

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.

## AMENDMENT NO. 409

At the request of Mr. JEFFORDS, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. DAYTON) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 409 intended to be proposed to 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.

## AMENDMENT NO. 418

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 418 proposed to 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.

## AMENDMENT NO. 427

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. DAYTON) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 427 proposed to 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.

## AMENDMENT NO. 441

At the request of Mr. SPECTER, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 441 proposed to 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 in-

admissibility and removal, to ensure expeditious construction of the San Diego border fence, and for other purposes.

## AMENDMENT NO. 502

At the request of Mr. DODD, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 502 intended to be proposed to 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.

## AMENDMENT NO. 504

At the request of Mrs. CLINTON, the names of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CORZINE) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 504 intended to be proposed to 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.

## STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

MONDAY, APRIL 18, 2005

By Mr. INHOFE:

S. 830. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to insert a new definition relating to oil and gas exploration and production; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, 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. 830

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

## SECTION 1. DEFINITION RELATING TO OIL AND GAS EXPLORATION AND PRODUCTION.

Section 502 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1362) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(24) OIL AND GAS EXPLORATION, PRODUCTION, PROCESSING, TREATMENT OPERATION, OR TRANSMISSION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘oil and gas exploration, production, processing, treatment operation, or transmission’ means all field activities or operations associated with

oil or gas exploration, production, or processing, or oil or gas treatment operations or transmission facilities.

“(B) INCLUSIONS.—The term ‘oil and gas exploration, production, processing, treatment operation, or transmission’ includes activities necessary to prepare a site for oil or gas drilling and for the movement and placement of drilling equipment, whether or not the field activities or operations may be considered to be construction activities.”.

## STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. FEINGOLD:

S. 838. A bill to allow modified bloc voting by cooperative associations of milk producers in connection with a referendum on Federal Milk Marketing Order reform; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, today I am re-introducing a measure that will begin to restore democracy for dairy farmers throughout the Nation.

When dairy farmers across the country voted on a referendum six years ago, perhaps the most significant change in dairy policy in sixty years, they didn't actually get to vote. Instead, their dairy marketing cooperatives cast their votes for them.

This procedure is called “bloc voting” and it is used all the time. Basically, a Cooperative's Board of Directors decides that, in the interest of time, bloc voting will be implemented for that particular vote. It may serve the interest of time, but it doesn't always serve the interests of their producer owner-members.

While I think that bloc voting can be a useful tool in some circumstances, I have serious concerns about its use in every circumstance. Farmers in Wisconsin and in other States tell me that they do not agree with their cooperative's view on every vote. Yet, they have no way to preserve their right to make their single vote count.

I have learned from farmers and officials at the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) that if a cooperative bloc votes, individual members have no opportunity to voice opinions separately. That seems unfair when you consider what significant issues may be at stake. Co-ops and their individual members do not always have identical interests. Considering our nation's longstanding commitment to freedom of expression, our Federal rules should allow farmers to express a differing opinion from their co-ops, if they choose to.

The Democracy for Dairy Producers Act of 2005 is simple and fair. It provides that a cooperative cannot deny any of its members a ballot to opt to vote separately from the co-op.

This will in no way slow down the process at USDA; implementation of any rule or regulation would proceed on schedule. Also, I do not expect that this would often change the final outcome of any given vote. Co-ops could still cast votes for their members who do not exercise their right to vote individually. And to the extent that co-ops