

added as cosponsors of amendment No. 2485 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. REED (for himself and
Mr. CHAFEE):

S. 1989. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 57 Rolfe Square in Cranston, Rhode Island, shall be known and designated as the "Holly A. Charette Post Office"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to one of Rhode Island's brave soldiers, Lance Corporal Holly A. Charette, who was killed in Iraq on June 23, 2005. In honor of her sacrifice, I am introducing a bill, along with Senator CHAFEE, to name the post office at 57 Rolfe Square in Cranston, RI, the "Holly A. Charette Post Office."

Twenty-one year old Holly Charette died when a suicide bomber in Fallujah attacked the military convoy in which she was riding. This was the deadliest attack on women in the U.S. military since the start of operations in Iraq, and yet another example of the violence that continues to plague our soldiers serving in this conflict.

Those who were close to Holly describe her as a happy and positive young woman loved by all those who knew her. She was a cheerleader at Cranston East High School, where she worked hard in college-prep courses. Her teachers remember her as a "bright, shining star."

Holly had dreams of becoming a postal worker. Instead, in 2002, she made the choice to serve her Nation by joining the U.S. Marine Corps.

She was deployed to Iraq in March of this year with her unit from Camp Lejeune, NC, and assigned to Headquarters Battalion, 2nd Marine Division, II Marine Expeditionary Force. It was here that Holly was able to combine her dreams of postal service with that of serving her Nation.

During her service in Iraq, Holly utilized her strong organizational skills to take on and complete various administrative tasks, including that of mail delivery to the troops. She became known as the "Marine who brought the good news." Holly never forgot a name, and would often stop Marines in the mess hall to let them know that they had mail.

The day that Holly was killed, she was working with Iraqi security forces to prevent insurgents from gaining a foothold in that country.

Her tragic passing has touched the lives of Rhode Islanders. Holly's pres-

ence will be deeply missed by all those who knew and loved her.

This legislation will pay proper tribute to this remarkable young woman, and commemorate her valor for future generations. I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Lance Corporal Holly A. Charette by supporting this bill.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this legislation to name the post office in Cranston after Lance Corporal Charette be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1989

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

SECTION 1. HOLLY A. CHARETTE POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 57 Rolfe Square in Cranston, Rhode Island, shall be known and designated as the "Holly A. Charette Post Office".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Holly A. Charette Post Office".

By Mr. BURR:

S. 1990. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the outreach activities of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BURR:

S. 1991. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish a financial assistance program to facilitate the provision of supportive services for very low-income veteran families in permanent housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, I rise today to honor our Nation's veterans for their service and their sacrifice. We will celebrate Veterans Day tomorrow, and I am proud of the improvements we have made in providing benefits and care to our country's heroes.

In the past 10 years, since I first came to Congress, the veterans budget has increased by 77 percent, an annual average increase of over 7 percent. The VA's health care budget has increased over 85 percent during this time. We have also enacted a fix to the concurrent receipt problem and made groundbreaking progress with computerized health records at the Veterans Department. I am proud of these efforts, but I certainly understand the need to do more to stay ahead of the curve.

I also want to detail the recent growth in the veterans population in North Carolina. Our State's veteran population has increased by over 100,000, to 780,000 veterans since 1980.

This growth rate comes at a time when the number of veterans in the United States is decreasing. Veterans

are moving to the State because many of them were stationed there while on active duty, and they have moved back because of the quality of life in North Carolina.

I have two bills I have introduced today that I believe will improve the services we currently provide to our veterans. The first is the Services to Prevent Veterans Homelessness Act which makes grants to nonprofit and faith-based organizations to provide services to extremely low-income veterans who are in permanent housing. The goal is to keep them from becoming homeless. The services provided for in this bill—from vocational counseling and personal finance planning to health and rehabilitation—were designed to address the root causes of homelessness.

The VA estimates on any given night as many as 200,000 veterans are homeless and as many as 400,000 are homeless at some point during the year. We also know that 45 percent of the homeless veterans have a mental illness, and 50 percent have some sort of addiction.

The cost of this bill is \$25 million annually, a small sum to help the poorest of our veterans. In North Carolina alone, over 43,000 veterans live below the poverty line. This bill would allow the VA to partner with nonprofits in order to help poor veterans escape the root causes of homelessness. I urge the Senate to consider whether we are doing enough on this issue. More importantly, I invite my colleagues to study this bill and to become a cosponsor.

Next, I introduced the Veterans Outreach Improvement Act which authorizes the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to partner with State and local governments for outreach to veterans. This bill provides grants to State veterans agencies and county veterans service offices to help them with outreach and claims development and to provide education and training of officers. The bill would also authorize \$25 million annually for this outreach program.

