

of uncompensated care is shifted onto doctors, hospitals, and taxpayers.

And our Nation pays a steep economic cost. The Institute of Medicine estimates that lack of health insurance costs America between \$65 billion and \$130 billion a year in lost productivity and other costs.

Making the high cost and growing inequities even more troubling is that on the whole, we seem to be getting less for our health care dollar than we should be.

The World Health Organization recently reported that Americans pay twice as much per capita for health as the average industrialized nation. We pay a third more than the next-highest country. But despite the high costs, we are not getting any bang for our buck.

Among industrialized nations, Americans' life expectancy is only 24th, and we have one of the highest infant mortality rates in the world.

We may pay twice as much, but we don't even get in the top 20 when it comes to mortality or life expectancy.

The results of the past few years beg the question, "How can we be paying the highest costs and getting so meager a return." In short, where is all the money going? Who is better off today?

A recent article in the *Economist* offered one answer.

Noting that profit margins for health insurers are as high as they have ever been, the article notes:

Since [2000], the prices of many [health insurers' stocks] have quadrupled. And if shareholders have done well, executives have been more than amply rewarded. . . .

One CEO earned \$30 million in pay in 2003 and exercised \$84 million in stock options from earlier years. This left him with options worth \$840 million at the company's current share price. His second-in-command earned \$13.7 million in compensation and holds options worth \$350 million. Another CEO of a leading insurer earned \$16 million; yet another, \$51 million; and still another, \$27 million.

While insurers and their executives are reaping billions, and Americans are fearing that their benefits will be the next to be sacrificed for the sake of even higher profits, the administration has done nothing to rein in the cost of health care. In fact, in the recently enacted Medicare bill, the administration included tens of billions of dollars in giveaways to HMOs, not to mention the windfall created for prescription drug companies.

The proposals the administration has offered would extend coverage only to a small fraction of Americans who lack insurance today. Often, their solutions extend meager coverage to a small number of vulnerable Americans at the expense of a larger group.

For instance, according to the Congressional Budget Office, the President's plan to create "association health plans" would decrease the number of uninsured Americans by only about 600,000 people. Six hundred thousand out of nearly 44 million. But it

would increase premiums for 80 percent of employees of small businesses. The administration's band-aid approach to our health care crisis won't work. It is the wrong treatment, and its cost would preclude us from affording the right one.

The results of the administration's so-called solutions can be seen each month as more Americans lose their insurance or feel themselves pushed closer to the point where the cost of coverage is too large a burden to bear.

As a nation, we are not better off than we were four years ago. We are losing ground. We can do better. But to do so will demand a change in direction. We need to reject the notion that we are helpless to control health care costs.

We need to reject the notion that with a little tinkering around the edges, our health care system can offer the kind of care every American deserves. Most of all, we need to reject the notion that the primary purpose of our health care system is to provide profits for health care companies and the drug industry.

That is wrong. That is the thinking that brought us to the point where families such as the Larsons are forced to turn over the proceeds of their life's work, just to pay the bill for treating a single illness.

There are better answers, and working together we can find them. We can find ways to ensure that every American is able to see a doctor when he or she is sick. We do not have to be the only major industrialized nation in the world that fails to guarantee health care for all its citizens.

We can do better, and none of us should rest until we do.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The Senator from Kansas is recognized.

#### THE REAGAN CULTURAL DOCTRINE

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I rise today to speak on a topic called the Reagan Cultural Doctrine.

Presidents are noted for foreign policy doctrines which they articulate and put forward. President Reagan had his

own noteworthy and very successful foreign policy doctrine, the Reagan Doctrine, involving the confrontation with communism that led to its ultimate demise. President Reagan is to be credited and given great praise for it.

But President Reagan had another doctrine I want to speak about today, the Reagan Cultural Doctrine, which I think it would be fitting for us to acknowledge and press forward to its successful completion.

President Reagan respected each and every human life at whatever stage of that life and wherever it was located. This was a unifying theme that lay behind some of his most significant policy choices and movements. It led him to insist that the Soviet empire was evil and to demand of the new Soviet leaders that they "tear down this wall."

It was what led him to note that "until and unless someone can establish the unborn child is not a living human being, then that child is already protected by the Constitution which guarantees life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness to all of us."

That is a direct Reagan quote.

Toward the end of his Presidency on January 14, 1988, President Reagan took the opportunity to clearly articulate the Reagan cultural doctrine, a very simple yet profound Presidential Declaration. President Reagan proclaimed and declared "the inalienable personhood of every American from the moment of conception until natural death."

