

S. 2707

At the request of Mr. SUNUNU, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2707, a bill to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 to exempt qualified public housing agencies from the requirement of preparing an annual public housing agency plan.

S. 2810

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUE) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR) were added as cosponsors of S. 2810, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to eliminate months in 2006 from the calculation of any late enrollment penalty under the Medicare part D prescription drug program and to provide for additional funding for State health insurance counseling program and area agencies on aging, and for other purposes.

S. 3069

At the request of Mr. DODD, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. KOHL), the Senator from Arkansas (Mrs. LINCOLN), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SANTORUM) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. VOINOVICH) were added as cosponsors of S. 3069, a bill to amend section 2306 of title 38, United States Code, to modify the furnishing of government markers for graves of veterans at private ceremonies, and for other purposes.

S. 3275

At the request of Mr. ALLEN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3275, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide a national standard in accordance with which nonresidents of a State may carry concealed firearms in the State.

S. CON. RES. 71

At the request of Mr. AKAKA, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 71, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that States should require candidates for driver's licenses to demonstrate an ability to exercise greatly increased caution when driving in the proximity of a potentially visually impaired individual.

S. CON. RES. 96

At the request of Mr. BROWNBACK, the names of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. DOMENICI) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) were added as cosponsors of S. Con. Res. 96, a concurrent resolution to commemorate, celebrate, and reaffirm the national motto of the United States on the 50th anniversary of its formal adoption.

S. RES. 331

At the request of Ms. LANDRIEU, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. SNOWE) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 331, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding fertility issues facing cancer survivors.

S. RES. 420

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 420, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that effective treatment and access to care for individuals with psoriasis and psoriatic arthritis should be improved.

AMENDMENT NO. 4189

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, her name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4189 intended to be proposed to S. 2012, a bill to authorize appropriations to the Secretary of Commerce for the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act for fiscal years 2006 through 2012, and for other purposes.

#### STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. MCCAIN:

S. 3457. A bill to provide a national franchise and other regulatory relief to video service providers who offer a-la-carte programming for cable television, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, today I am introducing the Consumers Having Options in Cable Entertainment, CHOICE, Act of 2006. This bill would encourage broadcasters and cable companies that own cable channels to sell their channels individually to subscribers. It would also promote cable programming distribution over the Internet.

For almost 10 years I have supported giving consumers the ability to buy cable channels individually, also known as a la carte, to provide consumers with more control over the viewing options in their home and their monthly cable bill. Cable companies have resisted this and have continued to give consumers all the "choice" of a North Korean election ballot. There is only one option available: buy a package of channels, whether you watch all the channels or not. The alternative is to not receive cable programming at all. Why have cable companies and cable programmers refused to give consumers the ability to buy and pay for only those channels consumers watch? Simply because they do not have to. They are the only game in town. But not for long, I hope.

Telephone companies have realized that consumers want more and are poised to provide consumers across the nation with an alternative to the local cable company. Many of these telephone companies, including AT&T, are also ready to offer consumers the ability to purchase channels a la carte. Such companies will offer two crucial benefits to consumers: more competition in the video service provider market, and more options for programming packages. Together, these two offerings will allow consumers to have greater control over the content that enters the home and the ability to manage their monthly cable bills.

According to a Government Accountability Office, GAO, report, in communities where there are two cable companies competing for customers, cable rates are 15 percent less than in communities without any competition. A subsequent GAO study suggests that in some markets the presence of another cable competitor may reduce rates by an astounding 41 percent. Unfortunately, today less than 5 percent of communities have two companies competing to provide consumers cable television service.

The CHOICE Act would help bring competition to the cable television market. Choice in cable television delivery is long overdue for consumers who have suffered steep rate hikes year after year. Since 1996, cable rates have increased 58 percent or nearly three times the rate of inflation. The Federal Communications Commission, FCC, has found that rates increased 7 percent in 2001 and 2002, and 5 percent in 2003. The FCC's most recent report found that rates again rose 5 percent in 2004, double the rate of inflation, but only 3.6 percent where the local cable company faced competition. I can only imagine the savings consumers could reap if presented with a choice of providers of cable service and a choice of channels. For this reason I call on Congress to pass the CHOICE Act.

