



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 109th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 152

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, JUNE 16, 2006

No. 78

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. STEVENS).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Sovereign Lord, our God and King, You have promised that those who trust You will not miss out on anything good.

Give to our Senators the wonder of Your grace. Impart to them the wisdom to use their talents for Your purpose and glory. Today, surround them with the shield of Your favor and use them as instruments of Your will. May their thoughts and actions please You, for You are the one Who fills our lives with gladness.

Remind us all that when our lives please You, You enable us to live in peace even with our enemies.

We pray in Your strong Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, today, at 10:45, the Senate will resume consideration of the Department of Defense au-

thorization bill. The bill's two managers, Chairman WARNER and Senator LEVIN, will be here to continue to work on this important bill. Although there will be no votes during today's session, Senators are encouraged to come today and speak on the bill. Senators who are intending to offer amendments should be consulting with the managers on getting their amendments in the queue.

Senators are reminded there is a scheduled vote for 5:30 on Monday on a U.S. circuit judge nomination. We could possibly have additional votes on Monday evening on amendments to the Defense bill.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS BILL

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, just very briefly, I want to comment on the supplemental appropriations bill we passed yesterday morning.

I commend Senator COCHRAN and really both of the managers, and all of our colleagues, as well as the House, and especially Congressman LEWIS, for their leadership in crafting a package that reflects our commitment to economic growth, that keeps America moving forward, that is fiscally responsible.

As the majority says time and time again, the Federal budget is not the Government's money. It is the taxpayers' money. Americans work hard to get what they earn. And it is our responsibility to spend that money wisely, appropriately.

That is why we are working hard to crack down on excessive Washington spending. And I think the way that supplemental bill was handled from the beginning, and especially at the end, reflects that fiscal responsibility. As we all know, that bill did reflect a lot of priorities of this body, but it grew and grew and grew. Once that bill was taken to conference, under the leadership of Chairman COCHRAN and Con-

gressman LEWIS, it was scaled back down to meet the specific guidelines and request of the President of the United States. I think we exercised fiscal restraint and responsibility, but still there is a lot more we do need to do in terms of demonstrating that fiscal restraint and that responsibility.

One of our big challenges is the fact that much of our spending is on autopilot. We see that in our entitlement programs. Also, our budgetary process—the way it is conducted—leaves little time for oversight as to the spending.

I mention that because I want to express my strong support for the efforts of our budget chairman, Senator GREGG, for an act that is called the SOS Act, called the Stop Overspending Act, that will be marked up by his committee, addressed in his committee next week. What it is—and he introduced it to many of us this week—is a broad package on the budgetary process. It is a package of reforms that will tamp down on and give us the tools and ways to control excessive spending.

It adopts the President's proposal to establish a legislative line-item veto. It would reestablish spending caps which have been used effectively in the past. It initiates across-the-board reductions in entitlement spending if the Federal deficit fails to meet specific established targets.

It includes a proposal I have been very supportive of and introduced actually when I first arrived in the Senate to put the budget on a 2-year budget cycle, thereby giving us time for appropriate oversight.

I realize enacting this entire bold package—comprehensive in many ways, this SOS package—would be a huge challenge, particularly in Washington where the forces of spending from below, from within, remain so strong. But achieving even one of the reforms or, hopefully, several of the reforms of this package would be a major

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S5987

victory in the battle to control spending. It is my goal to accomplish just that before I leave the Senate.

So just like every family has to make tough tradeoffs and live within their means, Congress should, too.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Democratic leader is recognized.

IRAQ

Mr. REID. Mr. President, our valiant troops are now serving in their fourth year in Iraq. Day after day, they have demonstrated courage, skill, and bravery. They do not ask for much. But all of us owe them a lot.

At the top of the list of things we owe them is an honest debate about what is going on in Iraq.

Yesterday, Democrats offered an amendment to express the sense of the Senate that Iraq not grant amnesty to terrorists who kill our troops as part of their reconciliation plan. The amendment came in response to reports that the Iraqi Prime Minister was in favor of such a proposal.

But instead of joining us in a debate about this amendment, the majority, the Republicans, decided to play a political game and quickly claimed the Iraqi Prime Minister had been "misquoted" and offered some procedural gimmicks to stop a vote from taking place on this amendment.

But, just this morning, there is more news that the Prime Minister has talked about and does favor amnesty to those Iraqis who kill American troops. It is all over the country in the news. For example, it is on page 22 of the Washington Post. The aide who first leaked the story has now resigned, but he stands by what he said. Today, he is quoted as saying:

The prime minister himself has said that he is ready to give amnesty to the so-called resistance, provided they have not been involved in killing Iraqis.

What that says is just what we said yesterday: Amnesty will be granted to those who kill Americans, but not to those who hurt Iraqis.

I think this sounds like it deserves the Senate's attention. Doesn't it seem like we should weigh in on this, and tell the Iraqis there will be no "get out of jail free" cards for those who kill our troops?

We should have had that debate yesterday. But instead of having the debate, the Republicans cut and run from the debate. In effect, they are filibustering their own Defense authorization bill, not allowing the matter to move forward—stopped in midday. It does not make sense. Until we know exactly where the Iraqis stand, President Bush must come forward and tell the Iraqis to stand down.

Terrorists who kill our troops should not be set free. Our soldiers have given too much in the name of Iraqi freedom.

Mr. President, there is something else we owe our troops: an acknowledgment of their tremendous sacrifice.

Yesterday, as we know, we had a moment of silence in this Chamber because we lost our 2,500th troop in Iraq.

Mr. President, 2,500 of our finest have been killed in Iraq. The reason we had a moment of silence is because it was a solemn milestone, which we should acknowledge.

But over at the White House, I guess they have a different feeling. They apparently view this sad occasion differently. With all the news around the country today, there is a quote from Tony Snow, the President's Press Secretary, who said, in response to the news: "It's a number." "It's a number." "It's a number."

I say to Tony Snow, and others at the White House, it is more than a number. It is somebody's son or daughter. It is someone's father or mother, a neighbor, an uncle, or an aunt.

Nevada has lost 39 soldiers in Iraq—39. Every one of them is more than a number. I wonder how—and they are now my friends—two Nevadans, who came to visit me before Memorial Day—and they came to the Memorial Day ceremonies we had at the Boulder City Veterans Home, where last year we buried more than 2,000 veterans—I wonder how John Lukac's and William Salazar's parents feel about their sons being just numbers.

They are not numbers. They are no more numbers than the people who have been wounded. They are not numbers. They are people, in many instances, who have lost arms or legs or eyes or are paralyzed. They are not just numbers.

I think maybe we should discuss briefly what a Republican Congressman said yesterday. I know this man. I know him well. I have been going to the House gym for a lot of years. He is a man by the name of WAYNE GILCHREST. He is my friend. He is a Republican Congressman from Maryland.

We were standing in the House gym. I have known him for many, many years. And because of our knowing one another—he was shaving actually, with his shirt off. And on his back he had—I noticed it for years—a real scar.

I said: WAYNE, what is that scar?

He said: I was shot.

I said: Tell me about it.

He was in Vietnam. He was a sergeant. He raised his arm to fire, and as he did that, somebody shot him through the chest. The bullet came out of the back. He has a big scar in the back. The words he remembers are: "Sarge's been shot. I hope he's not dead."

He survived, but after many months in hospitals. He was a school teacher. He came back from Vietnam and taught kids. Now he is a Member of Congress, and has been for some time.

Here is what he said in yesterday's Washington Post:

I can't help but feel through eyes of a combat-wounded Marine in Vietnam, if someone

was shot, you tried to save his life . . . While you were in combat, you had a sense of urgency to end the slaughter, and around here we don't have that sense of urgency.

That is a direct quote. He went on to say:

To me, the administration does not act like there's a war going on. The Congress certainly doesn't act like there's a war going on. If you're raising money to keep the majority, if you're thinking about gay marriage, if you're doing all this other peripheral stuff, what does that say to the guy who's about ready to drive over a land mine?

Republican Congressman WAYNE GILCHREST.

John Lukac is just a number? William Salazar is just a number?

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ISAKSON). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be a period for the transaction of morning business until 10:45 a.m., with Senators able to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, my understanding is that we are to end morning business and go on to the bill at 10:45. The hour of 10:45 has arrived, and I note that the chairman and ranking member are not here. I believe they are at a briefing. They are expected to be here shortly. But what I would like to do is ask consent that I be allowed to speak in morning business for up to 10 minutes. When the chairman of the committee and the ranking member arrive, I will ask them for permission to continue, if necessary, but if they have other business, I will understand that. I think the priority is the Defense authorization bill.

So I ask unanimous consent to continue in morning business for 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INDIAN HEALTH CARE IMPROVEMENT ACT

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I have come to the floor today to talk about the Indian Health Care Improvement Act and some frustration—I should say enormous frustration—that I and Senator MCCAIN have about what is happening with a piece of legislation that is so very important.

In this country, we have responsibility for health care for two groups of people: Federal prisoners who are incarcerated in prison—we are responsible for their health care. If they get

sick, they go to an infirmary, they go to a hospital, we are responsible. We provide health care for Federal prisoners. We also have trust responsibility for providing health care for American Indians. That is our trust responsibility.

It is interesting and enormously disappointing to me that we spend twice as much per person on health care for Federal prisoners as we do in providing health care, as is our obligation, for American Indians.

I want to talk a little about that because we have written a piece of legislation called the Indian Health Care Improvement Act, which builds on a piece of legislation that was passed some while ago. I want to talk about what American Indians are facing out in the country with respect to health care.

Let me describe it first with respect to a story. This is a very typical story about a member of the Mandan, Hidatsa, and Arikara Nation, which is called the Three Affiliated Tribes in North Dakota. It is a story about a fellow who had diabetes. By the way, I held a hearing some years ago on that reservation. On that reservation, the rate of diabetes is not double, triple, or quadruple the rate of diabetes elsewhere. At that reservation, at that point, it was 12 times the rate of diabetes that existed elsewhere.

The person I am speaking about on the Three Affiliated Tribes or Fort Berthold Reservation is Laidmen Fox, Sr. He was a Native American who had struggled, as other members of his family had, with diabetes. He had his feet amputated. Later he had his knees amputated. Finally, his entire legs were amputated. He was on dialysis. And, finally, the doctors told him he would have to have his hands amputated. At that point, Mr. Fox said he wanted to be taken off of the dialysis machine and to be taken home to die. He died 2 years ago. He went home to be with family and friends, having lost his feet, his knees, then his legs, and then told he would lose his hands. He died, was taken off dialysis.

Just this last February, his daughter—who was 41 years old, and blind from diabetes, and also on dialysis—chose to have herself taken off the machine and went home to die in a similar manner.

We now have in this country something nobody wants to talk about. We ration health care for American Indians. Yes, there is health care rationing. There is something called contract health services. That means that when American Indians show up at a clinic or a hospital and, through the Indian Health Service, seek treatment for their problems, the only treatment they will get and the only reimbursement they will get for that medical condition is if it means “life or limb,” threatening “life or limb.” Otherwise, in most cases, under the contract health provisions, there is no health care available.

Let me talk about some other examples, if I might.

A member of the Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa Indians in my State was suffering from cancer. He went through chemotherapy, and went through chemotherapy again for a number of years through referral from the Indian Health Service to the University of Minnesota. All of a sudden the Indian Health Service said to him: We don't have any more funding. And they refused to pay for any additional treatment, even after he had a number of relapses.

This is not unusual for American Indians to face this sort of thing.

Another American Indian fell as a result of insulin shock at his home. He hit his hip, and hurt his hip badly in the fall. He was taken to a hospital by ambulance, given a shot for the pain and told he was to be released. His father objected because he said: My son can't walk. You can't release him. And the father said: I can't carry him. He can't walk. He must stay here.

The doctor said he could stay in the hospital for one night's observation. The next day, when the pain did not subside, they gave him an x-ray, found out his hip was broken, and referred him to another facility. And because so much time had elapsed since the accident, he had to have a full hip replacement.

Another tribal member was a Vietnam veteran and should have had the services of both the Indian Health Service and the VA available to him. He died after the Indian Health Service denied his request for a referral for him to be seen by a lung specialist at the Mayo Clinic. The IHS told him they had no money to send him to a specialist, and this Vietnam veteran died as a result.

In Montana, an Indian man went to the Indian Health Service clinic seeking assistance for gallstones. He was told it was not a “life or limb” situation, which would get him referred to a health provider off the reservation under the contract health provisions I have just described. Subsequent to that, his duct ruptured and he became infected. He had to have part of his pancreas removed, and now he is on dialysis.

Several months ago, a 24-year-old man at the Spirit Lake Nation went to the IHS clinic complaining he had abdominal pain. He was given some medicine and was sent home because he was not considered a “priority” patient. He ended up in the emergency room in a nearby hospital, off the reservation, and then transported to a larger medical center 125 miles away. His appendix had ruptured. That was 3 months ago, and he is still in the hospital 3 months later, as they attempt to try to control his body temperature and other related matters.

He was determined not to have a “life or limb” emergency medical need, and so his actual condition was overlooked, with the results of several months now of acute care in a hospital.

Mr. President, I have spoken a number of times on the floor of the Senate about a young girl named Avis Little Wind. I brought her picture to the floor of the Senate. I did that with the permission of her relatives. She was 14 years old, and she hung herself. She killed herself 2 years after her sister had killed herself.

I went to the reservation because we have had a cluster of suicides of young teenagers on Indian reservations. I talked to this young girl's teachers, school administrators, people in the mental health area, tribal council folks, to try to understand what is wrong here.

What I discovered is this little 14-year-old girl, named Avis Little Wind, laid in a bed for 90 days in a fetal position. Clearly, something was seriously wrong with this young woman. Yet, it did not send a signal to anybody. Her father killed himself. Her mother was dysfunctional, a substance abuser. This young girl somehow just slipped through the system, and she got up one day out of that bed and took her own life.

Avis Little Wind is one person, but a person whose future was stolen from her because she felt hopeless or helpless. And the fact is, on that Indian reservation—as is the case for most Indian reservations—there is no mental health treatment available. There are not enough people available just for the diagnosis of serious problems. You would think someone who misses 90 days of school at age 14 would send alarm bells all over, but it did not. There is not enough money in the Indian Health System to deal with it.

Senator McCain and I have passed some legislation recently dealing with the issue of Indian teen suicide and trying to begin to address that issue. But there is a serious lack of attention to the health care needs of Native Americans and, yes, teenagers like Avis Little Wind and the tragedy that resulted in her death.

It is not uncommon to see 75 people stand in line waiting to have a prescription filled. It is not uncommon for them to stand in line only to find out they can't get the prescription filled because the medicine is not available there.

I have been to a health care facility where one dentist is working in a small trailer house serving 5,000 people. Is that fair? Is that the right thing to do? We can do better than that as a country. Yet, somehow, this issue of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act is not a priority. The administration has dragged its feet, and dragged its feet for months and months. Senator McCain and I have just written the administration a letter saying: How about some help here? How about some cooperation? Let's find a way to solve this and fix it.

While we talk and while we dither and while the administration decides to delay, we have people losing their lives, and we have people going to

health care facilities with very serious problems being told: We don't have the money to refer you.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DORGAN. The tribal chairman for the Three Affiliated Tribes in North Dakota says: Everybody up there on the reservation understands, don't get sick after June. Just don't get sick after June because the money has run out on contract health services. If you get sick after June, there is no money. They are not going to send you to a hospital. Or if you go to the hospital, the hospital will charge back to you because they won't get the money from the Indian Health Service. It will ruin your credit, and you will have to file for bankruptcy. But don't get sick after June because the money won't be there.

What kind of message is that to the American people, especially the most vulnerable in our society? These reservations are where there is substantial poverty, great difficulty.

I have not mentioned methamphetamine. We have had hearings about that. It is unbelievable what is happening with respect to these reservations and health care, and yet somehow there is no urgency here.

Senator McCain and I are asking for a little cooperation from the administration and some cooperation here in the Senate to move this bill.

We had a witness just the other day at a hearing about methamphetamine on reservations. Methamphetamine is a scourge all across this country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DORGAN. One of the witnesses at that hearing on methamphetamine on reservations, who is the chairperson of an Indian tribe, lives on a rural reservation with 13,000 Native Americans who live on that reservation. She told us that one-half of the babies who have been born to tribal members on that reservation—one-half of the babies—have tested positive for alcohol or drugs, including methamphetamine. Think of that.

I was in a hospital one day when they showed me a young baby that was born with a .12 blood alcohol content lying in the nursery. This baby was born with a .12 blood alcohol content, and the mother was down the hall and refused to see the baby because she did not want the baby. She checked into the hospital dead drunk.

The fact is, we have serious problems with methamphetamine and substance abuse and teenage suicide, and all of these issues, and we have a health care system on Indian reservations that is a rationing system. When the chairman of the tribe in my State says, "All the Indians know: don't get sick after June because the money is not there under contract health to help you," that is a serious problem.

All I am asking for and all Senator McCain is asking for is a little help and a little cooperation from the administration and, yes, from our colleagues to move this legislation called the Indian Health Care Improvement Act. It is the right thing for this country to do. Mr. President, I see the chairman of the committee is here, and I will, at this point, yield the floor.

I do have an amendment I wish to offer on the Defense authorization bill today, and I am available to do that when it is convenient. But the chairman and ranking Member are here, so at this point I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I was much taken by the remarks of the Senator from North Dakota. I have great respect for the Senator from North Dakota. I tell you, you do a lot of homework. You do a lot of independent work. And while I do not have the expertise with regard to the reservations that you have, any of us listening to your comments would immediately come to the conclusion that we better step in to help. And I say to the Senator, you can count on me when the time comes. I think that matter should be addressed as quickly as we can by the Senate.

I thank the Senator.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2007

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 2766, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2766) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 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.

Pending:

McCain amendment No. 4241, to name the Act after John Warner, a Senator from Virginia.

Nelson (FL)/Menendez amendment No. 4265, to express the sense of Congress that the Government of Iraq should not grant amnesty to persons known to have attacked, killed, or wounded members of the Armed Forces of the United States.

McConnell amendment No. 4272, to commend the Iraqi Government for affirming its positions of no amnesty for terrorists who have attacked U.S. forces.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I say to my distinguished ranking member, I think at this time it would be appropriate if the Senator wishes to bring up his amendment.

We are in business, I say to my colleagues wherever they are, for purposes of amendments. The Senator from Michigan and I will be here for some period of time in hopes of processing amendments.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from North Dakota. He covered such a wide range of issues with such depth and integrity that is really quite extraordinary. We are ready for his amendment. I think he is prepared to proceed with the amendment. We look forward to hearing from him on that matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

AMENDMENT NO. 4292

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the pending amendments are set aside.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN], for himself, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. HARKIN, proposes an amendment numbered 4292.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Text of Amendments.")

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, first of all, I thank the Senator from Virginia for his kind comments. He did not say he welcomed my amendment because he probably knows that this amendment is one which we have dealt with before. But I feel so strongly the need to continue to offer the amendment, if only by voice vote, which says what is going on I think is dreadfully wrong and needs to be corrected. I know the Senator from Virginia and the Senator from Michigan are legislators with goodwill and good skills. I hope they will join with me as I once again describe the issues of contracting that exist because we are spending so much money in such a hurry that there is waste, fraud, and abuse which simply cannot be addressed in the regular order.

I believe this amendment is once again a proposal whereby there was a Truman-type committee, the type that existed when Harry Truman served in the Senate, a Democratic Senate then, with a Democrat in the White House. Harry Truman, I am sure, caused some real angst at the White House by saying: I think there needs to be a special bipartisan committee established to take a look at waste, fraud, and abuse in military contracting. He traveled all across this country to military installations to meet with contractors. His committee unearthed a substantial amount of waste.

I offer it again, as I have offered it on previous occasions. I understand I have not been successful, but I offer it again only because I don't think the problem has abated. I think the problem still exists.

Just the other day, in a supplemental emergency appropriations bill, we spent \$92 billion. Some of that was for Katrina relief, but the rest of it, by and large, will find its way into the Pentagon accounts—to restore accounts.

The Senator from Illinois just came in, and the Senator from Illinois and I have jointly worked on this issue. Senator HARKIN has asked to be a cosponsor as well. I offer it on behalf of myself and Senators DURBIN and HARKIN. This is something that we have talked about at some length over a period of time.

We have approved emergency supplemental appropriations bills to the tune of tens and tens and tens of billions of dollars. I believe it is now over \$340 billion. Think of that: almost a third of \$1 trillion approved without being paid for. This adds right on the top of the Federal debt.

This spending is in support of our military. I voted for it because we can't send our troops abroad and not provide them the equipment and things they need.

But when you spend this much money, including \$18 billion-plus for reconstruction in Iraq, and then begin to see who gets hold of this money, it is hair raising to hear the stories about what is happening.

I am not suggesting that there would never be any waste as a result of this war. Wartime is a different circumstance. I understand that. But I think it is safe to say that there has been more waste, more fraud, and more abuse of the taxpayers' money in the recently short time, several years, than in the history of this country. I think it is unparalleled. I think we have a responsibility to deal with it.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DORGAN. Yes.

Mr. DURBIN. Through the Chair, I am happy to join him in this effort in which we are trying to have some oversight on tax money being spent on this war. The Senator and I have worked on this concept together. We went back to a day when the Senator from Missouri, Harry Truman, decided to ask the same hard questions of the administration during the Second World War, trying to find instances where tax dollars were being wasted and people were profiteering and soldiers were getting equipment that wasn't up to standard.

I ask the Senator from North Dakota: Isn't it curious that Senator Harry Truman, a Democrat from Missouri who created this commission and asked hard questions, when there was a Democratic President named Franklin Roosevelt, was suggesting that when it comes to profiteering, Congress doesn't do the administration nor the people of this country any favors by saying we are going to protect our own party in the White House? Shouldn't we be dealing with a nonpartisan issue of waste at the expense of taxpayers and, more importantly, at the expense of soldiers?

Isn't it true that at the hearings which Senator DORGAN has chaired

bringing together whistleblowers who tell us these terrible stories of waste of millions of dollars of taxpayers' money, that absent these hearings there has been very little done on Capitol Hill by way of oversight of the giants who are winning these no-bid contracts, multibillion-dollar contracts, and wasting too much of taxpayer dollars?

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, it is the case that whistleblowers from Kuwait, Iraq, and various parts of the United States have come to me and said: What is going on is wrong. We have held some hearings through our policy committee to take a look at it. They have wanted to testify.

Let me give you one example. I talked about Rory before. A man named Rory, an engaging fellow, who was a supervisor at a food service operation in Iraq, he said to us that what was going on was wrong. He worked for Kellogg, Brown & Root, a subsidiary of Halliburton.

No. 1, he said we were charging for thousands of meals that we weren't serving.

No. 2, we were feeding the troops food that had expired date stamps on them.

He brought it to the attention of his superiors. They said: It doesn't matter. Feed it to the troops. It doesn't matter.

He said: We had convoys of trucks that were attacked on the road with food in them. He was told: You go into that truck bed and you find out what food has shrapnel in it. If you find good pieces of shrapnel, you give it to your supervisors as souvenirs, but feed the food to the troops.

The other thing that was very interesting, talking about employees of Kellogg, Brown & Root, a subsidiary of Halliburton, he said: We were told that when Government auditors come around, don't you dare talk to them. You are forbidden to talk to them. If you do, one of two things will happen. You will either be fired, or you will be sent to a part of Iraq where there is active, hostile shooting going on.

This fellow, in fact, was sent to one of the active areas of Falluja. He had the courage, guts, and temerity, and decided he would talk to Government auditors.

It is unbelievable to me to hear a whistleblower say that a contractor which was being paid with Government funds told the employees: Don't you dare talk to Government auditors. If you do, you will be fired.

That is so fundamentally wrong.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, if I may ask one more question, in one of the hearings that I attended, I recall that Senator DORGAN brought in one of these whistleblowers who talked about the monogrammed towels they were charging the Government to be put into certain facilities. The Senator talked about running up the price of gasoline that they were charging to the Government. I hope the Senator will recount those particular instances.

But I would like to ask the Senator, when Members of Congress get up here and say: We love our soldiers and we love our troops and we stand behind them, how can we then cast a blind eye and overlook the obvious? When our soldiers aren't getting the right equipment, when our soldiers aren't getting the goods they deserve, when they are not getting the supplies they need to be safe and successful, how can that reflect any love of our troops? If we are truly committed to these soldiers, wouldn't we be holding oversight hearings, bringing in under oath these whistleblowers and their bosses? Let us bring them in and put them before the cameras and ask them if they are wasting taxpayer dollars and endangering the lives of our troops. Wouldn't that be the true measure of our commitment to these men and women in uniform?

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, clearly that is what we ought to do on behalf of soldiers.

I tell the Senator that the most recent allegations have been made by two people who worked for, once again, Kellogg, Brown & Root, a subsidiary of Halliburton Corporation, about the water that was provided to the military installations. Let me describe that.

Taking water from the Euphrates River—and some of it goes into a system where it is purified and used as potable water to drink. Some of it is used as nonpotable water. But the way they designed the lines to serve nonpotable water to the base, which is used for showering, shaving, and brushing teeth, and so on, the water that was coming out nonpotable areas was actually more contaminated with E. Coli, bacteria, than the raw water coming out of the Euphrates River from the sewage disposal.

Halliburton said it is not true. The Pentagon said it is not true.

It just wasn't one base. We have a memorandum from the person from KBR, a Halliburton subsidiary in charge of water to all the military installations in Iraq. That memorandum, which has now been made public, was from the person who was in charge on behalf of Halliburton, or KBR, of all the water for all the installations. That memo admits that they have a serious problem, and they have made big mistakes that could have caused serious problems, including death.

After we held hearings, a young woman, an Army captain in Iraq, wrote us a long, unsolicited e-mail. She said: There is something going on on my base. I saw there was some questions about water to our military installations in Iraq. I am here. I am treating people for all kinds of skin problems. And I began to see things that made me suspicious that there was something wrong with the water.

She said: I had my staff track back to the water line.

She said: What I found out was they were providing nonpotable water to the

soldiers on this base that was contaminated.

This is from a doctor who is there today. This isn't conjecture, speculation, or accusation. This is from a doctor who is actually treating people. Yet, once again, the company that we are paying as a contractor to provide water service to these bases, connect and purify the water and provide the water to soldiers, denied publicly that anything was wrong. We have two eye witnesses who have testified, whistleblowers one that worked for the company. We have the internal document from the company that discussed how they had made these mistakes, and we have a doctor, a physician, who works for the Army. This is like the old Western movie: Who are you going to believe, me or your own lying eyes?

The fact is, we know what is happening there, yet no one seems much concerned about it. I write to the Defense Secretary about this and say it is quite clear that unhealthy water is being supplied to troops for showering, brushing their teeth, and shaving. No one seems to get really excited over that. It seems to me the Secretary of Defense ought to say, Wait, what on Earth is going on? Let's put a stop to this.

I will talk in a few minutes about how all of this happens. It happens because we have sole-source, no-bid contracts and very little oversight.

Mr. DURBIN. If the Senator will yield for one last question, what strikes me is there is not a sense of outrage that American tax dollars are being wasted but, even more important, that American troops are being shortchanged.

What do we ask of these men and women in uniform? Quite simply, we say, take an oath to wear this uniform and risk your life for America—how much more could we ask—and they do it. And then they expect from us support—support when they are in the field and support when they come home.

I don't understand why there isn't a sense of outrage in this Congress on a bipartisan basis, on both sides of the aisle, that we are not only being ripped off as taxpayers by these no-bid contracts but that we are shortchanging these men and women who are risking their lives while we stand in the comfort and safety of this Senate.

I know Halliburton is a big political force in this town. I know in some quarters you are not supposed to question Halliburton. This is some sacred institution politically. I don't buy it. I count the soldiers that are putting their lives on the line to be much more sacred and much more valuable than any big, huge, no-bid corporation.

I say to the Senator from North Dakota, we have done this before, the two of us have joined together, and said let's put together a bipartisan commission that will ask the hard questions, a commission that will bring people in and put them under oath, find out if

they are cheating us, find out if they are profiteering during a war, find out if they are shortchanging our soldiers, and let the chips fall where they may. If we find there is a violation of law, even if it reaches all the way to the boardroom, so be it.

How many times have we come to the Senate, I ask the Senator from North Dakota, refresh my memory, how many times have we brought this option to the Senate and said to our colleagues, please, for the sake of the troops, let's have real oversight, let's ask these questions.

How many times have we done this during the course of this 3-year war, I ask the Senator from North Dakota who has been the leader in this effort, and I have been glad to join him, how often have we tried?

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, we have had three recorded votes on this, and we have brought this to the Senate maybe six times now, altogether. I know it is repetitious. I know it probably is not pleasant to hear all of these things again, yet I don't think there is any choice.