County veterans service officers are charged with assisting veterans and their dependents in seeking benefits as a supplement to the work being performed by the Department of Veterans Affairs. They are overseen by the Division of Veterans Affairs in North Carolina and receive accreditation from organizations approved by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs. Many veterans need assistance in filing claims in order to make sure that the claim is accurate and complete. County veterans service officers and officials from State veterans agencies are often the officials who can actually sit down face to face with a veteran to develop a claim and to send it to the VA. This bill makes the VA a partner in that outreach process.

On the eve of Veterans Day this year, I join my colleagues in honoring veterans across this country for their heroic service to our Nation.

By Mr. HARKIN (for himself, Mr. LUGAR, and Mr. OBAMA):

S. 1994. A bill to require that an increasing percentage of new automobiles be dual fueled automobiles, to revise the method for calculating corporate average fuel economy for such vehicles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, when we talk about moving toward energy independence in this country, we are really speaking to the issue of reducing America's dangerous dependence on imported oil. Our addiction to oil is most acute in the U.S. transportation sector where a stunning ninety-seven percent of our fuel comes from petroleum—97 percent. In the electricity sector we have largely turned away from oil but not so in transportation.

Fortunately a growing percentage of transportation energy is now coming from clean, domestically-produced renewable fuels like ethanol and biodiesel. With the nearly 8-billion-gallon Renewable Fuels Standard now the law of the land, renewable fuels will supply 5 percent of the energy for our passenger vehicles by 2012, perhaps more. These home-grown, environmentally friendly alternatives made from corn, soybeans and other sources of biomass are helping to improve air quality, reduce greenhouse gas emissions and enhance the rural economy while substantially reducing dependence on foreign oil.

The best part of this trend is that the health, community, and domestic security benefits of renewable fuels come with the bonus of price savings at the pump. Ethanol prices in this country can be as much as 70 cents a gallon less than regular gasoline. Drivers in my State of Iowa are saving as much as 10 cents a gallon on E10—a blend of just 10 percent ethanol and 90 percent gasoline. This is a savings of about \$100 a year for a typical family.

A report earlier this year by the Consumer Federation of America found that consumers throughout our country would experience similar savings if all refiners offered E10. That is a significant savings in all regions of the country. Now, consider the savings if ethanol and other renewable fuels were blended not at 10 percent, but at 85 percent or more. That \$100 a year savings turns into hundreds of dollars each year for a typical family.

Unfortunately, right now only about two percent of vehicles on the road in the United States can use ethanol blends of 85 percent—what we call E85. It turns out standard gasoline engines aren't designed for the different fuel to oxygen ratio.

The good news is, manufacturing a new vehicle to run on E85 or other clean alternative fuel blends is simple—the manufacturer adds a fuel sensor and modifies the engine calibration and fuel line to allow the vehicle to run on gasoline or a combination of gas and alternative fuels.

Right now, these “flex-fuel” vehicles cost at most an additional \$100 or so to produce. Some cost estimates are as low as \$50. Many auto manufacturers offer them to customers at no additional cost. But few Americans are even aware of the option.

At a time of record-high gas prices and continued instability in the Middle East and other oil-producing countries of the world, I believe that all Americans deserve the option to choose the fuel they put in their car.

In Brazil, all new vehicles on the road are expected to be flex-fuel-ready by 2008—meaning every new vehicle owner will have the choice to fill up with gasoline, ethanol, or a combination of the two. If the Brazilians can do it, why can't we?

That's why today Mr. LUGAR, Mr. OBAMA and I are introducing the Fuel Security and Consumer Choice Act to require that automobile manufacturers equip a growing percentage of new vehicles sold in the U.S. for flexible fuel operation. Mr. LUGAR is a leader in promoting research and development into the conversion of cellulosic biomass into useable fuels. Mr. OBAMA is a leader in promoting renewable fuels and in particular E85.

Starting eighteen months after the bill's enactment, manufacturers will be required to equip 10 percent of their cars and light trucks with flex-fuel vehicle, FFV, capability. This is a modest proposal. Several manufacturers are close to meeting or beating this requirement already.

Each model year thereafter, the requirement increases 10 percentage points, so in the second year the manufacturers would have to make at least 20 percent of their vehicles FFVs, and so on, until in about ten years' time 100 percent of new vehicles sold in the United States are flex fuel. I recognize that we could be more aggressive in our timetable, but I believe we've struck the right balance here in pushing and prodding.