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of President Reagan's January 14, 1988 Presidential declaration on the inalienable personhood of the unborn be printed in the RECORD.

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

PROCLAMATION 5761 OF JANUARY 14, 1988  
NATIONAL SANCTITY OF HUMAN LIFE DAY, 1988  
(By the President of the United States of America)

America has given a great gift to the world, a gift that drew upon the accumulated wisdom derived from centuries of experiments in self-government, a gift that has irrevocably changed humanity's future. Our gift is twofold: the declaration, as a cardinal principle of all just law, of the God-given, unalienable rights possessed by every human being; and the example of our determination to secure those rights and to defend them against every challenge through the generations. Our declaration and defense of our rights have made us and kept us free and have sent a tide of hope and inspiration around the globe.

One of those unalienable rights, as the Declaration of Independence affirms so eloquently, is the right to life. In the 15 years since the Supreme Court's decision in *Roe v. Wade*, however, America's unborn have been denied their right to life. Among the tragic and unspeakable results in the past decade and a half have been the loss of life of 22 million infants before birth; the pressure and anguish of countless women and girls who are driven to abortion; and a cheapening of our respect for the human person and the sanctity of human life.

We are told that we may not interfere with abortion. We are told that we may not "impose our morality" on those who wish to

allow or participate in the taking of the life of infants before birth; yet no one calls it "imposing morality" to prohibit the taking of life after people are born. We are told as well that there exists a "right" to end the lives of unborn children; yet no one can explain how such a right can exist in stark contradiction of each person's fundamental right to life.

That right to life belongs equally to babies in the womb, babies born handicapped, and the elderly or infirm. That we have killed the unborn for 15 years does not nullify this right, nor could any number of killings ever do so. The unalienable right to life is found not only in the Declaration of Independence but also in the Constitution that every President is sworn to preserve, protect, and defend. Both the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments guarantee that no person shall be deprived of life without due process of law.

All medical and scientific evidence increasingly affirms that children before birth share all the basic attributes of human personality—that they in fact are persons. Modern medicine treats unborn children as patients. Yet, as the Supreme Court itself has noted, the decision in *Roe v. Wade* rested upon an earlier state of medical technology. The law of the land in 1988 should recognize all of the medical evidence.

Our Nation cannot continue down the path of abortion, so radically at odds with our history, our heritage, and our concepts of justice. This sacred legacy, and the well-being and the future of our country, demand that protection of the innocents must be guaranteed and that the personhood of the unborn be declared and defended throughout the land. In legislation introduced at my request in the First Session of the 100th Congress, I have asked the Legislative branch to declare the "humanity of the unborn child and the compelling interest of the several states to protect the life of each person before birth." This duty to declare on so fundamental a matter falls to the Executive as well. By this Proclamation I hereby do so.

Now, therefore, I Ronald Reagan, President of the United States of America, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and laws of the United States, do hereby proclaim and declare the unalienable personhood of every American, from the moment of conception until natural death, and I do proclaim, ordain, and declare that I will take care that the Constitution and laws of the United States are faithfully executed for the protection of America's unborn children. Upon this act, sincerely believed to be an act of justice, warranted by the Constitution, I invoke the considerate judgment of mankind and the gracious favor of Almighty God. I also proclaim Sunday, January 17, 1988, as National Sanctity of Human Life Day. I call upon the citizens of this blessed land to gather on that day in their homes and places of worship to give thanks for the gift of life they enjoy and to reaffirm their commitment to the dignity of every human being and the sanctity of every human life.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this 14th day of January, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and eighty-eight, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and twelfth.

RONALD REAGAN.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, our Nation cannot be the "shining city upon the hill" without the respect and recognition of the inalienable personhood of every American from the moment of conception until natural death. Reagan realized and declared this. The Reagan Cultural Doctrine is

synonymous with the culture of life. President Reagan's commitment to the culture of life was evident from the first days of his Presidency.

In recent days, some have implicitly questioned President Reagan's commitment to the inalienable personhood of every American by suggesting that destructive embryonic stem cell research should be conducted in President Reagan's name. And here we are not talking about adult stem cell research or umbilical cord blood which are supported by virtually everybody and are producing true results—here we are talking strictly about destructive embryonic stem cell research which results in the death of a young human embryo after its conception.

