

detention and postrelease supervision of terrorists, and for other purposes.

S. CON. RES. 67

At the request of Mr. COCHRAN, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CORZINE) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 67, a concurrent resolution expressing the need for enhanced public awareness of traumatic brain injury and supporting the designation of a National Brain Injury Awareness Month.

S. RES. 202

At the request of Mr. CAMPBELL, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 202, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the genocidal Ukraine Famine of 1932-33.

S. RES. 209

At the request of Mr. JEFFORDS, the names of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. KOHL), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. LUGAR) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 209, a resolution recognizing and honoring Woodstock, Vermont, native Hiram Powers for his extraordinary and enduring contributions to American sculpture.

S. RES. 222

At the request of Mr. BIDEN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 222, a resolution designating October 17, 2003 as "National Mammography Day".

STATEMENTS OF INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Ms. CANTWELL:

S. 1614. A bill to designate a portion of White Salmon River as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Ms. CANTWELL. 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:

S. 1614

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Upper White Salmon Wild and Scenic Rivers Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds the following:

(1) The Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act (16 U.S.C. 544 et seq.) directed the Secretary of Agriculture to study the Upper White Salmon River for possible designation as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System.

(2) The study, conducted by the Forest Service, included extensive public involvement by a broadly inclusive task force.

(3) The study determined that the Upper White Salmon River and its tributary, Cascade Creek, are eligible for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System

based on their free-flowing condition and outstandingly remarkable scenic, hydrologic, geologic, and wildlife values.

SEC. 3 UPPER WHITE SALMON WILD AND SCENIC RIVER.

Section 3(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(a)) is amended by adding the following new paragraph at the end:

"() WHITE SALMON RIVER, WASHINGTON.—

"(A) DESIGNATION.—Segments of the main stem and Cascade Creek, totaling 20 miles, to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture as follows:

"(i) 1.6-MILE SEGMENT.—The 1.6-mile segment of the main stem of the White Salmon River from the headwaters on Mount Adams in Sec. 17, T. 8 N., R. 10 E., downstream to the Mount Adams wilderness boundary shall be administered as a wild river.

"(ii) 5.1-MILE SEGMENT.—The 5.1-mile segment of Cascade Creek from its headwaters on Mount Adams in Sec. 10, T. 8 N., R. 10 E. downstream to the Mount Adams Wilderness boundary shall be administered as a wild river.

"(iii) 1.5-MILE SEGMENT.—The 1.5 mile segment of Cascade Creek from the Mount Adams Wilderness boundary downstream to its confluence with the White Salmon River shall be administered as a scenic river.

"(iv) 11.8-MILE SEGMENT.—The 11.8-mile segment of the main stem of the White Salmon River from the Mount Adams Wilderness boundary downstream to the Gifford Pinchot National Forest boundary shall be administered as a scenic river."

SEC. 4. ADDITIONAL SECTIONS.

Nothing in this Act, or any amendment made by this Act, shall limit the suitability of the 18.4-mile segment from the Gifford Pinchot National Forest boundary to the confluence with Gilmer Creek for designation as a wild and scenic river under section 3(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(a)).

SEC. 5. MANAGEMENT.

The Secretary of Agriculture shall develop and administer the comprehensive management plan required by section 3(d)(1) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(d)(1)) for the designated sections of the Upper White Salmon River in general accordance with that portion of the preferred alternative of the Forest Service Wild and Scenic River Study Report and Final Legislative Environmental Impact Statement for the Upper White Salmon River dated July 7, 1997, addressing only the designated sections.

SEC. 6. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

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

By Mr. DASCHLE (for himself and Mr. DURBIN):

S. 1615. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to make permanent the rates of hostile fire and imminent danger special pay and family separation allowance for members of the uniformed services as increased by the Emergency Wartime Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2003; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, today, I rise to introduce a bill that is as simple as it is significant. It promises our soldiers that while they fight to protect us, we will do what we can do protect them and their families by not allowing their pay to be cut.

Each day brings a fresh reminder of the debt we owe our men and women in uniform. Today, well over 200,000 Amer-

icans are stationed abroad, many facing hostile fire in difficult conditions, thousands of miles from home. In spite of enormous difficulties, they have served magnificently, bringing honor to their families and their country.