A recent USA Today/Gallup poll found that a majority of Americans would like to buy cable channels individually and an AP/Ipsos poll found that a remarkable 78 percent of Americans would like to do so. According to Nielsen Media Research, households receiving more than 70 channels only watch, on average, about 17 of these. Consumers know that they could have greater control over their monthly bill if given the ability to choose their channels. This was recently confirmed by the FCC. This year the FCC found that consumers could save as much as 13 percent on their monthly cable bills if they could buy only the channels they want.

Mr. President, consider the situation of a senior citizen on fixed income living in Sun City, Arizona, who watches only a few news and movie channels, but continues to pay for high priced channels such as ESPN, Fox Sports, and MTV—channels that other consumers enjoy, but channels that certain seniors may not want and possibly cannot afford. In fact, the general manager of the Sun City cable system has told my staff that he has tried to drop several expensive music video channels from the company's channel lineup to make room for channels his viewers want to receive and to decrease costs, but the owners of the music video channels have forbid him to do so without serious repercussions. So the residents of Sun City continue to subsidize the cost of these channels for viewers around the country. That is why AARP, representing 35 million senior citizens, supports the ability for viewers to buy channels on an a la carte

basis. But again, cable companies don't have to listen to these 35 million viewers because there is no real threat of losing them. They have nowhere to turn.

The CHOICE ACT, Mr. President, is not a mandate on cable providers. Instead it is designed to encourage choice and competition by granting significant regulatory relief to video service providers, such as telephone and cable companies, that agree to both offer cable channels on an a la carte basis to subscribers and to not prohibit any channel owned by the video service provider from being sold individually. In exchange, video service providers would receive the right to obtain a national franchise; would be permitted to pay lower fees to municipalities for the use of public rights of way; would benefit from a streamlined definition of "gross video revenue" for the calculation of such fees; and would gain a prohibition on the solicitation of institutional networks, in-kind donation, and unlimited public access channels.

In addition, broadcasters that have an ownership stake in a cable channel would get the benefit of the FCC's network non-duplications rule if the broadcaster does not prohibit the channel from being sold individually. The FCC's network non-duplication rule provides exclusivity for broadcasters by not allowing another broadcaster with the same network affiliation from broadcasting in the same community. The bill would also modify Section 616(a) of the Communications Act that currently prohibits video service providers from using coercion or retaliatory tactics to prevent cable channels from making their services available to competing companies to extend this provision to distribution over the Internet.

For example, if Time Warner Cable offered CNN, a cable channel it owns, on an a la carte basis to its cable subscribers and allowed other cable companies, satellite companies, and video programmers who choose to distribute CNN to make it available on an a la carte basis, Time Warner Cable would be eligible for a national franchise and other regulatory relief. If Disney, which owns ESPN, allowed other cable companies, satellite companies, and video programmers who choose to distribute ESPN to make it available on an a la carte basis, Disney's ABC broadcast stations would have the benefit of the FCC's network non-duplication rule.

Mr. President, contrary to what some might want the American people to believe, the CHOICE Act does not force video service providers or broadcasters to do a single thing. It is their choice whether to act or not act. The bill provides them with such a choice even though they currently don't provide meaningful choices to their customers. This bill is incentive-based legislation that would encourage owners of cable channels to make channels available for individual purchase and would do

nothing to prevent cable companies from continuing to offer a bundle of channels or tiers of channels.

The cable industry regularly touts the value of its package of channels, noting that it costs less than taking a family of four to a movie or professional sporting event. However, watching cable television is not always a family event. Several channels have programming that consumers find objectionable or that parents believe is unsuitable for young children. Complaints about indecent cable programming have increased exponentially in recent years. In 2004, the FCC received 700 percent more cable indecency complaints than it received in 2003. Most of the cable programs about which indecency complaints have been filed with the FCC aired during hours when many children are watching television.

Cable and satellite companies currently provide subscribers with a variety of methods of blocking the audio and video programming of any channel that they do not wish to receive. However, subscribers are still required to pay for these channels that they find objectionable. The "v-chip" does not effectively protect children from indecent programming carried by video programming distributors. Most of the television sets currently in use in the United States are not equipped with a v-chip; of the 280 million sets currently in United States households, approximately 161 million television sets are not equipped with a v-chip. Households that have a television set with a v-chip are also likely to have one or more sets that are not equipped with a v-chip.