If I might, just for the benefit of my colleague from Illinois, Senator DURBIN and I began talking about this some long while ago when we began to see the evidence of waste. We have worked at it since then.

When Senator DURBIN was asking a question, I described the water issue. I want to read a quote from a memorandum that was written May 13, 2005, an internal Halliburton memorandum, written by Will Granger, the man who was paid with taxpayer funds to do this contract for Halliburton for all of the water issues in Iraq. These are the water issues for the U.S. bases in Iraq that directly affect United States soldiers.

Will Granger, the Halliburton employee:

No disinfection to the non-potable water was occurring [at Camp Ar Ramadi] for water designated for showering purposes. This caused an unknown population to be exposed to potentially harmful water for an undetermined amount of time.

This event should be considered a "NEAR MISS" as the consequences of these actions could have been VERY SEVERE resulting in mass sickness or death.

The deficiencies of the camp where the event occurred is not exclusive to that camp; meaning that country-wide, all camps suffer to some extent from some or all of the deficiencies noted.

That is what was covered up. This was not made public until I was able to dig it out. But when a whistleblower said this is happening—and I am not referring to Will Granger, but to a whistleblower who said this is happening in his testimony to our committee—Halliburton said that it is not happening, you are not telling the truth, the Pentagon says there is no evidence of it.

And here is the internal Halliburton report that says it is happening, No. 1; and, No. 2, this camp was a "near miss" and:

... the consequence could have been VERY SEVERE resulting in mass sickness or death.

A lot of people are making a lot of money, spent by this Congress, in support of our soldiers who are at war, and we have some contractors who are not playing straight with the soldiers or the American people.

I ask consent to show two items on the floor of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DORGAN. A man whose name was Henry Bunting came to a hearing I held. I believe Senator DURBIN was at that hearing. Henry Bunting worked for Kellogg, Brown & Root, a subsidiary of Halliburton in Kuwait. In Kuwait, he was the purchaser of supplies for the U.S. Army. They wanted some hand towels, needed some towels, so a purchase requisition goes to Henry. Henry is going to buy some towels. Except when he put in the order for the towels, his company said, no, no, no, you cannot buy those regular towels that way. Towels have to have our logo embroidered on them.

So this is what he had to buy, at more than double the cost of the regular towels, so that the company logo could be put on the towels, and the taxpayers could be charged twice as much.

I am sure the soldiers didn't care one way or another whether there was that embroidered logo on the towel. But Henry, the purchaser, was told: You buy these. And don't ask any questions.

Henry says, You know, the American taxpayer got charged double and he didn't like it and he want to speak publicly. And not just this, it was a thousand other examples of costs being run up, from \$45 for a case of Coca-Cola, to \$7,500 a month to lease an SUV. Henry said, It is not just the towels, but he brought the towels along to show us what is going on is really wrong. The American people are taking a bath here and it undermines the soldiers, as well.

Thank God there are some whistleblowers who are willing to come forward.

What we need now, of course, is the opportunity to legislate and see if we can't stop this.

I will not go much longer, although I don't see anyone preparing to offer another amendment yet. I do want to make a couple of points I made the other day on the broader amendment that was turned down by the Senate. That amendment dealt with contracting as well, but it was a much broader amendment than this.

I made the point then, and this actually had to do with Bunnatine Greenhouse. I know there are some who do not want to hear about this anymore. But I don't think we have any choice. This was the top civilian contracting official at the Corps of Engineers. She was the one responsible for overseeing the contracts.

Through the Corps of Engineers, Halliburton and KBR got no-bid, sole-

source contracts, giant contracts. Over one half of the contracts in the war theater are Halliburton.

By the way, this has nothing to do with the Vice President. Whenever you mention that term, they say, You are attacking the Vice President. No, he has been gone a long time. It doesn't have anything to do with him. It has to do with a company that got over 50 percent of the contracts in Iraq.

Bunnatine Greenhouse, the top contracting officer at Corps of Engineers who lost her job, now, as a result of telling the truth, says:

I can unequivocally state that the abuse related to contracts awarded to KBR represents the most blatant and improper contract abuse I have witnessed during the course of my professional career.

For that, she got demoted. Pretty harsh treatment for people who are whistleblowers in this town. She has been replaced, by the way, by someone without experience. When I have asked the general who runs the Corps of Engineers, he said the person that is replacing Bunnatine Greenhouse is now being trained. Not much consolation or confidence, in my judgment, in that for the American people.

One final story. If the issue of water does not motivate someone, let me talk again about Custer Battles. I have plenty of people come to me about Mr. Custer and Mr. Battles. This is an example of what is going on with so much money available.

Mr. Custer and Mr. Battles show up in Iraq without any money, without much experience in contracting, and decide, I will get some of this; I want to get some of this contracting that is available. It was not very long and they got some contracts very quickly. In fact, they ultimately got over \$100 million in contracts.

The first contract was to provide security. They set up a little firm to provide security at the Baghdad airport. Now, among other things, whistleblowers from their own company came forward and said, Here are the things they were doing. They are cheating you blind. They took the forklift troop trucks out of the Baghdad airport, took them somewhere else, put them in the warehouse, painted them blue and sent them back and sold them to the Coalition Provisional Authority. They do not belong to them. They repainted them and sold them back to us. They set up subsidiaries in Lebanon and other places to buy and sell to and from themselves, and inflate the price, and, therefore, injure the taxpayer.

Here is what the fellow who runs the security system at the Baghdad airport said. The Baghdad airports director of security in a memo—a guy, also, that was trying to provide some warning—a memo to the Coalition Provisional Authority, and that is us in Iraq; it was set up by Donald Rumsfeld and that was the United States—here is what he said:

Custer Battles have shown themselves to be unresponsive, uncooperative, incom-

petent, deceitful, manipulative and war profiteers. Other than that they are swell fellows.

This from the director of security at the Baghdad airport. These guys ended up getting over \$100 million in contracts. I will show you a little bit of their money. This is a picture of \$2 million in cash, \$100 bills wrapped in Saran Wrap. I happen to know this guy; you do not see his head, just his body standing in front of the \$2 million. He showed up here. He wanted to talk about this. Here is what he wanted to say.

What he wanted to say was, When I was there, standing in Baghdad, working on these accounts, the word went out to all of the contractors: We pay in cash; bring a bag. He said it was like the Wild West. Bring a sack because we pay in cash.

This \$2 million actually went to Custer Battles. They took a picture of it. He said they used to throw these around as footballs, Saran Wrapped \$100 bills. They threw them around as footballs in the office. And down below they had billions and billions of dollars, apparently.

Lest there be any question about the misuse of money, let me show \$2 million Saran Wrapped just before it went to Custer Battles. How did this happen? Because this guy right here, this fellow right here, told me that our message to everyone was "bring a bag because we pay in cash."

Does anyone doubt there is going to be dramatic waste, fraud, and abuse in those circumstances? Does anyone doubt that at all, and after all of these stories? Doubling the price of hand towels; 25 tons, 50,000 pounds of nails laying on the sands of Iraq because they were ordered in the wrong side, dumped in the sand.

I could go on forever from what I learned from whistleblowers. I will not do that, only to say this: The next step for this Congress, I think, is to establish a Truman-type committee. We have done it before and we can do it again. Never has it been more needed than now. There is, I think, plenty of evidence that the most significant waste, fraud, and abuse that has ever been visited on the taxpayers of this country is occurring now and has occurred in the last 3 years.

The remedy for that? It is not to blame anyone here. The remedy for that is for us to fix it, for us to do something. What should we do? Let's put together the type of thing that worked previously. Harry Truman had the guts to do it.

Harry Truman was a Democrat. There was a Democrat in the White House. I am sure they all were gnashing their teeth at what Harry Truman was trying to do, but on a bipartisan basis Harry Truman put together, with the consent of the Senate, the Truman Committee that sunk their teeth into this issue and really did investigate and came up with a massive amount of waste, fraud, and abuse.

That is a minnow compared to the whale that exists at the moment in waste, fraud, and abuse. It is required of us, in my judgment, required of us to pass this legislation.

Having said all of that, let me compliment the chairman and the ranking member, but let me not do it because it is obligatory but because I really do think they do a great job. I hope they decide to strongly support this amendment. Then I will come back and compliment them some more.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, first let me compliment the Senator from North Dakota. He has been absolutely steadfast on this issue. He has made a major contribution on this issue.

If the Senator will stay for a moment, I want to ask him a question about the Truman Committee which he has made reference to. Perhaps I will make a brief statement and then ask him if he concurs with this history.

When then Senator Truman was appointed to head up the special committee to look into the abuses of contracting during World War II, he did an incredible job for a lot of reasons. One, he took on the abuse, the waste, the fraud that existed. He unearthed it. He brought it out in the daylight. He made a major contribution to our troops and to the taxpayers. It was such an important contribution that his temporary ad hoc special committee then became a Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

So that the origin of our Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations which now exists over at the Homeland Security Committee was the special Truman Committee. That is how big an impact that Truman Committee had. And I am wondering whether or not that little bit of history shows us in addition to all of the reasons that were given by the Senator from North Dakota how vitally important these special committees can be, what a contribution they can make to the war effort and to saving taxpayers' dollars.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, the Senator is absolutely correct, first, about the history and, second, about the importance of this. Harry Truman used to have a sign on his desk saying, "the buck stops here." Well, the buck stops here in the Congress on this issue. We are the ones who have to go find this waste, fraud, and abuse and put a stop to it. If we don't do it, it won't happen.

Harry Truman was a straight talker, a straight thinker. He used to say he would only accept one-armed economists because he didn't want people around him saying "on the one hand" and "on the other hand." He decided to sink his teeth into the issue of waste, fraud, and abuse, and he made a big difference at a time when there was substantial waste, fraud, and abuse.

But I would venture to say there has never been a case in our history where

we have pushed hundreds of billions of dollars out the door in a very large hurry and put them in the hands of no-bid, sole-source contracts with big companies and said, "Have a good time." It is unbelievable what is going on, and it is our responsibility to stop it—not tomorrow; it is our responsibility to stop it now.

This is the bill in which we should do it. This amendment fits exactly in this piece of legislation. My hope is that when the dust settles, we will have decided to accept this amendment.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. LEVIN. I again thank the Senator from North Dakota for the amendment and I hope that we can get some bipartisan support for it.

There have been reports on abuses. Reports are no substitute for hearings. When you have hearings following a special committee investigation, you have people who are put under oath, who are in the public spotlight so that we can bring a focus on these whistleblower complaints, and that is what has been missing. We have not had a place where the whistleblowers and the people who defend against their charges are brought together, both put under oath in a public forum so that we can then try to end what seems to be so clearly the abuses which have existed.

One of these contracts is a \$10 billion contract-plus, basically. It is for indefinite delivery of goods, and it is for an indefinite amount quantitatively. So you have this contract which exists with Halliburton or the company that they own which allows them to have the total, complete, unilateral sole-source ability to be given a work order—sometimes the money is agreed upon in advance, sometimes the amount of the contract is not agreed to until afterwards—indefinite delivery for indefinite quantities of indefinite goods.

Now, that kind of a contract just automatically lends itself to abuses, which should not happen here. This is something I spoke about yesterday. There should have been at least two and perhaps three contractors who were put in the exclusive contract to provide goods and services in support of the troops.

This is an open-ended contract of undefined scope which then later on billions of dollars of work orders are then put in place. It just lends itself to excess and to abuse. This is something again which I have spoken on a number of times. You need to have competition—not just for who is going to get an open-ended contract but in the implementation of work orders you need some competition. The only way you are going to get it in this circumstance when we are at war is if you have two or three contractors that are awarded these so-called IDIQ contracts so that when it comes to supplying the goods underneath it, they can compete against each other. It is the only hope that you have for a fair price for an amount of goods that is not known at

the beginning but which has to be then supplied during the contract.

What these hearings which Senator DORGAN has spearheaded have shown is this kind of a contract and the potential for abuse that it leads to. It has raised all kinds of questions as to whether Halliburton overcharged the Coalition Provisional Authority for several million dollars for oil that was purchased in Kuwait and delivered to Iraq.

It raised the question of whether Halliburton overcharged the Department of Defense for thousands of meals that were not actually served.

It raised the question of whether Halliburton had the estimating subcontracting and financial management systems needed to run two multi-billion-dollar contracts in Iraq.

It raised the question of why did Halliburton receive a follow-on contract for the reconstruction of the Iraqi oil industry at a time when the DCAA, the Defense Contract Audit Agency, had warned that the company's systems were not up to this challenge.

It raised the question, these hearings that were spearheaded by Senator DORGAN, as to whether Halliburton knowingly supplied our troops with spoiled food or unsafe drinking water.

It raised the question as to whether Halliburton intentionally withheld information from the Government to avoid raising questions about the quality of its performance.

There have been only two hearings in our subcommittee. I compliment our chairman. Our committee and our subcommittee every year have to deal with a bill, and this bill is in the Chamber. It takes a huge amount of our time as a practical matter. The two subcommittees that have hearings on this issue which Senator DORGAN raises simply have not been able to put in the kind of time that a special Truman Committee can focus on this kind of issue. And that is why I very much support the appointment by the Senate of a Truman Committee on Iraq contracting.

When you have this many tens of billions of dollars which are being spent and when you have allegations by whistleblowers, people who are in the know, that we have been unable to get into or have not gotten into for one reason or another, they have not been investigated or overseen by the other committee that might do this, this really needs a focus if we are going to have some credibility in the expenditure of these huge amounts of money in the Iraq war. And this should be done on a bipartisan basis. It would be with a Truman Committee. It needs to be done in a way which is free of any kind of political taint or political slant. But it needs to be done. We have to restore credibility and confidence in this contracting system, and the only way we are going to do that I can see is to have a bipartisan Truman-like committee that spends the time, has the staff focus on it, making recommendations

which I think will be similar to the ones that were defeated yesterday but they should not be prejudged. In any event, it could make recommendations to this body, and I would hope we would all welcome those kinds of recommendations.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, if I could engage my distinguished ranking member in a colloquy, historically this amendment is almost identical in form to what came before the Senate on 14 September last fall, 2005. It was defeated by a vote of 53 to 44. And that was on the Commerce-State-Justice appropriations bill. Then, with the tenacity of our good friend from North Dakota, he brought the same amendment up again on October 19, 2005. Again, it was defeated by a vote of 54 to 44 on the Transportation appropriations bill.

So the Senate on two occasions has examined this before other committees and defeated it.

Now, let's go back a little bit in history, and this is a part of Senate history that you have greater familiarity with than do I. Your distinguished predecessor, Senator Nunn, when I worked with him—he was chairman, I was the ranking member of the Armed Services Committee—there would be times when he would say, "John, I simply have to take off a week; I have this special committee." He was then on the committee on which you served, I think, throughout your tenure in the Senate; now called Homeland Security, it used to be called Government Operations. And the Senate as a body some time ago decided to take the roots of the Truman Commission, which, indeed, was a successful operation, and repose it, place it into the Government Operations Committee, now the Homeland Security Committee.

Mr. LEVIN. I have been on that committee as long as I have been here.

Mr. WARNER. Another 28 years.

Mr. LEVIN. That subcommittee has a major agenda and a whole host of areas that the chairman has identified, frequently with my support, and it has a very full plate. This committee, our committee, has something that that committee does not have, and that is we have the knowledge, we have the information because we are the committee that specializes in the work of Halliburton in the field. We are the people who have the experience in terms of what the troops need and how it is provided to the troops. And so our committee also has the ability to handle these hearings. Neither committee has seen fit, either because it has too full a plate already—and I think our committee from firsthand knowledge is in that situation—has a very full plate, and therefore has not been able or for whatever reason has decided not to look at what are clearly excesses which need to be reviewed.

So it is a matter of finding, identifying Senators who have an interest in this matter who would focus on this

matter because of the attention that it deserves.

Now, it could be an outside commission. If the chairman would prefer that there be an outside commission to do this, perhaps Senator DORGAN would be willing to do it. But this requires a major undertaking with an investigative—you have to identify and set out special staff that will do the investigations on this, and then prepare for hearings. If our committee were able to do this, I would be all for it.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I say to my good friend, yes, there are instances of fraud and abuse, and work has been done by the Armed Services Committee Readiness Subcommittee. I believe Senator AKAKA is on that committee from your side of the aisle. It is a lot of work. It is not as if somebody is sitting on their hands.

Fraud, waste and abuse within the Federal contracting system, while not pervasive, is a significant problem that we as a Congress must, and are, addressing.

The potential for fraud, waste and abuse is not limited to just Iraq and Afghanistan. Through the use of normal committee legislative tools and processes we have uncovered fraudulent and wasteful cases and are conducting systemic oversight.

The Armed Services Committee has conducted numerous hearings and briefings on acquisition oversight and reform (including oversight of contracting in Iraq) and has initiated investigations by the GAO and the Inspector General on DOD acquisition practices and programs.

Other committees, such as Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and Foreign Relations, with jurisdiction over government contracting, have similar oversight records.

The Office of the Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction was established to look at Iraqi contracting. The special IG routinely briefs this Committee and others on its findings.

Just yesterday we approved an amendment to expand the special IG's oversight to include a broader range of funds being used to contract for Iraq reconstruction activities.

And, as I noted earlier this week, the special IG submits quarterly and semi-annual reports to Congress. The inspector general operates a hotline for reports of possible waste, fraud and abuse and has uncovered criminal activity that has been referred for prosecution.

The special inspector general's efforts have yielded important oversight results and have prompted three specific lessons learned initiatives.

The lessons learned initiatives are: (1) human capital management; (2) contract management; and (3) program management.

The contract management report should be out later this summer.

The committee has also addressed contract and acquisition reform through a series of legislative provisions and initiatives.

I will highlight three recent examples:

No. 1, Section 817 of last year's defense authorization act addressed the need for a joint contingency contracting plan;

No. 2, Section 841 of that same legislation required GAO to review efforts of the Department to identify and assess areas of vulnerability for contracting waste, fraud and abuse. This report should be completed soon;

No. 3, the committee included a provision in this year's bill to build on previous oversight efforts in the contracting area. Section 864 of our bill would require the Department to develop contingency program management plans. This section is part of a series of provisions designed to improve acquisition and contracting outcomes across the department through better overall program management.

I believe our activities, which I have very briefly outlined here, represent the best approach to conducting oversight. We bring in the experts and have them address systemic and specific problems.

We want to avoid an approach that would lead to wasting much of our oversight efforts on anecdotes of individual fraudulent acts which mayor may not show that we have a systemic problem.

We need to prosecute those singular cases and protect against fraud, waste and abuse in a way that can still deliver goods and services to the warfighter as quickly as possible.

So I say to my colleague, I appreciate his concerns and I look forward to working with him to address problems with Federal acquisition.

However, I do not support the establishment of a new special Committee which would duplicate the work of this Committee and would only look at selected Federal expenditures and contracts.

I come back to this creation of the entity that the Senator from North Dakota wants and I again draw attention to the fact that Homeland Security has been given by the Senate the overall responsibility and an investigating committee with special funding, special staff to do investigations. Senator Nunn utilized it frequently when he was chairman of our committee. But there isn't a committee in this body that is not faced from time to time with the subject of fraud, waste, and abuse. And the Senate decided, rather than have each of the committees have their own special investigating team, to put together this subcommittee in the Government Operations Committee to do this work.

So I come back to my friend and just ask, why should we create something additional to what is already present, structured by the Senate to address the fraud, waste, and abuse problems in all the committees that we serve on and it was placed in the Homeland Defense Committee?

Mr. LEVIN. There have been requests—I believe from the chairman of

the Homeland Security Committee—to get into this. And if the chairman would be willing to sign a letter with me making another request to that chairman to try to find time in either her committee work or in Senator COLEMAN's committee, I would again be very happy to join in that request.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I would certainly entertain that.

Mr. LEVIN. If we are unable to do that on our committee, which we have not been able to do anything that needs to be done here—and I understand the time pressures on the committee because of this annual bill we have; I know what is on the plate over at the Governmental Affairs Committee and on the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations—

Mr. WARNER. You serve on that committee.

Mr. LEVIN. That is exactly right. I have been there throughout my tenure. I am personally familiar with the work they have undertaken. But if Senator WARNER would be willing to sign a request to Senator COLLINS, I would be delighted to join in that.

Mr. WARNER. What I would suggest we do is have a consultation with Senators COLLINS and LIEBERMAN and then follow up with a letter, if we deem appropriate.

Mr. LEVIN. That would be fine.

Mr. WARNER. That committee has done a prodigious amount of work. I certainly commend the chairman and ranking member of the Homeland Security Committee. They are workers.

Mr. LEVIN. I am on that committee, as you pointed out. I know the workload they have. Just yesterday, they completed a markup on one bill which took 2 days. I don't know of any people who work harder in the Senate than do Senator COLLINS and Senator LIEBERMAN.

Mr. WARNER. So we have a procedure on that. For the moment, I suggest we set aside the pending amendment and turn to the matter of trying to clear some amendments on this side. Is that appropriate at this time?

Mr. LEVIN. That would be fine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the pending amendment is set aside.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 4254 AND 4295, 4296, AND 4297,
EN BLOC

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I send a series of amendments to the desk which have been cleared by myself and the distinguished ranking member. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate consider the amendments en bloc, the amendments be agreed to, the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to any of these individual amendments be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. LEVIN. Reserving the right to object, and I will not, I just wonder if the Senator would identify the Senator who has sponsored the amendment so that they will hear their amendments have now been cleared.

Mr. WARNER. Fine. The Senators I have indicated here on my sheet are

Senators SESSIONS, OBAMA, ALLARD, SALAZAR, and I judge that scribbling is Senator WARNER of Virginia.

Mr. LEVIN. I thank the chairman.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments were agreed to, as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 4254

(Purpose: To require the use of competitive procedures for Federal contracts worth over \$500,000 related to hurricane recovery, subject to existing limited national security, public interest, and other exceptions)

At the end of subtitle I of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1084. IMPROVED ACCOUNTABILITY FOR COMPETITIVE CONTRACTING IN HURRICANE RECOVERY.

The exceptions to full and open competition otherwise available under (2), (3), (4), and (5) of section 303(c) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 253(c)) and paragraphs (2), (3), (4), and (5) of section 2304(c) of title 10, United States Code, shall not apply to Federal contracts worth over \$500,000 for the procurement of property or services in connection with relief and recovery efforts related to Hurricane Katrina and the other hurricanes of the 2005 season.

AMENDMENT NO. 4295

(Purpose: To require a report on reporting requirements applicable to the Department of Defense)

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1066. REPORT ON REPORTING REQUIREMENTS APPLICABLE TO THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than March 1, 2007, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on each report described in paragraph (2) that is required by law to be submitted to the congressional defense committees by the Department of Defense or any department, agency, element, or component under the Department of Defense.

(2) COVERED REPORTS.—Paragraph (1) applies with respect to any report required under a provision of law enacted on or after the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108-136) that requires recurring reports to the committees referred to in that paragraph.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The report required by subsection (a) shall set forth the following:

(1) Each report described by that subsection, including a statement of the provision of law under which such report is required to be submitted to Congress.

(2) For each such report, an assessment by the Secretary of the utility of such report from the perspective of the Department of Defense and a recommendation on the advisability of repealing the requirement for the submittal of such report.

AMENDMENT NO. 4296

(Purpose: To prohibit the acquisition by the Secretary of the Army of real property to expand the Pinon Canyon Maneuver Site until the Secretary submits a report analyzing such expansion and provides to the congressional defense committees the extent to which the expansion could be carried out through transactions with willing sellers of the privately held land)

On page 546, after line 22, add the following:

SEC. 2828. REPORTS ON ARMY TRAINING RANGES.

(a) LIMITATION.—The Secretary of the Army may not carry out any acquisition of

real property to expand the Pinon Canyon Maneuver Site at Fort Carson, Colorado until 30 days after the Secretary submits the report required under subsection (b).

(b) REPORT ON PINON CANYON MANEUVER SITE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than November 30, 2006, the Secretary of the Army shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report containing an analysis of any potential expansion of the military training range at the Pinon Canyon Maneuver Site at Fort Carson, Colorado.

(2) CONTENT.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall include the following information:

(A) A description of the Army's current and projected military requirements for training at the Pinon Canyon Maneuver Site.

(B) An analysis of the reasons for any changes in those requirements, including the extent to which they are a result of the increase of military personnel due to the 2005 round of defense base closure and realignment, the conversion of Army brigades to a modular format, or the Integrated Global Presence and Basing Strategy.

(C) A proposed plan for addressing those requirements, including a description of any proposed expansion of the existing training range by acquiring privately held land surrounding the site and an analysis of alternative approaches that do not require expansion of the training range.

(D) If an expansion of the training range is recommended pursuant to subparagraph (C), the following information:

(i) An assessment of the economic impact on local communities of such acquisition.

(ii) An assessment of the environmental impact of expanding the Pinon Canyon Maneuver Site.

(iii) An estimate of the costs associated with the potential expansion, including land acquisition, range improvements, installation of utilities, environmental restoration, and other environmental activities in connection with the acquisition.

(iv) An assessment of options for compensating local communities for the loss of property tax revenue as a result of the expansion of Pinon Canyon Maneuver Site.

(v) An assessment of whether the acquisition of additional land at the Pinon Canyon Maneuver Site can be carried out by the Secretary solely through transactions, including land exchanges and the lease or purchase of easements, with willing sellers of the privately held land.

(c) REPORT ON EXPANSION OF ARMY TRAINING RANGES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than February 1, 2007, the Secretary of the Army shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report containing an assessment of the training ranges operated by the Army to support major Army units.

(2) CONTENT.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall include the following information:

(A) The size, description, and mission essential training tasks supported by each such Army training range during fiscal year 2003.

(B) A description of the projected changes in training range requirements, including the size, characteristics, and attributes for mission essential training of each range and the extent to which any changes in requirements are a result of the 2005 round of defense base closure and realignment, the conversion of Army brigades to a modular format, or the Integrated Global Presence and Basing Strategy.

(C) The projected deficit or surplus of training land at each such range, and a description of the Army's plan to address that projected deficit or surplus of land as well as

the upgrade of range attributes at each existing training range.

(D) A description of the Army's prioritization process and investment strategy to address the potential expansion or upgrade of training ranges.

(E) An analysis of alternatives to the expansion of Army ranges to include an assessment of the joint use of ranges operated by other services.

AMENDMENT NO. 4297

(Purpose: To make technical corrections to provisions related to the National Museums of the Armed Forces)

On page 65, line 16, insert "facility designated by the Secretary as the" before "National".

On page 65, line 24, insert "facility designated by the Secretary as the" before "National".

On page 66, line 17, insert "facility designated by the Secretary as the" before "National".

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan and I have been here, together with the leadership of both sides, making it clear we are ready to conduct business on such amendments as may be brought before the Senate on this bill. I believe at this time we have now completed such business as was ready. I anticipate the leadership will advise us with regard to the schedule on Monday, and most certainly we will be back up at some point in time during that day to continue. I hope I will be joined by my distinguished colleague from Michigan urging Senators to come to the floor.

On our side of the aisle, I only know of perhaps two amendments that might be offered—one, as you are quite familiar with, by the Senator from Georgia with regard to certain aircraft programs. That is clear on its face. The other one I will work through. Frankly, I would have to say to my colleagues throughout the Senate, most particularly to my ranking member, I begin to see the light at the end of the tunnel, certainly as regards the amendments that could be forthcoming from this side of the aisle.

Mr. LEVIN. I was hoping the Senator was referring to Iraq, but since he is referring to our bill, I also see that we ought to be able to finish this next week. We will have a good debate on Iraq, I guess probably next Tuesday. Next Monday, I believe we have an amendment lined up.

Mr. WARNER. I know the Senator from Georgia wishes to offer his.

Mr. LEVIN. On your side of the aisle. After Senator DORGAN offered his today, it would then go to your side of the aisle to offer the next amendment, if we want to keep that informal order which has been established.

Mr. WARNER. Correct.

Mr. LEVIN. Then we could perhaps pick up the debate on the Dorgan amendment on Monday after the debate on the judge.

Mr. WARNER. I think the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts intends to revisit his strong approach to some of the situations in Iraq, particularly regarding troop structure.

Mr. LEVIN. I wouldn't want to speak for the Senator from Massachusetts. I

do believe, though, he is working on an amendment. There will be at least two amendments on this side relative to Iraq.

Mr. WARNER. In addition to the one from the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. LEVIN. There is one Senator JACK REED and I are working on, and I think there is one Senator KERRY is working on. I can't speak for others. There may be a number of amendments on this side.

