

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Madam President, I rise to speak in support of the nomination and confirmation of someone for whom I have a great deal of respect, Susan Braden, to be a Judge for the U.S. Court of Federal Claims. I cannot think of a better person for this court. She is currently counsel at Baker & McKenzie. She earned her bachelor degree in 1970 and her law degree in 1973 from Case Western Reserve University. She has worked as a trial attorney in the Department of Justice. She has served as a senior attorney at the Federal Trade Commission. For the past 18 years, she has had a distinguished career in the private sector, specializing in Federal litigation, antitrust, international trade practices, and intellectual property.

Her work on international trade gave her the opportunity to accompany a delegation led by Justices O'Connor, Kennedy, Ginsburg, and Breyer on an official visit to several European courts in 1998.

She is very qualified, and I wish to say on a personal note that she and her husband, Tom Sussman, have been friends of mine for a long time. I went to law school with Tom Sussman. I have a great deal of respect for both Tom and Susan, and I urge my colleagues to support this qualified nominee. She will be a wonderful public servant.

Madam President, I urge approval of the three nominees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, I wish to add my comments to the confirmation of Susan Braden. I happen to know her. She represented a business in the steel industry in Alabama that was in trouble. We tried to save it for the State. She worked so hard with the union members and with the company. I came to be extraordinarily impressed with her dedication, her legal skill, her love of law, and her integrity. I think she will do an excellent job in this important position.

I wanted to add my comments that we need more people like Susan Braden in the courts of America. I think she will do a super job. I am very proud of her on this special day.

I yield the floor.

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I rise today in support of the confirmation of Susan Braden, who has been nominated to serve as a judge on the U.S. Court of Federal Claims. Ms. Braden has the breadth of experience and accomplishment we look for in a Federal judge, and I commend President Bush for nominating her.

After graduating from law school, Ms. Braden served for 7 years as a trial attorney, and then as a senior trial attorney, for the Department of Justice Antitrust Division. She then worked at the Federal Trade Commission for 5 years as a senior attorney advisor and senior counsel to Chairman David Clanton and Chairman James Miller III. In this capacity, she assumed re-

sponsibility for special policy and legislative projects, such as drafting a potential set of guidelines concerning interlocking directorates and issues concerning enforcement of the antitrust laws to professionals.

Ms. Braden has worked in the private sector for the past 18 years, where she has focused on antitrust law, complex civil litigation, international trade matters for industrial clients, and computer software litigation. Her experience will serve her well on the bench. I am confident that she will execute her duties on the bench with integrity, intelligence, and fairness. I ask my colleagues to join me in my unqualified support for her nomination.

NOMINATION OF MARY ELLEN COSTER WILLIAMS

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I am pleased today to speak in support of Mary Ellen Coster Williams, who has been nominated to the U.S. Court of Federal Claims.

Judge Williams has served with distinction on both sides of the bench. Upon her graduation from Duke University Law School in 1977, she worked in private practice with Fulbright & Jaworski and with Schnader, Harrison, Segal & Lewis.

Judge Williams then left private practice in 1983 to work in the Civil Division of the United States Attorney's Office in Washington, DC. She returned to private practice in 1987 as a partner with Janis, Schuelke & Wechsler.

During her 8 years in private practice and 3½ years as an Assistant United States Attorney, Judge Williams gained valuable experience handling matters involving Government contracts, employment law, torts, and commercial litigation. Since 1989, she has served as an administrative judge on the General Services Administration Board of Contract Appeals.

Judge Williams was named a Life Fellow by the American Bar Association and is currently the vice chair of the ABA Section on Public Contract Law. She also has been active in the District of Columbia Bar Association. Since 1997, she has served on the U.S. Court of Federal Claims Advisory Council, so she has much more than simply a passing familiarity with the court to which she has been nominated.

With her wealth of experience and dedication, Judge Williams is well equipped to serve on the Court of Federal Claims. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting her nomination.

