1768, a bill to permit the televising of Supreme Court proceedings.

S. 1791

At the request of Mr. SMITH, the names of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR) were added as cosponsors of S. 1791, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a deduction for qualified timber gains.

S. 1891

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. TALENT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1891, a bill to authorize the leasing, development, production, and economically feasible and prudent transportation of oil and gas in and from the Coastal Plain, and for other purposes.

S. 1926

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. DEMINT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1926, a bill to provide the Department of Justice the necessary authority to apprehend, prosecute, and convict individuals committing animal enterprise terror.

S. 1947

At the request of Mr. SUNUNU, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1947, a bill to amend chapter 21 of title 38, United States Code, to enhance adaptive housing assistance for disabled veterans.

S. 1958

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. JEFFORDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1958, a bill to authorize the Attorney General to establish and carry out a program, known as the Northern Border Prosecution Initiative, to provide funds to northern border States to reimburse county and municipal governments for costs associated with certain criminal activities, and for other purposes.

S. 1960

At the request of Mr. BUNNING, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. DOMENICI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1960, a bill to protect the health and safety of all athletes, to promote the integrity of professional sports by establishing minimum standards for the testing of steroids and other performance-enhancing substances and methods by professional sports leagues, and for other purposes.

S. CON. RES. 55

At the request of Mr. CRAIG, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. LOTT), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CONRAD) and the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. DAYTON) were added as cosponsors of S. Con. Res. 55, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress regarding the conditions for the United States to become a signatory to any multilateral agreement on trade resulting from the World Trade Organization's Doha Development Agenda Round.

S. RES. 180

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. DORGAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 180, a resolution supporting the goals and ideals of a National Epidermolysis Bullosa Awareness Week to raise public awareness and understanding of the disease and to foster understanding of the impact of the disease on patients and their families.

S. RES. 219

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 219, a resolution designating March 8, 2006, as ''Endangered Species Day'', and encouraging the people of the United States to become educated about, and aware of, threats to species, success stories in species recovery, and the opportunity to promote species conservation worldwide.

S. RES. 294

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 294, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate on the retention of the Federal tax deduction for State and local taxes paid.

S. RES. 299

At the request of Ms. LANDRIEU, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 299, a resolution to express support for the goals of National Adoption Month by promoting national awareness of adoption, celebrating children and families involved in adoption, and encouraging Americans to secure safety, permanency, and well-being for all children.

AMENDMENT NO. 1425

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. DAYTON) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1425 proposed to S. 1042, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2006 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2348

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2348 proposed to S. 1932, an original bill to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 202(a) of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2006 (H. Con. Res. 95).

AMENDMENT NO. 2383

At the request of Mr. BAUCUS, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) and the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 2383 proposed to S. 1932, an original bill to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 202(a) of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2006 (H. Con. Res. 95).

AMENDMENT NO. 2410

At the request of Mr. BAUCUS, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. CLINTON) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2410 intended to be proposed to S. 1932, an original bill to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 202(a) of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2006 (H. Con. Res. 95).

AMENDMENT NO. 2423

At the request of Mr. ALLARD, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. SALAZAR), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. DEMINT), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER), the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 2423 proposed to S. 1042, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2006 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2424

At the request of Mr. NELSON of Florida, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. MARTINEZ), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. BINGAMAN), the Senator from New York (Mrs. CLINTON), the Senator from Arkansas (Mrs. LINCOLN), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) and the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 2424 proposed to S. 1042, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2006 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. SPECTER (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. CORNYN):

S. 1968. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect judges, prosecutors, witnesses, victims, and their family members, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Court Security Improvement Act of 2005. This bill is in direct response to the tragic events that occurred in Chicago on February 28, 2005. On that day, the husband and aged mother of Judge Joan Lefkow

were shot and killed in their own home. The perpetrator, as described by Judge Lefkow, was an angry litigant. These attacks on Federal judges are not as isolated as one might think. Federal judges receive on average 700 inappropriate communications or threats each year, and three Federal judges have been assassinated in the last 25 years.