In light of all that we read in our daily newspapers about our soldiers' heroic performance, it should be unthinkable that anyone would consider cutting their pay. But this isn't a rumor or some errant bureaucratic proposal. Unless the President and the Congress act soon, many of our soldiers will see their monthly pay reduced by as much as \$225 at the end of the current fiscal year. My legislation would help us honor the debt we owe to our soldiers by making permanent the rates of pay currently provided to our soldiers.

Unfortunately, we have received very mixed messages from the administration about their position on this issue. In July, the Defense Department issued a position paper to the Congress expressing its views on military pay and a series of other legislative proposals. According to the official Pentagon document, the Defense Department urged Congress to reduce our troops' pay. Last month, the San Francisco Chronicle, in an article entitled "Troops In Iraq Face Pay Cut," reported, "The Pentagon wants to cut the pay of its 148,000 U.S. troops in Iraq, who are already contending with guerrilla-style attacks, homesickness, and 120-degree plus heat. . . . The Defense Department supports the cuts, saying its budget can't sustain the higher payments and a host of other priorities."

Not surprisingly, these reports triggered a fire storm. The administration quickly backpedaled. Its latest position is that pay will be kept at current levels for our troops in Iraq and Afghanistan, but pay for troops deployed abroad in other countries should be cut. This does a disservice to the men and women who have chosen to risk their lives for their country and have been deployed far from their homes and their families.

At a time when we are asking so much of these troops and their families, it is inconceivable to me that this Nation can't sustain current pay levels for all troops deployed abroad and that the administration would not fully support this proposition.

The legislation would send a clear signal to all of our troops, both those deployed abroad and those facing the possibility of deployment in the coming weeks and months. This Nation recognizes and appreciates the risks they take on our behalf and we honor our commitment to them. I urge the administration and my colleagues to join with me in this effort. Our troops and their families deserve no less.

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:

S. 1615

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

SECTION 1. MAINTENANCE OF INCREASED RATE OF HOSTILE FIRE AND IMMINENT DANGER SPECIAL PAY.

(a) RATE.—Section 310(a) of title 37, United States Code, is amended by striking “\$150” and inserting “\$225”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on October 1, 2003.

SEC. 2. MAINTENANCE OF INCREASED RATE OF FAMILY SEPARATION ALLOWANCE.

(a) RATE.—Section 427(a)(1) of title 37, United States Code, is amended by striking “\$100” and inserting “\$250”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on October 1, 2003.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I have joined Senator DASCHLE in introducing a bill today that would make permanent the increases in Imminent Danger Pay and Family Separation Allowance passed by Congress in the Fiscal Year 2003 Emergency Wartime Supplemental Appropriations Act.

Last spring, when the Senate considered the Budget Resolution, it passed, by a vote of 100 to 0, an amendment I offered with Senator LANDRIEU that would have allowed for \$1 billion to cover the increase in these special pay categories.

Then when the Senate considered the Fiscal Year 2003 Emergency Wartime Supplemental Appropriations Act, it unanimously accepted an amendment I offered with Senator STEVENS and Senator INOUE, increasing these pay categories for the remainder of the fiscal year.

The amendment we offered to the supplemental, sunset these pay increases, not because we wished to end them, but simply to allow the Armed Services Committee—the Committee of Jurisdiction—to increase these pay levels in the Fiscal Year 2004 Defense Authorization bill, which it did.

Now, when soldiers are dying in Iraq and military families have been separated for many months, we hear that the administration wishes to cut these pay increases in the conference committee.

The Statement of Administration Policy on the House version of the bill objects to the provision increasing both pay categories, saying it would “divert resources unnecessarily.” The statement on the Senate bill only objects to the increase in Family Separation Allowance.

When confronted with questions about why the administration wanted to reduce these pay categories, Defense Department spokesman, Under Secretary David Chu, came up with the classic Washington non-denial denial. On August 14, Chu said:

I'd just like very quickly to put to rest what I understand has been a burgeoning rumor that somehow we are going to reduce compensation for those serving in Iraq and Afghanistan. That is not true . . .

What I think you're pointing to is one piece of a very thick technical appeal docu-

ment that speaks to the question, do we want to extend the language Congress used in the Family Separation Allowance and Imminent Danger Pay statutes. And no, we don't think we need to extend that language. That's a different statement from, are we going to reduce compensation for those in Iraq and Afghanistan . . .