Again, Mr. President, I am aware that not all consumers want to block and not pay for certain channels, but shouldn't all consumers have the choice to do so? Cable programmers and broadcasters have started offering individual television programs for download on the Internet. This is the purest form of a la carte—where one can watch and pay for only specific programs they choose. In addition, many of these same broadcasters and cable programmers make their channels available for individual purchase in Hong Kong, Canada, and other countries. Why do these cable programmers treat the American cable subscriber differently than a subscriber in Hong Kong or Canada or an Internet user? It remains unclear.

Lastly, Mr. President, I know that the cable programmers and broadcasters will not be the only group that may have some concerns with this bill. Many of my friends in local government are also likely to be interested in the reduced "rights of way" fee and streamlined definition of "gross video revenue" under this bill. Cable companies pay these fees to municipalities to use the right-of-way land under sidewalks, streets and bridges to reach customers' homes and then pass these fees on to subscribers. However, these fees often surpass the costs of managing "rights of way" land, and municipali-

ties use these funds for other expenditures. Just last month at a hearing before the Senate Commerce Committee, Michael A. Guido, Mayor of Dearborn, Michigan, confirmed that these fees are often used to pay for other city expenses, such as emergency vehicles.

In 2004, State and local governments collected approximately \$2.4 billion in these fees, slightly more than \$37 per year from every household subscriber. Americans for Tax Reform believes that the "franchise fee is just a stealth tax on our consumption of the cable television," as do other economists and taxpayer advocacy groups. To this end, the legislature in my home state of Arizona just recently passed a bill to reduce such fees and taxes on cable television subscribers.

The Phoenix Center, a non-partisan legal and economic think tank, has found that the introduction of competition to cable companies could allow the fee to be lowered "significantly without doing any harm to local governments." Based upon this research, the CHOICE Act would reduce the fee from 5 percent to 3.7 percent for eligible video service providers and allow local governments to petition the FCC for a higher fee if it is necessary to cover the costs of managing "rights of way" land. I believe this would provide some real cost savings to cable subscribers.

I remain open to working with municipalities on this issue and look forward to working with all interested parties to ensure that American consumers receive greater options for affordable and acceptable television viewing. Mr. President, I hope the introduction of the CHOICE Act furthers the debate on the issue of a la carte channel selection and I look forward to the Senate's consideration of the bill.

By Mr. OBAMA:

S. 3475. A bill to provide housing assistance for very low-income veterans; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. OBAMA. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Homes for Heroes Act of 2006.

When we talk about veterans in Washington, I often think about my grandfather, who signed up for duty in World War II the day after Pearl Harbor. He marched across Europe in Patton's army, and when he came home to Kansas, he could have very easily faced some tough times.

He could have had trouble paying for college, or finding a job, or even finding a home. But at the time, he lived in a country that recognized the value of his service—a country that kept its promise to defend those who have defended freedom. And so he was able to afford college through the G.I. Bill, and he was able to buy a house through the Federal Housing Administration, and he was able to work hard and raise a family and build his own American dream.

And after I think about my grandfather, and the opportunities he had as

a veteran, I then think about a veteran I met named Bill Allen, who told me that on a recent trip he took to Chicago, he actually saw homeless veterans fighting over access to the dumpsters. Think about that. Fighting over access to the dumpsters.

Each and every night in this country, more than 200,000 of our Nation's veterans are homeless. And more than half a million will experience homelessness over the course of a year. There is no single cause for this. Homeless vets are men and women, single and married. They have served in every conflict since World War II. Many suffer from post-traumatic stress disorder; others were physically and mentally battered in combat. A large number left the military without job skills that could be easily used in the private sector.

All have risked their lives for their country. All deserve—at the very least—the basic dignity of going to sleep at night with a roof over their head. And every day we allow them to go without, it brings shame to every single one of us.

This is wrong. It is because we're quick to offer words of praise for our troops when they were abroad, but quick to forget about their needs when they come home. It's wrong because we have the resources and the programs in place to help solve this problem. And it is wrong on a fundamentally moral level—the idea that we would allow such brave and selfless citizens to suffer in such biting poverty. And so it is now our responsibility—it is now our duty—to make this right.

Last year, I introduced the Sheltering All Veterans Everywhere Act, S. 1180—the SAVE Act—to strengthen services for homeless veterans. The SAVE Act would reauthorize and expand two of the most successful programs in dealing with homeless veterans: the Homeless Providers Grant and Per Diem Program and the Homeless Veterans Reintegration Program. In addition, the SAVE Act would expand the reach of the Homeless Veterans Reintegration Program to also include veterans at risk of homelessness, so that we can work to prevent homelessness before it happens.