In addition, the bill allows auto manufacturers to bank and trade FFV credits toward meeting the requirements. In other words, if one company produced more than its required percentage of FFV vehicles in a given year, it could trade or sell extra credits earned to another company that would then use them to meet the bill's requirements. Credits would have a three-year window if banked or traded. This banking and trading provision is similar to others in law, in the RFS for example, making it that much easier for companies to meet statutory obligations at the lowest possible cost.

Finally, the bill would leave intact the corporate average fuel economy (CAFE) credits for FFV production. However, the bill would change the way the credits are calculated for vehicles produced above the required percentages. Rather than keeping the assumption that the vehicle runs 50 percent of the time on fuel like E85, which isn't an appropriate figure since most

don't run yet on E85, we phase-down the assumed use from 50 percent in the first model year the requirement applies to 30 percent in the second year, 10 percent the third year, and 0 percent thereafter. This should still spur interest among automakers in the early years of the requirement to go beyond the minimum FFV production levels outlined in the bill to get the extra credits. And in the meantime the FFV requirement is kicking in and the ramp up of FFVs won't dilute or weaken CAFE.

This bill will give American consumers true choice in fuel selection for the first time. Drivers will have the option to choose low-price, high-performance E85, or another fuel. My firm belief is that consumers will choose to buy home-grown renewable fuels that directly reduce oil dependence rather than buy traditional fossil fuels often derived from unstable regimes around the globe.

Now, I don't doubt some automobile manufacturers will complain that this requirement is unduly onerous, that it will hurt the industry somehow. Well, I heard the same thing back in 1989 when I proposed another revolutionary idea: closed captioning for TV sets. Industry was in an uproar when I suggested that the hearing impaired should have access to television programming on the public airwaves. The industry said closed captioning would bankrupt it and drive the price of televisions through the roof.

But then, an amazing thing happened. Electronics manufacturers realized that they could reach a broad range of new audiences, including not just the hearing impaired, but also the learning disabled, and immigrants for whom English is a second language. Sales for several companies reached an all-time high, and with implementation across the electronics industry, the cost of the closed captioning chip dropped dramatically to less than a dollar a set.

I have no doubt that vehicle manufacturers will discover similar unexpected efficiencies and benefits with flex fuel vehicles. As more Americans discover the savings from flexible fuels, the more they will seek them out. What better way to boost car sales than to market the fuel cost savings that flexible fuel vehicles offer? Any very small additional cost of the flex-fuel vehicle will be more than offset by the price benefits drivers will achieve from a flexible fuel supply over time, not to mention the tremendous energy security benefits for our Nation.

The country will benefit from cleaner air, reduced greenhouse gas emissions, reduced dependence on foreign oil, and an enhanced rural economy. Simply put, this is a low-cost measure with a tremendous payoff.

It is already well-established that federal auto standards for the benefit of our Nation are an appropriate policy option. It's also important to note that auto manufacturers already comply

with literally dozens of other requirements having to do with the make-up, design, and performance of their vehicles. Making an FFV is a lot cheaper than putting in air bags, or many other components.

Agriculture and renewable fuels producers are ready to provide the fuel. Automobile manufacturers have the technology to do it. Given the country's great energy and security challenges, all sectors must do their part to chart a path toward energy independence: government, individual citizens, energy companies, and yes, auto manufacturers.

I'm grateful that this legislation has been endorsed by a wide array of renewable fuel, agriculture, clean energy and security organizations, including the Renewable Fuels Association, American Coalition for Ethanol, Alliance to Save Energy, Set America Free, and National Corn Growers Association.

In closing I want to recognize Mr. LUGAR and Mr. OBAMA for co-sponsoring this legislation with me today. Mr. LUGAR and I have teamed up many times over the years, most recently to enact the national Renewable Fuels Standard, which we did as part of the comprehensive energy bill. This bill builds upon the RFS, to guarantee that renewable fuels which are being produced in ever greater abundance can find a home in just about any vehicle on the market a few short years from now. I am thankful for his leadership on this and so many other important energy security issues. I am also grateful to Mr. OBAMA for his leadership.

I hope we can rapidly enact this legislation.

Mr. OBAMA. Mr. President, oil companies recently announced record profits. Those of us who drive cars and trucks could feel our wallets shrink at the news. Throughout most of this year, American drivers have paid the highest gas prices of all time—more so in the wake of refinery disruptions caused by Hurricane Katrina. While petroleum company shareholders enjoy healthy stock dividends, the rest of us hemorrhage the cash. Industry analysts explain it away as “business is business.”

Sound familiar? In the 1970s, political conflicts compelled Middle East oil sheiks to tighten their reins on oil production, sending shockwaves throughout our economy and creating long lines at the gas pump. Congress responded with laws promoting energy conservation and fuel efficiency that we thought would reduce our dependence on foreign oil.