What do these statements mean?

Evidently the administration wants to claim that it will keep compensation the same for those serving in Iraq and Afghanistan, through other pay categories, but does indeed intend to roll back the increases to Imminent Danger Pay and Family Separation Allowance.

This means that a soldier getting shot at fighting the war on terrorism in Yemen or the Philippines would receive less money than one who is similarly risking his or her life in Iraq. This means that a family bearing huge costs because of burdensome, long-term deployments would only be helped if the service member is deployed to Iraq or Afghanistan, but not if that same service member is deployed anywhere else in the world.

It is unfair to cut funding intended to help military families that are bearing the costs of far-flung U.S. deployments. It is unacceptable that imminent danger would be worth less in one combat zone than in another.

The bill we introduce today makes a clear statement that these pay categories should be increased permanently and should not be cut in conference.

Until these pay levels were increased in the supplemental, an American soldier, sailor, airman, or Marine who put his or her life on the line in imminent danger only received an extra \$150 per month. My amendment increased that amount to \$225 per month—still only an acknowledgment of their courage, but an increase nonetheless.

Prior to the increase in the Supplemental Appropriations bill, Family Separation had been only \$100 per month. We succeeded in raising it to \$250 per month.

These increases are only part of a normal progression of increases—for example, in 1965, Imminent Danger Pay was \$55; \$100 in 1985, and raised to \$150 in 1991. Family Separation Allowance was \$30 in 1970, \$60 in 1985, \$75 in 1991, and \$100 in 1997.

Family Separation Allowance was originally intended to pay for things that the deployed service member would have done, like cut the grass, that the spouse may then have had to hire someone to do. That may well have been appropriate in the past, but now most families have two working spouses—sometimes two working military spouses—and the absence of one or both parents may add huge child care costs that even the increased rate is unlikely to cover.

Military spouses sometimes find that they must give up their jobs or curtail their working hours in order to take up the family responsibilities that otherwise would have been shared by the missing spouse.

Examples of increased costs that families may incur when military personnel are deployed, in addition to increased child care costs, include: health care costs not covered by TRICARE; for example, the cost of counseling for children having a difficult time with their parents' deployment; costs for the family of an activated Reservist or National Guard member to travel to mobilization briefings, which may be in another state; various communication and information-gathering costs.

I would like to quote for the RECORD from an article that appeared in The Washington Post on April 11, 2003, entitled “Military Families Turn to Aid Groups,” that outlines how military families have had to rely on private aid organizations to help them when their spouses are deployed. The article highlights the case of one mother, Michele Mignosa and says:

The last 18 months have brought one mishap or another to Michelle Mignosa. Her husband, Kevin, is an Air Force reservist who since the Sept. 11, 2001, terrorist attacks has been away from their Lancaster, Calif., home almost as much as he's been there. First, there were the out-of-state trips to provide airport security. Then he was deployed to Turkey for 2½ months last spring. Now he's in Greece with an air-refueling unit. . . . And while he has been gone, the problems have piled up at home. . . . Strapped for cash since giving up her part-time job because of Kevin's frequent far-off postings, she didn't know where the money would come from to resolve yet another problem.

I applaud the efforts of private aid groups to help military families, but I believe that it is the duty of the U.S. Government to cover more of the costs incurred because of military deployments. If should not matter to which country the service member is deployed. Cuts must not be made to funds helping military families that are bearing the costs of war, homeland security, and U.S. military commitments abroad.

To say that pay will not decrease to those serving in Iraq or Afghanistan is ignoring the truth—rolling back Family Separation Allowance from \$250 per month to \$100 per month will cost our military families and could be especially painful for those living on the edge.

I urge my colleagues to support the bill that Senator DASCHLE and I introduce today and make a strong statement to the Defense Department that Congress will not stand for cutting Imminent Danger Pay and Family Separation Allowance.

By Ms. LANDRIEU:

S. 1616. A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to prevent the preemption of State community property law as it relates to nonforfeitable accrued retirement benefits; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, the Senate is expected to consider important legislation that will affect the pensions of millions of Americans and

their families during the 108th Congress. In the last Congress we provided greater security to pensions by correcting the accounting abuses that lay at the heart of the Enron and WorldCom bankruptcies—bankruptcies that caused the employees of these companies to lose their life savings and hurt the investment portfolios of thousands of individual investors.