And while it is one thing to get veterans off the streets temporarily; it is another to keep them off—to place veterans in real, permanent homes. In fact, the VA has consistently identified permanent housing as one of the top three unmet needs in the fight against veteran homelessness.

That is why I'm introducing a bill today called the Homes for Heroes Act. This is a bill that would help expand access to long-term, affordable housing by creating a fund so that the community and nonprofit organizations could purchase, build, or rehabilitate homes and apartments for veterans.

So that we don't just leave them, to face their personal challenges on their own, the organizations would also provide services like counseling, employment training, and child care to the

veterans who live in this housing. And the Homes for Heroes Act would expand the number of permanent housing vouchers for veterans from the current number of less than 2,000 to 20,000. These are vouchers that have been highly successful in giving veterans the chance to afford a place to live.

Every day in America, we walk past men and women on street corners with handwritten signs that say "Homeless Veteran—Will Work For Food." Sometimes we give a dollar; sometimes we just keep walking. These are soldiers who fought in World War II, Vietnam, and Iraq. They made a commitment to their country when they chose to serve—and now we must keep our commitment to them. Because when we make the decision to send our troops to war, we also make the decision to care for them, to speak for them, and to think of them—always—when they come home.

This kind of America—an America of opportunity, of collective responsibility for each other—is the kind that any of our parents and grandparents came home to after the Second World War. Now it is time for us to build this America for those sons and daughters who come home today.

Mr. AKAKA:

S. 3476. to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish employee professional development programs at the Department of Homeland Security; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation that will help train and motivate our homeland security workforce. As the ranking member of the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Federal Workforce Subcommittee, I understand the challenges facing the Department of Homeland Security, DHS. Our committee and subcommittee have held numerous hearings on a broad spectrum of DHS-related issues, including poor contract management, ineffective financial systems, and major human capital challenges. I have met with DHS employees and management officials to discuss problems ranging from leadership deficiencies and high employee turnover rates to management challenges. Vacancies resulting from the recent departures of key, high level officials further threaten employee morale and the Department's ability to provide for the security of our Nation. DHS cannot meet its mission if it does not have a well-trained and dedicated workforce. Failure to provide adequate training and career development programs for employees will have serious consequences for our national security.

My bill, the Homeland Security Professional Development Act of 2006, will strengthen the workforce at DHS through the establishment of formal mentoring and rotational programs. The mentoring program will partner junior and entry level workers with more experienced employees to foster

an understanding of how employees' roles and responsibilities fit into the Department's mission and to develop career goals. The voluntary rotation program would place midlevel employees in a different component of DHS for a period of time to provide for professional development; increased knowledge of the Department's various missions; and networking opportunities. Participants in the rotation program would be eligible for promotions or other employment preferences. Together the mentoring and rotational programs will improve communication; strengthen recruitment and retention programs; help with succession planning; enhance networking opportunities; and provide a pool of qualified future leaders.

I commend DHS for recognizing the need to strengthen its workforce. Last July, the Department unveiled its Homeland Security Learning and Development Strategic Plan to align education, training, and professional development with the Department's strategic goals. The plan addresses the need to align education and professional development with the Department's vision, mission, core values, and strategic plan. However, this plan alone will not address the daunting challenges facing DHS. Congress must act to ensure that agency-wide employee development programs are in place to eliminate cultural and educational stovepipes.

My bill will increase employee organizational knowledge and technical proficiency in the critical homeland security skill sets required to keep our Nation safe. For example, the Science and Technology Directorate, S&T, would benefit greatly from rotational programs with other DHS directorates and components, including Immigration and Customs Enforcement, ICE, and Customs and Border Protection, CBP. Rotations between these entities would ensure that S&T projects and priorities are correctly aligned with ICE and CBP requirements, in addition to ensuring a cohesive homeland security workforce.

Mentoring programs can hasten the learning curve for new employees, improve employee performance, and alter the culture of the organization by creating a collaborative, team-based, and results-oriented structure. Such programs have a proven track-record of success. According to the April 10, 2006, issue of Federal Human Resources Week, mentoring opportunities are welcomed by federal workers and help in recruitment and retention efforts. This finding is not new. A 1999 workforce study found that 35 percent of private sector employees who did not receive regular mentoring planned to seek other jobs within the next 12 months. This number was reduced to 16 percent when employees received regular mentoring. In addition, according to the International Mentoring Association, employee supervision increases productivity by only 25 percent. However, when training is combined with

coaching and mentoring, productivity is increased by an astounding 88 percent.

