

crimes by supplying thousands of guns to the criminal market. We must use this type of information to help point the way to policies that keep guns out of the hands of criminals.

COST ESTIMATES

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for three cost estimates from the Congressional Budget Office to be printed in the RECORD.

These estimates are for three important bills which the Committee on Foreign Relations has already reported to the Senate. They are S. 2489, S. 3709, and S. 3722.

The Standing Rules of the Senate require that committee reports on bills or joint resolutions contain cost estimates for such legislation.

When the Committee on Foreign Relations reported these bills earlier this year, the committee had not received the Congressional Budget Office's cost estimates.

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

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE COST ESTIMATE

S. 2489—U.S. Additional Protocol Implementation Act

Summary: S. 2489 would implement the obligations of the United States under the Protocol Additional to the Agreement between the United States of America and the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) for the Application of Safeguards in the United States of America (hereafter called the Additional Protocol). The Additional Protocol was signed by the United States in 1998 and ratified by the Senate in 2004 (Treaty Document 107-7). The bill would authorize government agencies to conduct vulnerability assessments at government and commercial facilities to protect national security interests. The bill also would authorize the U.S. government to seek search warrants when owners of commercial facilities bar the government from entering the location in support of the IAEA inspections and would establish guidelines for conducting environmental sampling at both government and commercial locations.

CBO estimates that implementing S. 2489 would cost \$17 million in 2007 and \$72 million over the 2007-2011 period, assuming appropriation of the necessary amounts. Enacting the bill would not affect direct spending or receipts.

Section 4 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA) excludes from the application of that act any legislative provisions that are necessary for the ratification or implementation of international treaty obligations. CBO has determined that because this bill would implement the Additional Protocol, it falls within that exclusion. CBO has thus not reviewed the bill for intergovernmental or private-sector mandates.

Estimated cost to the Federal Government: The estimated budgetary impact of S. 2489 is shown in the following table. The costs would fall within budget functions 050 (national defense), 270 (energy), and 370 (commerce and housing credit). CBO assumes that the bill will be enacted near the start of fiscal year 2007 and that the estimated amounts will be appropriated each year.

	By fiscal year, in millions of dollars—				
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
CHANGES IN SPENDING SUBJECT TO APPROPRIATION					
Estimated Authorization Level ..	23	13	13	13	13
Estimated Outlays	17	15	14	13	13

Basis of estimate: Enacting S. 2489 would enable government agencies to implement the Additional Protocol. Specifically, the bill would:

Authorize government agencies to conduct vulnerability assessments at government and commercial facilities.

Designate government agencies to provide outreach programs to the commercial facilities and to issue regulations in order to implement the provisions of the Additional Protocol.

Authorize the federal government to seek search warrants when the owner of a commercial facility refuses to give consent for inspection by the IAEA, and

Set guidelines for the IAEA to conduct environmental sampling at government and commercial facilities.

CBO expects that most of the assessments would be performed by the Department of Defense (DoD) and the Department of Energy (DOE) at universities, fuel-fabrication plants, and commercial manufacturing sites currently working on DoD projects, as well as DOE labs. Although DoD and DOE already have the authority to perform such assessments, CBO believes that those agencies will not perform these assessments unless S. 2489 is enacted. Based on information from those two departments, CBO estimates that the Department of Defense would conduct about 50 assessments a year, while the Department of Energy would conduct about 50 assessments in 2007 and about 10 assessments each year thereafter, at an average cost of about \$200,000 per assessment. Accordingly, CBO estimates that conducting vulnerability assessments would cost \$15 million in 2007 and \$65 million over the 2007-2011 period, assuming appropriation of the estimated amounts.

CBO expects that most of the outreach efforts would be performed by the Department of Commerce (DOC). DOC is developing a new database to support the reporting requirements of the Additional Protocol. The department also would conduct outreach, training, and inspection support programs at commercial facilities. CBO anticipates that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's (NRC's) staff would revise regulations to include the new requirements for implementing the Additional Protocol and would prepare guidance documents for its commercial licensees to prepare for the IAEA inspections. Under current law, 90 percent of the additional costs for the NRC would be covered by fees paid by operators of nuclear power plants. Based on information provided by DOC and NRC, CBO estimates that the net cost of these efforts would be \$2 million in 2007 and \$7 million over the 2007-2011 period.