Mr. WARNER. I see the distinguished minority whip here. Maybe he could advise us what his ascertainment might be with regard to the balance of amendments on that side.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I have an amendment related to the rendition of prisoners which I would like to say a word about before we adjourn today. There may be an indication that there are still a few more amendments to be forthcoming. I will bring my amendment to your attention today, and I hope all Members will do the same so that you can plot the schedule for the upcoming week.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, we believe there are a number of amendments which will need debate. It would be useful for all Senators on either Monday or Tuesday morning, if they could, to let us know what amendments they are planning on offering so we could get an estimate—I know you would agree as the floor manager—as to how many amendments are out there.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, Senator FRIST and I have discussed that. I believe he is in conversation with the leadership on your side. I heartily endorse that approach. Perhaps we could formalize it in some way.

Mr. LEVIN. I think we might be better off not formalizing it.

Mr. WARNER. Only in the sense that the two leaders and you and I come to the floor. I am not suggesting cloture or anything of that nature. I would hope this bill could be passed on by the Senate without the benefit of any cloture motion.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I would like to ask through the Chair, if this would be an appropriate moment, I would like to speak to the amendment which I will offer and a few other remarks not to exceed 5 or 10 minutes.

Mr. WARNER. Whatever the distinguished Senator from Illinois wishes, please proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to recognizing the Senator from Illinois for 10 minutes?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, after wars are completed, history stands in judgment of the leaders, not just whether there was a victory or defeat in the war but whether the war was conducted properly. Almost without fail, history has been a brutal, sometimes difficult judge of the conduct of war. Caught up in concern about protection and security, nations do things which don't stand the test of time and reflection. The man I think was our

greatest President, Abraham Lincoln, in the course of the Civil War suspended the writ of habeas corpus. By suspending that writ, he held prisoners without charges and without due process for long periods of time. It was controversial. Later on, it was judged that perhaps President Lincoln had gone too far.

In the midst of the First World War, with our concern over espionage, Congress enacted the Sedition Act which unfortunately tarred and condemned innocent Americans, and later on we came to realize that. In World War II, the most notorious conduct by our own Government was against our fellow citizens of Japanese ancestry who were interred in camps, innocent people. I know some of them. I have grown up with some of them. I know they carry scars from that incarceration. Throughout our history, as we reflect, we find there are things we should not have done in the course of a war.

I have said on this floor several times that I believe eventually history will be a very strenuous judge of our conduct in this war on terror when it comes to the use of torture. For decades, the United States had established a clear standard that we would never engage in torture—cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment. Then after 9/11, in the shock and fear that followed, this administration ended up trying to rewrite the standards for interrogation and torture. It wasn't a proud chapter in our history. We now know the administration abandoned that effort after some time. We know as well that some of the people who were involved in it have been reluctant to even discuss what they were doing. But there was a good ending when last year Senator JOHN MCCAIN offered an amendment in the Senate to state unequivocally that the United States would not engage in the torture of prisoners, not engage in cruel, inhuman, and degrading treatment of prisoners.

The reasons are obvious. Prisoners who are being tortured will say anything. It doesn't have to be true. Secondly, the standard we set in the treatment of our prisoners could one day be used against Americans who are taken as prisoners. So not only does it give you invalid information, it sets a standard that we never want our soldiers to be subjected to.

By a vote of 90 to 9, the Senate enacted JOHN MCCAIN's standard for torture, saying that we were not abandoning our longstanding commitment to it. I was happy to cosponsor that effort. There was a debate where Vice President CHENEY came forward and said we need to make an exception for agents of intelligence agencies in our Government. Thank goodness, the Vice President's recommendation was rejected. The President signed it, and I hope he is living by it. Sadly, most of that is being done behind closed doors, and we won't know for a long time, if ever, whether it is being followed. I trust the word of the President when

he says we are not engaging in torture. Now comes the next chapter.

If the President's words are an indication, Guantanamo Bay is likely to be closed. That is a good thing. Guantanamo Bay and the prisoners who are being held there have to be moved to a different situation. If they are in fact a danger to the United States or to any soldiers or any person we value, they should be charged and held or held as enemy combatants. But if they are being held for intelligence purposes, we should be honest. After 3 years, for goodness' sake, what value could they possibly bring to our intelligence?

Several hundred men are being held. Last week, there was the startling discovery that three had committed suicide. It is an indication to me that Guantanamo Bay should be closed, as the President has suggested. I hope it is sooner rather than later.

Then what will happen to the prisoners? The amendment I will offer says that if we are going to be involved in the rendition of these prisoners, the transfer of these prisoners to some other place, some other country, we need to make sure that country abides by the same standards of humane conduct to which the United States ascribes. We cannot be content in sending these prisoners to some other place where they will be subjected to torture if, in fact, we have expressed a value in the United States that we are opposed to torture. That is what the amendment will say, that we make that effort to ascertain and to review regularly those detention facilities to make sure they live by that same standard.

There has been a debate this week in Washington over the war in Iraq. It was also a week when the Department of Defense reported that we have lost 2,500 soldiers. White House spokesperson Tony Snow was asked to comment on this loss of 2,500. I am sure the statement he made doesn't reflect what he really feels in his heart when he said:

It's a number.

I am sure he feels as we all do that it is more than a number. It is more than an aggregate. It is 2,500 precious lives that have been lost by men and women in uniform willing to stand and serve and risk their lives for America.

I have attended some of the funerals. They are heartbreaking. Most of the soldiers are very young. I recall going down to southern Illinois where the funeral service was right outside the farmhouse where this young man grew up, down in Perry County. His mom and dad brought out for us to see, around the tent where the service was taking place, little souvenirs from his life—his fishing rods, his hunting rifle. We were just a few feet away from the tree house he and his dad built. I will never forget that scene as long as I live. It was a reminder that before he was in uniform, he was a son, he was a boy. Their heartbreaking experience will be with them for a long time. There are 2,499 other stories just like

that of grief which will be shared by families for years to come.

We are debating now what should we do in Iraq. The idea that we pull out our troops quickly, precipitously, is unacceptable. It would leave a situation which I am afraid would descend further into chaos and maybe create more instability and more problems to come.

But here is what worries me. When the President of the United States goes to Iraq and says to our enemies in Iraq that we are here to stay, that may be a strong message to our enemies of our resolve, but it is the wrong message to our allies and friends. The Iraqis have to understand we are not going to stay indefinitely. Think of what we have done in this country, not only giving 2,500 of our best and bravest lives, not only having 20,000 of our soldiers come home, half of them with serious permanent injuries, 2,000 of them with head injuries, not only spending \$300 billion in behalf of this effort in Iraq, not only sacrificing at home where we can't afford to fund medical research, Amtrak, education, health care, and the programs which Americans value, not only all these things, but we have been successful; we have deposed their dictator, Saddam Hussein; we dug him out of a hole in the ground and put him on trial.

We have given the Iraqis more than ample opportunity to control their fate and future. We offered them free elections. We have given them a chance to form a government. We have given this country so much in the 3 years we have been there. Now we must say to them: The day has come when you must stand and defend your own country. If you value Iraq as a nation, be prepared to stand and fight and maybe even die on behalf of that nation. But if we say to the Iraqis that we are staying there indefinitely, it is the best deal on Earth because it is the best military on Earth that will be there for them serving as a babysitter and a referee in an ongoing civil war for an indeterminate amount of time.

How many more lives will America give to this conflict before the Iraqis stand and defend their own nation? And when the President and many in the Chamber here don't want to speak to any kind of withdrawal date, they are suggesting to the Iraqis we are there to stay. That is the wrong message. We need to tell them that we have fought and offered our best for their future and that they need to accept that responsibility from this point forward.

This week, I stood in silence at my desk on the floor of the Senate with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in reverence to the 2,500 lives that have been lost, saying a prayer for their memory and their families, thinking as well of the veterans who have come home, some broken in body and in spirit, who have done so much for this country. We owe it to them, we owe it to their families to reach a point where

we can come home with our mission truly accomplished.

It is more than just a number. Mr. President, 2,500 of our soldiers have given their lives. When this came up initially, I voted against authorization for war. I believed at the time that the administration had misled us as to what was happening there, this threat of weapons of mass destruction and nuclear weapons and connections with 9/11. It turned out they were all false. None of it was true, and we went to war anyway. We were told as soon as we arrived that the Iraqi Army would turn on Saddam Hussein and join us in the fight, and that didn't happen. We were told the Iraqi people would greet us with open arms, and I know many are appreciative for what we have done, but it is still so unsafe in that country. The average soldier just going down the street in a military vehicle is risking his life every single day, more than 3 years after our invasion.

Having voted against that authorization for war, though, I have voted for every penny this President asked for. I lived through Vietnam. I remember what happened. An unpopular war was taken out on our soldiers, and that is not fair. Our soldiers did what we asked of them in the Vietnam war, as they are doing today. Politicians and elected officials can debate and differ on policy, but the bottom line is our soldiers are serving us and we should stand by them. I voted for every penny because of one basic standard: If it were my son or daughter in uniform, I would want them to have everything they needed to come home safely. That is the way I feel, and that is why I voted this week for the supplemental appropriation. But that won't stop me today and in the coming days from challenging this administration and challenging this Congress to make it clear that the Iraqis have to stand and fight and defend, and the American troops are coming home. It is only when that happens that we can truly say that our mission is accomplished.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I would like to share a few thoughts about the Strategic Forces Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee, which I chair, which deals with space, missile defense, satellites, and many of the other high-tech systems on which our Defense Department relies. But I just want to respond to my colleague, Senator DURBIN. I don't think he actually meant to say that our soldiers are coming home broken in body and spirit, but he came close. That is not what I am hearing. Go out to Walter Reed. They may have broken bodies and broken bones, but they are not broken in spirit.

The night before last, I attended a wonderful ceremony of the 231st birthday of the U.S. Army. I was talking with soldiers there. We were talking about the war and the politics of the

Capitol. They are aware of what is going on. I told them that I thought the Congress would not vote for any immediate withdrawal, and indeed we voted yesterday 93 to 6 against any kind of withdrawal requirement for this year. That vote, represents a strong bipartisan consensus of the Senate. One of those soldiers said: I will tell you what we want, Senator; "We want to win." We want to win this war. That is what the American people want, that is what the soldiers who have gone there and sacrificed want, and that is what they believe in. The soldiers who have been there believe in what they have done. They have been courageous in performing their mission.

It is difficult for me and for them to understand this idea that we can support the soldiers but not support the mission we sent them on, sent them by a three-fourths vote of this Senate. A majority of Democrats and Republicans voted for this war, and we are going to stay the course, we are going to help our military succeed, and we are going to help them win.

The point I pick up more and more as I talk with these soldiers, what I am hearing from them, is they are afraid we are going to mess it up. They believe they are winning. They believe they are doing their job. They believe they will be successful. And they are really worried that this Congress will be the one that will lose its nerve and not stand with them after they put their lives on the line for this country.

I believe this is a big deal, and that success in Iraq is important for our Nation. I visited that region recently. I talked to the leaders of Turkey, Kuwait, Afghanistan, and Pakistan. What would it mean for us if we had a disastrous event in Iraq where the terrorists take over that country? What would it mean to their neighbors? What would it mean to the region? All nations of good will know we must succeed.

Iraq is stepping up. There are now 260,000 Iraqi soldiers and security personnel in uniform and reaching higher and higher levels of performance. They are doing a much better job every day. They will soon be at 350,000 by the end of this year. They are being better equipped and better trained, and I believe we are doing a much smarter job of imbedding our soldiers with the Iraqi units so we can call in air support, we can provide mentoring, we can provide advice, we can call on other kinds of support, if they need it, to be effective.

A majority of the raids and actions that are taking place in Iraq are taking place by the Iraqis. Iraqi soldiers are taking more casualties than American soldiers. We are not babysitting them. This image of millions casting their ballots for a freely elected government of Iraq is not a bad image for us to remember. We need to remember that, and it is important for us, let me note first and foremost, that this Nation not allow the terrorists to win in Iraq.

We are going to be successful. But I realize the American people are concerned. They don't like to see violence and continued death. They don't like to see our soldiers at risk. I certainly understand that; neither do I.

I have been an admirer of General Abizaid, CENTCOM commander, and his team of generals because General Abizaid has always resisted the temptation to see how many troops we can put in Iraq. He said that is not the way to win this war. We need the right number of troops, and we need to begin to draw them down as soon as it is appropriate to draw them down and lift up the Iraqi Army. That is what we need to do.

Some want to have the President set forth a detailed plan so they can criticize it, basically. How will some sort of formalized plan help our soldiers be effective in the battle? It just tells your enemy what you are going to be doing. More importantly, a detailed plan is not going to be permanent. It will have to change because the enemy changes. As soon as you shut off one avenue of enemy success, they take another one and you have to respond to that. That is the history of warfare. That is the way wars have always been fought: you constantly adjust and constantly alter your efforts to be successful toward your ultimate goal of victory. That is what our military is doing.

Trying to demand a date from our military to withdraw or trying to demand from them a plan of what they are going to do 5 months from now fails to understand and recognize the nature of this conflict, and this conflict more than most conflicts because we face an asymmetrical enemy, a nontraditional enemy, who knows it cannot stand and fight our military successfully, so it devises devious and sneaky ways to pit one religion against another, to attack American soldiers, to attack the local police, all designed to crumble the Government of Iraq. But it hasn't happened. Iraqis are still signing up and becoming policemen. Iraqis are still signing up and the army is growing. The Government of Iraq has elected, for the first time, their permanent leadership.

Prime Minister Maliki is in office. His whole Cabinet now has been established. The two key Cabinet positions on which they spent extra time, Defense and Interior, have now been established, confirmed and voted by the 275 member Parliament. So they have their government now, fully elected, a permanent government, just like any other nation in the world. There is no interim government now.

I believe they are going to be successful, and I tell you, it is going to be important for the United States that they are. We have invested a lot; our soldiers have invested a lot. They are proud of what they are doing. They are not broken in spirit. They want to be successful and win.

I have some numbers I will share with my colleagues and those around

the country who might be listening. In this conflict, the Army has had the largest number of people serving in Iraq, yet their enlistment rate through May of this year was 104.3 percent. They have exceeded their enlistment goals for this year. They have exceeded their reenlistment goals. The Army for a few months did miss their goals, and some critics said it was a broken Army and predicted disaster. The Army said: No, we are not broken, and we are going to meet our goals. For 13 consecutive months, the Army has met its goals. The highest retention reenlistment rates come from the units that have just come back from Iraq and Afghanistan.

Staff Sergeant Barr, who was at Walter Reed, was injured by an explosive device. He was punctured by as many as 100 different pieces of shrapnel. He was told he would have difficulty walking and would probably never run again. He said he was going to run again, and he was going back to Iraq with the unit that he came with. And he worked at it and he worked at it and he ran. He eventually went back to Iraq and served again. That is the kind of spirit that we have. That is the kind of spirit that you see in our Army.

I was told by an officer who knew that story that every single soldier in his squad reenlisted. This is the spirit that this Congress needs to strive to be worthy of. This is the kind of professional commitment and courage that inspires us, or should inspire us. We should not be whining around here and trying to find some error that was made somewhere where body armor did not get to a soldier. Body armor is out there protecting soldiers. It is not a problem. To say that there has never been a shortage somewhere or somehow a supply failed to get where it was supposed to, I can't say; but it is not a systemic problem. But to go around and suggest to the citizens of our country that this Congress and the military is not committed to providing body armor to our soldiers is bogus and false and undermines what they are doing. It must be most confusing to our soldiers there.

But I think the vote yesterday should give them confidence that most of this talk is simply politics. Most of it is just complaining and second-guessing, like is done on the floor of the Senate every day. We hear it every day on many issues and debate and criticism is passed of the strength of American Government.

But I would urge my colleagues to think differently about soldiers in conflict, soldiers in harm's way. We need to be careful what we are saying here. It may sound good, it may hurt President Bush, to make this allegation or that allegation, but is it perhaps creating in the eyes of our enemies a belief that we are divided, that we won't stay the course, and that if they just kill enough people, civilians, Americans, Iraqis, that somehow, it will all just fail. Is that the possibility that we

are creating? That is why I urge my colleagues to be very careful and watch what you say in terms of attacks on the efforts that our military have so courageously undertaken in Iraq. Things happen in war. Bad things happen. But no military has done a better job of striving for perfection than ours has.

I would also like to respond to charges that this Nation is going to be embarrassed historically because we have tortured people that were captured in this war on terrorism. We talked about Lincoln. Lincoln eliminated the writ of habeas corpus. Roosevelt, as Senator DURBIN said, locked people up, Japanese Americans, in a way that was not justified. He basically takes a view, as so many seem to be saying on the left and on the Democratic side, that we have a policy of torture in the United States. That is not so. The President has repeatedly, time and time again, said: We have no policy of torture; we do not torture.

There is a statute in the United States Code passed shortly before I came here that defines and prohibits torture. It does not say you can never put any stress on someone, but it says you can't subject them to torture, and it defines it precisely.

They say, well, what about Abu Ghraib. Let me remind everybody, we learned about Abu Ghraib when the Army general reported what happened in Abu Ghraib. Let me remind people that what happened to those prisoners in Abu Ghraib, so wrong that it was, had nothing to do with interrogation, had nothing to do with any plan of torture. These were not even prisoners who had any intelligence. It was the late graveyard shift and a group of soldiers lost their discipline—lost their discipline under the stress of war—and performed in a way that got them prosecuted and sent to jail by the U.S. military. That was not the policy of the United States of America. We have heard this most complex chain of thoughts and reasoning, this complex chain of reasoning which is almost laughable, and is worthy of the most incredible conspiracy theorists, that somehow President Bush is responsible for what happened in Abu Ghraib.

It is not so. The military responded firmly and aggressively to this terrible wrong. And do you remember the story—I know the Presiding Officer does—of the fine African-American colonel under the stress of attacks on his men in Iraq, he fired a gun near the head of an enemy that had been captured in order to attempt to frighten him and to get intelligence from him. Apparently, he got some intelligence of value that he believed helped protect the lives of his soldiers. But do you know what. He was booted out of the military because we don't tolerate that kind of thing. His actions went beyond what our standards allow, and he was cashiered from the Army. A fine person with a fine career who made a big mistake, and he paid for it because we don't accept that kind of thing.

It is demeaning, it is dishonest, it is wrong to suggest that we have a policy to torture prisoners. With regard to Guantanamo, I know the President said he would like to see it closed. Well, I want to know what he is going to do with those prisoners. I have been there twice. Those soldiers do their jobs under difficult conditions every single day. They are highly professional. They do not allow themselves to be baited into overreacting when these prisoners display the worst kinds of anti-Americanism.

Until just recently, not a single captive had died at Guantanamo. Now we have three suicides. So I suppose that is our fault now, that we had three people commit suicide who were being held down there. These are not bad conditions at all. They are good conditions. They are treated fine. They are given the Koran, given places to worship, given places to exercise, and given all kinds of things that most prisons around the world don't give to the prisoners of their own countries, much less to the people who want to destroy their country.

But what I would say is this: They committed suicide. Those suicides were a political statement. They were their efforts to attack and undermine the United States. Their fervent desire was that Members of this Senate and the House of Representatives would use their deaths to speak on the floor to try to undermine our war against terrorism to make us less successful in the war on terrorism. That is exactly what their goal was. And, I would say this: does anyone in this Chamber doubt that if they had access to a bomb, they would have put that bomb on their body and killed anybody they could have? They would have killed themselves to promote their terrorist agenda. If they had been given the opportunity, wouldn't they have put a bomb on and killed others at the same time?

I say those suicides are an absolute indication that we have in Guantanamo some of the most dangerous terrorists in the world.

Now, I heard an official of our great ally, the United Kingdom, say we ought to close Guantanamo. I wanted to write him and say: Do you want to take these prisoners to the U.K.? Do you want to hold them? And then if you get tired of holding them, are you just going to let them go in London on your subways and on your buses? Then the critics worry that if we turn them back to their home countries and we have a rendition of the prisoners back to their home countries, that we have to guarantee that they are going to be treated wonderfully. So we can't keep them in Guantanamo, we can't—who else wants them? We can't even send them back to their home countries to be held in prison, apparently.

So this reminds me of nuclear waste. Everybody has nuclear waste, but nobody wants to do anything with it, and they use the argument that you can't

dispose of nuclear waste to try to block nuclear power. So this is just another attempt to make it more difficult, in my view, for us to be successful in handling these prisoners. They are not being tortured at Guantanamo. It is not the policy of the United States to torture anyone, and they are not being tortured. The few people who violated our high standards have been disciplined and punished.

So let me say this in conclusion, Mr. President. The good news is that we have free debate here, and we get to duke it out and we get to have our say. We just voted yesterday 93 to 6 to declare we have no intention of any precipitous withdrawal from Iraq; that we are going to stand there with our soldiers, and we are going to stand with our allies in Iraq and help them establish a free, decent, democratic government, a government that will be to our national interests to an incredible degree. It will be more valuable than most people can comprehend to us and to the world to have a decent, peaceful Iraq and to defeat the terrorists there who want to take it over and make it their place.

The other good news is that we have had a very successful attack on the CEO of terrorism, Zarqawi, and he has been killed. He clearly was the No. 1 executive officer of terrorism in the world, and that was a big victory.

We also now completed the confirmation of the Defense Minister and the Interior Minister for Iraq, so the entire Cabinet is in place, and an entire government is in place. The Iraqi Army continues to get better, and it continues to grow, and we are beginning to see the possibility that our troops can be withdrawn. If we have to send more troops there, I will listen to the commanders. If they can bring the troops down, that will make me happy. We are going to listen to our commanders and do what it takes and continue this process in a way that leads to—what? Victory. That is what the soldiers we have sent there want, that is what the American people want, and that is what we in this Congress have to do; to figure out how to help our military people go forward and achieve victory. That will be my effort, and I think for the most part that is the bipartisan consensus of this Senate.

Mr. President, again, I finish with a tribute to the professionalism of those in service, to the risk they have incurred; how they have attempted to conduct the violence of war in a way that mitigates civilian casualties and that reflects the highest ideals of the United States of America. I could not be more proud of their service. The conduct of this war on terrorism will be received as the most humane and careful war in history.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, let me begin by saying I very much share the view of the Sen-

ator from Alabama about our troops. Day in and day out, they bring the utmost professionalism and the utmost courage and valor to the cause of standing up for American values. I very much share his views with respect to the tribute we ought to be paying to those who serve us, who wear the uniform of the United States and who do it with such extraordinary patriotism and service to our country.

(Mr. SESSIONS assumed the Chair.)

What I am here to talk about, though, is the political decisions that are made and how they affect those courageous troops and how they affect the security of the country.

In March of this year, at a press conference, a reporter asked President Bush:

Will there come a day, and I'm not asking you when, not asking for a timetable—will there come a day when there will be no more American forces in Iraq?

The President responded:

That, of course, is an objective and that will be decided by future Presidents and future governments of Iraq.

... decided by future Presidents. . . .
... decided by future Presidents. . . .
... decided by future Presidents. . . .

I found that statement troubling for two major reasons. First, staying in Iraq for years and years, in my view, will threaten Americans' preparedness to deal with a host of other threats that ought to concern all of us. Certainly at the top of that list would be Iran and North Korea, but suffice it to say, it is a dangerous world.

I serve on the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence. I know the distinguished Senator from Alabama has a great interest in military affairs. No Senator who looks at the facts and the world in a realistic way would conclude otherwise. It is a dangerous world. There are real threats to our country. It is my view that to stay and stay and stay in Iraq will threaten the preparedness of our country at a dangerous time.

Second, it seems to me that making this kind of open-ended commitment to stay in Iraq, an open-ended commitment that in effect says we will be there at least until 2009, doesn't send the right message to the Iraqis about getting serious about their most serious challenges. For example, when I was recently in Iraq with my colleague, Senator SNOWE, I was especially troubled by the Iraqis' response to my concerns about corruption in the Iraqi oil sector. We all know that 90 percent of the revenue generated in Iraq comes from oil, and there has been one independent analysis after another documenting widespread corruption in Iraq's oil sector. I brought that to the attention of the officials Senator SNOWE and I met with on our trip. Essentially, the response was one of denial: Well, Senator, it really isn't that bad; well, Senator, we are getting serious about it; well, Senator, we are thinking about trying X, Y, and Z.

But I say to the Senate today that we continue to read these independent

analyses which have documented widespread corruption and malfeasance in the Iraqi oil sector. Yet it is not being dealt with. My view is that to say the future of American forces in Iraq will be decided by future Presidents is yet another signal to the Iraqis that they have plenty of time to deal with serious problems like corruption in the oil sector, which should have been dealt with some time ago.

Again, I share the view of the Senator from Alabama concerning the professionalism of our troops. Our country and the world is better as a result of the death of Mr. Zarqawi. The kind of carnage and the brutal campaign that Mr. Zarqawi conducted is well understood. We are all very hopeful, because we all root for success in Iraq, that this will deal a blow to the insurgency. Our soldiers and all concerned ought to be proud of what they accomplished in taking down Zarqawi. I am proud of them. I know the Senator from Alabama is as well.

But let us think about the implications of overstretching our Armed Forces. That is why I say I am troubled about what is going to happen to American preparedness for a dangerous world if we stay and stay and stay—until at least 2009. Oregon Guard members, for example, of whom we are exceptionally proud, are on their third rotation in the theater. Some Active-Duty Forces are on their fourth rotation. Others are getting ready for their fifth rotation into harm's way. I am sure that is also the case in Alabama. I am sure it is also the case in every part of the United States. I will tell the Senate today that I think the stress our courageous Armed Forces are dealing with now is at the point where, if we can't get the Iraqis to speed up securing their own defense, this is going to undermine America's preparedness to deal with a dangerous world.

Our Armed Forces are maintaining an exceptional level of professionalism under exceptional stress, but at a certain point it is just not possible to continue in that way and be ready for the kinds of crises and the kinds of national security challenges that exist today. So the preparedness of our U.S. military to deal with a host of national security challenges hinges on what happens in Iraq. The more responsi-

bility the Iraqis take for their future, the less the United States must shoulder, and the sooner we can start bringing our troops home.

When our President says that a future American President will decide when to bring U.S. troops home, it seems to me that sends a message to the Iraqis that they have a lot more time. For the sake of preparedness, for the sake of Iraq securing its own future, we have to speed this timetable up. American troops cannot and should not be in Iraq forever.

Shortly, I will introduce a very simple resolution. It is a sense of the Senate on the President's intention to keep U.S. forces in Iraq until at least 2009. The resolution is very simple. I will just read it this afternoon:

That it is the sense of the Senate that—
(1) the members of the Armed Forces deserve the enormous respect and support of the Senate and the American people for the sacrifices that they are making on behalf of our country; and

(2) the President's intention, as stated on March 21, 2006, that "future Presidents" will determine whether to keep members of the Armed Forces in Iraq undermines the preparedness of the United States military to respond to other crises and should not be supported.

I will close. Again I pick up on the Chair's statement about the commitment of our troops and their courage and their valor. This is not, today, a debate about whether it was right to go to war. We had that debate. I was on the side that voted against, and other Senators were for it. We are long past that point. What we are dealing with now is how to win the peace. That is something which all Senators should be looking to try to work together on and find some bipartisan common ground.

I commend the Senator from Alabama for his statement about our troops. But I do believe we have to find a way to get beyond some of these artificial choices—like cutting and running or staying the course. Hopefully we can do that. I believe one area for bipartisan cooperation should be to try to speed up Iraq taking over its own future.

I was very troubled by the statement that it was the President's intention that the future of our Armed Forces in Iraq would be dealt with by future

Presidents. We have to deal with it now. We have to find a way to win the peace and do it on a bipartisan basis. I intend to work with colleagues on both sides of the aisle to advance this goal, which is not about whether you are for the war or against the war, it is today about winning the peace, and that is why I will be offering my resolution.

I yield the floor.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, as chairman of the Budget Committee, I regularly comment on appropriations bills that are brought to the Senate for consideration and present the fiscal comparisons and budgetary data. I believe it is useful to expand that practice, when required, for authorization bills that we consider.

S. 2766, the national Defense authorization bill for fiscal year 2007, is, of course, one of the most important bills the Congress brings up on an annual basis. As Senators know, the Budget Committee does not enforce the levels of the authorizations of appropriations contained in the bill, even though they constitute the vast majority of programs and projects addressed. Ultimately, those authorizations of appropriations only spend money once the Appropriations Committee acts on its Defense bill.

But there is another category of spending in the Defense authorization bill which the Budget Committee does enforce because passage of this bill and its signature by the President would create automatic spending. By that, I mean the direct spending or mandatory spending provisions in the bill.