Shortly after the Lefkow murders, on March 14, 2005, I wrote to the Director of the United States Marshals Service to find out what security measures were in place and what additional measures could be instituted, particularly off-site security measures, following this terrible tragedy.

On March 14, 2005, Assistant Attorney General William E. Moschella responded on behalf of the U.S. Marshals Service, stating that Attorney General Gonzales and Director Reyna are reviewing all aspects of judicial security, both at judicial facilities and off-site, but no specifics were offered, and no specifics have yet to be received.

On April 5, 2005, the Judicial Conference of the United States wrote to the President about the issue. Stating that ''attacks such as these strike at the core of our system of government,'' the Judicial Conference asked that immediate actions be taken to improve judicial security, particularly outside of the courthouse. On May 6, 2005, I met with Third Circuit Judge Jane Roth, who chairs the Committee on Facilities and Securities for the Judicial Conference, to discuss security issues.

Congress quickly responded and passed the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Tsunami Relief, which was enacted on May 11, 2005. The Act provided $11.9 million to the U.S. Marshals Service for ''increased judicial security outside of courthouse facilities, including priority consideration of home detection systems in the homes of Federal judges,'' and as a result home intrusion detection systems will soon be available to every Federal judge who wants one. But we must do more.

On May 18, 2005, I chaired a full Judiciary Committee hearing entitled ''Protecting the Judiciary at Home and in the Courthouse'' and it is evident from this hearing that much more needs to be done in the area of judicial security. The responsibility of protecting our Federal judiciary and the halls of justice rests primarily with the U.S. Marshals Service, but we heard compelling testimony that coordination and cooperation is sorely lacking between the Federal judiciary and the agency principally charged with its protection.

Not only does the U.S. Marshals Service arrogantly fail to coordinate and cooperate with the Federal judiciary, serious questions were raised regarding the efficacy of its existing security programs. For example, a report issued by the Inspector General of the Department of Justice in March 2004 found that the U.S. Marshals Service's threat assessments are ''untimely and of questionable validity,'' and that the U.S. Marshals Service has ''limited capability to collect and share intelligence, and lacks adequate standards for determining appropriate protective measures.''

This legislation would enhance judicial security in several respects. The legislation would statutorily require the U.S. Marshals Service to cooperate and coordinate with the Judicial Conference regarding judicial security on a continuing basis. The legislation also would provide new criminal sanctions on individuals who harass or intimidate judges either by filing false or malicious liens against judges or by knowingly posting personal information regarding Federal judges on the Internet with the intent that such information be used to harm them. The legislation would extend the Judicial Conference's authority to redact sensitive personal information from judges' financial disclosure forms so that such information cannot be used for harassment or intimidation purposes.

The rampage in Atlanta reminds us that the issue of judicial security is no less of a compelling problem for State and local courts, where approximately 32,000 State and local court judges sit compared to approximately 2,400 Federal judges. This legislation would address these State and local issues by authorizing grants for court security and witness protection.

In conclusion, there is no doubt that the rule of law is the backbone of our civilized society. The ability of the judiciary to determine the rule of law without fear or favor is an indispensable prerequisite to our democratic society. Our judges' personal security, along with judicial independence, must be safeguarded at all costs, and I believe this bill is an important step toward providing those safeguards.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, last May, the Judiciary Committee heard the courageous testimony of Judge Joan Lefkow of Chicago. She is the Federal judge whose mother and husband were murdered in their home. The tragedy that befell Judge Lefkow and her family is a terrible reminder not only of the vulnerable position of our judges and their families, but of the critical importance of protecting judges where they work and where they and their families live. We cannot tolerate and no one should excuse or justify—violence or the threat of violence against our judges. I was appalled earlier this year when right-wing activists compared judges to terrorists and the KKK and threatened them with punishment for decisions they did not like, even quoting Joseph Stalin's violent answer to anyone who opposed his totalitarianism by urging the formula of ''No man, No problem.'' Stalin killed those with whom he disagreed. This rhetoric can only foster unacceptable violence against Judges and it must stop, for the sake of our Judges and the independence of the judiciary. We ought to be protecting judges physically and institutionally rather than taking rhetorical pot shots that put judges in real danger and that attack the very independence of our federal judiciary.