CBO expects that most facilities would cooperate with the inspections and that the costs to seek and execute warrants required under the bill would be insignificant. Also, based on information from the State Department, CBO believes that the IAEA would not be able to conduct environmental sampling at government or commercial facilities because the United States, as a lawful nuclear weapons state, would forbid such sampling under existing treaty rights. Thus, CBO estimates that the U.S. government would incur no costs related to such sampling.

Intergovernmental and Private-Sector Impact: Section 4 of the UMRA excludes from the application of that act any legislative provisions that are necessary for the ratification or implementation of international

treaty obligations. CBO has determined that because this bill would implement the Additional Protocol, it falls within that exclusion. CBO has thus not reviewed the bill for intergovernmental or private sector mandates.

Previous CBO Estimate: On August 10, 2006, CBO transmitted an estimate for S. 3709, a bill to exempt from certain requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 United States exports of nuclear materials, equipment, and technology to India, and to implement the United States Additional Protocol, as ordered reported on July 20, 2006. Title II of that bill is identical to S. 2489, and the estimated costs are the same in both estimates.

At the request of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, CBO prepared an analysis of the costs associated with ratifying the Protocol Additional to the Agreement Between the United States of America and the International Atomic Energy Agency Regarding Safeguards in the United States (Treaty Document 107-7). In that analysis, dated March 5, 2004, CBO estimated that one-time costs to the U.S. government for implementing the Additional Protocol would total between \$20 million and \$30 million, and recurring costs would total between \$10 million and \$15 million a year, assuming appropriation of the estimated amounts. Those estimated costs are similar to the costs described in this estimate.

Estimate Prepared by: Federal Costs: Raymond J. Hall; Impact on State, Local, and Tribal Governments: Melissa Merrell; Impact on the Private Sector: Tyler Kruzich.

Estimate Approved by: Robert A. Sunshine, Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE COST ESTIMATE

S. 3709—A bill to exempt from certain requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 United States Exports of nuclear materials, equipment, and technology to India, and to implement the United States Additional Protocol

Summary: S. 3709 would exempt India from the current-law prohibition on the transfer of nuclear materials and technology to countries that are not signatories to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. In addition, S. 3709 would implement the obligations of the United States under the Protocol Additional to the Agreement between the United States of America and the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) for the Application of Safeguards in the United States of America (hereafter called the Additional Protocol).

CBO estimates that implementing S. 3709 would cost \$17 million in 2007 and \$72 million over the 2007-2011 period, assuming appropriation of the necessary amounts. Enacting the bill would not affect direct spending or receipts.

Section 4 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA) excludes from the application of that act any legislative provisions that are necessary for the ratification or implementation of international treaty obligations. CBO has determined that because title II of this bill would implement the Additional Protocol, it falls within that exclusion. Other provisions of the bill contain no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates and would not affect the budgets of state, local, or tribal governments.

Estimated Cost to the Federal Government: The estimated budgetary impact of S. 3709 is shown in the following table. The costs would fall within budget functions 050 (national defense), 270 (energy), and 370 (commerce and housing credit).

	By fiscal year, in millions of dollars—				
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
CHANGES IN SPENDING SUBJECT TO APPROPRIATION					
Estimated Authorization Level	23	13	13	13	13
Estimated Outlays	17	15	14	13	13

Basis of Estimate: CBO assumes that the bill will be enacted near the start of fiscal year 2007 and that the estimated amounts will be appropriated each year.

U.S. Additional Protocol Implementation (title II)

Enacting title II of S. 3709 would enable government agencies to implement the Additional Protocol. Specifically, the bill would: Authorize government agencies to conduct vulnerability assessments at government and commercial facilities, Designate government agencies to provide outreach programs to the commercial facilities and to issue regulations in order to implement the provisions of the Additional Protocol, Authorize the federal government to seek search warrants when the owner of a commercial facility refuses to give consent for inspection by the IAEA, and Set guidelines for the IAEA to conduct environmental sampling at government and commercial facilities.