Today, I am introducing legislation to correct a unique problem under ERISA for States with community property laws. The issue came to light in the 1997 Supreme Court decision in the case of *Boggs v. Boggs*. The Court held that ERISA preempted the application of Louisiana's community property law in the disposition of pension benefits. While the case originated in Louisiana, the holding tears a hole in the fabric of community property laws of seven other States, Texas, New Mexico, California, Arizona, Nevada, Washington, and Idaho.

Long before the women's movement, community property laws stood for the basic premise that a marriage is an economic, as well as social, child rearing partnership in which the ownership of property acquired during the marriage is shared equally. The *Boggs* case involved a husband and wife. The husband began accumulating benefits in a pension plan after they got married. The wife did not have a pension plan, but under the community property law of Louisiana, half of her husband's benefits were hers. The wife died before her husband retired, and before the plan's benefits were subject to distribution. In her will she left her interest in the pension benefits to her husband for the rest of his life, with the remaining interest to her sons for after her husband died. The husband subsequently remarried, retired, and ultimately died, leaving property to his second wife and an interest in his remaining assets to his sons. The sons attempted to enforce their State-law interest in the pension benefits bequeathed to them by their mother against the second wife. The Supreme Court held against the sons, saying that they were not beneficiaries of, nor participants in, the pension plan under ERISA.

This holding goes against the fundamental principles of community property. What the Court is saying is that although a husband's 401K plan may contain a million dollars of deferred earnings accumulated during the course of his marriage, if his wife dies before he retires, her interest terminates; she co-owns none of it. The fundamental principle of marriage as an equal partnership under community property is rendered meaningless by this decision.

The *Boggs* ruling will also lead to conflicting results in the disposition of assets at death in community property States. If, instead, the money had been put in an ordinary savings account that is not covered by ERISA, half of it would have been owned by the wife as

community property in recognition of her contribution to the marriage. At her death, she would have been free to dispose of the assets as she saw fit. Furthermore, after *Boggs*, if a couple has both a 401K plan and a savings account, upon the death of the wife the husband gets all of the 401K plan plus half of the savings account; the wife's estate gets only half of the savings account. That is not the equal outcome community property laws seek.

The legislation that I am proposing will create a narrow exception within the ERISA preemption provisions to address the circumstances under *Boggs*. Instead of losing the community property interest in any non-forfeitable accrued pension benefits at death, a spouse will retain that interest and will be able to pass that interest on to his or her heirs. This is not an exceptional change to ERISA. What I am proposing does not affect the joint and survivor annuity required by ERISA nor does it prevent the participant from having the use and enjoyment of the entire retirement asset until his death. It does not place any new burden on the retirement plan administrators. It envisions that upon the death of the participant, the State probate court will apply normal community property principles, taking into account the value of the retirement assets at the time of the participant's death, in distributing the participant's property between the heirs of the participant and the heirs of the predeceased spouse. Furthermore, each community property State will have the freedom to implement the amendment by whatever means the State deems best, including the option not to implement the amendment at all.

ERISA already contains exceptions to its preemption provisions. One applies to divorce or other Qualified Domestic Relations Orders. This exception, added to ERISA by the Retirement Equity Act of 1984, allows States to apply their community property laws or equitable division laws to retirement assets when a couple gets divorced. A divorced spouse can retain an interest in the undistributed pension assets of their ex-husband or wife. As it now stands, therefore, ERISA is more favorable to a spouse who divorced the participant before dying, than a spouse who remained married to the participant until death.

The Senate should act to reaffirm the principles of community property. My legislation upholds the basic ideal of community property law: that marriage is a partnership that values as equal the contributions of both the husband and the wife. This notion of equality holds true whether one spouse worked and the other stayed at home. I urge my colleagues to pass this legislation.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1616

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

SECTION 1. STATE COMMUNITY PROPERTY LAW RIGHT TO RETIREMENT BENEFITS NOT PREEMPTED BY ERISA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 514(b) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1144(b)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (8) and (9) as (9) and (10), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (7) the following:

“(8)(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), if—

“(i) under the community property laws of any State the spouse of a participant of a pension plan is entitled to any portion of the participant's nonforfeitable accrued benefit; and

“(ii) the spouse's interest in such benefit under such laws passed to an individual other than the participant by reason of the death of the spouse; then subsection (a) shall not apply to an order issued by a court of such State disposing of such interest.

