

In this, as in so many things, he represented the true spirit of Wisconsin, which pioneered laws in this area. He once said that "Power always has to be kept in check; power exercised in secret, especially under the cloak of national security, is doubly dangerous." Today, as we struggle for openness and oversight on national security issues, I think his words have never been more true, and open, accountable government has never been more important.

And then there's Bill Proxmire's lesson in courage. How many times did he stand on this floor and say what needed to be said, truly representing the people back home, saying what they would say if they stood here themselves, about boondoggle projects, or the importance of open government? Here was a man who knew what mattered, and knew how to bring attention to a cause no one else was championing.

He was perhaps most famous for his Golden Fleece Awards, where he put the spotlight on the kind of waste that, unfortunately, we still see too much of in the Senate today. While most members just let waste pass by unnoticed, Proxmire was unrelenting. Here are a couple choice examples of Golden Fleece winners: To the National Institute of Dental Research in 1984, for sponsoring a \$465,000 study on the "effects of orthodontia on psycho-social functioning"; to 190 Federal officials in September 1982, for door-to-door chauffeur service costing \$3.4 million; and to the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration in February 1977, for a \$27,000 study of why prison inmates want to escape.

I think that last one says it all about why the Golden Fleece awards struck such a chord with the American public. There's a lot of numbness in Washington to wasteful spending, but Bill Proxmire wasn't numb to it. He was outraged by it. He had the innate aversion to waste that the American people have, people who have to sit down at their kitchen tables, work out a budget, and decide what they can afford, and what they can't. They think that if they have to do this, we should do. So Senator Proxmire stood up and demanded a little common sense, and a measure of discipline for the Federal budget. It was very courageous and very representative of the people who sent him here, I can tell you.

This is a very sad day for our State. But it is also a day to reflect on the Proxmire legacy, and to be proud of the impact he made on our state, and on the Nation. He was a fighter, literally and figuratively. He was a college boxing champ who managed to hold off two people who tried to mug him near the Capitol, and then helped in a drag-net that led to their arrest. He was a proud veteran, a newspaper reporter, and a dogged campaigner who lost three races for office and was written off by a lot of people in Wisconsin politics before he won the race to fill the seat of Senator Joe McCarthy after McCarthy died in 1957.

He was as determined as they come, it was that quality that served him so well during his years in this body. It continued to serve him all his life, even as he fought a long and difficult battle against Alzheimer's disease.

His wife Ellen, his children and grandchildren are in all of our thoughts today. As we remember William Proxmire, and all that he did, I feel deeply proud that he represented my State. He did great honor to the State of Wisconsin by personifying the highest standards of public service in this country. So I humbly honor his memory, and express my gratitude for his outstanding service to our Nation to our democracy.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I join the Senators from Wisconsin in praising the late Senator William Proxmire. Neither of the Senators currently representing Wisconsin was in the Chamber when Senator Proxmire was here. The distinguished senior Senator, Mr. KOHL, was elected in 1988, when Senator Proxmire retired. Senator FEINGOLD was elected in 1992. I had the opportunity to serve 8 years with Senator Proxmire. He was a powerful figure. He sat in the last row on the extreme right-hand side, the seat now occupied by Senator ROCKEFELLER. He was on the floor every day talking about genocide. He was the conscience of the Senate, the conscience of the Congress, the conscience of the country, really, the conscience of the world speaking on that subject every single day.

He never missed a vote. I don't recollect exactly how many consecutive votes he had, but I think it was in the range of 17,000 that he never missed.

He had a record for minimal expenditures on campaigns for his own reelection. I recollect the average figure was about \$173. That figure sticks in my mind as to what he spent to be reelected. There is some variance on what it costs to be reelected today to the U.S. Senate, but he was a towering figure. There ought to be more Senators on the floor commenting about him. Even our senior Senator, Mr. LOTT, was not elected until 1988 and Senator GREGG until 1992, so most of the Senators who are around today didn't have the advantage of working with Bill Proxmire. There is a difference between knowing about him and actually seeing him in action and seeing him work. But he is a legend.