NOMINATION OF CHARLES F. LETTOW

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I rise today to express my full support for the confirmation of Charles F. Lettow, who has been nominated to the U.S. Court of Federal Claims.

Mr. Lettow is an excellent selection to join the Court of Federal Claims. He has a strong academic background and more than 30 years of litigation experience in constitutional and administrative law matters. A graduate of Stanford Law School, Mr. Lettow clerked for both the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals and the U.S. Supreme Court be-

fore taking a position in 1970 as Counsel to the Council on Environmental Quality, which was established by Congress a year earlier. His responsibilities included drafting legislation and Executive orders and working to negotiate bilateral agreements.

In 1973 Mr. Lettow joined the firm of Cleary Gottlieb as a litigation associate, became a partner three years later, and has remained with the firm since that time, focusing on Federal litigation and environmental cases. Cases he has handled over his career have presented often difficult questions of constitutional and administrative law, and he has handled them with expertise.

Mr. Lettow has argued before the U.S. Supreme Court three times and in the U.S. Courts of Appeals in more than 40 cases, as well as litigated in numerous Federal district courts and the U.S. Court of Federal Claims. I cannot imagine someone who is better prepared to sit on the Court of Federal Claims. I urge my colleagues to vote for his confirmation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the nominations are confirmed, en bloc, the motions to reconsider are laid upon the table, the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now return to legislative session.

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

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

#### FOREIGN RELATIONS AUTHORIZATION ACT, FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of S. 925, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 925) to authorize appropriations for the Department of State and international broadcasting activities for fiscal year 2004 and for the Peace Corps for fiscal years 2004 through 2007, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1136

Mr. LUGAR. Madam President, I send a substitute amendment to S. 925 to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. LUGAR] proposes an amendment numbered 1136.

Mr. LUGAR. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the 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.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. LUGAR. Madam President, today the Senate will be considering S. 925, the State Department authorization bill. During the last 4 months, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has been working hard on issues related to the funding and operations of the State Department. We have held hearings on public diplomacy, embassy security, the role of the State Department in the war on terrorism, the nonproliferation programs overseen by the State Department, and the overall State Department budget. In numerous other hearings and briefings covering such issues as Iraq, North Korea, Afghanistan, and NATO, we have reviewed the vital role of diplomacy at this stage of our United States history.

In our hearings and through our daily contacts with the State Department, the Foreign Relations Committee has witnessed the commitment and the skill of departmental personnel as they work to improve national security and our prosperity in increasingly difficult and often very dangerous circumstances.

We have seen both the benefits of our successes and the consequences of our failures. We cannot expect diplomacy to succeed 100 percent of the time, but it is vital that our diplomats have the resources and the capabilities that will maximize their chances of success. That is the job of the Senate today. We must make certain that Secretary Powell and this Department have the tools they need to make our case convincingly.

I wish to thank especially the ranking member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator JOE BIDEN, for his strong support of this process and his leadership in foreign policy matters. We have agreed on the vast majority of provisions in this bill, and when we have disagreed, we have worked hard to bridge our differences and find bipartisan solutions with our colleagues.

We have always shared the common goal of bringing good legislation to the floor for the Senate's judgment. Senator BIDEN's commitment to this process and his innumerable contributions to the substance of this bill have been indispensable.

After consultations with Senator BIDEN and the majority leader, we determined the Senate would best be served by adding the foreign assistance authorization bill, passed by the Foreign Relations Committee in May, to the State Department bill.

Consequently, the substitute amendment that is the pending business contains the language of both S. 925 and S. 1161. Both bills passed in committee by votes of 19-0. I believe that this combination will give us a chance for a meaningful debate on foreign policy,

while expediting the work of the Senate.