Unfortunately, 30 years later, here we are again. The Middle East remains in turmoil, and the engines of America remain firmly fueled on foreign oil. Exacerbating the problem is that the economies of China and India—two nations totaling over 2 billion citizens—are quickly expanding, and they are competing with the U.S. for the same pool of oil. Quite simply, worldwide

production capacity cannot keep pace. And that means U.S. gas prices likely will remain high for the foreseeable future.

More so than at any other time in a generation, our economy is exposed. In the year 2035, will the American market be shackled still to foreign oil? Will we question whether bolder past policies could have prevented future crisis?

The response to these questions can be “no” if we begin now.

For about \$100 worth of hoses and sensors, we can make our cars run on ethanol made from homegrown corn. Automakers made 1 million of these cars this year. We have the technology, and it is proven. With 200 million cars on the road, and 17 million more each year, why can't more cars run on ethanol?

The answer is they can, and that is why I am pleased to join my colleagues from Iowa and Indiana, Senators HARKIN and LUGAR, in introducing legislation to require all cars made in the United States to be ethanol-capable vehicles within 10 years.

Making ethanol cars is not expensive. It is less than the cost of airbags. It is less than the cost of a sunroof. It is less than the cost of foglights. It is less than the cost of a fancy CD player. It is less than the cost of heated seats.

Making ethanol cars is not restrictive. These cars are known as flexible fuel vehicles. Where ethanol is not yet available, you simply fill up with regular gas.

And making ethanol cars is good for American automakers, because American automakers have a head start. Already, 5 percent to 7 percent of their fleet can run on ethanol. We are only asking for an increase over a decade.

I remind my colleagues that the renewable fuels standard enacted in the Energy bill of 2005 will incorporate enough ethanol into our fuel supply to reduce the use of foreign oil. The Harkin-Lugar-Obama bill, if enacted, would accelerate that reduction. And we can do it without hardship, without requiring drivers to purchase matchbox cars, without proposing futuristic technologies that only our great-great-grandchildren's children will see.

The Harkin-Lugar-Obama bill transforms existing, inexpensive, and simple technology into a genuine movement towards energy independence for the United States within a time period that we all can witness. I urge my colleagues' swift approval of this legislation.

By Mr. JEFFORDS (for himself,
Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mrs. BOXER,
and Mr. OBAMA):

S. 1995. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to enhance the security of wastewater treatment works; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, today I rise to introduce the Wastewater Treatment Works Security Act of 2005.

This legislation is designed to improve the safety and security of our Nation's wastewater treatment systems.

There are 16,000 wastewater treatment facilities across the United States serving almost 190 million people. Approximately 1,600 facilities are located near large metropolitan areas. These industrial facilities use large quantities of toxic chemicals in their treatment and disinfection processes, and their collection systems run beneath every city and town in America.

A recent Department of Homeland Security planning scenario estimates that a chlorine tank explosion could result in 17,500 deaths, 10,000 severe injuries, and 100,000 hospitalizations. In February 2005, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) released a report on wastewater security which ranks the release of chlorine as the number two security risk after damage to sewer collection systems.

In the past few years alone, fatal accidents involving large quantities of chlorine have reminded us of the highly volatile nature of this popular wastewater disinfection agent. In January 2005, 9 people were killed in South Carolina when a train carrying chlorine gas was involved in a crash. In June 2004, 3 people died when two freight trains collided in Texas and caused a chlorine tank to rupture.

At the very least, wastewater facilities that use chlorine should evaluate how the chemical is stored on site and how to react in the event of a harmful intentional act. The GAO report on wastewater security recommends mandatory vulnerability assessments and emergency response plans as an immediate step towards addressing the security concerns.

The Wastewater Treatment Works Security Act takes the essential first step in closing the security gaps that make our wastewater treatment systems vulnerable to terrorist attack. The provisions contained in this bill are the product of four years worth of lessons learned since 9/11, mirroring similar legislative efforts to secure critical infrastructure and minimize potential terrorist targets.

This legislation requires all wastewater facilities to conduct vulnerability assessments and to develop or modify site security and emergency response plans to incorporate the results of the vulnerability assessments. Treatment works must certify that alternative approaches, such as using smaller quantities or replacing substances of concern, were considered in their site security plans. It requires that these documents be submitted to EPA for review, and it includes significant security measures to protect this information from unauthorized disclosure.

Additionally, the legislation authorizes \$250 million for assistance in completing vulnerability assessments, for immediate security improvements, and for assistance to small treatment works. Finally, it authorizes \$15 million for research to identify threats,

detection methods and response actions. This bill makes tangible progress towards more secure and better prepared wastewater treatment works.