When I chaired the Judiciary Committee in 2001, one of the first things I did was push for passage of the Judicial Protection Act, which toughened criminal penalties for assaults against judges and their families. We enacted it. We were right to do so. Protecting our judges and Federal law enforcement officers should be a top priority for us.

Today, in order to meet the continuing challenges of keeping our judges, our Courts, and the rest of the Federal judiciary safe, Chairman SPECTER and I are introducing the Court Security Improvement Act of 2005 (''CSIA''). CSIA responds to requests by the judiciary for a greater voice in working with the United States Marshals Service to determine their security needs. It strengthens and expands protections for judges and their families against the misuse of their personal information by those who intend to threaten them. It enacts new criminal penalties for the mis-use of restricted personal information to seriously harm or threaten to seriously harm judges, their families or other individuals performing official duties. It also enacts criminal penalties for threatening judges and federal law enforcement officials by the malicious filing of false liens, provides increased protections for witnesses, and makes available new resources for state courts to improve security for state and local court systems.

I appreciate the work of Chairman SPECTER on this important bill and, in particular, for including an extension of life insurance benefits to bankruptcy, magistrate and territorial judges, as well as health insurance for surviving spouses and families of federal judges.

We must better protect the dedicated women and men throughout the Judiciary in this country who do a tremendous job under challenging circumstances. They are hard-working public servants who are too often maligned and unfairly disparaged. We owe it to them and to our democracy to find ways to make sure that tragedies like those that befell Judge Lefkow are not repeated, and to ensure that Judges and their families have the peace of mind necessary to do their vital and difficult jobs.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I rise today to speak in favor of the Court Security Improvement Act of 2005, of which I am an original cosponsor. I want to commend Senator SPECTER and the other cosponsors of this bill for tackling the critical issue of judicial and courthouse security.

Our democracy depends on the dedication of public servants, including the men and women of the judiciary—from the trial courts to the appellate

courts—who daily preside over important and difficult issues. They faithfully carry out their duties and diligently work to support the administration of justice. We must do all that we can to provide adequate security to these dedicated men and women who sometimes are targeted for violence or harassment because of the position they hold.

Unfortunately, episodes of courthouse violence in this country are on the rise, including in my home State of Texas. I was a judge for 13 years and have a number of close personal friends who still serve on the bench today. I am outraged by acts of courthouse violence. I personally know judges and their families who have been victims of violence, and I have grieved with those families.

Acts of violence against judges are unacceptable and reflect a distortion of the role of the judiciary. Judges are impartial umpires of the law—they simply call the balls and strikes—and they cannot help but disappoint people. However, it is unacceptable for judges, courthouse personnel or other law enforcement officials to face threats and violence for doing nothing more than faithfully carrying out their professional duties.

The Senate Judiciary Committee has examined issues related to courthouse security at a recent hearing. At this hearing, the Judicial Conference raised several important issues, including its working relationship with the United States Marshals Service, the need to protect judges outside of the courthouse, and common instances of intimidation and harassment directed at judges.

This hearing and these issues provide the foundation for this bill. Let me discuss a few of the security improvements made by this bill.

The U.S. Marshals Service has primary responsibility for providing security to the judiciary. However, the Judicial Conference testified that they are not consulted when decisions, which directly implicate their security, are made. The Marshal's Service should willingly coordinate and communicate with the judiciary on security concerns. This legislation would codify this commonsense idea and keep the judiciary informed of, and allow them to provide suggestions for, decisions regarding their security.