One positive example of the benefits of mentoring is the apprentice program at the Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard in my home State of Hawaii. Established in 1924, the Pearl Harbor apprentice program has graduated thousands of highly qualified and skilled journeymen to ensure that the U.S. Navy remains "Fit to Fight."

The Department of Homeland Security continues to face considerable management, leadership, and human capital challenges. The Homeland Security Professional Development Act of 2006 will tackle these challenges by building on the current training efforts of the Department and fostering a well-rounded and well-trained homeland security workforce. I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation and ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 3476

*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 "Homeland Security Professional Development Act of 2006".

#### SEC. 2. ESTABLISHMENT OF PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS AT THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title VIII of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 361 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 843 the following:

##### "SEC. 844. HOMELAND SECURITY MENTORING PROGRAM.

"(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall establish the Homeland Security Mentoring Program (in this section referred to as the 'Mentoring Program') for employees of the Department. The Mentoring Program shall use applicable best practices, including those from the Chief Human Capital Officers Council.

"(2) GOALS.—The Mentoring Program established by the Secretary—

"(A) shall be established in accordance with the Department Human Capital Strategic Plan;

"(B) shall incorporate Department human capital strategic plans and activities, and address critical human capital deficiencies, recruitment and retention efforts, and succession planning within the Federal workforce of the Department;

"(C) shall enable employees within the Department to share expertise, values, skills, resources, perspectives, attitudes and proficiencies to develop and foster a cadre of qualified employees and future leaders;

"(D) shall incorporate clear learning goals, objectives, meeting schedules, and feedback processes that will help employees, managers, and executives enhance skills and knowledge of the Department while reaching professional and personal goals;

"(E) shall enhance professional relationships, contacts, and networking opportunities among the employees of the Department;

"(F) shall complement and incorporate (but not replace) mentoring and training programs within the Department in effect on the date of enactment of this section; and

"(G) may promote cross-disciplinary mentoring and training opportunities that include provisions for intradepartmental rotational opportunities, in accordance with human capital goals and plans that foster a more diversified and effective Federal workforce of the Department.

"(3) TRAINING LEADERS COUNCIL.—

"(A) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Training Leaders Council established by the Chief Human Capital Officer shall administer the Mentoring Program.

"(B) RESPONSIBILITIES.—The Training Leaders Council shall—

"(i) provide oversight of the establishment and implementation of the Mentoring Program;

"(ii) establish a framework that supports the goals of the Mentoring Program and promotes cross-disciplinary mentoring and training;

"(iii) identify potential candidates to be mentors or mentees and select candidates for admission into the Mentoring Program;

"(iv) formalize mentoring assignments within the Department;

"(v) formulate individual development plans that reflect the needs of the Department, the mentor, and the mentee;

"(vi) coordinate with mentoring programs in the Department in effect on the date of enactment of this section; and

"(vii) establish target enrollment numbers for the size and scope of the Mentoring Program, under the human capital goals and plans of the Department.

"(4) SELECTION OF PARTICIPANTS FOR MENTORING PROGRAM.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The Mentoring Program shall consist of middle and senior level employees of the Department with significant experience who shall serve as mentors for junior and entry level employees and employees who are critical to Department succession plans and programs.

"(B) SELECTION OF MENTORS.—Mentors shall be employees who—

"(i) understand the organization and culture of the Department;

"(ii) understand the aims of mentoring in Federal public service;

"(iii) are available and willing to spend time with the mentee, giving appropriate guidance and feedback;

"(iv) enjoy helping others and are open-minded, flexible, empathetic, and encouraging; and

"(v) have very good communications skills, and stimulate the thinking and reflection of mentees.

"(C) SELECTION OF MENTEES.—Mentees shall be motivated employees who possess potential for future leadership and management roles within the Department.

"(5) ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF PARTICIPANTS IN THE MENTORING PROGRAM.—

"(A) MENTORS.—

"(i) ROLE.—A mentor shall serve as a model, motivator, and counselor to a mentee.

"(ii) LIMITATION.—Any person who is the immediate supervisor of an employee and evaluates the performance of that employee may not be a mentor to that employee under the Mentor Program.