According to a Congressional Budget Office estimate of June 9, 2006, S. 2766 as reported increases budget authority for mandatory spending by \$458 million in fiscal year 2007 and \$1.508 billion over the next 5 years. Corresponding outlays are \$307 million in fiscal year 2007 and \$1.416 billion over the next 5 years.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table of direct spending for S. 2766 excerpted from CBO's official cost estimate be printed in the RECORD.

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

TABLE 4.—ESTIMATED IMPACT OF S. 2766 ON DIRECT SPENDING AND REVENUES

	By fiscal year, in millions of dollars—									
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
CHANGES IN DIRECT SPENDING										
Military Housing in Korea:										
Estimated Budget Authority	160	160	160	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Estimated Outlays	10	58	109	126	92	48	22	10	5	0
Pilot Projects for Military Housing:										
Estimated Budget Authority	0	0	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Estimated Outlays	0	0	4	14	9	2	1	0	0	0
Maximum Term of Leases for Overseas Facilities:										
Estimated Budget Authority	1	2	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Estimated Outlays	*	1	3	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
SBP Benefits:										
Estimated Budget Authority	53	57	61	63	66	68	70	72	74	76
Estimated Outlays	53	57	61	63	66	68	70	72	74	76
Paid-Up SBP:										
Estimated Budget Authority	202	213	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Estimated Outlays	202	213	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TRICARE Pharmacy Program:										
Estimated Budget Authority	42	61	62	54	46	39	31	22	12	2
Estimated Outlays	42	61	62	54	46	39	31	22	12	2

TABLE 4.—ESTIMATED IMPACT OF S. 2766 ON DIRECT SPENDING AND REVENUES—Continued

	By fiscal year, in millions of dollars—										
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	
Total Changes:											
Estimated Budget Authority	458	493	318	122	117	112	106	99	91	83	
Estimated Outlays	307	390	239	262	218	162	129	109	96	83	
	CHANGES IN REVENUES										
Thrift Savings Plan: Estimated Revenues	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	

NOTES.—Numbers in the text may differ from figures shown here because of rounding. SBP = Survivor Benefit Plan. * = between —\$500,000 and \$500,000.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, in evaluating our needs in the Department of Defense authorization bill, key factors will be our relationship with Iran and North Korea as we face two major problems of two nations: one having nuclear weapons and the other appearing to be intent on developing nuclear weapons. I applaud the President's recent move to agree to bilateral negotiations with Iran subject to certain conditions, and I think he was precisely correct in saying that notwithstanding the difficulties with Iran and their apparent intransigence, that all diplomatic efforts ought to be explored before any consideration is given to the use of military force. I think that is a way to approach the international issues. While we deal with some of these tough adversaries, all options should theoretically remain on the table. But to the extent that these problems can be solved through diplomacy, that is obviously the preferable course.

In dealing with countries such as Iran and North Korea, it is difficult when the United States has branded them as the "axis of evil." But President Reagan invited Soviet leader Leonid Brezhnev to a dialogue within weeks after labeling the U.S.S.R. as the "evil empire." So it is possible to have some tough dialogue and some tough rhetoric and, at the same time, work toward negotiations, no matter how difficult the adversary or potential adversary may be.

Early in my activities and public service, when I was an assistant district attorney in Philadelphia, I had an occasion to interview inmates at the State prison, Rockview, who were under the death sentence. Joining the district attorney's office, I was low man on the totem pole, and the low man got the job of traveling to the State prison and talking to people under the death penalty, people who wanted to have their death sentences commuted. It was quite an experience. Very, very tough people who had committed heinous crimes, outrageous lives, bad backgrounds, about as tough a gang as you could find off the streets of Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, and other parts of the State who had committed murders so atrocious that they had gotten the death penalty. That taught me a lesson, leading me to the conclusion that if you could talk to people like that, you could talk to anybody. You don't have to agree with people, but there is no reason not to talk. I am aware that it is a significant transfer to apply that kind of an experience to

international diplomacy, but I think it has some weight.

There are those who oppose talking to Iran or North Korea on a bilateral basis because we don't want to recognize them, we don't want to give them any status. I think a comprehensive answer was made to that by Richard Armitage, who was Deputy Secretary of State right under Colin Powell during President Bush's first term. This is what Mr. Armitage had to say:

It appears that the administration thinks that dialogue equates with weakness, that we have called these regimes evil and, therefore, we won't talk to them. Some people say that talking would legitimize the regimes. But we are not trying to change the regimes, and they are already legitimized in the eyes of the international community. So we ought to have enough confidence in our ability as diplomats to go eye-to-eye with people, even though we disagree in the strongest possible way, and come away without losing anything.

Our relationship with Iran has obviously been extremely difficult since the Shah was deposed in 1979. And Iran is a proud country with a proud history. There is, at least, some part of the motivation to become a nuclear power, nuclear military force to be with the big boys as a matter of international status. I think if we were willing to meet with Iran in a straightforward, diplomatic way as negotiating equals—the United States is never going to be equal with Iran because of the great difference in our power in the international field—but I do believe that our foreign policy would be enhanced if we treated foreign leaders, foreign countries with more dignity and respect. I think it would be a significant step forward if Iran were treated as a diplomatic and negotiating equal, that it might take some of the pressure off their determination to be a nuclear military power or, at a minimum, I think it is worth a try.

I made my first trip to the Mideast back in 1964, and in the intervening 42 years I have made almost 30 trips to the region. I tried to go to Iran shortly after the Iran-Iraq war ended in 1988, and my efforts to go there have never been successful. It is possible to travel to Iran as a tourist, but it is not—they are not receptive to having an official visit.

In the absence of being able to go to Iran, I have contacted and had discussions with two of the Iranian Ambassadors to the United Nations. I made my first contact back in May of the year 2000, a little more than 6 years ago, and I discussed with the Iranian Ambassador to the United Nations the

possibility of an exchange of parliamentarians; that a group of Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives might meet with a group of parliamentarians from the Iranian Parliament. I invited the Iranian Ambassador to the United Nations to a dinner in my hideaway, my office here in Washington, attended by a number of Members. I then met with his successor in August of 2003 and had moved toward concrete plans to have a group of Iranian parliamentarians meet with Members of Congress in Switzerland in January of 2004, but unfortunately, those plans fell through because there was a concurrent, harsh exchange of rhetoric, and the Iranians were not willing to meet at that time.

There was a significant development when the Iranian President, on May 8 of this year, sent President Bush an 18-page letter, and the President appropriately responded, showing interest in having negotiations with Iran. We had been pursuing efforts to have diplomatic pressure applied by Iran in concert with our European allies, trying to involve China and trying to involve Russia, and then Secretary of State Rice signified a shift of U.S. policy by indicating our willingness to negotiate directly with Iran by putting conditions on that offer to negotiate. To repeat, I believe that we ought to be willing to negotiate without conditions. We have similarly sought to deal with North Korea in collaboration with other nations, including Japan and South Korea, China, and Russia, and here again, it would be my hope that we would seek and be willing to have those talks without preconditions.

I was part of a CODEL led by Senator BIDEN in August of 2001, at the time when Senator BIDEN was chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, and we traveled to the Far East and had plans to meet with the North Korean President, and that did not materialize because at that same time, the North Korean President made an unexpected trip to China. In looking toward the future, it is my hope to be able to go to North Korea. I think there is a climate there of receptivity to meeting with Members of Congress, and that is a course which I intend to pursue.

I have found that in the meetings I have had on foreign travels that, at least in my opinion, they have been a bit productive. In the 25 years of my service in the Senate, I have been on the Appropriations Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, and for 8 years I served on the Intelligence Committee, chairing that committee during the

104th Congress in 1995 and 1996, and those committee assignments and my interests generally in foreign policy have taken me to some 93 countries.

One of the countries I have visited on many occasions is Syria. I have visited Syria on 15 trips. On nine occasions I have had an opportunity to meet with President Hafez al-Assad. I was the only Member of Congress to accompany the Secretary of State to his funeral in the year 2000, and I have since had an opportunity to visit on three occasions with President Bashar al-Assad.

In the course of those meetings I got to know President Hafez al-Assad. The first meeting was in 1988, and it lasted for approximately 4½ hours. I had long heard about President Assad's willingness to engage in extended discussions. We covered a wide variety of subjects. We talked about Syrian relations with Israel. We talked about the Palestinian problems. We talked about the Iran-Iraq war. We talked about U.S.-Soviet relations. On a number of occasions I suggested that I had taken too much of his time. On each occasion he would say: No, I am interested in talking more.

In the course of meeting President Hafez al-Assad on some nine occasions, it developed into a cordial relationship, even, you might call it, a joking relationship. I would urge President Assad to meet with Israeli Prime Ministers and say that our meeting, always attended by the local photographers, would appear on the front page of the Syrian newspaper, the Damascus newspaper, but if President Assad would meet with the Israeli Prime Minister, it would be world news.

I told him when Prime Minister Rabin and Foreign Minister Perez and Palestinian Authority Chairman Arafat got the Nobel Peace Prize, if he would work for peace with Israel, that he would get the Nobel Peace Prize in Stockholm.

He replied: Well, I might be welcome in Stockholm under the arrangement you suggest, but I might not be able to get back to Damascus.

In 1988 I suggested to President Assad that he permit the Jewish women in Syria to leave the country because there were very few Jewish men for them to marry. That was a subject which Congressman Stephen Solarz had undertaken, and I was carrying forward some of what Congressman Solarz had sought to do. President Hafez al-Assad said to me that anyone who came to claim a Syrian Jewish bride would be permitted to take the bride with him out of the country. I relayed that message to the large Syrian community in Brooklyn, NY. Nothing much ever came of it. But in 1992, President Assad permitted all the Jews to immigrate out of Syria. My exhortations might have had some effect—who knows as to what that might have been.

I consistently would urge President Assad to negotiate with Israel, and he would say that he would not do so but entertained the possibility of negotia-

tions with Israel if sponsored by the big 5: sponsored by the United States, the Soviet Union, Britain, France, and the China. Israel was unwilling to engage in those negotiations because only the United States would be neutral or perhaps friendly toward Israel. Finally, President Assad did agree to go to Madrid, in 1991, to negotiate with Israel.

I had extensive discussions with a very distinguished Syrian diplomat, Walid al-Moualem. When Benjamin Netanyahu was Prime Minister of Israel, in 1996, upon taking office Prime Minister Netanyahu made a forceful declaration that Israel and he would hold Syria responsible for the actions of Hezbollah in southern Lebanon. That led to a realignment of the Syrian military, and for a time it looked as if that was a tense situation. I was in Israel at that time and was asked by Prime Minister Netanyahu to carry a message to President Assad that Israel wanted peace. I conveyed that message to President Assad, and later, when I met with Walid al-Moualem, the Syrian Ambassador to the United Nations—met with him here in Washington—he told me that the conversations I had and the message I carried from Prime Minister Netanyahu to President Assad had been, as he put it, “helpful in deescalating the dangerous tensions.”

Ambassador Moualem later told me I had gained the trust and confidence and personal relationship with President Assad because, as he put it, “they viewed me as being objective” even though, as he put it, “nobody could question my support for Israel.”

I am not making any major contentions, or making any claims as to what effect these visits would have had. But every little bit helps. In getting to know Assad and getting to know his son, it does provide an opportunity for a statement as to our values in the United States, what we would like to see happen. I think it is helpful and certainly can do no harm.

In January of 1989, I made my first trip to Iraq and returned a year later with Senator SHELBY.

I will conclude briefly and will supplement my remarks today with more specification at a later time on exact dates, based on trip reports which I make after coming back from each of my travels.

I had referenced the conversation which Senator SHELBY and I had with Saddam Hussein in January of 1990. I do not know if it would have ever have been possible to have dissuaded Saddam Hussein from his practices of aggression, but on that occasion Senator SHELBY and I had a professional conversation with him, and it is my view conversations of that sort have the potential to be helpful.

I have had occasion to visit with Palestinian Authority Chairman Yasser Arafat on some eight occasions. I have conveyed messages from Prime Minister Netanyahu to Chairman Arafat

about the terrorism issue. Whether it had any effect or not I do not know. I have had occasion to visit Cuba on three occasions, meeting with President Fidel Castro on a wide range of conversations, urging him to have respect for human rights. I questioned him about the deployment of Soviet missiles in 1962, asking about possible involvement in the assassination of President Kennedy, which he denied in talking to him about assassination efforts. I believe there is a fruitful basis to have cooperation with Cuba on drug interdiction, and it is something I have pursued and intend to pursue in the future.

I have had occasion to visit China on four visits. I have had discussions with the Chinese leader about their failure to respect human rights, about the detention of a librarian from Dickerson College, who later was freed after a condemnatory resolution was filed in the Senate, and I have taken the lead in urging Temple University to establish a school in Beijing to inform Chinese leaders about the due process of law.

I had an opportunity to meet with President Chavez in Venezuela last August. There was a controversy on drug enforcement. The Venezuelans would not meet with our ambassador, and I asked for a meeting of President Chavez with our ambassador. I met with the Venezuelan Minister of the Interior. I don't have time to summarize it now, but President Chavez was willing to discuss a protocol for drug cooperation.

I believe the talks with people, even our tough adversaries, our toughest adversaries, can be fruitful. As we structure our legislation for the Department of Defense and look later to the Department of Defense appropriations subcommittee, a subcommittee on which I serve, it is my hope that the United States would be vigorous in the pursuit of negotiations with Iran to diffuse the risk there, to try to find a way of recognizing them in respect and dignity, persuading them not to become a nuclear power, and to have bilateral talks with North Korea on the same unconditional basis—again treating them with respect and seeking to find a way to have an international protocol which would contain and control the significant threat posed by North Korea.

As I say, Mr. President, I have generalized. Most of what I have said has come from floor statements which I have made in the past 25 years. And I will document this further at a later time when there is more time for the presentation.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I want to thank the Democratic Leader, Senator REID, for his leadership and the hard work he has done to include an amendment to National Defense Authorization Act which increases protections for the dedicated women and men throughout our judiciary. The recent

shooting of a State judge in Nevada provides another terrible reminder of the vulnerable position of our State and Federal judges. Unfortunately, this is not the only recent reminder. Last May, the Judiciary Committee heard the courageous testimony of Judge Joan Lefkow of Chicago, the federal judge whose mother and husband were murdered in their home. We must protect judges where they work and where they and their families live.

The amendment now incorporated into the bill which I cosponsored with Senator REID, Chairman SPECTER, and Senator DURBIN, would enact provisions from the Court Security Improvement Act of 2005, CSIA, S. 1968, which Chairman SPECTER and I introduced last November. Our bill and this amendment authorize additional resources to improve security for State and local court systems. We also respond to requests by the Federal judiciary for a greater voice in working with the U.S. Marshals Service to determine their security needs. This amendment provides criminal penalties for the misuse of restricted personal information to seriously harm or threaten to seriously harm Federal judges, their families or other individuals performing official duties. It provides criminal penalties for threatening Federal judges and Federal law enforcement officials by the malicious filing of false liens, and provides increased protections for witnesses. It also includes an extension of life insurance benefits to bankruptcy, magistrate and territorial judges, and provides health insurance for surviving spouses and families of Federal judges, both of which are provisions that I suggested be included.

Finally, this amendment contains provisions which have passed the Senate several times extending and expanding to family members the authority of the Judicial Conference to redact certain information from a Federal judge's mandatory financial disclosure. This redaction authority is intended to be used in circumstances in which the release of the information could endanger the filer or the filer's family. I hope that the House of Representatives finally takes up and passes this extension and expansion of redaction authority.

U.S. MARINE CORPS BASE CAMP LEJEUNE WATER CONTAMINATION

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, the motto of the U.S. Marine Corps is *Semper Fidelis*. Translated, it means, "Always Faithful," but among members of the Marine Corps the motto holds a deeper meaning. *Semper Fidelis* represents our Nation's shared commitment to those who dedicate their lives to protect us. As a Navy veteran, I know we must always honor the men and women of our Armed Forces and their families for the sacrifices they make for our Nation everyday.

Lately, I am afraid Congress has not fulfilled its commitment to our men

and women in the military, and this is especially evident in the lack of support for our military veterans and their families. Our lack of assistance for those exposed to the highly contaminated drinking water at U.S. Marine Corps base Camp Lejeune in North Carolina is one of the best examples of this body's shortcomings.

Camp Lejeune is the site of one of the largest drinking water catastrophes in our Nation's history. Between 1980 and 1985, Camp Lejeune drinking water samples conducted by the Marine Corps found high levels of volatile organic compounds used by the Marines in solvents for industrial degreasing. The contaminated wells were closed in 1985; however, the contamination itself may date back until the late 1950s. To put the contamination in perspective, the current EPA health standard for these chemicals is 5 parts per billion. The tap water samples taken at homes and the elementary school between 1980 and 1985 reached levels as high as 1,400 parts per billion.

While the health effects of exposure to the contaminants at Camp Lejeune are still being studied, the U.S. Agency for Toxic Substances, ATSDR, has documented at least 100 babies exposed in utero to the contaminated drinking water at Camp Lejeune have birth defects and cancers, including spina bifida, leukemia, and cleft palates. This is at least twice the rate found in the general population.

For the last 20 years, the calls for assistance from those affected by this contamination have gone unanswered. The Department of Defense's cooperation has been slow, and the political will in Congress has been lacking. I will offer a modest amendment to answer the call for help.

Senator DOLE's amendment would do two things. First, it would provide veterans' health care benefits to those exposed in utero while at Camp Lejeune. The in utero exposures to Camp Lejeune's contaminated water happened under the Marine Corps watch, and it is our responsibility to assist those who were harmed. Medical assistance is a modest step to help restore faith among our veterans and their family members in the Government's commitment to them.

Second, it requires the Marine Corps to notify those who may have been exposed to the water contamination upon the completion of the ATSDR's study on the human exposures to drinking water. To date, the Marine Corps has issued targeted press releases, but information has not been sent to all who may have been exposed. The ATSDR's modeling of the contaminated water will make it possible to notify exposed segments of the Camp Lejeune population, without creating undue worry among the greater population that resided on base. This amendment will require the Marines to provide notice to those who may have been exposed, to outline the events leading to the exposures, to describe the potential adverse

health effects, and to give the affected people resources they can use to obtain more information.

I thank Senator DOLE for her leadership on this issue. Without her, this tragic situation would not have gotten the attention it deserves.

Nevertheless, concerns have been raised about this amendment. The people exposed to the highly contaminated drinking water at Camp Lejeune have waited for decades for answers. Congress needs to take steps now and not delay for years debating this issue.

For this reason, I have worked with Senator DOLE on a second, compromise Dole-Jeffords amendment. This amendment would require a comprehensive National Academy of Sciences study to be completed within 18 months to evaluate the strength of the link between TCE and PCE exposure and adverse health impacts for prenatal, childhood, and adult exposures at Camp Lejeune.

It also requires the Navy to notify those potentially affected by the water contamination at Camp Lejeune so they can learn what happened, how it may have affected them, and what steps they may want to consider taking now to minimize the potential health impacts. While I am told by the Defense Department that individual notification by letter to each person affected is impractical, under this compromise amendment, the Navy would carry out a media blitz and place a letter on its Web page providing the information that those affected deserve to have.

Again, I thank Senator DOLE for taking a bipartisan approach to this issue and for pushing to make constructive progress. We have a moral responsibility to support our troops and their families, and any failure to do so, is a failure to fulfill our commitment embodied in the Marine's motto *Semper Fidelis*. I urge my colleagues to approve this compromise amendment.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FATHER'S DAY

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, in a few moments we will be closing for the week. Before we leave, I want to take just a few moments to reflect on a very special holiday coming up this weekend, and that is Father's Day.

On Sunday, families all across America will celebrate their dads with dinners and lunches and gifts and, if my

family is typical, some gentle teasing over the course of the day.

It is a day that we show our gratitude and how important our dads are—and have been and continue to be—in our lives.

In my own case, I cherish my memories of my dad. I think of him each and every day. He was my mentor in medicine, mentor in public service, mentor in humanitarian efforts, and my friend. It was his love and his wisdom and his encouragement that gave me the confidence to work outside of the box, to take risks, and to set high goals.

As I was thinking back a few moments ago as to what I would say, I remembered and recall most vividly, after returning back to Nashville, TN, and working at Vanderbilt—after having been away from Nashville for a long period of time with college and medical school and my internship and residency and training and moving back to Nashville—every day I would drive by my parents' home on the way to work at Vanderbilt Hospital.

As I would go by that house—and, ironically, it is the same house I live in today, but as I would go by that house, I would think, each day, about the values that dad—both parents and really the entire family—instilled in each of us.

I also used it as a marker place in coming home every night. As I drove by that white house, I would call. That number would be dialed as I was driving by. And by the time I got home, we would complete our conversation, on a daily basis—each and every day.

Indeed, he was an extraordinary man in many ways, not in his accomplishments or just being a great physician, a humble physician treating people throughout middle Tennessee, but in his acts of generosity and in his kindness, known throughout the community for his good works.

My father died in 1998. Mother and Dad both died within about 36 hours of each other of totally independent causes. In truth, it was referred at the funeral as a great love story. A lot of people arrived for the funeral of my dad—my mother died about 30 hours later—and there were two caskets there. Thinking about how tragic it was, in truth it was a manifestation of what was a great love story, a marriage of over 65 years.

Dad, not too long before he died, wrote a letter to his grandchildren and great-grandchildren and great-great-grandchildren that he would never know—that is the way he opened the letter to them—passing on in about a two-page letter the insights he had in very simple ways, humble ways. It is a long letter, and I won't read the whole of it but just a few paragraphs.

Again, this is a letter he left to be passed on to future generations. His advice was:

Be happy in your family life. Your family is the most important thing you can ever have. Love your wife or your husband. Tell your children how great they are. Encourage them in everything they do.

Be happy in your community. Charity is so important. There's so much good to do in the world and so many different ways to do it.

A little bit later in the letter he wrote:

The world is always changing, and that's a good thing. It's how you carry yourself in the world that doesn't change. Morality, integrity, warmth, and kindness are the same things in 1910, when I was born, or in 2010 or later when you will be reading this. And that's a good thing, too.

Dad is the one who had the high ideals. I have done my best to try to live up to those ideals and to that sterling example he set before us. I have worked hard as a dad to instill those same values and commitments in my own sons.

This weekend, as we celebrate our fathers and the good news that America's fathers are more present in their children's lives than ever, we all realize that they have a huge impact. Children involved with loving fathers are more likely to do well in school, to have healthy self-esteem, to show empathy, to avoid destructive behaviors. Kids do better with their dads around.

For a while, America seemed to forget this. But now we know in our kids what we have always known in our hearts: America's dads deserve our respect and our support, dads on the frontline who risk their lives for our freedom, dads on the home front who work hard to support their families.

Fatherhood is the most important responsibility a man will ever take on. It is also the most rewarding.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, banks of day lilies are celebrating their brief moments of glory as they turn their vibrant orange faces to the sun. The days are warm and mellow, not too hot for working in the garden or in the yard. The evenings linger, fading slowly into velvet nights filled with the trill of crickets, the sparkle of lightning bugs and the soft songs of whippoorwills. These are perfect evenings to spend on a country porch, watching the day slide into night. Late spring, almost summer—it is a lovely time of year.

On Sunday, June 18, the Nation will celebrate Father's Day. Father's Day does not arrive with quite the same fanfare as Mother's Day. To be sure, stores have been busy reminding us to shop for Father's Day, and the racks are full of Father's Day cards, but there doesn't seem to be the same level of intensity as that which surrounds Mother's Day. The long distance lines will not be as busy. Florists will not be swamped with orders. But fathers around the country will be treated to brunch or to some other family gathering. They will open presents of golf shirts, ties, or cologne bought by family members frustrated because dad always just buys what he really wants whenever he wants it. He is forgiven for this fault only because his family is fairly sure that dad is unaware of the approach of any holiday, including Father's Day. Of course, fathers will put their dramatic skills to the test in

order to express their gratitude. The comedian Bill Cosby famously once said, "Fatherhood is pretending the present you love most is 'soap-on-a-rope.'"

This is not to say that Nation does not appreciate men. Far from it. We observe the birthdays of our Founding Fathers. We celebrate the fathers and other men who brave the terrors of distant battlefields to defend the Nation. We have monuments and parks, schools and mountains named after men who have won battles, made important discoveries, or who have contributed to the growth and prosperity of our Nation. But rarely, if ever, are these memorials dedicated to the important role that men play in their own families. The role that fathers play in the lives of their children, in helping to shape the future of the Nation, certainly merits this one day of recognition. The poet William Wordsworth observed: "Father!—to God himself we cannot give a holier name."

Fathers carry a heavy load of duty, responsibility and worry. Every day, and during many sleepless nights, they worry about big things, like the state of the economy or the impact of trade agreements on their jobs. Will they be able to support their families and make their mortgages on time? Will they keep their job or lose it to an overseas competitor? Is their pension secure? Will they have health care—not for themselves, for men are not very good about going to the doctor regularly, but for their families. Fathers also worry about small details, like oil level in the lawn mower or that suspicious drip under the sink. Is the prime interest rate going up or down, and how will that affect their ability to pay the monthly bills? Everything that can affect their families is a concern for fathers, who take their role as providers for their families very seriously, indeed.

By June 18, children are out of school at last. In days past, that would mean long summer days to while away with swimming and in play, and idle hours spent reading a book in the shade. In today's world, however, summer vacation for children out of school is often a headache for families with two working parents. Summer becomes instead a scheduling nightmare of day camps or sitters, or of latchkey kids who must spend the day indoors behind lock and key because there is no adult available to supervise their play. Instead of two working parents meaning a better life, today two working parents may as easily signal a family working hard just to keep up. Many fathers endure long commutes between work and home so that their families can live in a nicer neighborhood than those same fathers did growing up. Fathers are often portrayed as workaholics who live for their jobs and who see families as a minor annoyance, if they notice them at all. In truth, fathers worry about their jobs because they fear that, if they do not concentrate on their work,

they will lose their jobs and not be able to provide for their families. Today's economy is too uncertain, too volatile, and too global to take for granted.

This Father's Day, so many fathers are in harm's way in Afghanistan or in Iraq facing daily dangers that have already taken too many other fathers from their wives and children. To them and to their families, I offer my prayers of thanks and of safekeeping. May God bring them safely home. The families for whom this Father's Day will be a mix of loving remembrance and painful loss, I can offer only the comforting words of sympathy and the acknowledgment of their sad, sad loss. These fathers in heaven, for there they surely are, still have an important place in the family. Like all fathers, they teach by example. In this case, their example is one of bravery and sacrifice, patriotism and service.

Clarence Budington Kelland once wrote of his father: "He didn't tell me how to live; he lived, and let me watch him do it." These fathers in uniform, like good fathers everywhere, teach by the example of their own lives. "The words that a father speaks to his children in the privacy of home are not heard by the world, but, as in whispering-galleries, they are clearly heard at the end and by posterity." Jean Paul Richter made that observation, and that truism captures the essence of a father's importance. Each day they gird themselves for battle, whether that battle be in Iraq or in an office or a factory. They go, and they return. They do not complain, or at least not much, about how much time they must spend away from home. They simply do the best that they can for their families, day after day, year after year. They love their children. They play with them when they can. They monitor schoolwork and behavior. They set standards and measure performance. They mete out discipline. They scrutinize their children's friends. They say "yes" as often as they say "no." Good fathers participate in all aspects of their children's lives.

Our families are our Nation's greatest resource and greatest treasure. I am proud each year to take a few minutes to recognize the critical role of mothers and fathers on the days set aside for each of them. It reminds me to think always of how families are affected by the votes I cast here in the Senate. The votes we cast here affect the lives and well being of mothers and fathers and families. We need to make life easier for families, not harder. We should not send fathers into battle without good cause. We should not add to the burden of debt without good cause. Our spending decisions should add to the prosperity and well-being of the Nation and our families, first and foremost.

I close with a favorite poem of mine, one that I often recite for Father's Day. I learned it as young boy, and the words and the lesson have come to mean more to me with each passing year:

THAT DAD OF MINE

He's slowing down, as some folks say,
With the burden of years from day to day;
His brow bears many a furrowed line;
He's growing old—that dad of mine.
His shoulders droop, and his step is slow;
And his hair is white, as white as snow;
But his kind eyes sparkle with a friendly
light;
His smile is warm, and his heart is right.
He's old? Oh, yes. But only in years,
For his spirit soars as the sunset nears.
And blest I've been, and wealth I've had,
In knowing a man like my old dad.
And proud I am to stand by him,
As he stood by me when the way was dim;
I've found him worthy and just as fine,
A prince of men—that dad of mine.

REFERRAL OF NOMINATION

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

U.S. SENATE,
SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE,
Washington, DC, June 15, 2006.