At this time in our history we are experiencing a confluence of foreign policy crises that is unparalleled in the post-cold war era. Our Nation has lived through the September 11 tragedy, and we have responded with a worldwide war against terrorism. We have fought wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, where we are likely to be engaged in security and reconstruction efforts for years to come. We have been confronted by a nuclear crisis in North Korea that threatens U.S. national security and that could destabilize the entire north-east Asian region. We are continuing efforts to safeguard Russia's massive stockpiles of chemical, biological, and nuclear weapons and to prevent proliferation throughout the world. We have experienced strains in the Atlantic Alliance, even as we plan for its expansion. We are trying to respond to the AIDS pandemic in Africa and elsewhere, as well as help stabilize Colombia and preserve democracy in Venezuela.

Despite these extraordinary international conditions that demand the constant attention of our Government, the State Department and our foreign assistance programs are still underfunded. Although President Bush and Secretary of State Powell have supported important funding increases for our foreign policy accounts during the last 2 years, we dug a deep hole for ourselves during the 1990s, when diplomatic capabilities were placed at the bottom of our spending priorities.

From 1994 through 1997, for example, the Function 150 account, which funds State Department operations and foreign assistance, sustained consecutive annual real decreases of 3.6 percent, 5.6 percent, 11.4 percent, and 1.5 percent. This slide occurred even as the State Department was incurring the heavy added costs of establishing new missions in the 15 states of the former Soviet Union. Relative to other spending priorities, we continue to disadvantage our diplomatic capabilities. As a percentage of discretionary spending, the international affairs account stands at about 3.4 percent in fiscal year 2003. This is the lowest percentage of discretionary funding devoted to international affairs in the past 2 decades. We are still conducting diplomacy on a shoestring in an era when embassies are prime terrorist targets and we depend on diplomats to build alliances; work with foreign governments to apprehend terrorists before they reach U.S. soil; and explain U.S. principles, values, and policies worldwide.

In April, with the assistance of Senators FEINSTEIN, BIDEN, DEWINE, HAGEL, SARBANES, CHAFEE, SMITH, JEFFORDS, KENNEDY, and others, I offered an amendment to the Senate budget resolution that restored \$1.15 billion to the 150 account. The amendment brought the 150 account up to the level requested by the President. The success of the amendment on this Senate

floor, during a process when few amendments received favorable votes, illustrates the growing appreciation for and understanding of the role of Secretary Powell and the State Department. But we need to go further. We need to commit to a long-term course that assigns U.S. economic and diplomatic capabilities the same strategic priority that we assign to military capabilities.

There is a tendency in the media and sometimes in this body to see diplomatic activities as the rival of military solutions to problems. We have to get beyond this simplistic formulation. We have to understand that our military and our diplomats are both instruments of national power that depend on one another. They both help shape the international environment and influence the attitudes of governments and peoples. They both gather information and provide expertise that is vital to the war on terrorism. And they both must be unsurpassed in their capabilities, if the United States is going to survive and prosper.

Americans rightly demand that U.S. military capabilities be unrivaled in the world. Should not our diplomatic strength meet the same test? If a greater commitment of resources can prevent the bombing of one of our embassies, or the proliferation of a nuclear weapon, or the spiral into chaos of a vulnerable nation wracked by disease and hunger, the investment will have yielded dividends far beyond its cost.

Both the State Department authorization bill and the foreign assistance authorization bill for 1-year authorizations. Given that the Foreign Relations Committee has many new members, the State Department's responsibilities are expanding, and world events are unpredictable, we decided that it would be wise to retain the opportunity for the committee and the Senate to revisit these bills next year after we have had some time to perform oversight.

The State Department portion of this bill contains funding that covers the operating expenses for the department, embassy construction and security, education and cultural exchange programs, as well as other programs and activities. It also includes funding for: assessed contributions to international organizations required by treaty; international commissions and such centers as the Asia Foundation and the East-West Center; international broadcasting activities; refugee and migration assistance; and Peace Corps funding for 2004 through 2007.

The committee is recommending increases to the administration's request for the State Department of about \$400 million, or roughly 4 percent. These increases address needs that the Foreign Relations Committee identified as keys to U.S. success in this dangerous new century. They include: an additional \$312 million for embassy construction that will allow groundbreaking this

year for three new embassy compounds; approximately \$8 million to increase the cap on hardship pay and danger pay for State Department employees; an increase of \$8.9 million to restore cuts in international broadcasting to Eastern and Central European nations; the restoration of \$25 million that was cut for SEED and Freedom Support Act funding to Central Europe and the Balkans; and an additional \$30 million to strengthen public diplomacy and international exchanges with the Islamic world.

In addition, in committee, individual members offered amendments on such important issues as international support for a successor regime in Iraq, U.S. policy toward Haiti, and U.S. policy regarding recognition of a Palestinian state. A detailed listing of other issues covered and policy recommendations made by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in this bill are contained in the committee report.

As our committee undertook an in-depth study of State Department needs, we simultaneously examined our foreign assistance programs and their evolving role in U.S. humanitarian and national security efforts. As I indicated, in May, we passed a foreign assistance authorization bill by a 19-0 vote.

The committee held hearings on U.S. foreign assistance in six strategic regions of the world: the Near East, South Asia, East Asia, Eurasia, the Western Hemisphere, and Africa. In other hearings we explored numerous topics related to foreign assistance, including global hunger, reconstruction in Iraq and Afghanistan, and President Bush's vision for a new Millennium Challenge Corporation.

In the hearings, we learned how the administration's 2004 budget request would support U.S. foreign policy interests. Those hearings were very informative, and I again want to express my appreciation to the subcommittee chairs and ranking members who conducted them, as well as to all Senators who participated.

This was only a first step. Since the mid-1980s, Congress has not fulfilled its responsibility to pass an Omnibus Foreign Assistance Act. Several discrete measures, such as the Global AIDS bill, the Freedom Support Act, and the Support for Eastern European Democracy, SEED, have been enacted.

But in the absence of a comprehensive authorization, much of the responsibility for providing guidance for foreign assistance policy has fallen to the Appropriations Committees. The appropriators have kept our foreign assistance programs going, but in many cases, they have had to do so without proper authorization. In most years, the Foreign Relations Committee did pass a State Department authorization bill, but that bill only authorizes about 35 percent of the function 150 account. To fund the remaining accounts, appropriators frequently had to waive the legal requirement to appropriate funds

only following the passage of an authorization bill.

There is no single reason why the Congress has failed to pass a comprehensive foreign assistance authorization bill for so long. But we all recognize the difficult legislative task involved. As a general spending item, foreign assistance rarely is high on the list of constituent priorities. Yet specific provisions in foreign assistance bills have often raised political emotions. Thus, comprehensive foreign assistance bills have contended with the most difficult of legislative circumstances—they have generated seemingly intractable political disputes, while lacking an overriding legislative payoff.

We must stop thinking in conventional political terms. Passing a comprehensive foreign assistance bill is good politics, as well as good policy. It is good politics because it underscores the leadership of this Senate at a time when our country is in great peril. It is good politics because foreign assistance is an instrument of national power in the war on terrorism. It is good politics because it recognizes that our standard of living, the retirements of our parents, our children's educations, advancements in our health care, and the security of Americans depend on winning the war on terrorism.

With this in mind, Senator BIDEN and I, with the support of the majority leader, bring the Foreign Assistance Authorization Act to the floor in tandem with the State Department authorization bill.

The Foreign Assistance bill before you authorizes funding levels for most of the foreign operations accounts within function 150 for fiscal year 2004. The committee took as a starting point the request submitted by the President last February. The executive branch has been working with our embassies around the world for many months to develop accurate budget numbers.

As I previously mentioned, the Foreign Relations Committee worked closely with the Budget Committee on maintaining the President's requests for the 150 account. I note this to highlight the fact that we have sought to work within the rules to achieve the overall funding levels that are before us today. Many members of the committee, including myself, would like to have more funding available. But I am hopeful that members will respect the budget process and the decisions that were made earlier in the year.

With respect to the foreign assistance authorization, the committee made relatively few changes to the dollar amounts requested by the President. We provided a \$70 million increase for the Freedom Support Act, a \$40 million increase for the Support for Eastern European Democracy Act, a \$15 million increase for development assistance, a \$6 million increase for peacekeeping operations, and a \$100 million increase for the Non-proliferation, Anti-terrorism, Demining and Re-

lated Programs account. The additional funds in the Account would be used to safeguard and hasten the destruction of weapons of mass destruction. They also would provide \$15 million for a new initiative, The Radiological Terrorism Threat Reduction Act of 2003, contained in title IV of the bill. This legislation authorizes the State Department to provide contributions and technical assistance to the IAEA to deal with the dirty bomb threat. The bill is the result of a cooperative effort between Senator BIDEN and myself, as well as Senator DOMENICI. I want to thank Senator BIDEN for his leadership, going all the way back to the hearings he held in 2002 on this issue.

On the other side of the ledger, we have reduced funding for two of the President's requested programs. The Millennium Challenge Corporation has been reduced from \$1.3 billion to \$1 billion. This is not an expression of doubt about the MCC concept. Rather, the reduction is based on the judgment that the MCC will require time to become established and may not be able to efficiently distribute the entire \$1.3 billion request in the first fiscal year. The \$300 million has been deferred until the next fiscal year when the MCC would be in a better position to spend it. We also have made a small cut in the Andean counter-drug initiative. It has been reduced from \$731 million to \$700 million—the amount appropriated in the previous fiscal year. In addition, we have authorized 2 new contingency funds at the request of the President—the Complex Foreign Crises Fund and the Famine Fund. But we have not authorized specific amounts for these Funds.

Finally, I would like to address the Millennium Challenge Corporation. For those Senators who have not studied this concept, it is a bold proposal by President Bush to provide a new model for U.S. foreign assistance programs. A compromise version of the Millennium Challenge Corporation bill is included in the substitute before us.

Our foreign assistance must be aimed at both humanitarian objectives and goals that aid in the fight against terrorism over the long run. These include strengthening democracy, building free markets, and encouraging civil society in nations that otherwise might become havens or breeding grounds for terrorists. We must seek to encourage societies that can fulfill the aspirations of their citizens and deny terrorists the uncontrolled territory and abject poverty that the terrorists use to their advantage. To do this, all of us should begin to think about foreign assistance as a critical asset in the long-term war on terrorism.

This process will require us to ask how nations develop political stability and economic momentum and how they become good international citizens that contribute to the peace and prosperity of the world community. The Millennium Challenge Corporation has

been proposed on the assumption that we do know some of the answers. We believe that successful societies cannot be built without good leadership, economies based on sound market principles, and significant investments in health and education. By establishing firm criteria to measure and reward the progress of low-income nations in these areas, the MCC can provide a powerful incentive to foreign governments to embrace and sustain reform.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee strongly supported the basic premise of the MCC and applauded the President's personal commitment to the concept. However, members came forward with differing proposals on the organization and bureaucratic status of the MCC. The committee passed a version of the MCC that differed substantially from the President's initial vision.

Since that time, Senator HAGEL, Senator BIDEN, and myself have sought to construct an efficient format for this concept that would be supported by the White House while meeting the concerns of our committee. These talks were difficult, but they also were a positive indication of the interest in the ultimate success of the MCC. I believe that we have succeeded in constructing a good compromise. Everyone gave up something to move the bill forward. Senator BIDEN and Senator HAGEL will be addressing the Senate on their views toward the MCC, and I am sure that they will outline some concerns and reservations. I want to thank both of them for their willingness to be flexible and their contributions during this process.

I would note that the White House also was instrumental in concluding this compromise. The administration has endorsed Senate passage of the the Lugar-Hagel version of the MCC.

Our MCC compromise creates the needed ingredients for inter-agency coordination, a top priority among a majority on the committee. It puts the MCC under the authority of the Secretary of State and has the chief executive officer report to the Secretary. But it does not determine the integrity of the President's concept. It gives the MCC the same autonomous status as the US Agency for International Development with the right to manage itself, hire staff, and create its own new culture. It mandates coordination between the MCC and USAID in the field and gives USAID the primary role in preparing countries for MCC eligibility.

I believe our MCC approach is the right plan at the right time. It provides a way to focus single-mindedly on economic development that is results-based and meets clear benchmarks of success. We can have the coordination we seek while also insulating it from short-term political considerations so that it can focus on the long-term benefits of widening the universe of countries that live in peace and look to a prosperous and stable future.

I would like to notify members that I will be offering a managers' package of amendments and will be asking unanimous consent that it be adopted. As part of that package, Section 204 of S. 925 will be deleted from our bill because it has been included in the defense authorization bill. I would like to express appreciation to Senator WARNER, the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, for his help on that matter.

The other amendments in the managers' package are technical in nature, clarifying original intention, or correcting errors.

I am looking forward to the debate on this bill and the constructive contributions of our Members at this important time in our Nation's history.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

ACCELERATING THE INCREASE IN THE REFUNDABILITY OF THE CHILD TAX CREDIT—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, first, I compliment the distinguished chair of the Foreign Relations Committee for his work on this omnibus piece of legislation. I intend to support it. I admire the work that has been done. I notice Senator HAGEL is in the Chamber, and Senator FEINGOLD. They and Senator BIDEN have really done yeoman work bringing us to this point. The MCC, foreign aid legislation, in addition to the State Department authorization bill, represents a tremendous amount of work and effort to get us to this point. I look forward to the debate.

Having said that, however, I must rise to express my frustration on an unrelated matter. I want to call to the attention of my colleagues the fact that it has now been a month since the Senate passed bipartisan legislation, 94 to 2, to rectify a problem that we all agreed should be fixed. I am referring to the 12 million children, and over 6 million families, that were excluded from legislation we recently passed and signed into law providing tax relief to American families.

Shortly after the exclusion was noted, the President admonished the Senate and the House to solve this problem as quickly as we can because we were bumping up against a deadline.

I recall all the speeches on the Senate floor. Republicans and Democrats came to the floor and said: Yes, we have to change this. Yes, we have to recognize that by July 25th all of this must be done. Yes, when all of these checks go out and relief is provided to everybody else, we should not be leaving out these 12 million children or these 6 million families. Let's resolve it. Let's do it. We said unequivocally that we were going to resolve this by the 25th of July.

Here we are, well into the second week of July, just a matter of a couple of weeks to go before the 25th is here,

and yet there is no action. We keep promising. We keep hearing the promises made by others. The fact is, nothing has been done.

I think it is important for us, once again, to light a fire, to reignite it, to state again our determination to see that this is going to be done, to see that these people are not left out, to ensure that we address this issue as we all promised we would do just a month ago.

While I want to get on with this bill and while I want to be as supportive as I can to assure that the very distinguished chair of the Foreign Relations Committee can move this legislation along, I simply believe it is time for us, once again, to restate our determination to solve this problem. We do not need any time. We can have the vote just as we had it before and complete our work on it. But I do think it has to be done prior to the time we get into the real, legitimate debate and discussion about the many worthy aspects of the bill the distinguished chair has laid down.

So, Madam President, at this time I move to proceed to S. 1162, the child tax credit bill, in order for us to accomplish that task first.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HAGEL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent I be allowed to speak for not more than 10 minutes on the pending legislation, to be followed by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin for 20 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. FEINGOLD. Madam President, if I could ask, when I am recognized, that my statement be as in morning business, rather than as part of this subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HAGEL. Madam President, I thank my friend and colleague from Wisconsin.

I rise this afternoon to support the legislation that the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has brought to the Senate floor today. I also wish to acknowledge his strong leadership, along with that of the distinguished ranking minority member, Senator BIDEN. They have done a particularly effective job at a historic time in the history of this country and the world. This country, the world, and this body will continue to look to their leadership as we go forward into the next challenging year.

I also rise this afternoon to support the Lugar-Hagel compromise regarding