"(iii) RESPONSIBILITIES.—The responsibilities of a mentor may include—

"(I) helping the mentee set short-term learning objectives and long-term career goals;

"(II) helping the mentee understand the organizational culture of the Department;

"(III) recommending or creating learning opportunities;

"(IV) providing informal education and training in areas such as communication, critical thinking, responsibility, flexibility, and teamwork; and

"(V) pointing out the strengths and areas for development of the mentee.

"(B) MENTEES.—The responsibilities of the mentee may include—

"(i) defining short-term learning objectives and long-term career goals;

"(ii) participating in learning opportunities to broaden knowledge of the Department; and

"(iii) participating in professional opportunities to improve a particular career area, develop an area of technical expertise, grow professionally, and expand leadership abilities.

"(6) REPORTING.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the establishment of the Mentoring Program, the Secretary shall submit a report on the status of the Mentoring Program and enrollment, including the number of mentors and mentees in each component of the Department and how the Mentoring Program is being used in succession planning and leadership development to—

"(A) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate;

"(B) the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives; and

"(C) the Committee on Government Reform of the House of Representatives.

#### "SEC. 845. HOMELAND SECURITY ROTATION PROGRAM.

"(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall establish the Homeland Security Rotation Program (in this section referred to as the 'Rotation Program') for employees of the Department. The Rotation Program shall use applicable best practices, including those from the Chief Human Capital Officers Council.

"(2) GOALS.—The Rotation Program established by the Secretary shall—

"(A) be established in accordance with the Department Human Capital Strategic Plan;

"(B) provide middle level employees in the Department the opportunity to broaden their knowledge through exposure to other components of the Department;

"(C) expand the knowledge base of the Department by providing for rotational assignments of employees to other components;

"(D) build professional relationships and contacts among the employees in the Department;

"(E) invigorate the workforce with exciting and professionally rewarding opportunities;

"(F) incorporate Department human capital strategic plans and activities, and address critical human capital deficiencies, recruitment and retention efforts, and succession planning within the Federal workforce of the Department; and

"(G) complement and incorporate (but not replace) rotational programs within the Department in effect on the date of enactment of this section.

"(3) TRAINING LEADERS COUNCIL.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The Training Leaders Council established by the Chief Human Capital Officer shall administer the Rotation Program.

"(B) RESPONSIBILITIES.—The Training Leaders Council shall—

"(i) provide oversight of the establishment and implementation of the Rotation Program;

"(ii) establish a framework that supports the goals of the Rotation Program and promotes cross-disciplinary rotational opportunities;

“(iii) establish eligibility for employees to participate in the Rotation Program and select participants from employees who apply;

“(iv) establish incentives for employees to participate in the Rotation Program, including promotions and employment preferences;

“(v) ensure that the Rotation Program provides professional education and training;

“(vi) ensure that the Rotation Program develops qualified employees and future leaders with broad-based experience throughout the Department;

“(vii) provide for greater interaction among employees in components of the Department; and

“(viii) coordinate with rotational programs within the Department in effect on the date of enactment of this section.

“(4) ALLOWANCES, PRIVILEGES, AND BENEFITS.—All allowances, privileges, rights, seniority, and other benefits of employees participating in the Rotation Program shall be preserved.

“(5) REPORTING.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the establishment of the Rotation Program, the Secretary shall submit a report on the status of the Rotation Program, including a description of the Rotation Program, the number of employees participating, and how the Rotation Program is used in succession planning and leadership development to—

“(A) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate;

“(B) the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives; and

“(C) the Committee on Government Reform of the House of Representatives.”.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 1(b) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 101) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 843 the following:

“Sec. 844. Homeland Security Mentoring Program.

“Sec. 845. Homeland Security Rotation Program.”.

### SEC. 3. REPORTS TO CONGRESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 41 of title 5, United States Code is amended by adding at the end the following:

#### “SEC. 4122. REPORTS TO CONGRESS.

“The Director of the Office of Personnel Management shall report annually to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Government Reform of the House of Representatives on the training, mentoring, and succession plans and programs of Federal agencies, including the number of participants, the structure of the programs, and how participants are used for leadership development and succession planning programs.”.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 41 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 4121 the following:

“4122. Reports to Congress.”.