By contrast, drinking water facilities have conducted vulnerability assessments under the Safe Drinking Water Act since 2002, when Congress passed H.R. 3448, the Public Health and Bio-terrorism Preparedness Response Act, P.L. 107-188. These plants are often collocated. It makes no sense to adopt strong standards for one infrastructure sector and not the other. In anticipation of congressional action on wastewater security, EPA has already issued guidance on conducting vulnerability assessments of wastewater treatment works, and many plants have already completed them.

The Wastewater Treatment Works Security Act will codify what are now voluntary prevention and security measures and require all wastewater facilities to complete vulnerability assessments and emergency response plans, just as drinking water facilities have done since 2002.

Our homeland security strategy begins with protecting critical infrastructure, and wastewater treatment facilities can no longer remain the exception. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

By Mr. KOHL:

S. 1996. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Energy to temporarily prohibit the exportation of a finished petroleum product or liquefied petroleum gas from the United States if the Secretary determines that the supply of the product or gas in any Petroleum Allocation Defense District has fallen or will fall below expected demand; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I would like to address an issue that I know my constituents in Wisconsin are worried about; indeed, something that all Americans should be concerned about. On Tuesday, the Energy Information Administration (EIA) announced the most recent outlook for home heating costs. For the average family, the cost of heating oil will increase approximately \$325. And for families relying on propane, they can expect to pay an increase of about \$230. I would like to stress that this is the average; in some areas, the prices could be much higher. And while these increased costs will place an undue burden on all sectors of the economy, the heaviest toll will clearly be on middle and low-income families.

Yesterday, executives from several major oil companies were called to Capitol Hill, to defend the nearly \$33 billion they earned last quarter. The answers they gave, for why Americans could expect to pay significantly more to heat their homes this winter, often were directed at the economics of supply and demand. The Chairman and CEO of ConocoPhillips argued that prices are “a function of longer-term

supply-and-demand trends, and lost energy production during the recent hurricanes.” John Hofmeister, the President of Shell Oil Company, told Senators that the industry is doing everything in its power to “supply shortfalls.”

Given the testimony of Mr. Hofmeister, I find it surprising to note that currently, American companies are actually exporting products that could be used for home heating. According to the EIA, between January and August 2005 more than 48 million barrels of refined product was exported out of the U.S. This amount is 24 times the size of what is stored in the Northeast Heating Oil Reserve. While some of this went to both Canada and Mexico, large quantities were also sent to Argentina, Chile, France and Peru.

I believe my constituents would be shocked to hear that while the oil companies are blaming high prices on low supplies, they are also reaping the benefits of exporting home heating oil abroad. That is why, on November 4th, I, along with 11 of my colleagues, wrote to several of the major oil companies and refiners, asking them to voluntarily halt all unnecessary exports of products that could be used for home heating. Such action would not be without precedent: in 2000, some refiners, including Shell Oil, voluntarily suspended heating oil exports after consulting with then Energy Secretary Richardson. We have not yet heard a response from any of the companies.

I remain hopeful that these companies will help American consumers by temporarily suspending their unnecessary exports. Yesterday's hearing, however, did not inspire confidence in the companies to act on behalf of consumers rather than profits. That is why I am introducing the Stop Heating Oil Exports bill today.

My legislation would grant emergency powers to the Energy Secretary to halt all unnecessary exports in the face of a serious price spike or supply shortfall. It is that simple. If the Secretary finds that demand will heavily outpace supply, then he or she should be able to stop exports—thereby temporarily improving supply, and preventing a major price spike, such as the one we can expect this winter.

Yesterday, the oil companies cautioned those of us in Congress against policy changes that would amount to long-term involvement in energy markets. I would assure these executives that my legislation is a simple, short-term answer that is designed to protect American consumers. The companies have a chance to do the right thing, to increase supply and avoid the significantly increased home heating prices that have been forecasted.

I believe that in the future, if they fail to use such an opportunity, the Energy Secretary should have the power to intervene on behalf of consumers. I would remind my colleagues that in 2000, as many as 4 refiners voluntarily suspended exports, citing “market con-

ditions” and the desire to ensure adequate supplies of home heating oil for the winter. And I would remind the President of Shell that his company was one of them.