CBO expects that most of the assessments would be performed by the Department of Defense (DoD) and the Department of Energy (DOE) at universities, fuel-fabrication plants, and commercial manufacturing sites currently working on DoD projects, as well as DOE labs. Although DoD and DOE already have the authority to perform such assessments, CBO believes that those agencies will not perform these assessments unless S. 2489 is enacted. Based on information from those two departments, CBO estimates that the Department of Defense would conduct about 50 assessments a year, while the Department of Energy would conduct about 50 assessments in 2007 and about 10 assessments each year thereafter, at an average cost of about \$200,000 per assessment. Accordingly, CBO estimates that conducting vulnerability assessments would cost \$15 million in 2007 and \$65 million over the 2007–2011 period, assuming appropriation of the estimated amounts.

CBO expects that most of the outreach efforts would be performed by the Department of Commerce (DOC). DOC is developing a new database to support the reporting requirements of the Additional Protocol. The department also would conduct outreach, training, and inspection support programs at commercial facilities. CBO anticipates that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's (NRC's) staff would revise regulations to include the new requirements for implementing the Additional Protocol and would prepare guidance documents for its commercial licensees to prepare for the IAEA inspections. Under current law, 90 percent of the additional costs for the NRC would be covered by fees paid by operators of nuclear power plants. Based on information provided by DOC and NRC, CBO estimates that the net cost of these efforts would be \$2 million in 2007 and \$7 million over the 2007–2011 period.

CBO expects that most facilities would cooperate with the inspections and that the

costs to seek and execute warrants required under the bill would be insignificant. Also, based on information from the State Department, CBO believes that the IAEA would not be able to conduct environmental sampling at government or commercial facilities because the United States, as a lawful nuclear weapons state, would forbid such sampling under existing treaty rights. Thus, CBO estimates that the U.S. government would incur no costs related to such sampling.

United States-India Peaceful Atomic Energy Cooperation (title I)

Under title I of this bill, the United States could transfer nuclear material and technology to India, subject to an agreement between the two countries, if the President certifies that India meets certain conditions. Those conditions would require India to: Provide a credible plan to separate civilian and military nuclear facilities, Conclude an agreement with the International Atomic Energy Agency, Work actively with the United States to conclude a multilateral treaty to stop the production of fissile materials for use in nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices, Support efforts of the international community to prevent proliferation of nuclear enrichment and reprocessing technology, and Gain the consensus support of the Nuclear Suppliers Group, an organization of countries with nuclear capabilities, for trade in items covered by its guidelines.

Additionally, in the event an agreement is reached for nuclear cooperation between India and the United States, the bill would require the President to submit a report detailing the basis for determining that India meets all the necessary requirements and to inform the appropriate committees of any significant nuclear activities of India. The bill also would require that the agreement be approved by a joint resolution of the two Houses of Congress that has been enacted into law. And finally, the bill would require that the exemption from current-law prohibition would cease to be effective if India detonates a nuclear explosive device after the date of the enactment of this bill.

CBO estimates that implementing title I of this bill would have no significant impact on the federal budget.

Intergovernmental and Private-Sector Impact: Section 4 of UMRA excludes from the application of that act any legislative provisions that are necessary for the ratification or implementation of international treaty obligations. CBO has determined that because title II of this bill would implement the Additional Protocol, it falls within that exclusion. Other provisions of the bill contain no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates and would not affect the budgets of state, local, or tribal governments.

Previous CBO estimate: On August 10, 2006, CBO transmitted a cost estimate for S. 2489,

the U.S. Additional Protocol Implementation Act. That bill contains provisions that are identical to those in title II of S. 3709, and the estimated costs are the same in both estimates.

On July 13, 2006, CBO transmitted a cost estimate for H.R. 5682, the United States and India Nuclear Cooperation Promotion Act of 2006, as ordered reported by the House Committee on International Relations on June 27, 2006. That bill contains provisions that are very similar to those in title I of S. 3709, and the estimated costs are the same in both estimates.