### SEC. 4. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as necessary to carry out this Act.

## SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 503—MOURNING THE LOSS OF LIFE CAUSED BY THE EARTHQUAKE THAT OCCURRED ON MAY 27, 2006, IN INDONESIA, EXPRESSING THE CONDOLENCES OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE TO THE FAMILIES OF THE VICTIMS, AND URGING ASSISTANCE TO THOSE AFFECTED

Mr. FEINGOLD (for himself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. BIDEN, and Mr. LUGAR) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 503

Whereas, on May 27, 2006, a powerful earthquake measuring 6.2 on the Richter scale occurred in Indonesia, centered near the City of Yogyakarta;

Whereas the earthquake and continuing aftershocks have caused more than 5,000 deaths, resulted in serious injuries to additional tens of thousands of people, and left hundreds of thousands of people with damaged or destroyed homes;

Whereas thousands of people in the affected region are living in temporary shelter or lack basic services, such as clean water and sanitation, thereby increasing the risk of additional suffering and death; and

Whereas the United States and donors from at least 20 other countries have, to date, pledged several millions of dollars in emergency and long-term reconstruction assistance, and have begun to deliver humanitarian supplies to survivors of the earthquake: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) mourns the tragic loss of life and horrendous suffering caused by the earthquake that occurred on May 27, 2006, in Indonesia;

(2) expresses the deepest condolences of the people of the United States to the families, communities, and government of the thousands of individuals who lost their lives in the earthquake;

(3) expresses sympathy and compassion for the hundreds of thousands of people who have been left with destroyed or damaged homes or have been seriously affected by this earthquake;

(4) welcomes and commends the prompt international humanitarian response to the earthquake by the governments of many countries, the United Nations and other international organizations, and nongovernmental organizations;

(5) expresses gratitude and respect for the courageous and committed work of all individuals providing aid, relief, and assistance, including civilian and military personnel of the United States, who are working to save lives and provide relief in the devastated areas;

(6) urges the President and the Government of the United States to provide all appropriate assistance to the Government of Indonesia and people of the affected region; and

(7) recognizes the lead role of the Government of Indonesia in providing assistance and promoting recovery for the affected population.

SENATE RESOLUTION 504 EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT THE PRESIDENT SHOULD NOT ACCEPT THE CREDENTIALS OF ANY REPRESENTATIVE OF THE GOVERNMENT OF LIBYA WITHOUT THE EXPRESSED UNDERSTANDING THAT THE GOVERNMENT OF LIBYA WILL CONTINUE TO WORK IN GOOD FAITH TO RESOLVE OUTSTANDING CASES OF UNITED STATES VICTIMS OF TERRORISM SPONSORED OR SUPPORTED BY LIBYA, INCLUDING THE SETTLEMENT OF CASES ARISING FROM THE PAN AM FLIGHT 103 AND LABELLE DISCOTHEQUE BOMBINGS

Mr. LAUTENBERG (for himself, Mr. GRAHAM Mr. MENENDEZ, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. REID, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. BIDEN, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. KERRY, Ms. Stabenow, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. DODD, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. ALLEN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. BURR, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. DEMINT, Mrs. LINCOLN, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. REED, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. KOHL, Mr. HATCH, Mr. COLEMAN, and Mr. ROCKEFELLER) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, in light of the recent announcement to remove Libya from the State Department's list of state sponsors of terror, I rise today to submit a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the Libyan Government should meet the terms of its financial commitment to the families of the victims of the Pan Am flight 103 bombing and other acts of terror supported by Libya before the President accepts credentials of any representative of the Government of Libya. I am pleased that Senators GRAHAM, MENENDEZ, CLINTON, KENNEDY, BIDEN, LIEBERMAN, LEVIN, KERRY, STABENOW, MIKULSKI, SCHUMER, BOXER, DODD, BINGAMAN, ALLEN, COLLINS, BURR, SALAZAR, DEMINT, LINCOLN, DORGAN, REED, DEWINE, KOHL, REID, and SANTORUM have agreed to cosponsor my resolution.

In May 2002, Libya made an unequivocal commitment to compensate the families who lost loved ones in the Pan Am 103 bombing over Lockerbie, Scotland, which killed 270 people, including 189 Americans. To date, Libya has not resolved these claims in full, particularly the last installment of compensation that is to be paid to each family upon Libya's removal from the list of state sponsors of terror. Now that the Secretary of State has announced Libya's removal from the list, the U.S. must ensure that Libya honors its commitment.

Before the U.S. normalizes its relationship with the Government of Libya, it is crucial that we underscore our expectation that Libya will fully honor its commitment to all these American families. The resolution also exhorts the President to press the Government of Libya to make a good faith