON, and Ms. MIKULSKI) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 600, supra.

SA 310. Mr. WARNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 600, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 311. Mr. WARNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 600, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 312. Mr. SANTORUM submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 600, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 313. Mr. DAYTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 600, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 314. Mr. FEINGOLD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 600, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 315. Mr. NELSON, of Florida submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1268, Making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2005, to establish and rapidly implement regulations for State driver's license and identification document security standards, to prevent terrorists from abusing the asylum laws of the United States, to unify terrorism-related grounds for inadmissibility and removal, to ensure expeditious construction of the San Diego border fence, and for other purposes; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

SA 316. Mr. NELSON, of Florida (for himself and Mr. CORZINE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1268, supra; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.