“(B) Nothing in subparagraph (A) shall be construed to allow a claim—

“(i) for a benefit directly from a pension plan;

“(ii) against a qualified joint and survivor annuity or qualified pre-retirement survivor annuity of a surviving spouse of the participant; or

“(iii) against the participant during his or her lifetime.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this Act shall apply to orders regarding the estates of decedents dying after the date of enactment of this Act.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself and Ms. SNOWE):

S. 1617. A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide comprehensive pension protection for women; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, it's a privilege to join Senator SNOWE in introducing the Women's Pension Protection Act of 2003, and I commend her for her commitment.

Retirement security is essential for all Americans, but too often we have failed to meet the needs of women on this basic issue. Women live longer than men, but they continue to earn far less in wages over their lifetimes. Women are much less likely to benefit from the private pension system. Just as women receive less pay and less recognition of their contributions in the workplace, they also receive fewer retirement benefits.

Women's lack of retirement security is based in the unfair treatment they face in the workplace. Women still earn only 76 percent of the wages of men, and this gap in pay leads to hundreds of thousands of dollars in lower pay over their careers. Women are twice as likely as men to work in part-time jobs without benefits. They are much more likely to spend time out of the workforce to meet their family responsibilities. All of these factors translate into seriously inadequate retirement income for vast numbers of women.

The realities of this injustice are grim. According to the most recent Census data, fewer than 20 percent of women age 65 and over are receiving private pension income—and these women are receiving an average of only \$4,200 a year in such income, compared with \$7,800 for men. Minority women are in even more desperate straits—only 15 percent of African-American women and 8 percent of Hispanic women receive pension income.

As a result of these lower wages, longer lifespans and unfair pensions, nearly one in five older single women are living in poverty.

Almost twenty years ago, we modified federal pension laws to provide greater protections for women in their retirements. The Retirement Equity Act of 1984 required defined benefit pension plans to pay survivor benefits, unless the spouse waived this protection. The time has come to extend and expand these protections. In many cases, the amount a spouse receives as a survivor benefit is often far too little to provide adequate support. The existing protections do not cover 401(k) and other defined contribution plans—which are now the only retirement assistance for over half of the American who have private pensions.

Under the legislation we are introducing today, women will have greater retirement security. They will have greater say in the management of their husband's 401(k) funds. Widows will have more generous survivor benefits. Divorced women will have a greater ability to receive a share of their former husband's pension after a divorce. Our legislation offer long overdue improvements in the private system, so that retirement savings programs are more responsive to the realities of women's lives and careers. Congress must do all it can to strengthen women's retirement security and end the many inequities that affect women in our current pension laws. I urge my colleagues to support the Women's Pension Protection Act.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 225—COMMEMORATING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND BULGARIA

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

S. RES. 225

Whereas the United States established diplomatic relations with the Republic of Bulgaria on September 19, 1903;

Whereas the United States acknowledges the courage of the Bulgarian people in deciding to pursue a free, democratic, and independent Bulgaria and the steadfast perseverance of the Bulgarian people in building a society based on democratic values, the rule of law, respect for human rights, and a free market economy;

Whereas the Bulgarian people, including Bulgarian civil and religious leaders, bravely protected 50,000 Bulgarian Jews from deportation and extermination during the Holocaust;

Whereas Bulgaria has supported stability in the Balkans by rendering support to Operation Allied Force and Operation Joint Guardian led by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), and by providing peacekeeping troops to the Stabilisation Force in Bosnia and Herzegovina and to the Kosovo Force in Kosovo;

Whereas Bulgaria was among the very first countries to denounce terrorism and pledge active support to the United States in the fight against terrorism following the events of September 11, 2001;

Whereas Bulgaria provided overflight and basing rights at the town of Burgas for Operation Enduring Freedom and Bulgaria deployed a military unit to Afghanistan as part of the International Security Assistance Force;

Whereas Bulgaria has stood firmly by the United States in the cause of advancing freedom worldwide during its tenure as a non-permanent member of the United Nations Security Council;