To suggest that this should be conducted in President Reagan's name is a completely contrary view of the Reagan Cultural Doctrine. It is a misappropriation of President Reagan's legacy, and it is damaging to the culture of life that President Reagan was so steadfast in defending. It is an assault on the Reagan Cultural Doctrine.

As former Reagan National Security Adviser and Interior Secretary William Clark noted in the *New York Times* recently,

Ronald Reagan's record reveals that no issue was of greater importance to him than the dignity and sanctity of all human life. "My administration is dedicated to the preservation of America as a free land," he said in 1983. "And there is no cause more important for preserving that freedom than affirming the transcendent right to life of all human beings, the right without which no other rights have any meaning." One of the things he regretted most at the completion of his Presidency in 1989, he told [William Clark], was that politics and circumstances had prevented him from making more progress in restoring protection for unborn human life.

Continuing in his *New York Times* piece, Clark then addressed Reagan's early efforts to protect innocent human life through halting Federal efforts on destructive research involving human embryos. Here we find that President Reagan himself pushed to stop destructive human embryonic research.

Clark says:

Reagan consistently opposed federal support for the destruction of innocent human life. After the charter expired for the Department of Health, Education and Welfare's ethical advisory board—which in the 1970s supported destructive research on human embryos—he began a de facto ban on federal financing of embryo research that he held to throughout his presidency.

I ask unanimous consent a copy of William Clark's June 11, 2004, *New York Times* op-ed piece titled "For Reagan, All Life Was Sacred," be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the *New York Times*, June 11, 2004]

FOR REAGAN, ALL LIFE WAS SACRED

(By William P. Clark)

PASO ROBLES, CALIF.—Ronald Reagan had not passed from this life for 48 hours before

proponents of human embryonic stem-cell research began to suggest that such ethically questionable scientific work should be promoted under his name. But this cannot honestly be done without ignoring President Reagan's own words and actions.

Ronald Reagan's record reveals that no issue was of greater importance to him than the dignity and sanctity of all human life. "My administration is dedicated to the preservation of America as a free land," he said in 1983. "And there is no cause more important for preserving that freedom than affirming the transcendent right to life of all human beings, the right without which no other rights have any meaning." One of the things he regretted most at the completion of his presidency in 1989, he told me, was that politics and circumstances had prevented him from making more progress in restoring protection for unborn human life.

Still, he did what he could. To criticize the *Roe v. Wade* decision on its 10th anniversary in 1983, he published his famous essay "Abortion and the Conscience of the Nation" in *The Human Life Review*. "We cannot diminish the value of one category of human life—the unborn—without diminishing the value of all human life," he wrote. He went on to emphasize "the truth of human dignity under God" and "respect for the sacred value of human life." Because modern science has revealed the wonder of human development, and modern medicine treats "the developing human as a patient," he declared, "the real question today is not when human life begins, but, What is the value of human life?"

In that essay, he expressly encouraged continued support for the "Sanctity of life ethic" and rejection of the "quality of life ethic." Writing about the value of all human life, he quoted the British writer Malcolm Muggeridge's statement that "however low it flickers so fiercely burns, it is still a divine flame which no man dare presume to put out, be his motives ever so humane and enlightened." And in the *Roe v. Wade* decision, he insisted, the Supreme Court "did not explicitly reject the traditional American idea of intrinsic worth and value in all human life; it simply dodged the issue."

Likewise, in his famous "Evil Empire" speech of March 1983—which most recall as solely an indictment of the Soviet Union—Ronald Reagan spoke strongly against the denigration of innocent human life. "Abortion on demand now takes the lives of up to one and half million unborn children a year," he said. "Unless and until it can be proven that the unborn child is not a living entity, then its right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness must be protected."

His actions were as clear as his words. He supported the Human Life Amendment, which would have inscribed in the Constitution "the paramount right to life is vested in each human being from the moment of fertilization without regard to age, health or condition of dependency." And he favored bills in Congress that would have given every human being—at all stages of development—protection as a person under the 14th Amendment.

Aside from the moral principle, President Reagan would also have questioned picking the people's pocket to support commercial research. He understood the significance of putting the imprimatur of the nation, through public financing, behind questionable research.

He consistently opposed federal support for the destruction of innocent human life. After the charter expired for the Department of Health, Education and Welfare's ethical advisory board—which in the 1970's supported destructive research on human embryos—he began a de facto ban on federal financing of embryo research that he held to throughout his presidency.