The Senators from Wisconsin have spoken eloquently about him. I wanted to add my voice in tribute to Bill Proxmire. He is still sitting in that chair. I still hear talk about the necessity to eliminate genocide. That voice, once lonely, is now the predominant voice. A good bit of what he has said has been accepted around the world to the benefit of humanity.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from

New Hampshire is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the 15 minutes which was to go to the majority for morning business be expanded a little bit and that 7 minutes be yielded to the Senator from Florida, then 5 minutes to the Senator from New Hampshire, and then 7 minutes to the Senator from Oklahoma.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. KENNEDY. Reserving the right to object, and I don't intend to, what is the business before the Senate now?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is currently in morning business.

Mr. KENNEDY. And what time do we start the 1 hour prior to the cloture vote?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there is 15 minutes to be controlled by the majority at the present time. Then the Senate will proceed to the debate on the PATRIOT Act.

Mr. KENNEDY. At that time, after this consent agreement, then the hour tolls prior to the cloture vote; am I correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour begins.

Mr. KENNEDY. And the time is divided?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KENNEDY. So just as a point of information, what time do we expect that time will begin, if the pending request for time is agreed to and whatever time the floor leaders agreed to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the pending request is agreed to, that would be 20 minutes from now.

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous consent request?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Florida is recognized for 7 minutes.

#### IRAQ ELECTION

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. President, yesterday we saw a historic day in Iraq. For the third time in less than a year, the people of Iraq did what only a couple of years ago would have been a dream: they voted in free elections. For those of us who have the appreciation of democracy as a result of having lived where that is denied, the ink-stained finger, the smiles, the celebratory atmosphere akin to a wedding is something to give us all hope.

Yesterday was a relatively trouble-free day. Seventy percent of Iraqis voted. Poll stations were open for an extra hour because of such long lines. The turnout was so good that ballot shortages were reported. This was clearly a successful day.

How does a date like this come to be? How do we go from a brutal dictatorship that threatens its citizens to a society of free elections? The answer is

that it is about choices. Do people want a way of life built around tyranny, oppression, and terrorism, or do they want to embrace democracy, freedom, and prosperity? Clearly, the people of Iraq have chosen the latter. Yes, they have chosen the more difficult path, but the rewards will be enormous.

I congratulate the people of Iraq for yesterday's historic elections. History will judge these elections to be pivotal, vital to building democracy, and part and parcel of our efforts in the war on terror.

As President Bush has highlighted in several recent statements, in an unbelievably brief period of time, Iraq has made tremendous gains in democracy and freedom. I commend the Iraqi people for these unprecedented strides.

The administration has outlined a clear strategy for going forward: three key tracks—political, economic, and security—with realistic terms that avoid imposing unrealistic expectations and very dangerous time frames.

I want to mention the story of a constituent of mine, a man who saw his son go into the service of his country, who saw his son called to war, and then sadly was here in Washington this week to lay that son to rest at Arlington National Cemetery.

Bud Clay of Pensacola shared a letter from his son, SSG Daniel Clay of the U.S. Marine Corps. Dan was one of 10 marines killed in Iraq by a roadside bomb in Fallujah. Knowing the danger he faced, knowing the unpredictability of war, Staff Sergeant Clay wrote a letter to his family to be opened only in the event of his death.

He wrote in part:

What we have done in Iraq is worth any sacrifice. Why? Because it was our duty. That sounds simple. But all of us have a duty. It has been an honor to protect and serve all of you. I faced death with the secure knowledge that you would not have to.

Staff Sergeant Clay writes:

As a marine, this is not the last chapter. I have the privilege of being one who has finished the race. I have been in the company of heroes. I now am counted among them.

He concludes by saying:

My race is over, my time in the war zone is over. My trials are done . . . Semper Fidelis.

SSG Daniel Clay was laid to rest Wednesday at Arlington National Cemetery. He is a hero. We honor his sacrifice, just as we honor the sacrifice of all those who have given so much in this war.

I conclude by again offering congratulations to the people of Iraq. Congratulations for going to the polls, for taking another significant step forward for your own future, and for embracing that glimmer of hope that your country can be as free, peaceful, and prosperous as any other society that rejects tyranny and entrusts its government to its people.