Whereas Bulgaria met each request of the United States relating to overflight and basing rights as well as transit of United States and coalition forces, and deployed a 500-man infantry battalion as part of a stabilization force in Iraq;

Whereas in November 2003, Bulgaria was invited to join NATO and has shown determination in enacting the continued reforms necessary to be a productive, contributing member of the Alliance;

Whereas Bulgaria strongly supports the strengthening of trans-Atlantic relations and considers the relations to be a basis for NATO unity and cooperation in countering new threats to global security; and

Whereas in May 2003, the Senate gave its consent with 96 votes to 0 for the ratification of the accession protocols of Bulgaria and 6 other aspirant countries from Central and Eastern Europe to NATO, thereby welcoming their contribution to common trans-Atlantic security: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the 100 years of diplomatic relations between the United States and Bulgaria;

(2) commends the Republic of Bulgaria for developing increasingly friendly and broadly based relations with the United States, which are now the most favorable in the history of United States-Bulgaria relations;

(3) recognizes Bulgaria's continued contributions towards bringing peace, stability, and prosperity to the region of southeastern Europe, including the contributions of Bulgaria to regional security and democratic stability;

(4) salutes Bulgaria's willing cooperation and increasingly vital role as a valuable ally in the war against international terrorism;

(5) highlights the importance of Bulgaria's active participation in regional initiatives such as the Stability Pact for Southeast Europe, the Southeast Europe Cooperative Initiative, and the Southeast Europe Cooperation Process, and the various projects of those initiatives, which are focused on fighting crime and corruption, increasing trade, improving the investment climate, and generally preparing Bulgaria and Southeast Europe as a whole for eventual membership in the European Union; and

(6) encourages opportunities for greater cooperation between the United States and Bulgaria in the political, military, economic, and cultural spheres.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 68—HONORING THE LIFE OF JOHNNY CASH

Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself, Mr. FRIST, Mrs. LINCOLN, and Mr. PRYOR) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was ordered held at the desk.

S. CON. RES. 68

Whereas Johnny Cash was one of the most influential and recognized voices of American music throughout the world, whose influence spanned generations and musical genres;

Whereas Johnny Cash was born on February 26, 1932, in Kingsland, Arkansas, and moved with his family at the age of 3 to Dyess, Arkansas, where the family farmed 20 acres of cotton and other seasonal crops;

Whereas those early years in the life of Johnny Cash inspired songs such as "Look at Them Beans" and "Five Feet High and Rising";

Whereas Johnny Cash eventually released more than 70 albums of original material in his lifetime, beginning with his first recording in 1955 with the Tennessee Two;

Whereas Johnny Cash was a devoted husband to June Carter Cash, a father of 5 children, and a grandfather;

Whereas Johnny Cash received extensive recognition for his contributions to the musical heritage of the Nation, including membership in the Grand Old Opry; induction into the Nashville Songwriters Hall of Fame, the Country Music Hall of Fame, and the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame; and his receipt of numerous awards, including Kennedy Center Honors, 11 Grammy awards, and the 2001 National Medal of Arts;

Whereas Johnny Cash embodied the creativity, innovation, and social conscience that define American music;

Whereas Johnny Cash was a vocal champion of the downtrodden, the working man, and Native Americans; and

Whereas the Nation has lost one of its most prolific and influential musicians with the death of Johnny Cash on September 12, 2003, in Nashville, Tennessee: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Congress—

(1) honors the life and accomplishments of Johnny Cash;

(2) recognizes and honors Johnny Cash for his invaluable contributions to the Nation, Tennessee, and our musical heritage; and

(3) extends its condolences to the Cash family on the death of a remarkable man.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, today I am introducing a concurrent resolution honoring Johnny Cash.

Johnny Cash died on Friday in Nashville. The man whose singing voice sounded like a big freight train coming, is gone. The concurrent resolution I introduce today is on behalf of my colleague, the majority leader, Senator BILL FRIST of Tennessee, the Senators from Arkansas, Mrs. LINCOLN and Mr. PRYOR, and the distinguished Senator ROBERTS, who probably knows the words to "I Walk the Line," as do most of us all over the world.

Johnny Cash lived a little bit outside of Nashville. I was in his home one time and I asked him: Johnny, how many nights do you perform on the road?

He looked at me with some surprise. He said: Oh, about 300 a year.

Why do you do that, I asked him in amazement?