Americans across the country could face potentially life-threatening conditions this winter, when temperatures drop and home heating prices soar. I believe that the oil companies have it in their power to prevent such a crisis—if they fail to use it, I believe it is the responsibility of the Federal Government to protect American families. I ask unanimous consent that the text of our legislation be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1996

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 “Stop Heating Oil Exports Act of 2005”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) according to the Energy Information Administration, households heated primarily with heating oil can expect to pay an average increase of \$378, or 32 percent more than last year, to heat their homes;

(2) households relying on propane can expect to pay, on average, \$325 more this winter;

(3) the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration projects a 3.2-percent colder winter than last year, and if colder weather prevails, home heating expenditures will be significantly higher;

(4) high home heating prices will disproportionately impact moderate- and low-income families;

(5) in October 2000, the Secretary of Energy, Bill Richardson, successfully worked with major refiners to temporarily halt heating oil exports, to ensure adequate supplies of home heating oil for the winter;

(6) between January and August 2005, refiners in the United States have exported more than 48,000,000 barrels, or 2,000,000,000 gallons, of product that could be used for home heating; and

(7) at a time when consumers in the United States can expect nearly double their home heating costs in 2004, refiners in the United States should not be diminishing the supply by exporting home heating products.

SEC. 3. AUTHORITY TO TEMPORARILY PROHIBIT EXPORT OF CERTAIN PETROLEUM PRODUCTS.

If the Secretary of Energy determines that the supply of a finished petroleum product or liquefied petroleum gas in any of the 5 Petroleum Allocation Defense Districts has fallen or will fall below expected demand for the product or gas, the Secretary may temporarily prohibit the exportation of the product or gas from the United States.

By Mr. HARKIN (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. BINGAMAN, and Mr. REED):

S. 1997. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Energy to establish a program of energy assistance grants to local educational agencies; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, today, I am introducing the School Energy Crisis Relief Act. This bill would authorize the Secretary of Energy to award School Energy Grants to the poorest school districts in each State. I am pleased that Senators Schumer, Clinton, and Bingaman have joined me in sponsoring this bill.

With cold weather setting in, people all across the country are worried about the sky-high cost of energy. Americans are feeling pain at the pump, and they are feeling even more pain at home, with home-heating costs expected to rise as much as 70 percent above last year's levels.

At the same time, many public school districts across the country are struggling to cope with a dramatic, unexpected surge in their energy costs. Schools are facing a double hit: they operate large fleets of buses, and they must heat large, sprawling buildings. This problem is especially acute in the West and Midwest, where many school districts cover large geographic areas, and in urban areas, which are burdened with some of the nation's oldest and often least energy-efficient buildings.

For affluent suburban districts, these unanticipated energy costs are a challenge. But for poor school districts, they are a full-blown crisis. Many school boards face a choice between paying their higher energy bills or cutting instructional staff and programs.

My bill would allow the Secretary of Energy to award grants to schools districts with the highest percentage and highest number of students eligible for Title I assistance. The grant amounts would be awarded based on the population of school-age children in the district, as well as the regional costs of transportation and heating fuel.

This is a nationwide crisis, and it calls for an urgent Federal response. School districts across the country are already implementing drastic measures in response to higher energy costs. In Kentucky, for instance, several school districts have cut back to four days of classes per week. In September, most of Georgia's schools cancelled classes for two days in an effort to conserve energy and cut costs.

In my State, the Iowa Association of School Boards estimates that, this winter, there will be \$40 million shortfall in funding to cover school heating costs. Higher fuel costs for school buses could worsen the shortfall by another \$8 million. And because that will come out of the fixed general fund for public education, every additional dollar spent on energy costs will come at the expense of classroom and instructional quality. For example, Charles City, IA, expects to spend \$140,000 more on fuel this winter. That's enough to pay the salaries of four teachers.

According to the Iowa Association of School Boards, school districts are responding to the energy crisis by reducing staff, increasing class sizes, reducing course offerings, postponing technology purchases, or cutting Headstart

transportation programs. Many school districts are lowering their thermostats to unhealthy levels. In fact, just yesterday, I heard that the school district in Ottumwa, IA, has asked parents to start sending kids to school with coats to keep them warm indoors. This is just not acceptable.

In addition, I remind my colleagues that school districts—especially high-poverty school districts—are struggling heroically to try to meet the requirements of the No Child Left Behind Act. It is penny wise and pound foolish to force these districts to cut instructional staff and classroom resources in order to pay their higher energy bills. And none of us can be comfortable with the prospect of children sitting at their school desks in coats and scarves to fight off the chill. As I said, this is just not acceptable.

The poorest school districts all across America are in desperate need of assistance with their energy costs. Low-income children deserve the opportunity to learn and achieve in classrooms that are properly heated. And we certainly don't want schools to be eliminating school days and laying off teachers because of higher energy costs. So we need to act. I urge my colleagues to support the School Energy Crisis Relief Act so we can respond to this emergency as expeditiously as possible. According to the Iowa Association of School Boards, this has led to some schools deciding to scale back after-school activities because of heating costs and to cut non-varsity sports because they lack funding necessary to take them to games. It is very troubling to me that schools have been forced to make cuts that have directly affected the educational experience of the children in their schools, in the name of rising fuel costs. For instance, some schools have had to cut back on field trips, put off buying new text books and school supplies, while reducing course offerings in fine arts and academics.