HON. BILL FRIST,
Senate Majority Leader,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. LEADER: On June 15, 2006, the Committee on the Judiciary reported favorably the nomination of Kenneth L. Wainstein to be the Assistant Attorney General for National Security. Pursuant to section 17(b)(1) of S. Res. 400 of the 94th Congress (as amended by Section 506(d) of the USA PATRIOT Improvement and Reauthorization Act of 2005, Pub. L. No. 109-177 (Mar. 9, 2006)), I request that the nomination of Mr. Wainstein be referred to the Select Committee on Intelligence for a period not to exceed 20 calendar days.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

PAT ROBERTS,
Chairman.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I today salute a hero for all Americans, a leader for his party, and my friend, Senator Robert Joseph Dole.

This week marks 10 years since Senator Dole retired from this Chamber, a day I remember well. Senator Dole left as the longest-serving Republican leader in Senate history. In fact, the beginning of his leadership tenure coincided with my first term in the Senate, starting in January 1985.

Even then, it was clear that Senator Dole was and is not just another Senator, but a national fixture in American politics. Author Michael Barone, writing in his *Almanac of American Politics*, has this to say about our friend from Kansas:

Senator Bob Dole is one of the large political figures of our time, in the middle 1990s towering over everyone else in the political landscape, even the president . . . for Bob Dole is not only one of the most successful politicians of the second half of the 20th Century but also one of the most enduring.

Powerful words about a powerful leader. Many of my colleagues have already recounted Senator Dole's extensive political career, his record of legislative accomplishment, and his leader-

ship of the Republican Party, here in the Senate and as the Republican candidate for both President and Vice-President of the United States. Beginning with his chairmanship of the Republican National Committee in 1971, Senator Dole was a prominent player on the national stage for a quarter-century.

Senator Dole's heroism on the battlefield is well-known and revered by us all as well. In 1945, a young Lieutenant Dole from Russell, KS, found himself on the hills of Italy, fighting the Nazis. Suddenly pain exploded in his back. Paralyzed by his war injury, Bob Dole spent 4 years in hospital wards, relearning how to do simple tasks, like button his shirt. To this day his right arm remains largely paralyzed.

I believe the determination and focus Senator Dole must have had to recover from that injury explains his success in politics, and with the American people. After struggling to regain control of one's body, lining up a vote on a difficult bill might be a little less daunting. I have heard Senator DOLE say before that no honor that has come his way has ever surpassed the pride he felt at wearing his country's uniform.

As a Republican Leader, Bob Dole was about results, not symbolism or showmanship. President George H.W. Bush, for instance, cited him as instrumental in the passage of the Americans with Disabilities Act in 1990. Out of office, he has continued to serve his country, fundraising for worthy causes and raising awareness of the dangers of prostate cancer.

Senator Dole is also famous for his dry, Midwestern wit, which has lifted many of us here in the Senate in times of despair as well as levity. This is a man who, after losing the Republican Presidential nomination in 1988, assured an audience that he "went home and slept like a baby. Every couple of hours, I'd wake up and cry."

My colleagues and I continue to be graced every day in this chamber by the presence of another prominent Senator DOLE, the Senator from North Carolina. ELIZABETH, I wish to express how happy we all are Bob has found you, and you have found Bob. You remind us of him every day, and we hope that you will tell him how much we all respect and miss him, and how pleased we are to honor his service.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, last Sunday marked the 10th anniversary of Senator Bob Dole's retirement from the Senate. Bob Dole served the people of Kansas and the people of the United States of America as a Member of Congress for more than three and a half decades. He was outspoken on many issues, but, above all, I will always admire his tireless, passionate advocacy on behalf of people with disabilities.

The first speech that Bob Dole ever made on the floor of the Senate—on April 14, 1969—was about the challenges faced by Americans with disabilities. That date was the 24th anniversary of the day he was gravely wounded in

World War II. In fact, every year that he was in the Senate, on or about April 14, Bob Dole made a statement on the floor about the challenges faced by individuals with disabilities. But Bob Dole did much more than just talk about expanding access and opportunity for people with disabilities. He was an outstanding leader in bringing about change for the good.

Most importantly, I will always be grateful for Senator Bob Dole's leadership in helping to pass the Americans with Disabilities Act in 1990. Both he and I remember the day that it was signed into law as one of the proudest in our entire legislative careers.

It is hard to believe, but it has been nearly 16 years since we passed the Americans with Disabilities Act. Just as many predicted, ADA has taken its place among the great civil rights laws in our Nation's history. Today, the impacts of ADA are all around us. Drive-through restaurants have visual displays allowing the deaf and hard of hearing to place their orders. Banks have talking ATMs, now, to assist those with visual impairments. Cities have installed curb cuts and ramps to allow wheelchair users easier access. And on and on. Just as important, because of ADA, we have seen an enormous change in attitudes. These changes that we see today, that we feel today, would not have been possible without the hard work and dedication of Senator Bob Dole in working cooperatively to help get the ADA passed.

On a bipartisan basis, we miss Bob Dole here in this body. But the good news is that there is still a Senator DOLE in the Senate, and our friend Bob has found a richly satisfying life after the Senate. Today, he continues to serve the American people in a whole range of voluntary capacities, proving President Reagan's dictum that "you don't have to be on the public payroll to be an outstanding public servant." I salute my good friend, Bob Dole, and I wish him all the best.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, of all my colleagues, I suppose that in 1996 I was the one most hoping that Bob Dole would not retire from the Senate. That was because I was doing my best to defeat him in the New Hampshire Presidential primary. If I had, Bob had told several friends he was "going back to the Senate." Well, Pat Buchanan beat both of us by a few percentage points, and Bob beat me. Within a few weeks, I was back in Tennessee at a press conference endorsing Bob Dole and presenting him with one of my red and black plaid shirts. "I hope it's his last one," Bob's friend Howard Baker was heard to mutter, referring to my shirt.

I should have known better. In my first Iowa poll in June of 1995, pollster Whit Ayres said, "Governor, this is the professional challenge of my career. The poll says, 'Dole 54, Alexander 3, margin of error 4 percentage points.'" The end result in the caucuses 6 months later was a good deal closer,

but Bob Dole won because he had earned for himself the unofficial title of "President of Iowa." Iowans liked his spare talk, his good humor, his war record, and his middle-America brand of politics.

So did and does the rest of America. Not everyone comes out of a Presidential race more admired than when he or she went in. But Bob Dole did. He ran three times, the last time securing the Republican nomination. And, I would judge, he is even more admired today than he was 10 years ago when he retired from the Senate.

Bob Dole is an emblem of America's greatest generation. He and our colleague ELIZABETH are together one of our country's most admired couples. When we think of him, and of them, we think of what is best about public service in America and about our country itself.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. President, today I honor a great American, a man who devoted his life to this nation and to the just principles he believed in. Born in Russell, Ks, Robert J. Dole would serve his country as a war hero, risking his life for a fellow soldier fighting the forces of fascism and Nazism in Italy, as a Senator, a great Majority Leader, my party's candidate for Vice President and President and today as an active private citizen fighting for veterans and the causes in which he believes.

For his bravery in World War II, Bob Dole received two Purple Hearts for his injuries, and the Bronze Star Medal for his attempt to assist a downed radio man. Bob Dole served in the House and Senate representing his home State of Kansas. In 1971, President Nixon asked him to be the Chairman of the Republican National Committee, a post he held for 2 years. Then in 1976, President Ford selected Bob Dole as his running mate for the Republican nomination.

Recognizing his leadership, Bob Dole rose to the pinnacle of our leadership here in the U.S. Senate as the Majority Leader. He was a tireless worker and effective champion of conservative principles, a strong foreign policy and personal freedom and responsibility.

One decade ago, Senator Dole resigned his post to devote himself fully to his 1996 presidential campaign. As my party's nominee he crossed the country running on a platform of lower taxation and smaller, more accountable government. Unfortunately, he didn't win, but he developed a good working relationship with President Clinton and the two leaders have devoted their time and energy to many notable causes over the years. Shortly after the 1996 election, President Clinton bestowed upon Senator Dole the highest civilian award in Government, the Presidential Medal of Freedom.

To those who know him, Senator Dole is a regular comedian. One story goes that on the campaign trail in his home state of Kansas, he would spend an hour at each stop telling jokes and only 10 minutes talking about politics.

Senator Dole was always able to demonstrate a quick wit, while also showing that he was well grounded in decency.

Senator Dole continues today to serve the many veterans of World War II who fought so valiantly to liberate Europe and defeat the Japanese. Most recently, it was his personal dedication and determination to see a monument honoring the sacrifice of the World War II veterans that led to the construction of the beautiful tribute to selfless service that now graces the National Mall.

I wish Senator Dole and his lovely wife, my colleague, Senator ELIZABETH DOLE, more happy years together and many happy returns to the United States Senate.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I was first elected to the Senate in 1993 in a special election to fill the remainder of Lloyd Bentsen's term. Bob Dole, like my predecessor Lloyd Bentsen, is a member of the "Greatest Generation"—the generation of men who never wavered in answering the call to duty, fighting in distant lands to protect the free world, and returning home to build the greatest Nation on Earth. Bob Dole epitomizes the "Greatest Generation," not only for his heroic service in battle, but also for what he did when he came home, ultimately serving in the U.S. Senate.

When I first arrived in Washington, Nancy Kassebaum of Kansas was the only other female Republican Senator. Fortunately, our leader Bob Dole understood the unique and important voice women brought to the Senate. He graciously welcomed me from the first day, and I enjoyed working with him as he ascended from minority leader to majority leader. He was great in both roles, and I appreciate the leadership and support he provided in my early days.

One of my first discussions with Bob was committee assignments. I told him I wanted to serve on the Armed Services Committee, as there are more military members serving in Texas than any other State. I hoped to carry on the great tradition of helping our men and women in uniform like so many Texas Senators before me. He understood why this committee assignment was important to me and realized the unique perspective I would bring to the national discussion. I was the first woman to sit on this committee in over 30 years. Today, there are three women serving on the Armed Services Committee, including Bob's wife, Senator ELIZABETH DOLE, who was elected after Bob retired from her home State of North Carolina.

On the 10th anniversary of Bob Dole's retirement from the Senate, I am proud to honor him for his many accomplishments and tireless service to our country. While we all regretted to see him go, we are grateful for the legacy he left behind, and I hope we can carry it forward for generations to come. He was a giant during his time

in this institution, and when the history of the Senate is written, I am confident that he will be fondly remembered as one of our great leaders.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, it was just about 10 years ago that Bob Dole announced his retirement from the Senate. It was 1996 and the Nation was in the midst of an intense campaign for the Presidency. Bob Dole had decided to resign his Senate seat for the good of his home State of Kansas, his party, and his country. He knew he would have to focus all his energies on his campaign for President if he were to be successful, so he left Washington to answer another call to serve his country and provide a choice to the people of Kansas and the rest of the United States when the election was held in November of that year.

We really shouldn't have been surprised. Answering the call to serve his country was nothing new for Bob Dole and he was proud to be able to do it. Over his life he had been many things, a legislator, a decorated war hero, and a leader both inside and outside of the Senate. Through the years, Bob Dole had always answered the call to serve his country when he was needed, and I have no doubt that he will continue to do so for many years to come.

It's no secret. Bob Dole has made it clear all his life. You want to know and understand him, you must first understand Russell, KS—the people who live there and the values and principles they hold dear. By coming to know the people of Russell, you understand the philosophy that Bob Dole has lived by his entire life. It's a philosophy of work, and of always giving your best to whatever you choose to do. It is a reflection of his father's view of the world—"stewers versus doers." Needless to say, you will always find Bob Dole in the "doers" group.

That is why the story of Bob Dole's life is thoroughly intertwined with the story of Russell, KS. For it was when he was growing up in Russell that Bob Dole committed himself to the service of God, Country and family. They came to become his core values as he learned at a young age that there are things worth fighting for and that is what drew him to his service in the military.

Those who have chronicled those difficult years in our history have called him part of our greatest generation. Without any regard for himself, Bob Dole left everything he called dear behind to face a challenge as great as any generation had faced before. Pearl Harbor had been attacked and the whole world had taken up arms in a battle against an unspeakable evil that had been unleashed upon the world. World War II had called him to action and Bob Dole was a young man serving in the U.S. Army. He would never be the same again in mind or body. Given the circumstances, I don't think anyone would have returned home from the battlefields of Europe and the South Pacific and not have been changed forever.

As he bravely fought in the mountains of Italy, he was wounded in action, but still he fought on. Then, he was wounded again, this time far more seriously. The odds were against him, but he somehow made it through those vital first days. He then began what would be a lengthy recovery. He had a long stay in the hospital and despite the efforts of those who attended him, he had lost the use of an arm.

When he was released from the hospital, he returned home, and that special place of Russell, KS, again reached out to him with open arms and provided him with the support he needed to continue to recover from the wounds he had suffered on the battlefield. Once again, the bonds that tied him to the people of Russell and Kansas became stronger. Those bonds helped Bob Dole to regain his strength and begin to plan for the future.

Soon he heard the call to serve again. With the support of the people of his home town, he left to work for the people of Kansas in the State house and then in the U.S. Congress. His leadership skills were quite apparent and he compiled quite a record in the Senate. He progressed through the ranks and served his party as minority and then majority leader. Every day on the Senate floor, he took a leadership role on a wide variety of issues that he knew were important to the people of his home State. Through the years he worked to ensure that our American values we protected and preserved in all the proceedings of Congress. It was a remarkable record of service that continued until that day, ten years ago, when he resigned to pursue the call to carry the Republican banner for President.

Although that final political campaign of his was not successful, Bob Dole will always be remembered for a lifetime of service to the United States. He has received many honors for his service to the United States, and for being a part of a noble cause that the greatest generation took up for which so many fought and died. He never forgot those with whom he served or the needs of our Nation's veterans. In fact, it was those ties from so many years ago that led him to join the effort to construct a memorial for World War II to recognize those with whom he served—especially those who never returned. His leadership in that effort resulted in the dedication of a beautiful memorial that will stand forever in the shadows of the Lincoln Memorial and the Washington Monument on the Mall in our Nation's Capital.

Today, Bob Dole and his wife ELIZABETH continue to be a great team as she serves the people of North Carolina with the same care and attention that Bob Dole has always provided the people of Kansas.

Bob Dole has always said that his goal in life was to defend and serve the America he learned to love in Russell. I think the record shows that he succeeded in that effort and, in so doing,

left his mark throughout much of the world as he fought in Europe to free the oppressed, and, in the Senate, for the principles and values he had learned to cherish as a young boy growing up in Russell, KS.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR ROBERT C. BYRD

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I take this opportunity to congratulate my friend, the distinguished Senator from West Virginia, who has achieved the distinction of being the longest serving Senator in the history of the Senate. Even though this is definitely a noteworthy achievement, what has set Senator BYRD apart from all others who have served as Senators is the dedication he has shown to the duties of his office, his respect for the traditions of the Senate, and his leadership of this body during his service in the Senate.

As President pro tempore, majority leader, and chairman of the Appropriations Committee, he has succeeded in protecting and enforcing the rules of the Senate, first written by Thomas Jefferson during his service as Vice President and the Presiding Officer of the Senate, and he used his leadership skills to successfully lead the Senate in changing the rules when a consensus for modernizing the rules permitted. His insights into the needs of his constituents and his devotion to their well-being have been admirable.

Perhaps his greatest contribution to our understanding of the Senate was his authorship of the "Addresses on the History of the United States Senate," the most comprehensive account of the role the Senate has played over the years.

I commend the Senator from West Virginia for his illustrious and record-breaking career in the Senate, and I wish for him many more years of service in this body.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I am sorry that I was not present on the floor on Monday when my colleagues paid tribute to my friend, ROBERT C. BYRD, but I would like to add my voice to the chorus speaking on his unsurpassed contributions to the U.S. Senate and to America.

I say without hesitation Senator BYRD is one of the most remarkable men I have ever had the privilege to work with. Although I have been here for 33 years, he is the only Member whom I have looked up to as my senior—my senior in every way.

When my days are finished in this Chamber, my children, my grandchildren, and my great-grandchildren will know that I served with the greatest servant of the U.S. Senate of all who have served.

Once someone said of another West Virginian, Stonewall Jackson, that "his character and will make him a stonewall and more of a stonewall than any man I've ever known."

I say the same of ROBERT BYRD. When he walks on the floor, Constitution in

his pocket, and he looks around, raises his voice, points his finger, he is our stonewall. He is the unshakeable rock of this institution. He is our foundation. He is the protector of this body.

I am absolutely certain that the Senator's service, knowledge, and contributions to the Senate will never be surpassed. This country gentleman has no peer. No one has given as much to this institution or loved it as much as the senior Senator from West Virginia.

The Senate is what it is because of ROBERT BYRD. And he is our wise senior, not because of the records but because he is a man of his conviction. He has told the truth on every issue that confronts our country. He is our rock of integrity.

When I was elected at age 29, and 6 weeks later, before I was sworn in, my wife and daughter were killed in a terrible car accident, Senator BYRD came to the funeral home. He waited in a long line to pay his respects. It was an act of kindness that I have never forgotten.

I know how bittersweet this honor is for him, as his lifemate, Erma, would have been 89 years old this week. We all admire the love and devotion the two of them had for each other, in health and in sickness. We know his first love was not in the Chamber; it was at home. We also know how proud she would be of him this week.

One of America's favorite West Virginians, who also set a lot of records in his day, is Mr. Clutch, Jerry West. He once said: "You can't get much done in life if you only work on the days when you feel good."

Senator BYRD has worked 17,331 days—days that have been good and bad. In all that time, he has made the most out of every one of them and gotten more done than anyone will ever know. It has been an honor serving with him for 12,209 of those days. I look forward to many more days and years together.

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. President, I join my colleagues in paying tribute to one of our most distinguished Members, the Senior Senator from West Virginia, Mr. BYRD.

As he passes the milestone of becoming the Senate's longest serving Member, I would remind him of a statement by Yogi Berra when they asked him about one of his many records. He said, "I knew that one would stand until it was broken." Perhaps when medical science allows us to live to be 150 years old his record may be broken, but until then, I think he is safe.

Knowing the Senator's affection for the simple truth, I just want to make three points in recognizing this achievement which he embodies to an extraordinary degree.

The first is: Your life is what you make it.

Our former colleague, Senator Dave Durenberger told me the story of a Friday afternoon in the Senate in 1987 when he was standing in for Senator Dole for the procedural "wrap up" with

Senator BYRD. The Twins were in the World Series at the time and on the Record, Senator Durenberger asked Senator BYRD if he wanted to come to Minnesota to see one of the games.

Senator BYRD said he has not seen a professional baseball game, or football game, or Hollywood movie for more than a decade. But he said he had not been idle. He shared that he had read the Bible cover to cover many times, had read all the plays of Shakespeare, all the Lives of Plutarch and the entire Oxford Unabridged Dictionary.

Many of us wonder what we might accomplish without the many distractions of modern life. We should look to Senator BYRD for the answer.

The second point I would like to make is: People change.

When we look at ROBERT BYRD's upbringing and the person he has become, it underlies a basic truth which has been made clear by all the great hearts and minds of history. Life is not what happens to you: life is what you choose to do with what happens to you.

Change and growth is always possible in people's lives, if they have the courage to change and discipline to grow.

And my third point is: This Senate is unique.

For the sake of the 100 of us who temporarily occupy these seats, Senator BYRD has embodied the truth that the Senate is unique in human history and its value must be preserved.

The genius of our Founders was their understanding of the heights and depths of human endeavor and their ability to translate those thoughts into practical institutions which maximized the heights and minimized the depths.

They knew that the philosophy of democracy must honor both the principle of majority rule and the protection of minority rights. And so in article I of the Constitution they created a House to operate mostly by majority rule and a Senate mostly to protect minority rights. The balance they struck has given a dynamic quality to the Congress that serves our Nation well on every conceivable issue.

I have often gone up to Senator BYRD on this floor and told him that he has given me something I could not get from any other source: a proper appreciation for the living history of the Senate that leads to reverence for this institution.

ROBERT BYRD and his service in the Senate is a great American story. It tells anyone who will listen how a person from humble origin can rise to leadership and then strive his whole life to keep the way open for those who would come up behind him.

We know that great ideas are just a generation from extinction. I am grateful to have had the chance to see many of those great ideas embodied and standing on this floor in the person of Senator ROBERT C. BYRD.

My tribute to him will be to try to learn and live out the lessons he has lovingly and forcefully tried to teach us all in this Chamber.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. President, I rise today to offer a tribute to my colleague Senator ROBERT BYRD. Few men in our Nation's history have had such a large hand in shaping the U.S. Senate and the destiny of our country as ROBERT BYRD. No one in our country's history has served in the Senate longer or with more distinction.

Senator BYRD's Senate career truly is a remarkable American success story. Only in America could a young man from the coal fields of Appalachia use hard work, intelligence, and determination to one day become the longest serving Senator in U.S. history.

He has often been called the Senate's historian. I have often been amazed at Senator BYRD's prolific ability to weave the great authors and poets of the past into modern relevant lessons for today's society. Cicero, Shakespeare, Tacitus, Aquinas, Jefferson, and Washington are not simply names memorized from a textbook for Senator BYRD. They are living characters with indelible truths that we should all spend more time studying and give more time to in quiet reflection. Senator BYRD reminds us all of the importance of the august traditions of the Senate and why this is the world's greatest deliberative body.

You will never find Senator BYRD without his copy of the Constitution. I dare say there are few individuals here in this body with a greater love or commitment to those noble ideas our Founding Fathers fought and died defending.

But above all, I have been most impressed with his love and dedication to his family.

Senator BYRD and his beloved wife, Erma, were an amazing example for what we should all strive for in a loving marriage. For nearly 69 years ROBERT and Erma were together side by side, living and loving together. I would like to share some touching words that Senator BYRD gave in testament to his great wife—his greatest treasure:

She met with kings and shahs, princes and princesses, Governors and Senators, Presidents. She entertained the high and the mighty, the powerful and the wealthy of this Nation in a foreign land because it was important to her husband who served as the majority leader of this Senate and various other Senatorial offices. She did it all with an innate, inherent graciousness, incredible patience, and a soft, warm smile. She was a remarkable lady of great wisdom, but most of all, great gentleness, yet she could be tough when she saw injustice or unfairness.

I think America could use more devotion like that.

In closing, I congratulate Senator BYRD on his amazing accomplishments and to his 17,329 days in service to his country in the U.S. Senate. When the history books record his deeds and actions, he will truly be remembered in the pantheon of legends that have forever left their mark on our great nation.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, just a few days ago Senator ROBERT C. BYRD set a

very remarkable record. He is now the longest serving Senator in the history of the Senate. The Senate, the legislative body that means so much to him, now honors him for his achievement and for the remarkable record of service that he has given to the United States. I appreciate having the opportunity to be a part of our recognition of our colleague and his commitment to public service and the people of his home State of West Virginia.

For almost 48 years now, ROBERT C. BYRD has carried the title of U.S. Senator. I think it is fair to say that no one has done so with a greater awareness of what it means to be a Senator and of all the institution of the Senate represents. He is truly our institutional memory and he is the master of the Senate's rules and procedures. No one knows better than he the precedents and prerogatives of the Senate, and no one is a better protector, promoter and defender of them than he is.

It is not just for the length of his service that Senator BYRD is being honored, however. It isn't so much the years he has served but the service he has provided to the people of the United States and his State of West Virginia that has earned him the accolades he has received and will continue to receive from his colleagues and his constituents.

Our celebration of this moment and all he has achieved is softened by the loss of his beloved wife Erma, his greatest friend and supporter, his companion through life and almost 69 years of marriage, who passed away recently. I am sure she is looking down on us all, proud and thrilled to see Senator BYRD's continued efforts to address the issues of importance to his beloved friends of West Virginia and to note his recognition for being their champion for so many years.

During my service in the Senate I have appreciated working with Senator BYRD on a variety of issues, most recently the Miner Safety Act. We were both there at the President's side as he took up his pen and signed the bill into law. As he did, he noted Senator BYRD's presence because he knew the bill was the result of Senator BYRD's heartfelt concern for the miners of his State, for their safety, and the security of their families.

I have no doubt that if we were to look up the words "constituent service" in any book it would immediately refer us to Senator BYRD's work in the Senate. He has been an active and effective advocate for the people of West Virginia and he has worked tirelessly and diligently to address their needs in the Congress.

Looking back, Senator BYRD's life reads like a Hollywood movie script. He graduated first in his high school class and married his high school sweetheart. He then spent 12 years saving the money he needed to start college.

Through the years that followed, he held a variety of jobs that gave him an

understanding of the needs of the working people of his State. He also developed his talent for the fiddle, and soon became known for that as well. Before long he was a member of the State legislature and, not too long thereafter, he came to the Senate.

Here in the Senate, no one has shown a greater understanding of the history and meaning of the U.S. Constitution and the role it plays in shaping our values and our way of life as Americans. We both have a habit of carrying a copy in our pocket to remind us of our job here in the Senate and our responsibility as Senators to adhere to the provisions of the Constitution and all it says and requires us to do.

Whenever I think of Senator BYRD, the first thing that comes to mind is his incredible knowledge and understanding of world history and the American experience. He also has a profound and substantive mastery of the legacy of the written word. Whenever he takes to the floor to present his views on an issue he always has a ready reference to the precedents of the past, or the words of some great author who had written something appropriate to the moment.

Now, Senator BYRD, the great student of the history of our Nation and so much more, is himself a part of the great story of America and the traditions of the Senate. Every day he joins us here to deliberate on the issues before the Senate, he writes another chapter of his own life's story, a story that will be forever told and retold back in his home State, in the mountains and valleys of West Virginia, by the people who live there who will forever remember him and his legacy as their Senator—a legacy that will never be forgotten.

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

1ST SERGEANT MICHAEL MATTHEWS

SERGEANT KENNETH KRAUS

STAFF SERGEANT JACOB LONG

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, it is my honor today to pay tribute to three courageous soldiers from the city of Roswell, GA, whose service to country and community merits grateful recognition.

1SG Michael Matthews has served 21 years in the U.S. Army and Army National Guard and is currently a member of Charlie Co., 108th Armored Regiment, 48th Brigade of the Georgia Army National Guard. On August 30, 2005, Sergeant Matthews was seriously wounded when two Iraqis detonated an Improvised Explosive Device next to his convoy 25 miles south of Bagdad. Sergeant Matthews continues to recover from his injuries, and following his recovery, the Roswell Police Department will welcome him back to his position on the force. Sergeant Matthews worked for 17 years as a uniform police officer and SWAT team member and, in 2005, was named the Police Officer of the Year.

SGT Kenneth Kraus served as a U.S. Marine on duty at the U.S. Embassy in Iran during February of 1979. As revolutionaries overpowered the Embassy, Sergeant Kraus successfully negotiated the release of several American civilians before he was wounded and taken hostage himself. Beaten and interrogated repeatedly, he was given a 20 minute trial and sentenced to die the next day. Sergeant Kraus was pulled from his cell in the hours after his sentence while a representative from the U.S. Embassy finally secured his release. He was flown to Germany for medical treatment and then home to the United States. The Roswell Police Department has been fortunate to have Sergeant Kraus work with them as a detective for over 11 years.

SSG Jacob Long serves as Company Master Gunner in Charlie Co., First Battalion, 121st Infantry Regiment, 48th Brigade of the Georgia Army National Guard. On April 22, 2006, Staff Sergeant Long returned from a year-long deployment in Iraq during which Charlie Co. became responsible for sending Baby Noor, an Iraqi infant with spinal bifida, on a flight to obtain vital treatment in the United States and Baby Noor underwent successful surgery in Atlanta. In addition to his service abroad, Sergeant Jacob has worked with the Roswell Parks and Recreation Department for over 10 years.

These individuals continue to better their community and their Nation with selfless dedication to their careers in public service. I am proud to join the city of Roswell, the State of Georgia, and our Nation in honoring these brave men who have exemplified service to others on the local, national, and international level.

A BLOW TO GUN TRAFFICKING

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, a unique type of gun trafficking sting operation was completed recently. Teams of undercover law enforcement officials wearing hidden cameras traveled to Georgia, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, and Virginia to make purchases which were designed to appear to be what are known as "straw purchases." Straw purchases are transactions that violate Federal law in which one individual submits to the required Federal background check for a gun that is clearly intended to be used by someone else. These purchasers play a crucial role in the illegal trafficking of guns by purchasing with the intention of reselling them to prohibited buyers.

In addition, a lawsuit was filed by the city of New York. The suit, filed in U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of New York in Brooklyn, asks the court to enforce gun laws regarding such sales and require extra training for and supervision of dealers. The lawsuit also seeks punitive and compensatory damages. According to New York City's Web site, its police have

confiscated more than 500 guns that were sold by the 15 dealers named in the lawsuit and subsequently used in crimes there.