At the request of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, CBO prepared an analysis of the costs associated with ratifying the Protocol Additional to the Agreement Between the United States of America and the International Atomic Energy Agency Regarding Safeguards in the United States (Treaty Document 107-7). In that analysis, dated March 5, 2004, CBO estimated that one-time costs to the U.S. government for implementing the Additional Protocol would total between \$20 million and \$30 million, and recurring costs would total between \$10 million and \$15 million a year, assuming appropriation of the estimated amounts. Those estimated costs are similar to the costs described in this estimate.

Estimate prepared by: Federal Costs: Raymond J. Hall and Sam Papenfuss, Impact on State, Local, and Tribal Governments: Melissa Merrell, Impact on the Private Sector: Tyler Kruzich.

Estimate approved by: Robert A. Sunshine, Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE COST ESTIMATE

S. 3722—Naval Vessels Transfer Act of 2006

Summary: S. 3722 would authorize the transfer of 10 naval vessels to foreign countries: five by grant and five by sale. In each case, the bill identifies the vessel, the type of transfer, and the recipient country. The authority to transfer those vessels would expire two years after enactment.

CBO estimates the specified sales would increase offsetting receipts by \$60 million over the 2007–2008 period. (Asset sale receipts are a credit against direct spending.)

S. 3722 contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA) and would not affect the budgets of state, local, or tribal governments.

Estimated Cost to the Federal Government: CBO's estimate of the budgetary effects of S. 3722 are shown in the following table. The costs of this legislation fall within budget function 150 (international affairs). For this estimate, CBO assumes that S. 3722 would be enacted near the beginning of fiscal year 2007.

	By fiscal year, in millions of dollars—										
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
CHANGES IN DIRECT SPENDING											
Estimated Budget Authority	0	-10	-50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Estimated Outlays	0	-10	-50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Basis of estimate: S. 3722 would authorize the transfer of 10 naval vessels to foreign countries. Under the act, five specific vessels

could be transferred to designated countries by grant and the other five vessels could be sold to specified countries. Based on infor-

mation from the Navy regarding the value of these ships and recent experience with actual sales and grants, CBO estimates that

the sales would increase offsetting receipts by \$10 million in 2007 and \$60 million over the 2007–2008 period.

Intergovernmental and private-sector impact: S. 3722 contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in UMRA and would not affect the budgets of state, local, or tribal governments.

Estimate prepared by: Federal Costs: Sam Papenfuss.

Impact on State, Local, and Tribal Governments: Melissa Merrell.

Impact on Private Sector: Victoria Liu.

Estimate approved by: Peter H. Fontaine, Deputy Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

SPACE SHUTTLE “ATLANTIS” STS-115 MISSION

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, today, September 21, 2006, marked the successful conclusion of the STS-115 Space Shuttle *Atlantis* mission with its safe landing at the Kennedy Space Center in Florida. This 12-day mission was the 116th shuttle mission and the 19th to visit the International Space Station. STS-115 marked the resumption of International Space Station construction for the first time since 2002. The *Atlantis* crew delivered and installed a large space station truss segment, two solar arrays and associated equipment, significantly increasing the electrical power generation capability on the space station. STS-115 included three critical spacewalks to install the truss and solar panels, laying the groundwork for the future doubling in size of the space station.

I applaud the skill, bravery, and accomplishments of the STS-115 crew—Commander Brent Jett, pilot Christopher Ferguson, and space walking mission specialists Daniel Burbank, Steven MacLean, Heidemarie Stefanyshyn-Piper, and Joseph Tanner. This successful mission is a testament to the thousands of people who work on the Space Shuttle and Space Station Programs.

We must continue to fly space shuttle in order to complete the construction of the International Space Station, honor commitments to our international partners, and utilize this laboratory for its intended purpose—extending our presence in space and increasing our understanding of the space environment for future explorers. Equally important, we must work together to preserve the workforce that will soon become the backbone of the new Orion crew exploration vehicle and the next human space project.

CODE TALKERS RECOGNITION ACT

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, this is a historic day. Last night we passed S. 1035, the Code Talkers Recognition Act.

As my fellow Senate colleagues may know, code talkers played a unique role in our battlefield successes by transmitting commands and messages in their native language, which, of course, completely baffled the enemy. I

was fortunate to meet one of these heroes during a visit to the Meskwaki settlement a couple years ago. Frank Sanache was modest and soft spoken about his heroism. But history has recorded his deeds in battle. And his passing was a loss to all of us who knew and respected him.