As for today's debate, as a defender of free people and free markets, he would have asked the marketplace question: if human embryonic research is so clearly promising as the researchers assert, why aren't private investors putting money into it, as they are in adult stem cell research?

Mr. Reagan's suffering under Alzheimer's disease was tragic, and we should do everything we can that is ethically proper to help others afflicted with it. But I have no doubt that he would have urged our nation to look to adult stem cell research—which has yielded many clinical successes—and away from the destruction of developing human lives, which has yielded none. Those who would trade on Ronald Reagan's legacy should first consider his own words.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I mean no disrespect to anyone in addressing this important issue, but we are talking about innocent young human life. Someone must speak for those who have no voice and for the great pro-life legacy of President Reagan now that he is no longer with us.

I would like to share the stories and memories of some of the Reagan revolutionaries who were privileged to interact with the President on this particular vital issue.

Just 2 days after his January 20, 1981, inauguration as President of the United States, Ronald Reagan made his personal commitment to pro-life issues clear. At a time when hundreds of people were waiting to meet the newly elected President in order to seek positions in his administration, the President made time for an unrelated meeting with pro-life leaders in Congress and the nonprofit sector. Senators Richard Schweiker and Jesse Helms were present at that meeting, as were Representatives HENRY HYDE and Bob Dornan.

This meeting, which was to become an annual policy meeting on the anniversary of Roe v. Wade, was tremendously significant. By 1980, the pro-life movement had been largely marginalized by previous administrations. But President Reagan's willingness to hold these meetings and to annually address the March for Life meeting by phone took the pro-life movement into the mainstream.

One participant in that first meeting noted that the President's personal conviction on the right to life for unborn children was obvious. The participant said:

President Reagan's deep commitment to pro-life issues was very evident when he spoke of viewing an inutero sonogram while he was Governor of California. It was moving to watch him speak. Clearly, he understood the life issue; it could be seen in his body language.

The quote continues:

There we were, two days after his inauguration. He didn't have to meet with us or do anything. Yet, he turned our 15 minute meeting into a 45 minute meeting.

President Reagan truly had great zeal for pro-life causes. I share in the sentiment made by long-time Reagan aide Michael Deaver, who made this observation in his political memoirs.

Deaver noted the President's zeal in the section of his book dedicated to the March 30, 1981, assassination attempt on President Reagan. This was in reference to a meeting soon after with the late Cardinal Terrence Cooke of New York. Deaver overheard the President's final words of this meeting with Cardinal Cooke. Reagan said this:

I have decided that whatever time I may have left, is left for Him.

"Him," referring to God. Anyone who knew Reagan has to acknowledge that this statement was from the heart. It summed up his subsequent involvement in the great moral issues of the day.

Deaver concludes this section with his own thoughts after the death of Cardinal Cooke:

When Reagan was told of his friend's death, the president's words from their earlier meeting echoed in my mind. "Whatever time I may have left is left for Him." I would never forget his promise, and I would see him deliver on it time and time again.

President Reagan's interest in life issues was not just convenient political positioning either. He actively wrestled with this issue. I will read a passage from "What I Saw at the Revolution," political memoir of Reagan's speech writer Peggy Noonan.

Look at him on abortion. It took courage to oppose an option that at least 20 million Americans had exercised since Roe v. Wade, when the issue isn't a coalition builder but an opposition creator, when the polls are against you and the boomers want it and when you've already been accused of being unsympathetic to women and your own pollster is telling you your stand contributes to a gender gap. . . .

Let me continue now further with the book:

But he puzzled it out on his own, not like a visionary or an intellectual but like a regular person. He read and thought and listened to people who cared, and he made up his own mind. And suddenly when they said, "The argument is over when life begins," he said, "Well look, if that's the argument: If there's a bag in the gutter and you don't know if what's in it is alive, you don't kick it, do you? Well, no, you don't."

He held to his stand against his own political interests (where were the anti-abortion people going to go?) and against the wishes of his family and friends. Nancy wasn't anti-abortion, the kids weren't anti-abortion, and people like the Bloomingtons and his friends in Beverly Hills—they did not get where they are through an overfastidious concern for the helpless. He was the only one of his group who cared.

A lengthy quote from Peggy Noonan.

President Reagan did care deeply about the sanctity of life, and we know that he was actively engaged on this issue. One example of this was President Reagan's interest in the pro-life journal, the Human Life Review. We know the President read this journal because he actually wrote a letter responding to the heroic mother of a child with spina bifida who had written a letter that was published in the journal in the summer of 1982 edition.

In his letter to the mother the President wrote:

Your recent letter published in the summer issue of the Human Life Review came to my attention. I want you to know that I was deeply impressed by what you wrote and by the obvious commitment you and your family have made to respond to the affliction of a handicapped child with affection and courage.

I strongly believe that protection of these children is a natural and fundamental part of the duty government has to protect the innocent and to guarantee that the civil rights of all are respected. This duty is a special order when the rights involved are the right to life itself. . . .

After learning of President Reagan's interest in their pro-life publication through this letter, Jim McFadden of the Human Life Review invited the President to write an essay for publication in the journal. The President obliged, and thus his famous "Abortion and the Conscience of the Nation" was published in 1983. In this essay, President Reagan made some profound statements laying the groundwork for the Reagan cultural doctrine.

A copy of this essay may be found on the Human Life Review website at [http://www.humanlifereview.com/reagan/reagan\\_conscience.html](http://www.humanlifereview.com/reagan/reagan_conscience.html).

Mr. BROWNBACK. In the essay, President Reagan lays out the great cultural issues surrounding abortion. In one place, he notes:

We cannot diminish the value of one category of human life—the unborn—without diminishing the value of all human life.

Embryo, fetus, infant, child, and adult are categories of human development, and they are all human life. Whether one is physically healthy or ill, emotionally healthy or ill, these are categories of human beings, and thus deserve protection. We should heed the words of President Reagan. All human life, no matter how it is categorized, should be esteemed and valued.

In his essay, President Reagan correctly argues that:

[A]nyone who doesn't feel sure whether we are talking about a second human life should clearly give life the benefit of the doubt. If you don't know whether a body is alive or dead, you would never bury it. I think this consideration itself should be enough for all of us to insist on protecting the unborn.

This, again, a direct quote from President Reagan on the Reagan Cultural Doctrine.

Then the President turns to discuss the real issue of the day. The President commented:

The real question today is not when human life begins, but, What is the value of human life?

That question remains today.

When President Reagan said, and those of us in the pro-life movement say, that human life begins at conception, we are speaking about biology, not ideology or belief.

I am concerned that there may be some confusion on this point today, perhaps as a result of misinformation being disseminated by those who favor destructive research on the youngest forms of human life.

A human embryo, an unborn child, or human fetus is, biologically speaking,

a young human life. To assert that it is not a life or that it is so-called potential life is not a scientific statement. To assert a human embryo is not a human life is a belief not supported by the facts, much in the same way that to say the Sun revolves around the Earth is a belief not supported by the facts.

Science is about the pursuit of truth in the service of mankind. Science tells us that the unborn child, from the moment of conception, is a human life.

That is why, in the debate over embryonic stem cell research, I continue to assert we must address the fundamental question of law: Is the young human embryo a person or a piece of property?

Our country has gotten this issue wrong before—notably, the 1857 Dred Scott case—but our system gives us an opportunity to rectify past wrongs. I suggest we base our laws on what science tells us, which is that the young human embryo is indeed a human life.

Anybody watching now was, at one point in time, a young human embryo. And if you were destroyed then, your life would not exist today. Those are the facts.

Unfortunately, not everyone in this debate is looking at biology. But once both sides acknowledge the scientific truth, that the young human embryo or unborn child is a human life, then we can start to address what Reagan posited as the real question: "What is the value of a human life?"

In "Abortion and the Conscience of a Nation," President Reagan lamented the case of Baby Doe, who was legally starved to death because he was mentally handicapped. In more recent times, we have the case of Terri Schiavo, who was saved from starvation. In that case, the American public, along with Florida Governor Jeb Bush, let their voices be heard that life is worth living. Those voices proclaimed that life—even if not the "quality of life" many would deem acceptable—still has incredible value. The value of every human life must be defended without exception.

To deny that a human embryo is a human life is to disregard what science tells us. It is to live willfully in ignorance.

In addressing his critics through the essay, President Reagan wrote:

Obviously, some uninfluential people want to deny that every human life has intrinsic, sacred worth. They insist that a member of the human race must have certain qualities before they accord him or her status as a "human being." . . . Every legislator, every doctor, and every citizen needs to recognize that the real issue is whether to affirm and protect the sanctity of all human life, or to embrace a social ethic where some human lives are valued and others are not. As a nation, we must choose between the sanctity of life ethic and the "quality of life" ethic.