Soldiers such as Staff Sergeant Clay are sustaining the development of Iraqi forces. We owe them our respect, grati-

tude, and undying honor as we demonstrate unwavering determination to complete this mission.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire is recognized for 5 minutes.

#### NEW HAMPSHIRE PRIMARY

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, there is an irony today as we look at Iraq. As democracy is flourishing, the Democratic Party in the United States has tried to contract the democratic process by attempting to mute the New Hampshire primary.

The New Hampshire primary is sort of the last best hope for the dream that anybody can become President in this country. It is the last opportunity in this country for a person who is underfunded and who has not been chosen by the Washington talking heads as a potential candidate of purpose to have the opportunity to go somewhere and actually make an impact. Underfunded, nonrecognized candidates who have legitimacy can succeed in New Hampshire and, therefore, interject themselves into the opportunity to become President. And it has happened time and again.

The argument that New Hampshire is not representative is belied by the facts. Again and again, New Hampshire has reflected an opportunity for people to come to New Hampshire, participate in the process, make a name for themselves, and move forward in the process.

Henry Cabot Lodge upset Nelson Rockefeller and Barry Goldwater there. Eugene McCarthy and George McGovern upset the candidates who were perceived to be the sure-fire winners of their nomination, in fact, in one case, a sitting President. Jimmy Carter and Bill Clinton not only came to New Hampshire and made a name for themselves as people not recognized nationally but moved on to become President of the United States. Even Ronald Reagan, arguably, might not have become President of the United States had he not had the opportunity to come to New Hampshire and participate in the national debate where he said:

I paid for this microphone, Mr. Green.

More importantly, New Hampshire gives the people of this country the only opportunity they have to test candidates for President one on one. Without any script, without any prescreening, Presidential candidates have to come to New Hampshire and go into living rooms, they have to go into VFW halls, they have to go to Rotary clubs, and they have to go to union halls. They have to answer questions from everyday American citizens, and those questions are tough. Regrettably, time and again, candidates have not lived up to that test.

So what we have today in the Democratic Party is an attempt by the

kingmakers of that party to try to eliminate the threat of having the American people actually meet their candidates and be tested by those questions as they try to mute the New Hampshire primary process.

This was said extraordinarily well in an article ironically written by a professor in England who is a specialist on the American political process. He looks at New Hampshire as the last best hope to maintain a populist approach to how we pick our Presidents in this country. Rather than having to have lots of money to pay for campaigns in big States or large groups of primary States or have a national name recognition that comes through having cozier up to the national press, a candidate can come to New Hampshire with very little money, without national name recognition, but with ideas, with purpose, with fire in their belly, and they can succeed in putting themselves and injecting themselves into the Presidential process.

It would be a huge detriment to a fundamental element of the American dream, which is that if you have purpose, if you have substance, and if you have a track record of success and have been a producer in our Nation, you can continue that course and pursue the Presidency. It will undermine fundamentally the capacity of the American people to participate in the picking of a President if they don't have one place in this country where people who want to be President have to actually answer questions from everyday Americans.

I certainly hope the Democratic Party will relent in its efforts to try to crush this one element of democracy which is so critical to our entire democratic process.

I ask unanimous consent that the article written by Roddy Keenan, a professor of American studies in England, be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Concord (NH) Monitor, Dec. 16, 2005]

EVEN FROM ACROSS THE POND, PRIMARY'S BEAUTY IS PLAIN TO SEE

(By Roddy Keenan)

Gary Hart had just won New Hampshire. The race for the Democratic nomination had been turned on its head. And it was all because of New Hampshire. To a 14-year-old watching the news in Ireland, this was all unfamiliar to me. But on that night in 1984, a fascination was born for a nation's politics and for a picturesque snow-covered state in New England.

Now, 21 years later, the New Hampshire primary is under attack. Watching from afar, I believe that attempts by Democratic powers-that-be to dilute the primary come with little justification, minimal forethought and an absence of logic.

I can only imagine that those looking to create such mischief have never witnessed the process or are fitted with the blinkers of self-interest.

For these reforming politicians and officials deeming themselves to be redressing an absence of inclusiveness and decrying the unrepresentative nature of the primary, there