In January of 1941, Frank and seven other Meskwaki tribal members—Edward Benson, Dewey Roberts, Dewey Youngbear, Mike Twin, Jude Wayne Wabaunasee, Mike Wayne Wabaunasee, and Willard Sanache—enlisted in the Iowa National Guard. They were recruited for code talker training, and served in the 168th Infantry, 34th Division.

In the Second World War, communication in Native American languages proved to be the perfect tool for frustrating enemy eavesdropping. Indian languages were used to develop military codes that were difficult to intercept and impossible to break. This is ironic, because in the years prior to the war, the Meskwaki and other tribes had been under constant pressure to abandon their traditional languages and cultures.

The use of these codes is credited with saving countless lives. Until recently, however, only the Navajos and the Navajo code were given broad recognition and credit. But, in fact, at least 17 other tribes, including Iowa’s Meskwaki, served as code talkers during the Second World War.

Congress has already recognized the courageous service of Navajo code talkers. And by passing S. 1035, the Code Talkers Recognition Act, last night, we are recognizing the service and sacrifice of all the code talkers and awarding congressional commemorative medals to these heroes.

I thank Senators FRIST, SHELBY, and SARBANES for allowing this important and historic legislation to move forward and the bipartisan effort from Senators INHOFE, JOHNSON, THUNE, and GRASSLEY in gaining 79 cosponsors.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO JOHN RIPLEY FORBES

• Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, today I wish to honor the memory of an extraordinary naturalist, conservationist, educator, father, and husband who devoted his life to sharing his love of nature with communities across the country. John Ripley Forbes lived in Georgia for over 30 years, and Georgians of all ages have been blessed by his delightful approach to nature, science, and learning.

Mr. Forbes was born in Massachusetts in 1913. From a very early age, he was fascinated during nature walks with his father and knew that he wanted to study nature for the rest of his life. At the age of 14, he became the protege of his neighbor, famed naturalist William Temple Hornaday. While

still in his teens, John Ripley Forbes guided visitors through his personal nature collection at the Bruce Museum of Arts and Sciences in Greenwich, CT. After studying zoology and ornithology for a time at Iowa State University and Bowdoin College, he worked as an ornithological collector on explorer Donald Baxter MacMillan’s 1937 expedition to Baffin Island. Fifty years later, in 1987, Bowdoin would award him an honorary doctorate degree.

Mr. Forbes continually combined his knowledge and experience as a naturalist with his enthusiastic focus on children’s education. After Hornaday’s death, John established and presided over the William T. Hornaday Foundation to underwrite children’s museums around the United States. The organization became one of John’s legacies, the Natural Science for Youth Foundation. He also worked to build museums from Naples, FL, to Sacramento, CA. In each one, he created fascinating opportunities for children to experience nature whether through habitat trails, wildlife preserves, or even animal lending libraries, which allowed children to “check out” small animals for a few days at a time. During his years of work through the foundation and whenever opportunities arose, Mr. Forbes helped found and build a national network of over 200 children’s museums and nature centers where, frequently, exhibits interact with visitors as much as the visitors interact with them.

John Ripley Forbes was known for his ability to charm donations from even the most intimidating people. His wife explained, “He would meet some of these people like the Rockefellers, and they were just enchanted with his enthusiasm to do the right thing.” He used this charisma for more than contributions. Mr. Forbes served at military bases in Alabama and Tennessee during World War II and supported returned airmen through simple fishing trips or nature walks. In his spare time, he would work with established natural history museums to fill new children’s museums with thousands of donated specimens.

He also used his boundless energy and charm to preserve nature in its original form. Shortly after moving to Georgia in 1971, he became focused on the preservation of Atlanta’s shrinking natural habitats. Mr. Forbes founded the Southeast Land Preservation Trust to shield green space from a rapidly growing real estate market and was determined to reason with developers and work out solutions that were mutually beneficial.

John Ripley Forbes exercised his passion for education and preservation through these many projects, and our future generations will reap and enjoy the results. I am grateful to people like him who, with their enthusiasm and energy, make a difference in the community and in the lives of others. His legacy will live for many generations through the work and accomplishments he left behind.