In addition, the Iowa Association of School Boards has reported that schools have cut back on staff and increased class sizes while also turning down the thermostat in the classroom. I ask, Mr. President, are we supposed to expect students to learn at a high-level when rising energy costs have put them in overcrowded, cold classrooms?

But this problem is not specific to my home State of Iowa. As the sponsor of companion legislation in the House of Representatives, Congressman Joe Baca, pointed out that some schools in Kentucky have cut back to four-day school weeks to keep their energy costs down. Recently, Georgia schools cancelled two days of classes in an attempt to keep their costs down. In Colton Joint Unified District in Congressman Baca's congressional district, the price of a gallon of diesel fuel has risen from under a dollar at one point to \$2.72 a gallon increasing annual fuel costs by over \$300,000.

So I have come to the floor today to introduce the School Energy Crisis Re-

lief Act. This legislation meets the needs of struggling school districts by authorizing the Secretary of Energy to award grants to poor school districts struggling to balance skyrocketing energy costs with providing a quality education. Grants would be awarded to the poorest urban and rural school districts in each state. In Iowa alone, this means both poor rural and urban districts would be eligible to receive grants.

I ask for my colleagues support for the School Energy Crisis Relief Act and urge the Senate to work quickly to pass this crucial legislation and provide relief to those school districts in need.

By Mr. CONRAD (for himself, Mr. VITTER, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. NELSON of Nebraska, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. THUNE, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. LAUTENBERG, and Mrs. DOLE):

S. 1998. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to enhance protections relating to the reputation and meaning of the Medal of Honor and other military decorations and awards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, it is an honor for me to introduce the Stolen Valor Act of 2005. This legislation will honor the brave veterans of our Nation who have been awarded valorous medals for their service to our Nation. It is only appropriate that this bill be introduced today, the day before our country remembers all servicemen and women—past and present—who have served America in uniform.

Recipients of the Medal of Honor, Distinguished Service Awards, Silver Star, or Purple Heart have made incredible sacrifices for our country. They deserve our thanks and respect.

Unfortunately, however, there are some individuals who diminish the accomplishments of award recipients by using medals they have not earned. These imposters use fake medals—or claim to have medals that they have not earned—to gain credibility in their communities. These fraudulent acts can often lead to the perpetration of very serious crimes.

Currently, Federal law enforcement officials are only able to prosecute those who wear counterfeit medals. The statute does not apply to individuals who claim to be award recipients either verbally or in writing, or to those who display fake medals in their offices or homes.

My legislation will allow law enforcement officials to prosecute those who falsely claim, either verbally or in writing, to be medal recipients. It calls for a six-month jail sentence and a fine for improper use of most medals, and includes a maximum sentence of one year for perpetrators who claim to have earned the Medal of Honor, Distinguished Service Awards, Silver Star, or Purple Heart.

The Military Order of the Purple Heart, the VFW, and the FBI Agents

Association have endorsed this legislation because of the capabilities it will provide law enforcement officials to prosecute these fraudulent acts.

It is my hope that this legislation will serve to honor the courageous heroes who have rightfully earned these awards. We must never allow their service and sacrifice to be cheapened by those who wish to exploit these honors for personal gain.

By Mr. KERRY:

S. 1999. A bill to amend the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 to transfer the YouthBuild program from the Department of Housing and Urban Development to the Department of Labor, to enhance the program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, today I am introducing legislation that would transfer the YouthBuild program from its current home in the Department of Housing and Urban Development to the Department of Labor. Transferring departmental jurisdiction over this program will help ensure that Youthbuild continues to receive the funds it needs to help unemployed and undereducated young people ages 16–24 work toward their GED or high school diploma while learning job skills by building affordable housing for homeless and low-income people. It is supported by the YouthBuild Coalition.

Poverty, neglect, abuse, and deprivation of all kinds can prevent people from reaching their true potential. Many of those who have fallen off track, suffered losses, and made mistakes can recover. If given the opportunity, they can learn to cope with obstacles and care effectively about themselves, their families and their communities. YouthBuild helps young people who have lost their way to turn their lives around.

YouthBuild is a uniquely comprehensive program that offers at-risk youth an immediate productive role rebuilding their communities. While attending basic education classes for 50 percent of program time, students also receive job skills training in the construction field, personal counseling from respected mentors, a supportive peer group with positive values, and experience in civic engagement. They build houses for homeless and low-income people while earning their own GED or high school diploma.