President Reagan concluded his essay with these words:

My administration is dedicated to the preservation of America as a free land, and there

is no cause more important for preserving that freedom than affirming the transcendent right to life of all human beings, the right without which no other rights have any meaning.

"Abortion and the Conscience of a Nation" was written by a man who was fully committed to the unalienable right to life from the moment of conception. And that man was President Reagan.

However, President Reagan did not stop at "Abortion and the Conscience of a Nation." He had to withstand much political pressure to maintain his stance in defense of life.

A Reagan aide recalled the President's 1987 meeting with leaders of the pro-life movement. He wrote:

In January 1987 the subject of parental consent for abortion came up as the groups met with the President in the Roosevelt Room. As you know, Ronald Reagan was a prodigious letter writer during all phases of his life and career, but he was also a prodigious letter reader and keeper. If a letter's contents appealed to him or struck a chord, he would keep it, use it in speeches, quote it to the media, etc. The letter he received from the young boy asking him if he was going to do his speech to the Congress "in his pajamas" after his recovery from the assassination attempt was one such example. Ronald Reagan loved to read samples of mail from the American people and called Anne Higgins to ask for it on Fridays if for some reason it was later than usual in getting to him. Meeting with the pro-life leaders that January day, he pulled from his left-hand jacket side pocket and read a letter he said he had held onto for many years. It was from a California mother who had written to him about the parental consent issue when he was governor in the early 1970's.

Ronald Reagan read the letter to the entire group. The mother described her own family and the daughters she had raised, the sweat she had expended, the clothes she had washed and folded, the hurt knees she had bandaged, etc. She wrote that now the opponents of parental consent for abortion were telling her that they had a right to perform surgery on those daughters without so much as letting her know. "Who do they think they are?" went her refrain.

The letter went on in this vein with other examples of the worries and stresses of loving parenthood, and the abrupt dismissal of that sacrifice by the [abortion providers] who think they know better when a child gets in trouble. Ronald Reagan read the letter through, folded it and put it back in his pocket, and said softly, "Who do they think they are?" You could have heard a pin drop.

The record could hardly be clearer. President Ronald Reagan vigorously worked to promote a culture of life, which included consistent opposition to destructive research on human embryos. It was and it remains the Reagan Cultural Doctrine. Witness after witness affirms this. It is important that the great moral stance President Reagan took be reaffirmed and boldly declared.

When we think of the great Presidential doctrines of the past, we think immediately of the foreign policy doctrines of Presidents Monroe and Truman—and, yes, Ronald Reagan. These doctrines have been and continue to be significant in defining American interests.

On January 14, 1988, President Reagan declared a new doctrine: the Reagan Cultural Doctrine. This doctrine is not about foreign policy; it is about something that especially defines us as a people. This doctrine speaks volumes, in the sense that it makes clear who we are and what we stand for as a people. It reaffirms the Declaration of Independence and the founding values that have been the source of America's greatness.

It is my hope President Bush will reissue the Reagan Cultural Doctrine on "the unalienable personhood of every American, from the moment of conception until natural death," and that the Congress will reaffirm the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution by passing laws that will guarantee the right to life to every American conceived within the boundaries of this life-loving and freedom-loving land. That is the Reagan Cultural Doctrine.

Madam President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. DOLE). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### SENATE ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Mr. FRIST. Madam President, the Senate has been busy over the past 4 weeks. I thought I would take a few moments to look back and then look ahead a bit.

The Memorial Day recess seems like a long time ago because so much has been shaped by us—referring to the progress we have made in the last several days in particular—and shaped by the other external events, a steady stream of national and world-changing events.

To begin, I will start with two nights ago when, on Wednesday night, we passed the Defense Authorization Act for 2005; and late last night, not that long ago, we passed the Defense Appropriations Act of 2005. It is appropriate to look at those two bills together because both focus on supporting our troops, supporting our U.S. Government in its war on terror.

We had 4 weeks of impassioned debate on the floor of the Senate, and at the end of those 4 weeks we completed two very important pieces of legislation which very clearly augment the support for our troops that are stationed throughout the world and also reflect our profound commitment to the defense of the United States of America, the defense of the citizens, the people, and the principles we stand for in this great country.

But we are at war. We see it daily; terrorists strike daily. It is these two pieces of legislation that focus around support in this war on terror and in the defense of this country that we see our