In January 2001, a 12-year-old boy in New York City, playing with a semi-automatic handgun from a pawnshop in Summerville, SC, accidentally shot someone in the chest. The gun involved was one of 49 such guns from the store linked to crimes and accidents in New York City. As New York Mayor Michael Bloomberg pointed out, "Our suit offers clear and compelling evidence that guns sold by these dealers are used in crimes by people ineligible to own a gun far more frequently than guns from other dealers."

To build its case, the city of New York compiled a list of gun dealers based on data it received from the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives. Investigators worked in pairs. One looked at the merchandise, talked with the salesman and handled the weapon, while the other wandered the store, seemingly uninterested. When it came time to complete the necessary background check forms, the first operator, often a man, would call over his partner, frequently a woman, who had not been part of the discussion of the weapon. The second investigator would fill out the background paperwork, and the first one would pay for the gun in cash. This procedure was used to clearly illustrate that the second person was making a "straw purchase" for the first person.

Gun-control advocates praise the sting operation and the lawsuit. This type of action sends a message to dealers that more government officials are not willing to look the other way. Other cities, including Gary, Indiana, Chicago and Detroit, have taken similar approaches in their own jurisdictions, often using local law enforcement officials. This operation however, marks the first time investigators across the country participated in such a sting involving a number of States.

I would like to commend everyone on both the Federal and local levels who aided in this investigation. This kind of illegal activity can be stopped by vigorously enforcing our existing gun laws, providing law enforcement with more tools to crack down on gun trafficking and corrupt gun dealers, and by passing sensible gun safety legislation.

PRELIMINARY 2005 UNIFORM CRIME REPORT

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about a very sobering report just issued by our FBI—its Preliminary 2005 Uniform Crime Report. This is the gold standard of crime reports in our country, taken from statistics by more than 12,000 law enforcement agencies all across our country.

Here is what the report says: Murders are up 4.8 percent. This means that there were 16,900 victims in 2005—16,900 in a single year. This is the most murders since 1998 and the largest percent-

age increase in 15 years. Violent crime more generally, which also includes forcible rape, robbery, and aggravated assault, rose 2 percent after seeing decreases over the last 3 years.

Some areas of the country were especially hard hit. The Midwest, for example, saw violent crime rise 5.7 percent. Medium-large towns—those with populations between half a million and 1 million—saw an increase in violent crime of 8.3 percent. Murders increased more than 12 percent in towns with populations between 50,000 and 250,000. These troubling increases come after more than a decade of record decreases in crime.

These historic decreases in crime happened for a reason and, I fear, the recent and dramatic increase in murders and violent crime are also happening for a reason.

Let me explain. In 1994, we passed the most sweeping anticrime bill in history. At the time, we faced a national crisis with respect to violent crime. Despite the tough-on-crime rhetoric of the 1980s, the Federal Government until that point had very little impact on crime rates. This is largely because only about 3 percent of all crimes are handled by the Federal Government.

We recognized in 1994 that the only way to seriously address crime in our communities would be to vigorously and consistently support State and local law enforcement. We made a commitment to do just that by creating the Community Oriented Policing Services Program—more commonly known as COPS.

This ambitious new program committed to put more than 100,000 new officers on the streets and to expand the concept of community-oriented policing. Crime rates went down every year for 8 consecutive years. Violent crime was reduced by 26 percent. The murder rate went down by 34 percent.

In just a few short years, Americans went from being afraid to go out on their streets to living in the safest neighborhoods in a generation. By giving State and local law enforcement the support they needed, we were able to improve the lives of millions of Americans.

I recognize there are many factors involved in whether crime rates go up and down and that the COPS Program was not the sole reason for this historic drop in violent crime. At the same time, the legacy of COPS is unmistakable. The Government Accountability Office, GAO, released a report in October 2005 that concluded what many police chiefs and sheriffs have said all along—the COPS Program helps reduce crime. Specifically, the GAO found that "as a demonstration of whether a federal program can affect crime rates through hiring officers and changing policing practices, the evidence indicates that COPS contributed to declines in crime above the levels of declines that would have been expected without it." For every \$1 in COPS hiring grant expenditures per capita,

there was a reduction of almost 30 index crimes per 100,000 persons.

Former Attorney General John Ashcroft called the COPS Program a "miraculous success." But, unfortunately, I fear that some of us have taken our eyes off the ball. Specifically, the Bush administration has forgotten the lessons we learned from the COPS Program. Despite the dramatic and historic COPS successes, President Bush has systematically eliminated the programs that helped to lay the foundation for our low crime rates.

President Bush has proposed to cut support for State and local law enforcement every year for the past 5 years, proposing a budget in 2007 that cut \$2 billion in guaranteed funding for State and local law enforcement from the amount we provided only 5 years ago. President Bush has steadily tried to kill the COPS hiring program, routinely trying to zero out all hiring funding.

And Congress has not held the line. During the 1990s, roughly \$1 billion per year was allocated for the COPS Program. In 2002, \$385 million was allocated to hire officers. That allocation was steadily reduced until last year when, for the first time, funding to hire officers was completely eliminated. Let me repeat: No Federal COPS funding whatsoever to hire officers. Adding insult to injury, President Bush has also proposed to zero out the Byrnes Justice Assistance Grant Program.

From 1994 to 2003, this wildly popular program provided around \$900 million per year to our States to improve their criminal justice systems, providing vital resources to our men and women officers. Since 2003, this number has steadily eroded, with President Bush proposing absolutely no funding in his 2007 budget request. And I fear that we are now seeing the results of this vast defunding of the COPS Program and the Byrne Program—a result that was certainly not unpredictable.

Earlier this year, in response to the President's latest budget request, the President of the International Association of Chiefs of Police, Mary Ann Viverette, stated: "these cuts have the potential to cripple the capabilities of law enforcement agencies nationwide and will undoubtedly force many departments to take officers off the streets, leading to more crime and violence in our hometowns and ultimately less security for our homeland."

Many of us in Congress have also tried to raise the warning flags repeatedly. This February, I released a report entitled, "Abandoning the Front Line: The Bush Administration's Record of Support for State and Local Law Enforcement" which warned that we need to keep our eye on the ball, otherwise we risk seeing dramatic increases in crime rates.

Another problem facing our local law enforcement agencies is the fact that the FBI is getting out of the crime business. Since 9/11, the number of FBI agents focusing on crime has gone

down by over 1,000 agents. As a result, drug investigations have dropped by 60 percent and violent crime investigations have been reduced by 40 percent.

This has created a perfect storm for law enforcement, and I hope that these latest dramatic and troubling crime statistics serve as a wake-up call to Congress and the President.

We must build on the successes of the past; we must never become complacent. When I speak to law enforcement groups on the subject of crime, I make the point that keeping crime rates low is like cutting the grass. You mow your lawn and it looks great. You let it grow for a week, and it starts looking ragged. You let it grow for a month and you have a jungle.

The preliminary numbers released yesterday show that we have not been cutting the grass. In Cleveland, from 1994 to 2001, we spent \$3.2 million per year for COPS hiring. From 2002 to 2005, we only spent \$875,500 per year. A 2004 news article noted that Cleveland lost 250 officers, a reduction of 15 percent in their force. In their latest crime numbers, murder is up 38 percent; violent crime is up 7 percent. In St. Louis, from 1994 to 2001, we spend \$770,000 per year for COPS hiring. From 2002 to 2005, that number was zero. A 2003 study found that St. Louis had lost 168 officers, a reduction of 11 percent in their force. In their latest crime numbers murder is up 16 percent, violent crime up 20 percent. The pattern is, unfortunately, clear.

In Philadelphia from 1994 to 2001, we spent \$5,250,000 per year for COPS hiring. From 2002 to 2005, that number was again zero. Last year, I asked the Philadelphia police chief about the number of officers they have lost recently. He said since 2003, they were down 600 officers. In Philadelphia's latest crime numbers, murder is up 14.2 percent, violent crime up 3.4 percent.

Now is the time to see the error in our recent ways. It is my hope that the Appropriations, Commerce, Justice, and Science Subcommittee will see fit to fully fund the COPS Program, the Justice assistance grants, and other critical crime control programs when it reports out its appropriations bill later this summer. If they do not, I will be offering an amendment to restore full funding for the COPS Program. I have done this for the past several years.

The Senate has previously not adopted my amendments, however—with opponents arguing that the COPS Program has worked, so we should kill it, or that it is not a Federal responsibility to fund local law enforcement. Critics will also argue that adding funding to the COPS Program will bust the budget.

I believe that the safety of the American citizens is our No. 1 priority, and I cannot accept the argument that we cannot find funding for local law enforcement at the same time we are giving a tax cut to our nation's millionaires. They did not ask for this tax cut,

and I know that they would be willing to give that back in order to keep their communities safer.

The COPS Program helps us prevent both crime and terrorism, and I hope my colleagues will support me in restoring funding for this critical program.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

THE LIFE OF DR. JAMES CAMERON

• Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, Dr. James Cameron, sadly, passed away on June 11, and with his passing, the Nation has lost one the 20th century's greatest civil rights pioneers.

James Cameron was born in 1914 in La Crosse, WI, but it was during the time that he lived in Marion, IN, that he would have a terrifying experience that would forever change the course of his life.

On August 7, 1930, when he was just 16, he was wrongly accused of and arrested for the murder of a White man and the rape of a White woman. While in jail, a mob broke in and dragged him, and the other two charged with the crime, out into the street. A rope was placed around Cameron's neck, but he was spared when a man in the crowd proclaimed Cameron's innocence. While Cameron survived the beating and attempted lynching, the other two men were lynched and killed.

Cameron was convicted as an accessory to involuntary manslaughter—for which he was later pardoned—but no one was ever accused, charged, or arrested for the lynching and murder of the other two men.

After surviving this horrific experience, Dr. Cameron dedicated his life to raising awareness of racial injustice in America. In the 1940s, he organized several chapters of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, NAACP, in Indiana. As the Indiana State director of civil liberties from 1942 to 1950, Dr. Cameron worked to end segregation. The strong presence of the Ku Klux Klan in Indiana at the time made his job that much more difficult and dangerous. Dr. Cameron faced threats of violence, including threats to his life.

After he moved to Milwaukee, he continued his civil rights work by protesting against segregated housing and police brutality. During the 1960s, he took part in marches in Washington, DC, with civil rights leaders Martin Luther King, Jr., and Coretta Scott King.

Furthering his commitment to civil rights education, Dr. Cameron mortgaged his home in 1982 to publish 5,000 copies of his memoir, "A Time of Terror." The book provides a moving account of his near-death experience in 1930.

After visiting Israel's Holocaust Museum, Dr. Cameron was inspired to construct a similar museum in Wisconsin,

dedicated to the history and struggles of African Americans. His dream became a reality in 1988 when he opened the Black Holocaust Museum, which has made an important contribution to Milwaukee and an invaluable contribution to our understanding of American history.

It was particularly fitting that Dr. Cameron was able to watch in person as the U.S. Senate finally passed a resolution apologizing to victims of lynching. His monumental efforts were central to that important and long-overdue moment.

Dr. Cameron dedicated his life to ending racial injustice. Now his strength and resilience must inspire all of us as we carry on that critically important work. James Cameron's incredible story of survival is a part of history. But Dr. Cameron was more than just a part of history—he helped to shape history, with his determined commitment to promoting civil rights. With everything James Cameron did, he served the cause of justice. He led a courageous, remarkable life, and he will be greatly missed.●

(At the request of Mr. REID, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

100TH ANNIVERSARY OF MADISON, WEST VIRGINIA

• Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, it is with great honor that I recognize the 100th anniversary of the founding of the town of Madison, WV. A celebration will take place this month, and I would like to take this opportunity to speak for a few moments about this wonderful Appalachian community. Madison was incorporated as the county seat of Boone County, which it remains today. It is also the home of a number of exemplary schools and dedicated churches. Madison has long been noted for its rich coal mining heritage, and was named for Colonel William Madison Peyton, pioneer coal operator and leader of the movement that led to the establishment of Boone County.

A significant percentage of Madison residents are employed by coal mining corporations, or related businesses. That makes it fitting that the township is the home of the Bituminous Coal Heritage Foundation Museum and the location of the West Virginia Coal Festival. Each year, thousands of people travel to Madison for this festival to celebrate coal heritage. This year, the festival will include a memorial service to the 18 West Virginians who tragically lost their lives in recent months in mining accidents. In light of these events, along with State and local officials and I have been working to better ensure the safety of all West Virginia coal miners. Another important asset to the City of Madison is Boone Memorial Hospital which serves the community with personalized care and respect for all in need of medical attention.

The town of Madison is the historical site of a crucial Union victory during

the Civil War. The Battle of Boone County Courthouse, the name of the town before it was known as Madison, occurred early in the war on September 1, 1861, at a time when the Union army had suffered many devastating defeats. The original court house in Madison was burned by Union soldiers as a result of the skirmish. Madison's centennial celebration will take place on the grounds of the restored structure.

On the grounds of that courthouse stands a memorial to soldiers who died in service of their Nation. Madison and Boone County, as all of West Virginia, have given more than its share of brave men and women to the service of our Nation. Boone countians are fiercely patriotic and dedicated to their families, their community and their God. They are resilient and determined, having suffered the ups and downs of the coal economy. They are also kind-hearted people. When I first came to West Virginia as a young man in the VISTA program over 40 years ago, it was to a community on the Boone-Kanawha county line. The people of that community taught me so much and forever changed my life. I will forever have a special place in my heart for Boone County, the town of Madison, and their residents. I certainly wish the town and its people the best for the centennial celebration and much success during the next 100 years.

I hope my fellow Senators and fellow West Virginians will join me in celebrating this special occasion, the centennial of Madison, WV.●

(At the request of Mr. REID, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

ST. ALBANS FIRE DEPARTMENT

● Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I wish to recognize the St. Albans Fire Department for 100 years of dedicated service to its community. Their outstanding achievement has not only improved the town of St. Albans, but West Virginia as a whole. I am proud to represent such a courageous and selfless group of individuals, who serve West Virginia well every day. All first responders are enormously important to our well being and to their communities, but the longevity of this department deserves special recognition.

The St. Albans Fire Department was started in 1906 as the St. Albans Salvage Corps. The small group of committed volunteers ventures to preserve property and save lives in this small Kanawha County community. Their goal created a foundation on which the St. Albans Fire Department—SAFD—was built. Today, the SAFD is a 26 person team of 19 full time and seven part time firefighters. Although the operation has grown tremendously, the firefighters still strive to protect every aspect of the community. They respond not only to fires, but also to automobile accidents, water rescue, as well as providing emergency medical service. The firefighters that represent St.

Albans are highly trained and capable of handling all types of emergencies.

The SAFD was presented with the Life Safety Achievement Award for the sixth time in 2005. This award is given to the departments that help reduce the number of fire related deaths each year. In 2004, St. Albans did not have any structural fire deaths. The Department was also able to improve their Insurance Safety Office rating from a Class 4 to a Class 3. The better rating will help not only the fire department, but the people they serve as well, by lowering their insurance premiums. This achievement shows the true dedication of the St. Albans Fire Department. Congratulations on such an amazing accomplishment, and let the next 100 years be as strong as the first.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Evans, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

S. 3534. A bill to amend the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 to provide for a YouthBuild program.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, June 16, 2006, she had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bill:

S. 1445. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 520 Colorado Avenue in Arriba, CO, as the "William H. Emery Post Office".

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mrs. MURRAY:

S. 3531. A bill to appropriate \$430,000,000 for medical care for veterans and \$70,000,000 to improve the security for personal data of veterans held by the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. LUGAR:

S. 3532. A bill to support the goals of the Commission on the Abraham Lincoln Study

Abroad Fellowship Program; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. COLEMAN:

S. 3533. A bill to require the Department of Homeland Security to carry out certain activities with respect to delivering training in age-appropriate basic life supporting first aid skills to school children, including funding of a program to provide this education to the public; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. ENZI (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. KERRY, and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. 3534. A bill to amend the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 to provide for a YouthBuild program; read the first time.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. FRIST (for himself and Mr. REID):

S. Res. 514. A resolution to authorize testimony and legal representation in City of Eugene v. Peter Vincent Chabarek; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 930

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 930, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to drug safety, and for other purposes.

S. 1353

At the request of Mr. REID, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CONRAD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1353, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of an Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis Registry.

S. 2148

At the request of Mr. SESSIONS, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2148, a bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to study the suitability and feasibility of establishing the Chattahoochee Trace National Heritage Corridor in Alabama and Georgia, and for other purposes.

S. 2154

At the request of Mr. OBAMA, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2154, a bill to provide for the issuance of a commemorative postage stamp in honor of Rosa Parks.

S. 2250

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CONRAD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2250, a bill to award a congressional gold medal to Dr. Norman E. Borlaug.

S. 2599

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAIG) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2599, a bill to amend the Robert T.

Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to prohibit the confiscation of firearms during certain national emergencies.

S. 2990

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2990, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to restore financial stability to Medicare anesthesiology teaching programs for resident physicians.

S. 3275

At the request of Mr. ALLEN, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) 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. 3487

At the request of Mr. KERRY, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3487, a bill to amend the Small Business Act to reauthorize and improve the disaster loan program, and for other purposes.

S. 3503

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) and the Senator from New York (Mrs. CLINTON) were added as cosponsors of S. 3503, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the financing of the Superfund.

S. CON. RES. 84

At the request of Mr. KYL, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. BUNNING) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 84, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding a free trade agreement between the United States and Taiwan.

S. CON. RES. 96

At the request of Mr. BROWNBACK, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor 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. 507

At the request of Mr. BIDEN, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. DEWINE) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 507, a resolution designating the week of November 5 through November 11, 2006, as "National Veterans Awareness Week" to emphasize the need to develop educational programs regarding the contributions of veterans to the country.

S. RES. 508

At the request of Mr. BIDEN, the names of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SANTORUM) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 508, a resolution designating October 20, 2006 as "National Mammography Day".

AMENDMENT NO. 4231

At the request of Mr. DEWINE, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4231 intended to be proposed to S. 2766, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 4245

At the request of Mr. ENSIGN, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4245 intended to be proposed to S. 2766, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 4246

At the request of Mr. ENSIGN, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAIG) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4246 intended to be proposed to S. 2766, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 4259

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. DAYTON), the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI), the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. AKAKA) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 4259 intended to be proposed to S. 2766, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 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. ENZI (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. KERRY, and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. 3534. A bill to amend the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 to provide for a YouthBuild program; read the first time.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the YouthBuild Transfer Act. I am pleased to be joined in this important effort by Senator KENNEDY, the ranking member of the Health,

Education, Labor and Pensions Committee, and Senators DEWINE, KERRY, and MURRAY.

This bill transfers the YouthBuild program from the Department of Housing and Urban Development, HUD, the Department of Labor, DOL, as an amendment to the Workforce Investment Act, WIA. YouthBuild was enacted in 1992. It provides programs for young adults aged 16 to 24 to build or rehabilitate housing for homeless or low-income individuals in their communities while they study to earn their own high school diploma or GED. These youth gain occupational and technical skills while building their knowledge to help them become and remain productive participants in the workplace.

By transferring YouthBuild to DOL, the program will be more closely aligned with and benefit from collaboration with the larger workforce system at the State and local levels. It will continue to serve those young adults most in need of these services, and enable them to serve their communities by building affordable housing, and assists them in transforming their own lives and roles in society.

YouthBuild assists young adults not currently enrolled in school gain needed education, skills and knowledge. The skill and literacy requirements of today's and tomorrow's workplace cannot be met if we do not provide everyone access to lifelong education, training and retraining.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

(The bill will be printed in a future edition of the RECORD.)

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I am pleased to cosponsor and express my strong support for the YouthBuild Transfer Act which will preserve and extend the YouthBuild Program by transferring its operations from Department of Housing and Urban Development, HUD, to the Department of Labor, DOL.

Last year, President Bush's budget request recommended transferring the operations of the YouthBuild Program from HUD to DOL. In November 2005, I introduced the YouthBuild Transfer Act of 2005, S. 1999, to authorize that transfer, and it is very similar to this legislation being introduced today.

I express my appreciation to Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Chairman ENZI and the ranking member, Senator KENNEDY, for their work in developing this consensus legislation. I also thank Senator DEWINE for his efforts in both developing this legislation and for his efforts to obtain funding for YouthBuild for many years. I believe this bill continues the bipartisan spirit which has been the hallmark of the YouthBuild Program.

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. During the 1960s, 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 citywide coalition and in 1990, led to YouthBuild USA, an organization created to replicate this program around the Nation.

After visiting a YouthBuild site, I introduced legislation in 1992 authorizing Federal funding for YouthBuild through the Department of Housing and Urban Development which was enacted into law as part of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act. Since then, I have led a coalition of Senators in support of Federal funding for this important program. The \$600 million that has been appropriated through HUD since fiscal year 1993 has leveraged over \$1.5 billion of additional public and private investment at the local level due to the resourcefulness of local leaders and the high demand for YouthBuild programs.

The results have been dramatic. Since 1994, YouthBuild has helped more than 60,000 disadvantaged youth into productive employment, higher education, and civic engagement across the Nation. At the same time, YouthBuild has helped rebuild low- and moderate-income communities by creating more than 15,000 units of affordable housing. Over 1,000 local organizations, in every State, have applied for HUD funds to bring YouthBuild to their communities.

Research on 900 YouthBuild graduates, several years after they had completed the program showed that more than 75 percent of them were either employed at an average wage of \$10 an hour or attending college and were positively contributing to their communities. Of those who had committed felonies, the recidivism rate was a strikingly low 15 percent and all studies to date have shown a recidivism rate below 20 percent strikingly lower than the 60 percent recidivism rate for most prison systems.

Today there are over 226 YouthBuild programs in 43 States engaging 8,000 young adults, and the number of programs could easily be expanded. Last year alone, 260 communities were denied YouthBuild funding. The demand is equally great from young people—in 2003 local programs turned away over 10,000 applicants solely for lack of funds, and in 2004 they turned away 12,000. The 20 percent cut suffered for fiscal year 2006 could cause the closing of 25 local programs; if the funds are restored and expanded, some of these closings can be averted. I am hopeful that the YouthBuild Transfer Act will be enacted into law. However, YouthBuild must continue to receive Federal funds in fiscal year 2007 in order to remain a successful program. President Bush included \$50 million for YouthBuild in his fiscal year 2007 budget request to Congress. Senator DEWINE and I have sent a letter to the Senate Appropriations Committee in support of \$90 million for the program. I look forward to working with the members of the Appropriations Committee to insure that this critical program receives an increase in Federal funding next year.

Increasing Federal funding for YouthBuild will help address critical national problems that cost society dearly. Over 32 percent of America's youth are dropping out of high school with no prospect of becoming gainfully employed, contributing members of society, taxpayers, and in inner-city communities, that percentage rises toward 50. States are spending \$36,000 per year per person to house 365,000 16 to 24 year olds, 65 percent of whom have dropped out of high school. In addition, the construction industry is short 80,000 workers. Furthermore, in the aftermath of Katrina, the need for construction workers is increasing, and YouthBuild programs are a resource in the gulf, sending trained crews to Mississippi to rebuild homes as part of their service to the Nation.

YouthBuild is also on the cutting edge of education reform for dropouts and effective re-entry for offenders. Forty YouthBuild programs have now been chartered by their States or authorized by their superintendent of schools to provide high school diplomas and to receive public funds as successful public schools reclaiming high school dropouts. In several States, the criminal justice departments are now supplementing HUD funds to expand capacity of YouthBuild programs as successful re-entry programs for ex-offenders. To maximize the investment already made in YouthBuild as a resource for education of dropouts and reentry of ex-offenders, it is imperative to keep the foundation of its Federal funding strong.

I ask all of my colleagues to support the YouthBuild Transfer Act to allow the YouthBuild Program to expand this unique comprehensive program to provide at-risk youth an immediately productive role rebuilding their communities.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 514—TO AUTHORIZE TESTIMONY AND LEGAL REPRESENTATION IN CITY OF EUGENE V. PETER VINCENT CHABAREK

Mr. FRIST (for himself and Mr. REID) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 514

Whereas, in the case of *City of Eugene v. Peter Vincent Chabarek*, Citation No. 06-05546, pending in Municipal Court for the City of Eugene, testimony has been requested from Juine Chada, an employee in the office of Senator Ron Wyden;

Whereas, pursuant to sections 703(a) and 704(a)(2) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, 2 U.S.C. §§288b(a) and 288c(a)(2), the Senate may direct its counsel to represent an employee of the Senate with respect to any subpoena, order, or request for testimony relating to their official responsibilities;

Whereas, by the privileges of the Senate of the United States and Rule XI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, no evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate may, by the judicial or administrative process, be taken from such control or possession but by permission of the Senate;

Whereas, when it appears that evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate may promote the administration of justice, the Senate will take such action as will promote the ends of justice consistent with the privileges of the Senate: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved that Juine Chada is authorized to testify in the case of *City of Eugene v. Peter Vincent Chabarek*, except concerning matters for which a privilege should be asserted.

SEC. 2. The Senate Legal Counsel is authorized to represent Juine Chada in connection with the testimony authorized in section one of this resolution.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 4292. Mr. DORGAN (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. HARKIN) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

SA 4293. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, *supra*; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4294. Mrs. CLINTON (for herself and Mr. SCHUMER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2766, *supra*; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4295. Mr. WARNER (for Mr. SESSIONS) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2766, *supra*.

SA 4296. Mr. WARNER (for Mr. ALLARD (for himself and Mr. SALAZAR)) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2766, *supra*.

SA 4297. Mr. WARNER proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2766, *supra*.

SA 4298. Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. BINGAMAN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. ROBERTS, and Mrs. DOLE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, *supra*; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4299. Mr. KENNEDY (for himself and Mr. SESSIONS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S.

2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4300. Mr. KENNEDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4301. Mrs. DOLE (for herself and Mr. JEFFORDS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4302. Mrs. DOLE (for herself and Mr. JEFFORDS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4303. Mr. CHAMBLISS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4304. Mr. THUNE (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4305. Mr. HAGEL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4306. Mr. HAGEL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4307. Mr. REID (for himself, Mr. BIDEN, and Mr. LEVIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4308. Mr. ENSIGN (for himself and Mr. REID) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4309. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 4292. Mr. DORGAN (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. HARKIN) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end of division A, add the following:

TITLE XV—SPECIAL COMMITTEE OF SENATE ON WAR AND RECONSTRUCTION CONTRACTING

SEC. 1501. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The wars in Iraq and Afghanistan have exerted very large demands on the Treasury of the United States and required tremendous sacrifice by the members of the Armed Forces of the United States.

(2) Congress has a constitutional responsibility to ensure comprehensive oversight of the expenditure of United States Government funds.

(3) Waste and corporate abuse of United States Government resources are particularly unacceptable and reprehensible during times of war.

(4) The magnitude of the funds involved in the reconstruction of Afghanistan and Iraq and the war on terrorism, together with the speed with which these funds have been committed, presents a challenge to the effective performance of the traditional oversight function of Congress and the auditing functions of the executive branch.

(5) The Senate Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program, popularly known as the Truman Committee, which was established during World War II, offers a constructive precedent for bipartisan oversight of wartime contracting that can also be extended to wartime and postwar reconstruction activities.

(6) The Truman Committee is credited with an extremely successful investigative effort, performance of a significant public education role, and achievement of fiscal savings measured in the billions of dollars.

(7) The public has a right to expect that taxpayer resources will be carefully disbursed and honestly spent.

SEC. 1502. SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON WAR AND RECONSTRUCTION CONTRACTING.

There is established a special committee of the Senate to be known as the Special Committee on War and Reconstruction Contracting (hereafter in this title referred to as the "Special Committee").

SEC. 1503. PURPOSE AND DUTIES.

(a) **PURPOSE.**—The purpose of the Special Committee is to investigate the awarding and performance of contracts to conduct military, security, and reconstruction activities in Afghanistan and Iraq and to support the prosecution of the war on terrorism.

(b) **DUTIES.**—The Special Committee shall examine the contracting actions described in subsection (a) and report on such actions, in accordance with this section, regarding—

(1) bidding, contracting, accounting, and auditing standards for Federal Government contracts;

(2) methods of contracting, including sole-source contracts and limited competition or noncompetitive contracts;

(3) subcontracting under large, comprehensive contracts;

(4) oversight procedures;

(5) consequences of cost-plus and fixed price contracting;

(6) allegations of wasteful and fraudulent practices;

(7) accountability of contractors and Government officials involved in procurement and contracting;

(8) penalties for violations of law and abuses in the awarding and performance of Government contracts; and

(9) lessons learned from the contracting process used in Iraq and Afghanistan and in connection with the war on terrorism with respect to the structure, coordination, management policies, and procedures of the Federal Government.