YouthBuild is built on success. The first YouthBuild program was created in 1978. At that time, YouthBuild's future founder, Dorothy Stoneman, formed the Youth Action Program to rebuild homes in New York City. The successful renovation of an East Harlem tenement led to a city-wide coalition and in 1990, led to YouthBuild USA, an organization created to replicate this program around the Nation.

In 1992, I introduced legislation which was enacted into law as part of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act, authorizing federal

funding for YouthBuild through the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

In its first 10 years of Federal funding, YouthBuild has demonstrated the ability to bring the most disadvantaged youth into productive employment, higher education, and civic engagement. Since 1994, more than 40,000 YouthBuild students have helped rebuild their communities, creating more than 12,000 units of affordable housing, while transforming their lives at the same time.

YouthBuild has earned majority bipartisan support for Federal funding in the Senate due to its great success in local communities. Today there are 226 YouthBuild programs in 44 States engaging 7,000 young adults.

The number of programs could easily be expanded. Last year alone, 260 communities were denied YouthBuild funding. The programs that exist could easily grow. In 2004, local programs turned away 10,000 applicants solely for lack of funds.

The expansion of YouthBuild would help address critical national problems: the construction industry is short 80,000 workers; over 500,000 youth are dropping out of high school every year with no prospects of becoming gainfully employed; states are spending huge amounts on prisons, housing 365,000 16 to 24 year olds, 65 percent of whom have dropped out of high school.

Consider this story of success: Manny Negron grew up in New Britain, CT. He left school during his Sophomore year after having some personal problems. He started selling drugs and getting into trouble. Then he joined YouthBuild, obtained a GED and learned more about the construction industry. "Before YouthBuild, I didn't know what I wanted to do with my life." Manny said. "I had no goals, no plans—I had nothing. If it was a weekend when I was partying and in the street, I had no plans. Now it's completely different and YouthBuild did that for me. Now that I'm away from all that, I actually see a future for myself and see what I'm capable of and what I can do with my life."

Research on 900 YouthBuild graduates several years after program completion showed that 75 percent were employed at an average wage of \$10/hour or in college. They were voting and paying taxes. Of those who had committed felonies, the recidivism rate was a strikingly low, 15 percent.

The legislation I am introducing today responds to the Bush administration's attempt to move YouthBuild from HUD to DoL in its FY 2006 budget request. I did not agree with the Administration attempt to transfer YouthBuild in the budget; it was simply the wrong approach. However, my staff has met with Administration officials, with YouthBuild and with YouthBuild's strong supporters. And I believe that we can find a way to do this, and I appreciate that the Administration has shown a willingness to

work with us so far. If done properly, I transferring YouthBuild from HUD to DoL could increase YouthBuild's scope, helping it to reach the communities and young people that are currently denied access due to a lack of funds. This legislation not only authorizes the transfer of YouthBuild from HUD to DoL, but also allows unlimited future federal funding, continues centralized management at DoL and continues the historic role of YouthBuild USA as the partner and contractor for quality assurance.

This legislation is an attempt to help move the process of transferring the YouthBuild program forward. I look forward to working with Senators Enzi and Kennedy, the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions to develop compromise legislation that will ensure that YouthBuild continues to assist young people around the nation. I ask that all my colleagues support this legislation and continue to support the YouthBuild.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 302—TO EXPRESS THE SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE IMPACT OF MEDICAID RECONCILIATION LEGISLATION ON THE HEALTH AND WELL-BEING OF CHILDREN

Mr. BINGAMAN (for himself, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. REED, Mrs. CLINTON, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BAUCUS, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. CORZINE, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. DODD, and Mr. SALAZAR) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

S. RES. 302

Whereas the Medicaid program provides health insurance for more than ¼ of children in the United States and pays for more than ½ of the births and health care costs for newborns in the United States each year;

Whereas the Medicaid program provides critical access to health care for children with disabilities, covering more than 70 percent of poor children with disabilities and children with special needs in low-income working families, including 1 in 9 military children with special health care needs;

Whereas low-income children who depend on the Medicaid program experience a rate of health conditions and health risks much greater than those found among children who are not low-income;

Whereas the Medicaid program is the largest source of payment for health care provided to children with special health care needs in the Nation and is also a critical source of funding for health care provided to children in foster care and for health care services provided in schools to children eligible for coverage under the Medicaid program;

Whereas the Medicaid program is the single largest source of revenue for the Nation's safety net hospitals, including children's hospitals and community health centers, and is critical to the ability of these providers to adequately serve all children;

Whereas the Medicaid program, in combination with the State Children's Health Insurance Program, has helped to dramatically