This bill also addresses a relatively recent problem that poses a particular danger to public officials. Personal information, such as home addresses and phone numbers, of Federal officials when posted on the Internet can be readily accessed and used to intimidate or harm them. Recently, personal information of Federal judges have been posted on the Internet and used to facilitate threats against them. This bill would punish those who, with the intent to harm, post restricted information of public officials, or of their immediate family, on the Internet.

Additionally, members of the Federal judiciary have been targets of intimidation or harassment by some who file false liens against the real or personal property of a judge who has presided over a criminal or civil case, or who has otherwise acted against the interests of a litigant. This provision would make it a crime to knowingly file a false lien against the property of a Federal judge or law enforcement officer on the basis of their official status.

Finally, and importantly, this bill authorizes Federal grants to be made available to State courts to improve security for State and local court systems. We must comprehensively approach this problem by providing funding to State courts to update their security while standing by to swiftly and severely punish those who cause or attempt to cause harm to anyone within the courts.

It is important for us to do all we can to protect the men and women who make up our judicial system because they are essential to the proper administration of justice. I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

I yield the floor.

By Mr. SANTORUM:

S. 972. A bill to require Members of Congress and legislative branch employees to report all contact with officials and representatives of countries designated as state sponsors of terrorism; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I rise today to offer remarks about a bill I introduced earlier today, the Terrorist Lobby Disclosure Act of 2005.

My legislation is simple, straightforward and necessary. Because the United States is actively involved in the global war on terror, we must be vigilant in fighting this war on all fronts. This means supplying our men and women of the Armed Forces with equipment and materiel to conduct military operations. It means providing our intelligence community with the resources it needs to make inroads against terrorist organizations and to better safeguard Americans against nations and groups that hate our way of life. It means devoting the time and resources to ensure the safety of our borders, ports and airports. Finally, it means providing transparency in dealing with those nations defined by our government as ''state sponsors of terrorism.''

According to the Department of State, Iran, Syria, Libya, Cuba, North Korea, and Sudan are the six governments that the U.S. Secretary of State has designated as state sponsors of international terrorism. These are governments that engage directly in terrorist activity themselves; support terrorist groups by providing funding, arms, or other material support; or provide training, logistical support, sanctuary, or diplomatic facilities. These states are the worst of the worst when it comes to fighting the global war on terror.

My bill requires Members of Congress and employees of the legislative branch to disclose, on a quarterly basis, any contacts with representatives or officials of governments that have been designated as state sponsors of international terrorism. The contacts must be reported to the U.S. Department of State, Secretary of the Senate, and Clerk of the House of Representatives. My bill makes sure that the congressional committees of oversight are also duly informed of these contacts. Let me be clear, my bill does not prohibit these contacts. Rather, with men and women serving in harm's way in the global war on terror, it simply requires disclosure and transparency in the conduct of their official duties.

As we commit final resources and valuable human capital to prosecute the global war on terror, we ought to know if members of our own government are meeting with individuals who are representatives of terrorist nations. The American people deserve to know if there are contacts happening with representatives of these regimes—regimes that are actively opposed to America.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2433. Mr. CHAMBLISS (for himself, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. PRYOR, and Ms. LANDRIEU) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1042, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2006 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

SA 2434. Mr. HAGEL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1042, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2435. Mr. KOHL (for himself and Mr. JEFFORDS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1042, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2436. Ms. SNOWE (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. CORZINE) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1042, supra.

SA 2437. Mr. CRAIG (for himself, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. BROWNBACK, and Ms. MIKULSKI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1042, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2438. Mr. HARKIN (for himself and Mr. DORGAN) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1042, supra.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 2433. Mr. CHAMBLISS (for himself, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. PRYOR, and Ms. LANDRIEU) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1042, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2006 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title V, add the following: