

it works, and what assistance this plan we are proposing today—how it will help the States and why it is necessary to help the States deal with our citizens, citizens of the United States of America who happen to reside in the various States.

It seems to me we do have a responsibility, that we can meet that responsibility, and, yes, I would love to have offsets, but I want to make sure the search for offsets is not what gets this off the track.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent I be allowed to speak for 10 minutes as in morning business.

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

(The remarks of Mr. WELLSTONE are printed in today's RECORD under "Morning Business.")

Mr. WELLSTONE. I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. REID. Mr. President, what is the matter before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is the Rockefeller second-degree amendment.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close the debate on the Rockefeller and others amendment No. 4316.

John D. Rockefeller IV, E. Benjamin Nelson of Nebraska, John Edwards, Paul Wellstone, Harry Reid, John F. Kerry, Blanche L. Lincoln, Richard J. Durbin, Jack Reed, Edward M. Kennedy, Susan Collins, Daniel K. Inouye, Patrick Leahy, Tom Daschle, Debbie Stabenow, Charles Schumer, Ron Wyden.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have been advised that Senators GRASSLEY and GRAMM wish to come to the floor and speak on the Rockefeller amendment. I am also advised that one of the Senators is going to raise a point of order, which we will attempt to waive. But we need them here to do that. I am sure they will be here soon.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. CANTWELL). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Madam President, it is my understanding we now are on the Rockefeller amendment. Is that right?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

The Senator from Texas.

Mr. GRAMM. Under section 205 of H. Con. Res. 290, I raise a point of order against the emergency designation of section (c) of the pending amendment, No. 4316.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I move to waive section 205 of the Budget Act. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is pending.

Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I have spoken to Senator GRAMM. He and others wish to speak. This is a debatable motion. We will set some time. Senator GRAMM has graciously acknowledged he doesn't want to speak too long since we already have a cloture motion filed. But we will shortly determine how much time will be needed and will debate this in the morning and vote sometime in the morning.

Hopefully, while we are waiting on the unanimous consent agreement to get the legislative branch appropriations bill, which also kicks in the fact that prior to next Wednesday—or on next Wednesday I should say, we will start debating the DOD appropriations bill.

So we have a lot to do in the next few days. This will move us down the road.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. CANTWELL). Without objection, it is so ordered.

VIOLENCE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, I and other Members of the Senate from time to time have taken the floor to address the tragedies which daily, weekly, monthly, and yearly come forth in the Middle East. Today, we were greeted by a headline in the Washington Post: U.S. Decries Israeli Missile Strike, Ponders The Effect On The Peace Bid.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

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

(See Exhibit 1.)

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, again, I have taken the floor several times to give just one Senator's viewpoint. I am almost at a loss for words to describe the tragic situation that has unfolded in the past 24 hours, or 36 hours—whatever the case may be—where a plane that was manufactured here in the United States delivered a missile into a residential area controlled by the Palestinians and brought about the deaths of many innocent people.

It is characterized and described at length in the article which appeared in this paper and the papers across the world today.

The raid, as told by the reports, took the life of an individual who has brought about great harm to the people of Israel over a long period, but along with that life went the lives of many children and innocent people.

Preceding this use of force—again, use of force which is perceived by the Israeli leadership as necessary to protect the integrity of their sovereign nation and the safety of the people, and I will not debate that at this point in time—preceding this event were the tragic bombings by humans going into the Israeli areas with the bombs strapped to them giving up their lives and taking the lives of innocent people on the streets. And on and on it goes.

What do we do about it?

I reiterate that I have spoken about this on this floor several times, and I intend to this time formalize it in a letter which I will be sending perhaps tonight or early tomorrow morning to the President of the United States. The thoughts in that letter are basically the same thoughts that I have said on this floor two or three times, and also at the time that the NATO Ambassadors came to visit the Congress of the United States. We had an informal meeting hosted by several of our colleagues. I was invited to speak. The very thoughts that I am referring to tonight I shared in that meeting some 2 weeks ago.

Our Nation recently celebrated our traditional Fourth of July holiday. It is normally a time of joyful reflection of our history, of patriotism, and just plain, old-fashioned summer fun. Thankfully, it was a peaceful day for America. But when we entered that holiday period, I remember so well that we were confronted with yet another warning by responsible individuals in our Government of a possible terrorist attack. In varying degrees in varying places here in our great United States, it had a dampening effect. I remember that so well.

A number of constituents—who I am proud to represent in Virginia, which adjoins the Nation's Capital—called to inquire whether it was safe to go down and watch the fireworks on The Mall. We gave them encouragement, in our opinion, to do so.

I myself was in the area during part of that day. Indeed, there was an enormous outpouring of our citizens and visitors from all around the world who enjoyed those fireworks that night. I say that thankfully it was a peaceful day. But we ended that holiday period confronted with that warning.

It is, indeed, prudent that our citizens be warned of such threats. There is no criticism of what I believe is a very responsible and prudent program of persons in our Government entrusted to make the decision to alert our people when they have reason to believe because of intelligence gathering that they should promulgate those warnings.

I, however, have to ask myself: Do these warnings continue indefinitely? Will people begin to ask of me and my colleagues, of our President and of all those in positions of authority, what is the root cause of this hatred towards the United States? Are we in leadership positions doing everything we can to learn of those causes, to lessen that hatred, to tell the truth about America's cause for freedom, and how our men and women of the Armed Forces—as the Presiding Officer knows so well having served in the military himself—have gone forth from our shores throughout these 200-plus years of this Republic only in the cause of freedom—never have taken a square mile of property and kept it. Temporarily, we have administered certain geographic areas throughout our history, but never used force to acquire land to augment this Nation.

People will begin to say: Has our Government done everything it can do? I think our President has exhibited—in the past, today, and will in the future—extraordinary leadership, together with his principal Cabinet officers and his military men and women for whom he is Commander in Chief.

The scourge of terrorism in the 21st century is a complex and multifaceted problem. None of us fully understand all the root causes and all the means with which we have to deal with it.

This Chamber, hopefully next week, will resonate with a strong debate on the bill for homeland defense. We will soon be giving final approval to the division in the military of commander in chief, forces north. Just think, Mr. President, CINC, commander in chief, for homeland defense, which means marshaling all the military assets and other assets of this Nation to try to protect our citizens against further terrorist attack.

There is not a single cause for this terrorism and hatred but many, including disparate economic development around the world, lack of political and economic opportunity in many regions, the alarming spread of radical fundamentalist religions, the dogmas, especially Islam, amongst those feeling disenfranchised from the mainstream of the world, and the tyrannical rise of ethnic conflicts after decades of repression by communists and other tyrannical regimes.

In this environment of perceived hopelessness and despair for many people, particularly the world's youth, seemingly unsolvable events continue to fan the flames of anger and hatred that lead to irrational acts, acts which are almost beyond comprehension.

This is manifested in the individual acts of terror we witness almost daily on the streets of Israel against the freedom-loving people of the State of Israel and in the recruitment of angry young men and women into radical terrorist organizations that encourage them to vent their anger in most destructive ways, most notably human suicide of themselves and against the innocent citizens of Israel.

Israel really has no recourse but to strike back in a manner that clearly indicates not only to the Palestinians but to the rest of the world that it is a sovereign nation and has the right to exercise every possible resource of that nation to protect its people.

Solving the conditions that have bred this hate and total disregard for peaceful solutions will be complex, but it must be systematically addressed. Again, clearly, our President and his administration have shown leadership.

But is our Congress showing leadership to help? Can more be done by others? These are the questions I ponder daily.

Clearly, the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, prolonged over a period of time that none of us ever envisioned, contributes, in some measure, to the unrest and anger in the Arab world directed towards the people of this great United States of America.

I cannot quantify it—I do not think anyone else can—but clearly that conflict is part of the root cause of hatred against us, hatred which is causing us to create a brand new Department of Government, Homeland Defense, an entirely new military command, to take all types of precautions in our daily life—whether it is at the airports or people just coming to visit here in the Congress of the United States—with security measures.

This conflict between the Israelis and the Palestinians often is presented and distorted in a very biased manner to the citizens throughout that region by the media in the Arab nations. We must confront that. We must take actions which are clear to show that we want to bring about peace in that region.

We have to address the disaffection and dissatisfaction felt by the people of that region. Each act of violence by either side in this unending conflict erodes hope for the peaceful future for Israel—it is in this article—and for the peaceful future of the people in Palestine.

In fact, each act of senseless violence in the Middle East further erodes hope that someday we can be more secure here at home.

All reasonable options to bring about an end to this violence and indiscriminate loss of life must be considered. We

can never, ever abandon hope. We must act together to renew hope in this land of the Middle East, the land of faith, the land from which so much history has emanated for the rest of the world.

One option I believe must be considered—and I said this many times here on the floor—is the use of NATO peacekeepers. But that can only be achieved if certain criteria are met.

First, I call upon the administration to explore, with the other member nations of NATO: Are they willing to take on this task, a task with unknown risks? Clearly there are risks, but the quantum of risk is unknown. Are they willing to take it on if these conditions are met—first, the people of Palestine and the people of Israel, ask them to take on this obligation to maintain conditions of stability. That is the first.

Second, if both the Palestinian people and the people of Israel, through their respected, elected leaders, will pledge to cooperate in every way with those NATO forces.

Now, Mr. President, there is a perception in the world that the Europeans are more sympathetic to the Palestinian causes, and that we here in the United States are more sympathetic to the Israeli causes. But NATO bonds us together, as we have been for these 50 years, in one constituted force.

And we would then go, as a constituted military organization, for the stated purpose, only, of trying to bring about stability, so that the diplomatic discussions, not only between the leaders of the Palestinian people and the leaders of the Israeli people can commence, but other leaders in the world, who desire, can step up.

There are those who have looked at this problem, and I respect them, and they disagree. I ask unanimous consent an article by a noted author, Mr. Kagan, be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 2.)

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Washington Post, July 24, 2002]

U.S. DECRIES ISRAELI MISSILE STRIKE, PONDERS EFFECT ON PEACE BID

(By Karen DeYoung)

The White House yesterday denounced Israel's missile strike in a densely populated area in the Gaza Strip as "heavy-handed" and described it as "a deliberate attack against a building in which civilians were known to be located."

Rejecting Israel's contention that it did not intend to kill innocents with a strike that was directed against a leader of the Hamas militant group, spokesman Ari Fleischer said. "These were apartment buildings that were targeted." In addition to Salah Shehada, the intended target, the missile fired from an Israeli F-16 warplane killed 14 other people, most of them under the age of 11, and injured about 150.

Although President Bush continues "to be a lead defender of Israel around the world and will speak out about Israel's right to self-defense," Fleischer said, "this is an instance in which the United States and Israel do not see eye to eye."

The Monday night attack was widely condemned in Europe and the Arab world. Many, particularly in Arab capitals, said it demonstrated that the government of Israeli Prime Minister Ariel Sharon was trying to undercut recent progress in the Middle East peace process.

The attack appeared initially to have stunned U.S. officials involved in peace efforts. They said they had no warning of Israel's plans despite talks here Monday between high-level representatives of the two governments. By yesterday, shock had turned to depression and uncertainty over where the process would go.

"There is considerable agreement that this represents something really problematic, something unique," one administration official said.

U.S. reaction to the attack, which occurred around 7 p.m. Washington time, was delayed until there was a clear picture of what had happened, the official said. After a flurry of telephone calls to the region, "within an hour, we knew what we were dealing with. Then discussions began on how to respond."

Talks Monday night among Secretary of State Colin L. Powell; his deputy, Richard L. Armitage; and William Burns, the assistant secretary for the region, were quickly joined by national security adviser Condoleezza Rice and her deputy, Stephen Hadley. While acknowledging deep and longstanding differences between the State Department and the White House over Middle East policy, the official said, "this particular time, there was agreement across the board."

Under the rhetorical code that has long surrounded statements on the Middle East, the United States normally "condemns" Palestinian terrorist attacks and uses the somewhat softer verb, "deplore," to criticize Israeli actions.

Officials considered, then rejected, condemning the Israelis or describing their actions as "counterproductive" before settling on "heavy-handed," as something they believed "captured the deploring," as one official put it.

It was decided that Daniel C. Kurtzer, the U.S. ambassador to Israel, would deliver the message to Sharon. U.S. officials here described that discussion yesterday as unpleasant, and said Sharon said little in private that differed from his description of the attack as "one of our major successes."

White House public comment was left to Fleischer, and Bush made no statement yesterday on the attack. "The president views this as a heavy-handed action that is not consistent with dedication to peace in the Middle East," Fleischer said.

Asked why Israel's action in Gaza was different from U.S. attacks against al Qaeda fighters in Afghanistan that resulted in the loss of innocent civilian lives—a comparison Israel has made—Fleischer replied: "It isn't accurate to compare the two. . . . There are going to be losses of innocents in times of war, and I think that's recognized around the world."

"What's important is, in pursuit of the military objectives, as the United States does in Afghanistan, to always exercise every restraint to minimize those losses of life," Fleischer said. "But in this case, what happened in Gaza was a knowing attack against a building in which innocents were found."

European Union foreign policy chief Javier Solana called the attack an "extra-judicial killing operation" that "comes at a time when both Israelis and Palestinians were working very seriously to curb violence and restore cooperative security arrangements."

Solana represents the EU in the "quartet" group on the Middle East that also includes

Powell, U.N. Secretary General Kofi Annan and Russian Foreign Minister Igor Ivanov.

Annan issued a statement late Monday deploring the attack, saying, "Israel has the legal and moral responsibility to take all measures to avoid the loss of innocent life; it clearly failed to do so."

There was no direct contact yesterday between Powell and the other quartet members, and no one seemed to have a clear idea how to proceed beyond waiting for the immediate fallout—including widely expected Palestinian retaliation—and its unpredictable impact on the wider peace process.

After months in which the process has been frozen, and despite Palestinian terrorist attacks against Israeli civilians as recently as last week, significant recent progress had been reported.

Plans to restructure the Palestinian Authority's security and financial infrastructure and prepare for elections in January were near completion. Israeli Foreign Minister Shimon Peres met with senior Palestinian officials last weekend for the first time in months, amid signs that Israeli troops would begin to withdraw from occupied Palestinian cities.

Egypt, Saudi Arabia and Jordan, the Arab countries most active in the peace process, all condemned the Israeli action. Egyptian Foreign Minister Ahmed Maher called it a "war crime," and his Saudi counterpart, Saud Faisal, said it was "a repulsive act that will be registered against [Sharon] in history."

EXHIBIT 2

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 18, 2002]

CAN NATO PATROL PALESTINE?

(By Robert Kagan)

When Pulitzer-Prize winning New York Times columnist Tom Friedman talks, people listen. Now one of Friedman's most radical ideas—to put a NATO peacekeeping force on the ground between the Israelis and Palestinians as a key part of an overall peace settlement—is actually starting to pick up steam around the world. U.N. Secretary General Kofi Annan has endorsed the idea of an international force as part of a settlement that would be imposed on Israel and the Palestinians. So has German Foreign Minister Joschka Fischer. More important, Secretary of State Colin Powell is believed to be mulling such a plan. He has publicly talked about putting American observers on the ground. Even some Israelis have warmed to the idea, provided of course that any force includes American troops. After Europe's lynching of Israel these past few weeks, that's the only army they trust.

Friedman's idea deserves to be taken seriously. And to those of us who have supported American troop deployments for peacekeeping in Bosnia, Kosovo, Haiti and elsewhere over the past decade, peacekeeping in the Middle East seems at least as worthy, in principal. Our strategic interest in a stable peace there is clear, and so is the moral case for doing something to end the bloodshed, defend the Israeli democracy and given the Palestinians a chance for a better life. After Sept. 11, we have to engage in peacekeeping and nation-building in messy places such as Afghanistan and, one hopes, post-Saddam Iraq, whether we like it or not. So why not in the Palestinian territories?

But if the idea of a U.S.-led force between Israel and a Palestinian state is starting to get serious attention, it's time for Friedman and others to spell out what exactly they have in mind, and with a little more candor about the costs and risks.

Take the size and role of the force, for instance. To carry out its mission and avoid disaster, the American force would have to

be, as they say in the military, "robust." For one thing, the demarcation line between Israelis and Palestinians that will have to be patrolled and controlled will be long, twisty, and difficult. For another thing, Americans are going to be the prime target for terrorist attacks. Friedman denies this, arguing that the Palestinian people will view the Americans as saviors—they will be "the midwife of a Palestinian state." But Hamas, Hezbollah and Islamic Jihad probably won't see it that way. Rallying to the cry of "Remember Beirut!" they'll look for ways to take out another 240 Marines. And they'll have help from Iran, Iraq, al Qaeda and all other jihadists out there.

That means any American force will have to be big—10,000 to 20,000 troops, with another 10,000 to 20,000 backing them up. And they'll have to be heavily armed. Potential attackers will need to be intimidated by American firepower every day and every night for as many years as it takes. And that means Tom Friedman and Kofi Annan and Joschka Fischer will need to become full-time lobbyists for massive increases in the American defense budget, because right now we have neither the troops nor the money to carry out their plan.

Now for the hard part. Let's say we get a peace agreement and we put the peacekeeping force on the ground between the Israelis and Palestinians. What happens when, despite all our best efforts, the occasional Hamas suicide bomber gets through anyway and commits the occasional massacre in Jerusalem or Tel Aviv? Count on it: This will happen. And what about when Hezbollah tries to use the new Palestinian state created by the peace settlement the way it now uses southern Lebanon, as a convenient place from which to launch Katyusha rockets at Israeli population centers? What do we do then?

Friedman et al. can't wish this problem away. And the options are less than enticing. One option is that the American-led peacekeeping force does nothing. But then we will have effectively created an American shield for terrorist attacks against Israel. This, by the way, was exactly the role a U.N. peacekeeping force played in Lebanon for several years in the late 1970s and early '80s, right up until the Israeli army invaded Lebanon and pushed the U.N. force (known as UNIFIL) aside.

Option two is that the peacekeeping force could, like UNIFIL, just get out of the way and let the Israeli military retaliate for any terrorist attacks. Then at least American forces wouldn't be helping the terrorist attack Israel. They'd be helping Israel attack the state of Palestine. That's how it would look to the Palestinians, anyway. So much for the Americans as saviors.

Option three is that the American-led force goes to war. We tell the Israelis to hold their fire and then send our own forces in to stop the terrorists. In essence, we take on the job the Israelis are currently doing in the territories. This prevents the outbreak of a new Israeli-Palestinian conflict—and begins the first round of the U.S.-Palestinian conflict. Maybe that's kind of progress, but it's not very attractive.

Is there another option I'm missing? If not, the proposal for an international peacekeeping force looks less like a real plan than a desperate if noble attempt to solve the insoluble in the Middle East—a *deus ex America* summoned to provide a miracle when all roads to peace have reached a dead end. Even Ehud Barak's idea of building a very, very big fence between Israel and the Palestinians looks better. Help us out, Tom.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I yield to our leaders. They have an important matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—H.R. 5121 AND H.R. 5010

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, let me compliment the distinguished Senator from Virginia on his remarks. I appreciate very much his willingness to yield the floor for this unanimous consent request.

I have been consulting with the distinguished Republican leader for the last several hours with regard to additional work on appropriations bills. We are now in a position to offer a unanimous consent request with regard to at least two more of these bills.

I ask unanimous consent that the majority leader, following consultation with the Republican leader, may proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 504, H.R. 5121, the legislative branch appropriations bill; that debate on the bill and the committee amendment be limited to 30 minutes equally divided and controlled between the chair and ranking member of the subcommittee; that immediately after the bill is reported, the text of the Senate committee-reported bill be inserted at the appropriate place in the bill; that the only first-degree amendments in order be those enumerated in this agreement, with the debate time limited to 10 minutes each, equally divided and controlled in the usual form; except that the Dodd and Specter amendments listed below not have a time limitation; that they be subject to relevant second-degree amendments that would also not be subject to a time limit; that upon disposition of these amendments, the bill be read a third time and the Senate then vote on passage of the bill, as amended; that upon passage, the Senate insist on its amendment and request a conference with the House; that the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate, without further intervening action or debate; provided further that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 505, H.R. 5010, the Department of Defense appropriations bill, no later than Wednesday, July 31—Durbin amendment regarding Capitol Police; Cochran amendment regarding congressional awards; Landrieu amendment regarding bicentennial commission; Specter amendment regarding mass mailings; Dodd amendment regarding mobile offices.

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

The Republican leader.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, with the unanimous consent agreement, I do want to get one clarification as to my understanding with Senator DASCHLE. First, I appreciate the work that has been done on this matter. I think it will help us move the legislative process forward, get some appropriations bills done, get the legislative appropriations done, but not too far down

this pike without doing the Department of Defense appropriations bill. This is a way to get both of them done and hopefully maybe even some other action before we leave. I want to make sure we understand that the intent is to complete the Department of Defense appropriations bill prior to the recess; is that correct?

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, that is correct. I would also note something the Senator mentioned: It is important for us not to consider this the complete list. It would be my hope, if we could entertain other unanimous consent requests regarding additional appropriations bills—we expect that that possibility could also be one we would want to entertain. My expectation and determination would be to complete work on the DOD appropriations bill next week.

Mr. LOTT. I yield the floor.

Mr. DASCHLE. I yield the floor and thank my colleagues.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

ORDER FOR NO SECOND-DEGREE AMENDMENTS—H.R. 5121

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I want to clarify that with respect to the agreement on the legislative branch appropriations bill, there are no second-degree amendments in order to the Durbin, Cochran, or Landrieu amendments. I ask unanimous consent that be the order.

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

CONFERRING HONORARY CITIZENSHIP OF THE UNITED STATES ON THE MARQUIS DE LAFAYETTE

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, with the consent of the leadership on both sides, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House on the joint resolution, S.J. Res. 13, conferring honorary citizenship of the United States on Paul Yves Roch Gilbert du Motier, also known as the Marquis de Lafayette.

The Presiding Officer laid before the Senate the following message from the House of Representatives:

S.J. RES. 13

Resolved, That the joint resolution from the Senate (S.J. Res. 13) entitled "Joint resolution conferring honorary citizenship of the United States on Paul Yves Roch Gilbert du Motier, also known as the Marquis de Lafayette", do pass with the following amendments:

Strike out all after the resolving clause and insert:

That Marie Joseph Paul Yves Roche Gilbert du Motier, the Marquis de Lafayette, is pro-

claimed posthumously to be an honorary citizen of the United States of America.

Strike out the preamble and insert:

Whereas the United States has conferred honorary citizenship on four other occasions in more than 200 years of its independence, and honorary citizenship is and should remain an extraordinary honor not lightly conferred nor frequently granted;

Whereas Marie Joseph Paul Yves Roche Gilbert du Motier, the Marquis de Lafayette or General Lafayette, voluntarily put forth his own money and risked his life for the freedom of Americans;

Whereas the Marquis de Lafayette, by an Act of Congress, was voted to the rank of Major General;

Whereas, during the Revolutionary War, General Lafayette was wounded at the Battle of Brandywine, demonstrating bravery that forever endeared him to the American soldiers;

Whereas the Marquis de Lafayette secured the help of France to aid the United States' colonists against Great Britain;

Whereas the Marquis de Lafayette was conferred the honor of honorary citizenship by the Commonwealth of Virginia and the State of Maryland;

Whereas the Marquis de Lafayette was the first foreign dignitary to address Congress, an honor which was accorded to him upon his return to the United States in 1824;

Whereas, upon his death, both the House of Representatives and the Senate draped their chambers in black as a demonstration of respect and gratitude for his contribution to the independence of the United States;

Whereas an American flag has flown over his grave in France since his death and has not been removed, even while France was occupied by Nazi Germany during World War II; and

Whereas the Marquis de Lafayette gave aid to the United States in her time of need and is forever a symbol of freedom: Now, therefore, be it

Amend the title so as to read "Joint Resolution conferring honorary citizenship of the United States posthumously on Marie Joseph Paul Yves Roche Gilbert du Motier, the Marquis de Lafayette."

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate concur in the House amendment to the joint resolution, that the Senate concur in the amendment to the preamble, that the Senate concur in the House amendment to the title, and that the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table en bloc.

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

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, this is a matter on which I and a number of others have worked for some time. I thank my distinguished colleague from Virginia, Congressman VIRGIL GOODE, whom I asked to introduce this measure in the House. He did so with great skill. It was passed by the House. It had previously been adopted by the Senate, but now the House bill has been adopted by the Senate. Hopefully it will be forthcoming to the President for signature.

I rise in support of this resolution which has been an idea I have had for many years.

It bestows honorary citizenship on the Marquis de Lafayette. I think it is an honor long overdue. This great Frenchman fought with Washington, as I shall enumerate, in a battle for our independence. He was very influential in having the French Government intervene, as they did decisively, at