(c) **INVESTIGATION OF WASTEFUL AND FRAUDULENT PRACTICES.**—The investigation by the Special Committee of allegations of wasteful and fraudulent practices under subsection (b)(6) shall include investigation of allegations regarding any contract or spending entered into, supervised by, or otherwise involving the Coalition Provisional Authority, regardless of whether or not such contract or spending involved appropriated funds of the United States.

(d) **EVIDENCE CONSIDERED.**—In carrying out its duties, the Special Committee shall ascertain and evaluate the evidence developed by all relevant governmental agencies regarding the facts and circumstances relevant to contracts described in subsection (a) and any contract or spending covered by subsection (c).

SEC. 1504. COMPOSITION OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE.

(a) **MEMBERSHIP.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Special Committee shall consist of 7 members of the Senate of whom—

(A) 4 members shall be appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate, in consultation with the majority leader of the Senate; and

(B) 3 members shall be appointed by the minority leader of the Senate.

(2) **DATE.**—The appointments of the members of the Special Committee shall be made not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) **VACANCIES.**—Any vacancy in the Special Committee shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

(c) **SERVICE.**—Service of a Senator as a member, chairman, or ranking member of the Special Committee shall not be taken into account for the purposes of paragraph (4) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate.

(d) **CHAIRMAN AND RANKING MEMBER.**—The chairman of the Special Committee shall be designated by the majority leader of the Senate, and the ranking member of the Special Committee shall be designated by the minority leader of the Senate.

(e) **QUORUM.**—

(1) **REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.**—A majority of the members of the Special Committee shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of reporting a matter or recommendation to the Senate.

(2) **TESTIMONY.**—One member of the Special Committee shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of taking testimony.

(3) **OTHER BUSINESS.**—A majority of the members of the Special Committee, or 1/3 of the members of the Special Committee if at least one member of the minority party is present, shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of conducting any other business of the Special Committee.

SEC. 1505. RULES AND PROCEDURES.

(a) **GOVERNANCE UNDER STANDING RULES OF SENATE.**—Except as otherwise specifically provided in this resolution, the investigation, study, and hearings conducted by the Special Committee shall be governed by the Standing Rules of the Senate.

(b) **ADDITIONAL RULES AND PROCEDURES.**—The Special Committee may adopt additional rules or procedures if the chairman and ranking member agree that such additional rules or procedures are necessary to enable the Special Committee to conduct the investigation, study, and hearings authorized by this resolution. Any such additional rules and procedures—

(1) shall not be inconsistent with this resolution or the Standing Rules of the Senate; and

(2) shall become effective upon publication in the Congressional Record.

SEC. 1506. AUTHORITY OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Special Committee may exercise all of the powers and responsibilities of a committee under rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate.

(b) **HEARINGS.**—The Special Committee or, at its direction, any subcommittee or member of the Special Committee, may, for the purpose of carrying out this resolution—

(1) hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, receive such evidence, and administer such oaths as the Special Committee or such subcommittee or member considers advisable; and

(2) require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, documents, tapes, and materials as the Special Committee considers advisable.

(c) **ISSUANCE AND ENFORCEMENT OF SUBPOENAS.**—

(1) **ISSUANCE.**—Subpoenas issued under subsection (b) shall bear the signature of the Chairman of the Special Committee and shall be served by any person or class of persons designated by the Chairman for that purpose.

(2) **ENFORCEMENT.**—In the case of contumacy or failure to obey a subpoena issued under subsection (a), the United States district court for the judicial district in which the subpoenaed person resides, is served, or may be found may issue an order requiring such person to appear at any designated place to testify or to produce documentary or other evidence. Any failure to obey the order of the court may be punished by the court as a contempt of that court.

(d) **MEETINGS.**—The Special Committee may sit and act at any time or place during sessions, recesses, and adjournment periods of the Senate.

SEC. 1507. REPORTS.

(a) **INITIAL REPORT.**—The Special Committee shall submit to the Senate a report on the investigation conducted pursuant to section 1503 not later than 270 days after the appointment of the Special Committee members.

(b) **UPDATED REPORT.**—The Special Committee shall submit an updated report on such investigation not later than 180 days after the submission of the report under subsection (a).

(c) **ADDITIONAL REPORTS.**—The Special Committee may submit any additional report or reports that the Special Committee considers appropriate.

(d) **FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.**—The reports under this section shall include findings and recommendations of the Special Committee regarding the matters considered under section 1503.

(e) **DISPOSITION OF REPORTS.**—Any report made by the Special Committee when the Senate is not in session shall be submitted to the Clerk of the Senate. Any report made by the Special Committee shall be referred to the committee or committees that have jurisdiction over the subject matter of the report.

SEC. 1508. ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS.

(a) STAFF.—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Special Committee may employ in accordance with paragraph (2) a staff composed of such clerical, investigatory, legal, technical, and other personnel as the Special Committee, or the chairman or the ranking member, considers necessary or appropriate.

(2) APPOINTMENT OF STAFF.—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Special Committee shall appoint a staff for the majority, a staff for the minority, and a nondesignated staff.

(B) **MAJORITY STAFF.**—The majority staff shall be appointed, and may be removed, by the chairman and shall work under the general supervision and direction of the chairman.

(C) **MINORITY STAFF.**—The minority staff shall be appointed, and may be removed, by the ranking member of the Special Committee, and shall work under the general supervision and direction of such member.

(D) **NONDESIGNATED STAFF.**—Nondesignated staff shall be appointed, and may be removed, jointly by the chairman and the ranking member, and shall work under the joint general supervision and direction of the chairman and ranking member.

(b) COMPENSATION.—

(1) **MAJORITY STAFF.**—The chairman shall fix the compensation of all personnel of the majority staff of the Special Committee.

(2) **MINORITY STAFF.**—The ranking member shall fix the compensation of all personnel of the minority staff of the Special Committee.

(3) **NONDESIGNATED STAFF.**—The chairman and ranking member shall jointly fix the compensation of all nondesignated staff of the Special Committee, within the budget approved for such purposes for the Special Committee.

(c) **REIMBURSEMENT OF EXPENSES.**—The Special Committee may reimburse the mem-

bers of its staff for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by such staff members in the performance of their functions for the Special Committee.

(d) **PAYMENT OF EXPENSES.**—There shall be paid out of the applicable accounts of the Senate such sums as may be necessary for the expenses of the Special Committee. Such payments shall be made on vouchers signed by the chairman of the Special Committee and approved in the manner directed by the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate. Amounts made available under this subsection shall be expended in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate.

SEC. 1509. TERMINATION.

The Special Committee shall terminate on July 1, 2008.

SEC. 1510. SENSE OF SENATE ON CERTAIN CLAIMS REGARDING THE COALITION PROVISIONAL AUTHORITY.

It is the sense of the Senate that any claim of fraud, waste, or abuse under the False Claims Act that involves any contract or spending by the Coalition Provisional Authority should be considered a claim against the United States Government.

SA 4293. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title III, add the following:

SEC. 375. WIND ENERGY FACILITIES AND RADAR FACILITIES IN THE UNITED STATES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Air Force shall, in consultation with the Secretaries of the other military departments, the Secretary of Energy, the Secretary of Labor, the chief executive officers of the several States, representatives of the wind energy industry, and other appropriate individuals from the public and private sector, lead in the development of strategies to prevent, reduce, or mitigate interference by wind turbines with the operation of radars in the United States.

(b) **REPORT.**—Not later than December 30, 2006, the Secretary of the Air Force shall submit to Congress a report setting forth recommendations for legislative or administrative action to—

(1) facilitate the coexistence of military missions and wind energy facilities, to the greatest extent possible, including mechanisms to apply mitigation strategies on a case-by-case basis to the location and operation of any particular wind energy facility; and

(2) create a centralized process within the Department of Defense for the evaluation of the potential impact on military radars of the operation of a proposed wind energy facility in the United States, including a process to assure the early evaluation of such impact by the Department and for the right of appeal from a decision of the Department following such an evaluation.

(c) **CONSTRUCTION.**—The lack of submittal of the report required by section 358 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109-163; 119 Stat. 3208) should not be construed as a reason or justification for the delay of the construc-

tion or completion of any wind energy or windmill project.

SA 4294. Mrs. CLINTON (for herself and Mr. SCHUMER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title XXXI, add the following:

SEC. 3121. INCLUSION OF CERTAIN ADDITIONAL FORMER NUCLEAR WEAPONS PROGRAM WORKERS IN SPECIAL EXPOSURE COHORT UNDER ENERGY EMPLOYEES OCCUPATIONAL ILLNESS COMPENSATION PROGRAM.

(a) **INCLUSION IN SPECIAL EXPOSURE COHORT.**—Section 3621(14) of the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 7384(14)) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(D) The employee was so employed at the Bethlehem Steel plant located in Lackawanna, New York, for a number of work days aggregating at least 250 work days—

“(i) which were during the period beginning on January 1, 1949, and ending on December 31, 1952; and

“(ii) during which the employee had direct exposure to material (including residual material) that emitted radiation.”.

(b) **DEADLINE FOR NIOSH DETERMINATION.**—The National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health of the Department of Health and Human Services shall make the determination required by clause (i) of subparagraph (D) of section 3621(14) of the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000, as added by subsection (a), not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 4295. Mr. WARNER (for Mr. SESSIONS) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1066. REPORT ON REPORTING REQUIREMENTS APPLICABLE TO THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than March 1, 2007, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on each report described in paragraph (2) that is required by law to be submitted to the congressional defense committees by the Department of Defense or any department, agency, element, or component under the Department of Defense.

(2) **COVERED REPORTS.**—Paragraph (1) applies with respect to any report required under a provision of law enacted on or after the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108-136) that requires recurring reports to the committees referred to in that paragraph.

(b) **ELEMENTS.**—The report required by subsection (a) shall set forth the following:

(1) Each report described by that subsection, including a statement of the provision of law under which such report is required to be submitted to Congress.

(2) For each such report, an assessment by the Secretary of the utility of such report from the perspective of the Department of Defense and a recommendation on the advisability of repealing the requirement for the submittal of such report.

SA 4296. Mr. WARNER (for Mr. ALLARD (for himself and Mr. SALAZAR)) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 546, after line 22, add the following:

SEC. 2828. REPORTS ON ARMY TRAINING RANGES.

(a) **LIMITATION.**—The Secretary of the Army may not carry out any acquisition of real property to expand the Pinon Canyon Maneuver Site at Fort Carson, Colorado until 30 days after the Secretary submits the report required under subsection (b).

(b) **REPORT ON PINON CANYON MANEUVER SITE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than November 30, 2006, the Secretary of the Army shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report containing an analysis of any potential expansion of the military training range at the Pinon Canyon Maneuver Site at Fort Carson, Colorado.

(2) **CONTENT.**—The report required under paragraph (1) shall include the following information:

(A) A description of the Army's current and projected military requirements for training at the Pinon Canyon Maneuver Site.

(B) An analysis of the reasons for any changes in those requirements, including the extent to which they are a result of the increase of military personnel due to the 2005 round of defense base closure and realignment, the conversion of Army brigades to a modular format, or the Integrated Global Presence and Basing Strategy.

(C) A proposed plan for addressing those requirements, including a description of any proposed expansion of the existing training range by acquiring privately held land surrounding the site and an analysis of alternative approaches that do not require expansion of the training range.

(D) If an expansion of the training range is recommended pursuant to subparagraph (C), the following information:

(i) An assessment of the economic impact on local communities of such acquisition.

(ii) An assessment of the environmental impact of expanding the Pinon Canyon Maneuver Site.

(iii) An estimate of the costs associated with the potential expansion, including land acquisition, range improvements, installation of utilities, environmental restoration, and other environmental activities in connection with the acquisition.

(iv) An assessment of options for compensating local communities for the loss of property tax revenue as a result of the expansion of Pinon Canyon Maneuver Site.

(v) An assessment of whether the acquisition of additional land at the Pinon Canyon Maneuver Site can be carried out by the Secretary solely through transactions, including land exchanges and the lease or purchase of easements, with willing sellers of the privately held land.

(c) **REPORT ON EXPANSION OF ARMY TRAINING RANGES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than February 1, 2007, the Secretary of the Army shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report containing an assessment of the training ranges operated by the Army to support major Army units.

(2) **CONTENT.**—The report required under paragraph (1) shall include the following information:

(A) The size, description, and mission essential training tasks supported by each such Army training range during fiscal year 2003.

(B) A description of the projected changes in training range requirements, including the size, characteristics, and attributes for mission essential training of each range and the extent to which any changes in requirements are a result of the 2005 round of defense base closure and realignment, the conversion of Army brigades to a modular format, or the Integrated Global Presence and Basing Strategy.

(C) The projected deficit or surplus of training land at each such range, and a description of the Army's plan to address that projected deficit or surplus of land as well as the upgrade of range attributes at each existing training range.

(D) A description of the Army's prioritization process and investment strategy to address the potential expansion or upgrade of training ranges.

(E) An analysis of alternatives to the expansion of Army ranges to include an assessment of the joint use of ranges operated by other services.

SA 4297. Mr. WARNER proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 65, line 16, insert "facility designated by the Secretary as the" before "National".

On page 65, line 24, insert "facility designated by the Secretary as the" before "National".

On page 66, line 17, insert "facility designated by the Secretary as the" before "National".

SA 4298. Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. BINGAMAN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. ROBERTS, and Mrs. DOLE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title II, add the following:

SEC. 215. SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY.

(a) **ARMY SUPPORT FOR UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES.**—

(1) **ADDITIONAL AMOUNT FOR RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, ARMY.**—The amount authorized to be appropriated by section 201(1) for research, development, test, and evaluation for the Army is hereby increased by \$10,000,000.

(2) **AVAILABILITY OF AMOUNT.**—Of the amount authorized to be appropriated by section 201(1) for research, development, test, and evaluation for the Army, as increased by paragraph (1), \$10,000,000 may be available for program element PE 0601103A for University Research Initiatives.

(b) **NAVY SUPPORT FOR UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES.**—

(1) **ADDITIONAL AMOUNT FOR RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, ARMY.**—The amount authorized to be appropriated by section 201(2) for research, development, test, and evaluation for the Army is hereby increased by \$10,000,000.

(2) **AVAILABILITY OF AMOUNT.**—Of the amount authorized to be appropriated by section 201(2) for research, development, test, and evaluation for the Navy, as increased by paragraph (1), \$10,000,000 may be available for program element PE 0601103N for University Research Initiatives.

(c) **AIR FORCE SUPPORT FOR UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES.**—

(1) **ADDITIONAL AMOUNT FOR RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, AIR FORCE.**—The amount authorized to be appropriated by section 201(3) for research, development, test, and evaluation for the Air Force is hereby increased by \$10,000,000.

(2) **AVAILABILITY OF AMOUNT.**—Of the amount authorized to be appropriated by section 201(3) for research, development, test, and evaluation for the Air Force, as increased by paragraph (1), \$10,000,000 may be available for program element PE 0601103F for University Research Initiatives.

(d) **COMPUTER SCIENCE AND CYBERSECURITY.**—

(1) **ADDITIONAL AMOUNT FOR RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE-WIDE.**—The amount authorized to be appropriated by section 201(4) for research, development, test, and evaluation for Defense-wide activities is hereby increased by \$10,000,000.

(2) **AVAILABILITY OF AMOUNT.**—Of the amount authorized to be appropriated by section 201(4) for research, development, test, and evaluation for Defense-wide activities, as increased by paragraph (1), \$10,000,000 may be available for program element PE 0601101E for the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency University Research Program in Computer Science and Cybersecurity.

(e) **SMART NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION PROGRAM.**—

(1) **ADDITIONAL AMOUNT FOR RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE-WIDE.**—The amount authorized to be appropriated by section 201(4) for research, development, test, and evaluation for Defense-wide activities is hereby increased by \$5,000,000.

(2) **AVAILABILITY OF AMOUNT.**—Of the amount authorized to be appropriated by section 201(4) for research, development, test, and evaluation for Defense-wide activities, as increased by paragraph (1), \$5,000,000 may be available for program element PE 0601120D8Z for the SMART National Defense Education Program.

(f) **SENSE OF SENATE.**—It is the sense of the Senate that it should be a goal of the Department of Defense to invest not less than an amount equal to 15 percent of the science and technology budget of the Department of Defense in basic research programs.

(g) **OFFSET.**—The amount authorized to be appropriated by section 301(5) for operation and maintenance for Defense-wide activities is hereby reduced by \$45,000,000.

SA 4299. Mr. KENNEDY (for himself and Mr. SESSIONS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by

him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title XXXI, add the following:

SEC. 3121. EDUCATION OF FUTURE NUCLEAR ENGINEERS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The Department of Defense and the United States depend on the specialized expertise of nuclear engineers who support the development and sustainment of technologies including naval reactors, strategic weapons, and nuclear power plants.

(2) Experts estimate that over 25 percent of the approximately 58,000 workers in the nuclear power industry in the United States will be eligible to retire within 5 years, representing both a huge loss of institutional memory and a potential national security crisis.

(3) This shortfall of workers is exacerbated by reductions to the University Reactor Infrastructure and Education Assistance program, which trains civilian nuclear scientists and engineers. The defense and civilian nuclear industries are interdependent on a limited number of educational institutions to produce their workforce. A reduction in nuclear scientists and engineers trained in the civilian sector may result in a further loss of qualified personnel for defense-related research and engineering.

(4) The Department of Defense's successful Science, Math and Research for Transformation (SMART) scholarship-for-service program serves as a good model for a targeted scholarship or fellowship program designed to educate future scientists at the postsecondary and postgraduate levels.

(b) REPORT ON EDUCATION OF FUTURE NUCLEAR ENGINEERS.—

(1) STUDY.—The Secretary of Energy shall study the feasibility and merit of establishing a targeted scholarship or fellowship program to educate future nuclear engineers at the postsecondary and postgraduate levels.

(2) REPORT REQUIRED.—The President shall submit to the congressional defense committees, together with the budget request submitted for fiscal year 2008, a report on the study conducted by the Secretary of Energy under paragraph (1).

SA 4300. Mr. KENNEDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title I, add the following:

SEC. 147. MULTI-SPECTRAL IMAGING CAPABILITIES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) The budget of the President for fiscal year 2007, as submitted to Congress under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States

Code, and the current Future-Years Defense Program adopts an Air Force plan to retire the remaining fleet of U-2 aircraft by 2011.

(2) This retirement would eliminate the multi-spectral capability provided by the electro-optical/infrared (EO/IR) Senior Year Electro-optical Reconnaissance System (SYERS-2) high-altitude imaging system.

(3) The system referred to in paragraph (2) provides high-resolution, long-range, day-and-night image intelligence.

(4) The infrared capabilities of the system referred to in paragraph (2) can defeat enemy efforts to use camouflage or concealment, as well as provide images through poor visibility and smoke.

(5) Although the Air Force has previously recognized the military value of Senior Year Electro-optical Reconnaissance System sensors, the Air Force has no plans to migrate this capability to any platform remaining in the fleet.

(6) The Air Force could integrate such capabilities onto the Global Hawk platform to retain this capability for combatant commanders.

(7) The Nation risks a loss of an important intelligence gathering capability if this capability is not transferred to another platform.

(b) SENSE OF SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the Air Force should investigate ways to retain the multi-spectral imaging capabilities provided by the Senior Year Electro-optical Reconnaissance System high-altitude imaging system after the retirement of the U-2 aircraft fleet.

(c) REPORT REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary of the Air Force shall submit to the congressional defense committees, at the same time the budget of the President for fiscal year 2008 is submitted to Congress under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, a plan for migrating the capabilities provided by the Senior Year Electro-optical Reconnaissance System high-altitude imaging system from the U-2 aircraft to the Global Hawk platform before the retirement of the U-2 aircraft fleet in 2011.

SA 4301. Mrs. DOLE (for herself and Mr. JEFFORDS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle I of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1084. HEALTH CARE BENEFITS FOR INDIVIDUALS EXPOSED IN UTERO TO CONTAMINATED WATER AT CAMP LEJEUNE, NORTH CAROLINA.

(a) ELIGIBILITY FOR BENEFITS.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall provide each individual described in subsection (b) with such health care as the Secretary determines is needed by such individual for any health problem, condition, or disability that is associated with the exposure of such individual as described in that subsection.

(b) COVERED INDIVIDUALS.—An individual described in this subsection is any individual, as determined by the Secretary of Defense in consultation with the Agency for Toxic Substances, who was exposed in utero to water contaminated with toxic chemicals at United States Marine Corps Base Camp Lejeune, North Carolina.

(c) AUTHORITY FOR CARE TO BE PROVIDED DIRECTLY OR BY CONTRACT.—The Secretary

may provide health care under this section directly or by contract or other arrangement with a health care provider.

(d) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to affect the rights or obligations of any person or entity, including the Federal Government, under any other law.

(e) NOTICE ON EXPOSURE.—

(1) NOTICE REQUIRED.—The Commandant of the Marine Corps shall, upon completion of the report by the Agency for Toxic Substances Disease Registry on human exposure to contaminated drinking water at Camp Lejeune, take appropriate actions to notify each person who may have been exposed to such drinking water of such exposure.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The notice provided under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) A description of the events resulting in exposure to contaminated drinking water at Camp Lejeune.

(B) A description of the duration and extent of the contamination of drinking water at Camp Lejeune.

(C) The known and suspected health effects of exposure to the contaminants in the contaminated drinking water at Camp Lejeune.

(D) A description of sources of additional information on—

(i) the contaminated drinking water at Camp Lejeune; and

(ii) the known and suspected health effects of exposure to the contaminants in such drinking water.

(f) HEALTH CARE DEFINED.—In this section, the term "health care" has the meaning given that term in section 1803(c)(1) of title 38, United States Code.

SA 4302. Mrs. DOLE (for herself and Mr. JEFFORDS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title III, add the following:

SEC. 352. NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES STUDY ON HUMAN EXPOSURE TO CONTAMINATED DRINKING WATER AT CAMP LEJEUNE, NORTH CAROLINA.

(a) STUDY REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Navy shall enter into an agreement with the National Academy of Sciences to conduct a comprehensive review and evaluation of the available scientific and medical evidence regarding associations between pre-natal, child, and adult exposure to drinking water contaminated with trichloroethylene (TCE) and tetrachloroethylene (PCE) at Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, as well as other pre-natal, child, and adult exposures to levels of trichloroethylene and tetrachloroethylene similar to those experienced at Camp Lejeune, and birth defects or diseases and any other adverse health effects.

(2) ELEMENTS.—In conducting the review and evaluation, the Academy shall review and summarize the scientific and medical evidence and assess the strength of that evidence in establishing a link or association between exposure to trichloroethylene and tetrachloroethylene and each birth defect or disease suspected to be associated with such

exposure. For each birth defect or disease reviewed, the Academy shall determine, to the extent practicable with available scientific and medical data, whether—

(A) a statistical association with such contaminant exposures exists; and

(B) there exist plausible biological mechanisms or other evidence of a causal relationship between contaminant exposures and the birth defect or disease.

(3) **SCOPE OF REVIEW.**—In conducting the review and evaluation, the Academy shall include a review and evaluation of—

(A) the toxicologic and epidemiologic literature on adverse health effects of trichloroethylene and tetrachloroethylene, including epidemiologic and risk assessment reports from government agencies;

(B) recent literature reviews by the National Research Council, Institute of Medicine, and other groups;

(C) the completed and on-going Agency for Toxic Substances Disease Registry (ATSDR) studies on potential trichloroethylene and tetrachloroethylene exposure at Camp Lejeune; and

(D) published meta-analyses.

(4) **PEER REVIEW.**—The Academy shall obtain the peer review of the report prepared as a result of the review and evaluation under applicable Academy procedures.

(5) **SUBMITTAL.**—The Academy shall submit the report prepared as a result of the review and evaluation to the Secretary and Congress not later than 18 months after entering into the agreement for the review and evaluation under paragraph (1).

(b) **NOTICE ON EXPOSURE.**—

(1) **NOTICE REQUIRED.**—Upon completion of the current epidemiological study by the Agency for Toxic Substances Disease Registry, known as the Exposure to Volatile Organic Compounds in Drinking Water and Specific Birth Defects and Childhood Cancers, United States Marine Corps Base Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, the Commandant of the Marine Corps shall take appropriate actions, including the use of national media such as newspapers, television, and the Internet, to notify former Camp Lejeune residents and employees who may have been exposed to drinking water impacted by trichloroethylene and tetrachloroethylene of the results of the study.

(2) **ELEMENTS.**—The information provided by the Commandant of the Marine Corps under paragraph (1) shall be prepared in conjunction with the Agency for Toxic Substances Disease Registry and shall include a description of sources of additional information relating to such exposure, including, but not be limited to, the following:

(A) A description of the events resulting in exposure to contaminated drinking water at Camp Lejeune.

(B) A description of the duration and extent of the contamination of drinking water at Camp Lejeune.

(C) The known and suspected health effects of exposure to the drinking water impacted by trichloroethylene and tetrachloroethylene at Camp Lejeune.

SA 4303. Mr. CHAMBLISS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title III, add the following:

SEC. 375. RECOVERY AND AVAILABILITY TO CORPORATION FOR THE PROMOTION OF RIFLE PRACTICE AND FIREARMS SAFETY OF CERTAIN FIREARMS, AMMUNITION, AND PARTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subchapter II of chapter 407 of title 36, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 40728 the following new section:

“§ 40728A. Recovery and availability of excess firearms, ammunition, and parts granted to foreign countries

“(a) **RECOVERY.**—The Secretary of the Army may recover from any country to which a grant of rifles, ammunition, repair parts, or other supplies described in section 40731(a) of this title is made under section 505 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2314) any such rifles, ammunition, repair parts, or supplies that are excess to the needs of such country.

“(b) **COST OF RECOVERY.**—(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), the cost of recovery of any rifles, ammunition, repair parts, or supplies under subsection (a) shall be treated as incremental direct costs incurred in providing logistical support to the corporation for which reimbursement shall be required as provided in section 40727(a) of this title.

“(2) The Secretary may require the corporation to pay costs of recovery described in paragraph (1) in advance of incurring such costs. Amounts so paid shall not be subject to the provisions of section 3302 of title 31, but shall be administered in accordance with the last sentence of section 40727(a) of this title.

“(c) **AVAILABILITY.**—Any rifles, ammunition, repair parts, or supplies recovered under subsection (a) shall be available for transfer to the corporation in accordance with the provisions of section 40728 of this title under such additional terms and conditions as the Secretary shall prescribe for purposes of this section.”.

(b) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 407 of such title is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 40728 the following new item:

“40728A. Recovery and availability of excess firearms, ammunition, and parts granted to foreign countries.”.

SA 4304. Mr. THUNE (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 26, line 19, add after the period the following: “The prohibition in the preceding sentence shall not apply to any C-130E/H tactical airlift aircraft that are declared by the Air Force to be grounded and are determined by the Secretary of the Air Force to be unsafe for exceeding structural design limits or to have structural cracks in excess of an economic ability to repair, but only if the Secretary submits to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a notice on such determination before retiring such aircraft.”

SA 4305. Mr. HAGEL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

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

SEC. 568. EXEMPTION FROM PAYMENT OF INDIVIDUAL CONTRIBUTIONS UNDER MONTGOMERY GI BILL OF INDIVIDUALS WHO SERVE AS ACTIVE DUTY MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES UNDER EXECUTIVE ORDER 13235.

(a) **ACTIVE DUTY PROGRAM.**—Notwithstanding section 3011(b) of title 38, United States Code, no reduction in basic pay otherwise required by such section shall be made in the case of a covered member of the Armed Forces.

(b) **SELECTED RESERVE PROGRAM.**—Notwithstanding section 3012(c) of such title, no reduction in basic pay otherwise required by such section shall be made in the case of a covered member of the Armed Forces.

(c) **TERMINATION OF ON-GOING REDUCTIONS IN BASIC PAY.**—In the case of a covered member of the Armed Forces who first became a member of the Armed Forces or first entered on active duty as a member of the Armed Forces before the date of the enactment of this Act and whose basic pay would, but for subsection (a) or (b) of this section, be subject to reduction under section 3011(b) or 3012(c) of such title for any month beginning on or after that date, the reduction of basic pay of such covered member of the Armed Forces under such section 3011(b) or 3012(c), as applicable, shall cease commencing with the first month beginning on or after that date.

(d) **REFUND OF CONTRIBUTIONS.**—(1) In the case of any covered member of the Armed Forces whose basic pay was reduced under section 3011(b) or 3012(c) of such title for any month beginning before the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary concerned shall pay to such covered member of the Armed Forces an amount equal to the aggregate amount of reductions of basic pay of such member of the Armed Forces under such section 3011(b) or 3012(c), as applicable, as of that date.

(2) Any amount paid to a covered member of the Armed Forces under paragraph (1) shall not be included in gross income under the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(3) Amounts for payments made by a Secretary concerned under paragraph (1) during fiscal year 2005 shall be derived from amounts made available for such fiscal year in an Act making supplemental appropriations for defense and the reconstruction of Iraq.

(4) In this subsection, the term “Secretary concerned” means—

(A) the Secretary of the Army, with respect to matters concerning the Army;

(B) the Secretary of the Navy, with respect to matters concerning the Navy or the Marine Corps;

(C) the Secretary of the Air Force, with respect to matters concerning the Air Force; and

(D) the Secretary of Homeland Security, with respect to matters concerning the Coast Guard.

(e) **COVERED MEMBER OF THE ARMED FORCES DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “covered member of the Armed Forces” means any individual who serves on active duty as a member of the Armed Forces during the period—

(1) beginning on November 16, 2001, the date of Executive Order 13235, relating to National Emergency Construction Authority; and

(2) ending on the termination date of the Executive order referred to in paragraph (1).

SEC. 569. OPPORTUNITY FOR INDIVIDUALS WHO SERVE AS ACTIVE DUTY MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES UNDER EXECUTIVE ORDER 13235 TO WITHDRAW ELECTION NOT TO ENROLL IN MONTGOMERY GI BILL.

Section 3018 of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (c) and (d) as subsection (d) and (e), respectively;

(2) by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection (c):

“(c)(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, during the one-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this subsection, an individual who—

“(A) serves on active duty as a member of the Armed Forces during the period beginning on November 16, 2001, and ending on the termination date of Executive Order 13235, relating to National Emergency Construction Authority; and

“(B) has served continuously on active duty without a break in service following the date the individual first becomes a member or first enters on active duty as a member of the Armed Forces,

shall have the opportunity, on such form as the Secretary of Defense shall prescribe, to withdraw an election under section 3011(c)(1) or 3012(d)(1) of this title not to receive education assistance under this chapter.

“(2) An individual described paragraph (1) who made an election under section 3011(c)(1) or 3012(d)(1) of this title and who—

“(A) while serving on active duty during the one-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this subsection makes a withdrawal of such election;

“(B) continues to serve the period of service which such individual was obligated to serve;

“(C) serves the obligated period of service described in subparagraph (B) or before completing such obligated period of service is described by subsection (b)(3)(B); and

“(D) meets the requirements set forth in paragraphs (4) and (5) of subsection (b), is entitled to basic educational assistance under this chapter.”; and

(3) in subsection (e), as so redesignated, by inserting “or (c)(2)(A)” after “(b)(1)”.

SA 4306. Mr. HAGEL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title VI, add the following:

SEC. 648. COMMENCEMENT OF RECEIPT OF NON-REGULAR SERVICE RETIRED PAY BY RESERVES WHO SERVED ON ACTIVE DUTY FOR SIGNIFICANT PERIODS DURING THE GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM.

(a) **REDUCED ELIGIBILITY AGE.**—Section 12731 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

“(1) has attained the eligibility age applicable under subsection (f) to that person.”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(f)(1) Subject to paragraph (2), the eligibility age for the purposes of subsection (a)(1) is 60 years of age.

“(2)(A) In the case of a person who, as a member of a reserve component of an armed force, served on active duty during a global war on terrorism service year under a provision of law referred to in section 101(a)(13)(B) of this title, the eligibility age for the purposes of subsection (a)(1) is reduced below 60 years of age by one year for each global war on terrorism service year during which such person so served on active duty for at least 90 consecutive days, subject to subparagraph (B).

“(B) The eligibility age may not be reduced below 55 years of age for any person under subparagraph (A).

“(C) In this paragraph, the term ‘global war on terrorism service year’ means—

“(i) the one-year period beginning on November 16, 2001, and ending on November 15, 2002; and

“(ii) each successive one-year period beginning on November 16 of a year.

(b) **ADMINISTRATION OF RELATED PROVISIONS OF LAW OR POLICY.**—With respect to any provision of law, or of any policy, regulation, or directive of the executive branch, that refers to a member or former member of the uniformed services as being eligible for, or entitled to, retired pay under chapter 1223 of title 10, United States Code, but for the fact that the member or former member is under 60 years of age, such provision shall be carried out with respect to that member or former member by substituting for the reference to being 60 years of age a reference to having attained the eligibility age applicable under subsection (f) of section 12731 of title 10, United States Code (as added by subsection (a)), to such member or former member for qualification for such retired pay under subsection (a) of such section.

(c) **EFFECTIVE DATE AND APPLICABILITY.**—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect as of November 16, 2001, and shall apply with respect to applications for retired pay that are submitted under section 12731(a) of title 10, United States Code, on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 4307. Mr. REID (for himself, Mr. BIDEN, and Mr. LEVIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1209. NORTH KOREA.

(a) **COORDINATOR OF POLICY ON NORTH KOREA.**—

(1) **APPOINTMENT REQUIRED.**—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall appoint a senior presidential envoy to act as coordinator of United States policy on North Korea.

(2) **DESIGNATION.**—The individual appointed under paragraph (1) may be known as the “North Korea Policy Coordinator” (in this subsection referred to as the “Coordinator”).

(3) **DUTIES.**—The Coordinator shall—

(A) conduct a full and complete inter-agency review of United States policy toward North Korea;

(B) provide policy direction for negotiations with North Korea relating to nuclear weapons, ballistic missiles, and other security matters; and

(C) provide leadership for United States participation in Six Party Talks on the denuclearization of the Korean peninsula.

(4) **REPORT.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the appointment of an individual as Coordinator under paragraph (1), the Coordinator shall submit to the President and Congress an unclassified report, with a classified annex if necessary, on the actions undertaken under paragraph (3). The report shall set forth—

(A) the results of the review under paragraph (3)(A); and

(B) any other matters on North Korea that the individual considers appropriate.

(b) **REPORT ON NUCLEAR AND MISSILE PROGRAMS OF NORTH KOREA.**—

(1) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter, the President shall submit to Congress an unclassified report, with a classified annex as appropriate, on the nuclear program and the missile program of North Korea.

(2) **ELEMENTS.**—Each report submitted under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) The most current national intelligence estimate on the nuclear program and the missile program of North Korea, and, consistent with the protection of intelligence sources and methods, an unclassified summary of the key judgments in the estimate.

(B) The most current unclassified United States Government assessment, stated as a range if necessary, of (i) the number of nuclear weapons possessed by North Korea and (ii) the amount of nuclear material suitable for weapons use produced by North Korea by plutonium reprocessing and uranium enrichment for each period as follows:

(I) Before October 1994.

(II) Between October 1994 and October 2002.

(III) Between October 2002 and the date of the submittal of the initial report under paragraph (1).

(IV) Each 12-month period after the submittal of the initial report under paragraph (1).

(C) Any other matter relating to the nuclear program or missile program of North Korea that the President considers appropriate.

SA 4308. Mr. ENSIGN (for himself and Mr. REID) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title III, add the following:

SEC. — EXPANSION OF JUNIOR RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS PROGRAM.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretaries of the military departments shall take appropriate actions to increase the number of secondary educational institutions at which a unit of the Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps is organized under chapter 102 of title 10, United States Code.

(b) **EXPANSION TARGETS.**—In increasing under subsection (a) the number of secondary educational institutions at which a unit of the Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps is organized, the Secretaries of the military departments shall seek to organize units at an additional number of institutions as follows:

(1) In the case of Army units, 15 institutions.

(2) In the case of Navy units, 10 institutions.

(3) In the case of Marine Corps units, 15 institutions.

(4) In the case of Air Force units, 10 institutions.

SA 4309. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title I, add the following:

SEC. 105. AMOUNT FOR PROCUREMENT OF HEMOSTATIC AGENTS FOR USE IN THE FIELD.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that every member of the Armed Forces should carry life saving resources on them, including hemostatic agents.

(b) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Of the amount authorized under section 104 for Defense-wide procurement, \$20,000,000 may be made available for the procurement of a sufficient quantity of hemostatic agents, including blood-clotting bandages, for use by members of the Armed Forces in the field so that each soldier serving in Iraq and Afghanistan is issued at least one hemostatic agent and accompanying medical personnel have a sufficient inventory of hemostatic agents.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the distribution of hemostatic agents to members of the Armed Forces serving in Iraq and Afghanistan, including a description of any distribution problems and attempts to resolve such problems.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that MAJ Shannon Sentell, an Army congressional fellow serving in my office, be granted the privileges of the floor for the remainder of the debate on S. 2766.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SENATE LEGAL COUNSEL AUTHORIZATION

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 514, which was submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 514) to authorize testimony and legal representation in City of Eugene v. Peter Vincent Chabarek.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, this resolution concerns a request for testimony and representation in a criminal trespass action in Municipal Court in Eugene, OR. In this action, an antiwar protestor has been charged with criminally trespassing on the building housing Senator RON WYDEN's Eugene, OR, office on March 20, 2006, for refusing repeated requests by building management to leave the premises. A trial on the charge of trespass is scheduled to commence on June 20, 2006. The defendant has subpoenaed a member of the Senator's staff who had conversations with the defendant and other protestors before and during the charged events. The enclosed resolution would authorize that staff member to testify in connection with this action, with representation by the Senate legal counsel.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 514) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 514

Whereas, in the case of City of Eugene v. Peter Vincent Chabarek, Citation No. 06-05546, pending in Municipal Court for the City of Eugene, testimony has been requested from Juine Chada, an employee in the office of Senator Ron Wyden;

Whereas, pursuant to sections 703(a) and 704(a)(2) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, 2 U.S.C. §§ 288b(a) and 288c(a)(2), the Senate may direct its counsel to represent an employee of the Senate with respect to any subpoena, order, or request for testimony relating to their official responsibilities;

Whereas, by the privileges of the Senate of the United States and Rule XI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, no evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate may, by the judicial or administrative process, be taken from such control or possession but by permission of the Senate;

Whereas, when it appears that evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate may promote the administration of justice, the Senate will take such action as will promote the ends of justice consistent with the privileges of the Senate: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Juine Chada is authorized to testify in the case of City of Eugene v. Peter Vincent Chabarek, except concerning matters for which a privilege should be asserted.

Sec. 2. The Senate Legal Counsel is authorized to represent Juine Chada in connection with the testimony authorized in section one of this resolution.

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 3534

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I understand there is a bill at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the title of the bill for the first time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 3534) to amend the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 to provide for a YouthBuild Program.

Mr. FRIST. I now ask for its second reading, and in order to place the bill

on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The bill will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

RECORD TO REMAIN OPEN UNTIL 2 P.M. TODAY

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD remain open until 2 p.m. today for submission of statements only.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, JUNE 19, 2006

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 2 p.m. on Monday, June 19. I further ask that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved, and the Senate resume consideration of S. 2766, the Defense authorization bill; further, that the previous order for executive session be changed so that at 4 p.m. on Monday, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the nomination of Sandra Ikuta; I ask unanimous consent that the time be equally divided as provided earlier, with the vote now occurring at 5 p.m., and that the remaining provisions of the order stay in effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, the first vote of the week will occur on Monday afternoon at 5:00. The vote is on a U.S. circuit judge nomination previously scheduled for 5:30. We have moved that up 30 minutes to 5 o'clock. We will extend the length of that vote slightly to allow for Members' arrival based on the previously ordered time.

Next week, we will continue to work through the amendments to the Defense authorization bill. Votes will be scheduled each day.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, JUNE 19, 2006, AT 2 P.M.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 1:47 p.m., adjourned until Monday, June 19, 2006, at 2 p.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive Nominations Received by the Senate June 16, 2006:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

NANCY MONTANEZ-JOHNER, OF NEBRASKA, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE FOR FOOD, NUTRITION, AND CONSUMER SERVICES, VICE ERIC M. BOST.

COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION

MICHAEL V. DUNN, OF IOWA, TO BE A COMMISSIONER OF THE COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING JUNE 19, 2011. (REAPPOINTMENT)

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

NANCY MONTANEZ-JOHNER, OF NEBRASKA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION, VICE ERIC M. BOST.

FEDERAL HOUSING FINANCE BOARD

GEOFFREY S. BACINO, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE A DIRECTOR OF THE FEDERAL HOUSING FINANCE BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING FEBRUARY 27, 2013. VICE FRANZ S. LEICHTER, TERM EXPIRED.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

THOMAS C. FOLEY, OF CONNECTICUT, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO IRELAND.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

MANFREDI PICCOLOMINI, OF NEW YORK, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE HUMANITIES FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 26, 2012. VICE ANDREW LADIS, TERM EXPIRED.

KENNETH R. WEINSTEIN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE HUMANITIES FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 26, 2012. VICE DAVID HERTZ, TERM EXPIRED.

JAY WINIK, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE HUMANITIES FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 26, 2012. VICE NATHAN O. HATCH, TERM EXPIRED.

JOSIAH BUNTING III, OF RHODE ISLAND, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE HUMANITIES FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 26, 2012. VICE WRIGHT L. LASSITER, JR., TERM EXPIRED.

WILFRED M. MCCLAY, OF TENNESSEE, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE HUMANITIES FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 26, 2012. (REAPPOINTMENT)

ROBERT S. MARTIN, OF TEXAS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE HUMANITIES FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 26, 2012. VICE JEFFREY D. WALLIN, TERM EXPIRED.

MARY HAYBECK, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE HUMANITIES FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 26, 2012. VICE JAMES R. STONER, JR., TERM EXPIRED.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

KARL HESS, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL SCIENCE BOARD, NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION, FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE TERM EXPIRING MAY 10, 2008. VICE DOLORES M. ETTER, RESIGNED.

THOMAS N. TAYLOR, OF KANSAS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL SCIENCE BOARD, NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION, FOR A TERM EXPIRING MAY 10, 2012. VICE DANIEL SIMBERLOFF, TERM EXPIRED.

RICHARD F. THOMPSON, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL SCIENCE BOARD, NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION, FOR A TERM EXPIRING MAY 10, 2012. VICE MARK S. WRIGHTON, TERM EXPIRED.

MARK R. ABBOTT, OF OREGON, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL SCIENCE BOARD, NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION, FOR A TERM EXPIRING MAY 10, 2012. VICE JANE LUBCHENCO, TERM EXPIRED.

CAMILLA PERSSON BENBOW, OF TENNESSEE, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL SCIENCE BOARD, NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION, FOR A TERM EXPIRING MAY 10, 2012. VICE WARREN M. WASHINGTON, TERM EXPIRED.

JOHN T. BRUER, OF MISSOURI, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL SCIENCE BOARD, NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION, FOR A TERM EXPIRING MAY 10, 2012. VICE JOHN A. WHITE, JR., TERM EXPIRED.

PATRICIA D. GALLOWAY, OF WASHINGTON, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL SCIENCE BOARD, NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION, FOR A TERM EXPIRING MAY 10, 2012. VICE DIANA S. NATALICIO, TERM EXPIRED.

JOSE-MARIE GRIFFITHS, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL SCIENCE BOARD, NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION, FOR A TERM EXPIRING MAY 10, 2012. VICE NINA V. FEDOROFF, TERM EXPIRED.

IN THE FOREIGN SERVICE

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED PERSONS OF THE AGENCIES INDICATED FOR APPOINTMENT AS FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF THE CLASSES STATED FOR APPOINTMENT AS FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS ONE, CONSULAR OFFICERS AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

JAMES C. CHARLIFUE, OF COLORADO
CATHERINE M. TRUJILLO, OF VIRGINIA

FOR APPOINTMENT AS FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS TWO, CONSULAR OFFICERS AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

KAREN LEE ANDERSON, OF MARYLAND
NOEL B. ANDERSON, OF VIRGINIA
SEAN EDWARD CALLAHAN, OF NEW YORK
JON M. CHASSON, OF FLORIDA

IDRIS M. DIAZ, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
ANDREW MARC HERSCOWITZ, OF CALIFORNIA
MAIL L. HUANG, OF CALIFORNIA
MICHAEL HUTCHINSON, OF WASHINGTON
F. CATHERINE JOHNSON, OF PENNSYLVANIA
WILLIAM F. PENOYAR, OF VIRGINIA
ANNE MARIE YASTISHOCK, OF PENNSYLVANIA

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

BARBARA J. MARTIN, OF MARYLAND

FOR APPOINTMENT AS FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS THREE, CONSULAR OFFICERS AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

ROLF RICHARD ANDERSON, OF NEW YORK
MICHAEL BLACKMAN, OF FLORIDA
ALEXANDER V. BOND, OF TEXAS
STEPHEN M. BRAGER, OF MARYLAND
CAROLINE B. BREARLEY, OF VIRGINIA
BRIAN L. CARNEY, OF FLORIDA
COURTNEY L. CHUBB, OF FLORIDA
DAVID JAMES CONSIGNY, OF WISCONSIN
CHRISTOPHER M. CUSHING, OF MASSACHUSETTS
ROBERT E. DAVIDSON, OF NEW YORK
REGINA R. DENNIS, OF MISSOURI
BARBARA J. DICKERSON, OF MARYLAND
ANNE MARGARET DIX, OF MARYLAND
LAWRENCE W. DOLAN, OF NEW JERSEY
JOHN LAURENCE DUNLOP, OF NEW JERSEY
RAMONA MARTINA MULLER EL HAMZAOU, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
MARGARET ELIZABETH ENIS, OF OKLAHOMA
MERVYN ANTHONY FARROE, OF FLORIDA
JEANNIE FRIEDMANN, OF CALIFORNIA
LUIS FERNANDO GARCIA, OF FLORIDA
NANCY GODFREY, OF FLORIDA
ANN HIRSCHHEY, OF NEW YORK
MELINDA HOBBS, OF MISSOURI
GWENETH HUGHES, OF GEORGIA
PAUL R. KOLSTAD, OF VIRGINIA
YVES KORE, OF MISSISSIPPI
JEFFREY LEHRER, OF NEW JERSEY
ANDREW LEVIN, OF VIRGINIA
JEFFREY R. LEVINE, OF VIRGINIA
DALE D. LEWIS, OF FLORIDA
JENNIFER M. LINK, OF ILLINOIS
KURT P. LOW, OF TEXAS
MANUEL MARROQUIN, OF FLORIDA
JOSEPH T. MCGEE, OF FLORIDA
J. MICHAEL NEHRBASS, OF WASHINGTON
VAN N. NGUYEN, OF TEXAS
CRISTINA AUSTRIA OLIVE, OF FLORIDA
KATHRYN J. PANTHER, OF VIRGINIA
LYNE PAQUETTE, OF FLORIDA
JOHN A. PENNELL, OF FLORIDA
ANDREW K. POSACKI, OF FLORIDA
MARGARET KATE SANCHO-MORRIS, OF PENNSYLVANIA
JOHN MORRIS STAMM, OF OHIO
LOREN O. STODDARD, OF UTAH
TANYA SUZANNA URQUIETA, OF TEXAS
LYNN NORTHCUTT VEGA, OF TEXAS
VIRGINIA KAY WADELLE, OF TEXAS
SAIMING T. WAN, OF CALIFORNIA
LISA Y. WHITLEY, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
JAMES S. WRIGHT, OF VIRGINIA

FOR APPOINTMENT AS FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS FOUR, CONSULAR OFFICERS AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

DARION K. AKINS, OF TEXAS
JOHN C. KELLEY, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED MEMBERS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE TO BE CONSULAR OFFICERS AND/OR SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, AS INDICATED: CONSULAR OFFICERS AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

SARAH C. ELLERMAN, OF KANSAS
ROBIN KESSLER, OF OHIO
JAMES E. SITTON, OF FLORIDA

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

JAMES M. ACUNA, OF MARYLAND
MONA LAKHAL AINSWORTH, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
SUSAN MARIE ALEXANDER, OF VIRGINIA
ANA M. AMANS, OF VIRGINIA
GILLIAN R. APFEL, OF WASHINGTON
TARO BERNARD ARAI, OF MARYLAND
AMBER AURA, OF CALIFORNIA
LILA BLAKELY BANDY, OF VIRGINIA
JEREMY K. BARNUM, OF UTAH
DAVIDA A. BARTNER, OF VIRGINIA
AMITABHA BHOUMIK, OF VIRGINIA
BRENT LYLE BIGHAM, OF VIRGINIA
EMILY M. BISHOP, OF VIRGINIA
CHRISTINA LYNCH BOBROW, OF MARYLAND
MONICA ALEXANDRA BODUSZYSKI, OF CALIFORNIA
MATT BONAIUTO, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
MANOELA GUIDORIZZI BORGES, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
KRISTEN M. BRADLEY, OF TEXAS
RANDALL BROWN, OF VIRGINIA
ANDREW WESLEY BROWNE, OF VIRGINIA
MARK W. BURT, OF VIRGINIA
JAMIE J. BYRD, OF VIRGINIA
HOWARD MATTHEW CAMERON, OF VIRGINIA

DOLORES CANAVAN, OF VIRGINIA
CATHERINE W. CARLETON, OF VIRGINIA
LAURA CHAMBERLIN, OF NEW MEXICO
LAUREN C.W. CHARWAT, OF VIRGINIA
KENNETH A. COCHRANE, OF VIRGINIA
NILES COLE, OF NEW YORK
STACY L. COMP, OF SOUTH DAKOTA
DAVID J. CONK, OF VIRGINIA
JERWAYNE DENNARD COOK, OF VIRGINIA
LESLIE KAY DAVIDSON, OF VIRGINIA
CYNTHIA DAY, OF TEXAS
JENNIFER FINNEY DUGMORE, OF VIRGINIA
SONJA W. EALEY, OF VIRGINIA
DANEAN F. EGAN, OF VIRGINIA
LULZIME ELMAZI, OF VIRGINIA
JASON DANIEL EVANS, OF VIRGINIA
RON FIE'EIKI, OF VIRGINIA
TERRY T. FINNECY, OF MARYLAND
MATTHEW BRENDAN FLACK, OF VIRGINIA
MICHAEL J. FLAHERTY, OF MARYLAND
DAVID E. FLIEG, OF VIRGINIA
KRISTI L. FLIS, OF VIRGINIA
ROBERT EMMETT FORD, OF VIRGINIA
JAMES T. GALLAGHER, OF VIRGINIA
LAUREN A. GARTMAN, OF SOUTH CAROLINA
JESSICA GAYLOR, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
PAUL W. GEARY, OF VIRGINIA
BETH W. GOLDBERG, OF MARYLAND
MEGAN ALANNA GOODFELLOW, OF VIRGINIA
CHARLES R. GOODMAN III, OF FLORIDA
JESSICA ELAINE GUPTA, OF VIRGINIA
ANGELA J. HAGER, OF VIRGINIA
MATTHEW CURTIS HALL, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
BENJAMIN C. HARRIS, OF VIRGINIA
ANDREW MICHAEL HARTSOG, OF FLORIDA
AARON B. HAWKINS, OF MARYLAND
KAREN E. HELMSOETH, OF ILLINOIS
LISE JEAN HERBERT, OF VIRGINIA
REBECCA JOY HESTER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
ERIC HEYDEN, OF TENNESSEE
THOMAS C. HILLBARY, OF VIRGINIA
DARCIE A. HOFFMAN, OF VIRGINIA
NAWANA S. HOLT, OF GEORGIA
MICHAEL D. HORTON, OF VIRGINIA
STEPHEN FRANK INGRAM, OF VIRGINIA
DAVID ALLAN JOHNSON, OF VIRGINIA
GAIL R. JOHNSON, OF VIRGINIA
DOUGLAS E. JOHNSTON, OF MASSACHUSETTS
NATHAN A. JONES, OF UTAH
JOHN C. KASTNIG, OF NEBRASKA
JOHN C. KERSHAW, OF PENNSYLVANIA
BENJAMIN L. KESLER, OF VIRGINIA
SOFIA MARIAM KHILJI, OF VIRGINIA
JIYOUN KIM, OF VIRGINIA
BRIAN JAMES KLOETZEL, OF VIRGINIA
MICHELLE K. KOOP, OF VIRGINIA
ROBYN KIM LABBE, OF VIRGINIA
MICHAEL J. LACOMBE, OF VIRGINIA
R. NICHOLAS LARSEN, OF UTAH
CHRISTINE E. LEE, OF VIRGINIA
TI-YING LEE, OF VIRGINIA
GREGORY MICHAEL LEHMAN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
HEIDI R. LIN, OF FLORIDA
ELIZABETH C. LINDER, OF VIRGINIA
THOMAS K. LIPPMAN, OF VIRGINIA
TISHA R. LOEPER-VITI, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
MARY JO A. LONG, OF VIRGINIA
AMY L. LORENZEN, OF SOUTH DAKOTA
DARIO N. LORENZETTI, OF VIRGINIA
HERBERT GORDON MACKAY, OF VIRGINIA
BRETT ALAN MAKENS, OF MICHIGAN
JOSEPH R. MARTELLO, OF VIRGINIA
ABRAMO MASTROIANI, OF VIRGINIA
DOUGLAS J. MATHEWS, OF VIRGINIA
JEFFREY RYAN MILES, OF PENNSYLVANIA
CATHERINE CONNELL MCSHERRY, OF FLORIDA
JAMES F. MONTGOMERY, OF VIRGINIA
DEWEY E. MOORE, JR., OF VIRGINIA
DENISE MICHELE MORAGA, OF VIRGINIA
ROBIN K. MOSER, OF VIRGINIA
SUPRANORM MULVEY, OF VIRGINIA
ANGELA LOUISE NEAL, OF MARYLAND
DATHANH T. NGUYEN, OF VIRGINIA
MBALLE M. NKEMBE, OF PENNSYLVANIA
MIRIAM NOVIK, OF MARYLAND
ANDREW MICHAEL NOZNESKY, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
MAUREEN A. O'NEILL, OF CALIFORNIA
MATTHEW LANG OSBORNE, OF VIRGINIA
ALICE N. PATERAS, OF FLORIDA
JOAN D. PATTERSON, OF UTAH
EMILY S. PETERS, OF VIRGINIA
CRAIG T. PIKE, OF VIRGINIA
CHRISTOPHER G. PIXLEY, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
LORI B. PORTER, OF MARYLAND
NADA N. PROUTY, OF VIRGINIA
MICHAEL P. RAHILL, OF VIRGINIA
LISA BETH RAYMOND, OF MARYLAND
GREGORY L. ROBERTS, OF VIRGINIA
RICHARD MILLER ROBERTS, OF TEXAS
THERON P. ROBISON, OF VIRGINIA
HEATHER MARIE ROGERS, OF MINNESOTA
ZACHARIAH L. ROLLINS, OF VIRGINIA
EMILY VICTORIA RONEK, OF NEW YORK
WAYNE M. ROSEN, OF VIRGINIA
MARK T. RYNAK, OF VIRGINIA
BRIAN J. SALVERSON, OF CALIFORNIA
THOMAS MICHAEL SCHMIDT, OF MISSOURI
WAYNE D. SCHMIDT, OF IDAHO
LEO A. SERVELLO, OF VIRGINIA
GREGORY M. SHAFFER, OF VIRGINIA
TRACY L. SHOLES, OF MARYLAND
MIMI L. SMITH, OF FLORIDA
TRISTAN M. SPICELAND, OF WASHINGTON
KIMBERLY L. STERGULZ, OF VIRGINIA
DAVID J. STRASHNOY, OF CALIFORNIA

TODD STRUMKE, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE	AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION
ANDREA R. TALLEY, OF TEXAS	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:	601:
MAURA L. TIERNEY, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	DEPARTMENT OF STATE	<i>To be lieutenant general</i>
WILLIAM R. UDELL, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	HEATHER ANN SCHILDGE, OF VIRGINIA	MAJ. GEN. MAURICE L. MCFANN, JR., 0000
KURT WESTON UPDEGRAFF, OF VIRGINIA	DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY	IN THE ARMY
BRIAN J. WEISS, OF VIRGINIA	BARBARA MATTHEWS, OF VIRGINIA	THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT
JENNIFER A. WHITE, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	IN THE AIR FORCE	IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDI-
MARINA S. WHITE, OF MARYLAND	THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT	CATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:
CAROL F. WILLIAMS, OF VIRGINIA	IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDI-	<i>To be brigadier general</i>
JENNIFER LEIGH WILLIAMS, OF TEXAS	CATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE	COL. MICHAEL J. SILVA, 0000
PETER M. WILLIS, OF VIRGINIA		
BROCK DANIEL WILSON, OF VIRGINIA		
SUSAN ELIZABETH WILSON, OF ILLINOIS		
PETER YOON, OF VIRGINIA		