

special responsibility to the world calling on our Nation to be “for the world, an example of a genuinely free, democratic, just and humane society.”

In recent years, even as his health deteriorated, he refused to give up. And in this, he served as a model to millions of people throughout the world about how faith and willpower can overcome adversity.

Indeed, I cannot remember a Pope who has been more warmly received and loved. I had the great honor to meet him at the Vatican in 1982 where I presented him with a cross sculpted from handguns melted down after being turned into police when they were banned in San Francisco. He received my gift warmly, giving me a rosary in return.

The world has lost a strong voice for peace, justice, and human dignity. Pope John Paul II will be dearly missed.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I watched with great sadness this weekend as the world lost a remarkable leader and faithful servant. Pope John Paul II, born Karol Wojtyla, was the leader of the world's largest church and shepherd to more than a billion Catholics throughout the world. In my home State of North Dakota, more than 130,000 Catholics are mourning the Pope's death this week and praying for the repose of his soul. I join these faithful and millions of others in grieving for the Holy Father who spread a message of peace and charity during his 26-year-long pontificate.

Reflecting on the Pope's legacy, I will forever admire his bravery, both in answering God's call and in challenging corrupt governments for the sake of humanity. In his first mass at St. Peter's Basilica in 1978, Pope John Paul II called on Catholics throughout the world to “be not afraid.”

The Pope spent his entire life living that call. Born on the eve of World War II, Pope John Paul knew the horrors of war; the Nazis forced him into labor when they invaded Poland in 1939. During this period, he found comfort in his Catholic faith and challenged the Nazis by attending illegal prayer meetings. These experiences hardened his conviction that war is “always a defeat for humanity.”

He again answered the call to “be not afraid” when he challenged the Soviet Union and the tyranny of communism in his homeland, Poland. Both as Archbishop of Krakow and then as Pope, John Paul II provided religious strength to those fighting these regimes. He is credited with helping to topple communism in Poland, and his steadfastness against oppression in all forms will forever be honored.

There may be no event more telling of his commitment to bravery and mercy than the attempt on his life in 1981. After being shot twice, nearly resulting in his death, the Pope recovered and continued his public works. Two years after the shooting, he visited his attacker in jail and offered his

forgiveness. Responding to this act of evil with compassion and grace, John Paul served as a witness to what humanity should strive to become.

The world has lost a great leader and the father of a religious family. John Paul II will be remembered as a teacher and defender of the faith he was called to serve. He will be honored as a diplomat and as a revolutionary in the fight against injustice and oppression. And he will provide us ongoing inspiration to respect human dignity and the worth of all humankind.

I am saddened by the loss of this just and holy man; however, I am joyful that he surely has passed to a more perfect place and is in communion with the God he served so faithfully. My thoughts and prayers are with the Catholic community and all those who mourn the death of Pope John Paul II.

#### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is now closed.

#### FOREIGN AFFAIRS AUTHORIZATION ACT, FISCAL YEARS 2006 AND 2007

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the pending business.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (No. S. 600) to authorize appropriations for the Department of State and international broadcasting activities for fiscal years 2006 and 2007, for the Peace Corps for fiscal years 2006 and 2007, for foreign assistance programs for fiscal years 2006 and 2007, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, today, the Senate will be considering S. 600, the Foreign Affairs Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 2006 and 2007. The Foreign Relations Committee passed this bill on March 3 by a vote of 18-0. This is the third successive year that the Foreign Relations Committee has reported out a comprehensive Foreign Affairs Authorization bill by a unanimous vote. We are pleased to have this opportunity to bring it to the floor for the Senate's consideration. I want to especially thank the majority leader and the Democratic leader for their assistance and support in bringing this measure to the floor.

This legislation gives voice to Senate views on issues touching every continent—from the threat of terrorism and weapons of mass destruction, to the safety of Americans working in our embassies overseas, to an increased and focused effort to spur economic growth in the poorest countries. It authorizes the executive branch to take important actions on a wide range of issues. And, it authorizes appropriations for our diplomats, our foreign aid workers, and our Peace Corps volunteers, as well as the programs and policies that they manage on behalf of the United States.

These people are our civilian soldiers—they pursue a bold war on terrorism and a noble and far-sighted battle against disease, poverty, and humanitarian disasters. Most work in circumstances where the threat level is severe. American diplomats and aid workers frequently have been targets of terrorism while serving overseas. But they understand the importance of representing the United States, and they go anyway.

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 nuclear proliferation problems in North Korea and Iran that threaten U.S. national security and regional stability. 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 have expanded it. We are trying to respond to the AIDS pandemic in Africa, the natural disasters in the Indian Ocean region, and the man-made calamity in Sudan. We are trying to take advantage of openings in the Middle East peace process and spur the advance of democracy in many countries. Emerging powers, including China, India, and Brazil, may soon reconfigure the world economically and politically in ways that we do not yet comprehend.

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 U.S. 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.

In considering this legislation today, it is important to remember that since the end of the Cold War, the Foreign Affairs Account frequently has suffered

from inadequate funding. The American public generally understands that the United States reduced military spending in the 1990s following the fall of the Soviet Union. Few are aware, however, that this peace dividend spending reduction theme was applied even more unsparingly to our foreign affairs programs. In constant dollars, the foreign affairs budget was cut in six consecutive years from 1992 to 1998. This slide occurred even as the United States sustained the heavy added costs of establishing new missions in the fifteen emergent states of the former Soviet Union. In constant dollars, the cumulative effect was a 26 percent decrease in our foreign affairs programs. As a percentage of GDP, this six-year slide represented a 36 percent cut in foreign affairs programs.

By the beginning of the new millennium, these cuts had taken their toll. The General Accounting Office reported that staffing shortfalls, lack of adequate language skills, and security vulnerabilities plagued many of our diplomatic posts. In 2001 the share of the U.S. budget devoted to the international affairs account stood at a paltry 1.18 percent—barely above its post-World War II low and only about half of its share in the mid-1980s, during the Reagan administration.

Under President Bush, funding for the Foreign Affairs Account has increased substantially. The President has requested increases in each of the last four budgets. In this year's budget, the President has requested a 13 percent increase over last year's appropriated amount for the Foreign Affairs Account—the largest percentage increase of any major account in the budget. This is a tangible demonstration of the President's commitment to diplomatic strength. Congress must now do its part by providing the resources and authorities that the President needs to carry out an effective foreign policy.

The bill before us preserves the funding decisions in the President's request. Inevitably, members will have some differences with the specifics of the President's request. But we should recognize that this bill represents a generous attempt to raise the profile and effectiveness of U.S. diplomacy. Those of us who have advocated funding increases for the 150 Account should take "Yes" for an answer. Accordingly, I believe that if amendments are offered to increase funding for a particular program, they should include offsets.

The bill funds the Millennium Challenge Corporation at the President's requested level of \$3 billion. Some have argued that the President should have requested \$5 billion—the amount he originally had conceived for the corporation's third year of funding. Others have argued that \$3 billion is too much for a new venture that is just getting off the ground, and that some of this money should be shifted to other priorities. My own view is that \$3 billion is

a reasonable amount, given the scope of the program and its potential for spurring democratic reforms overseas. The credibility of the program, which foreign nations are observing closely, would be strengthened if the Senate endorsed the President's funding request. For these reasons, I will oppose amendments that seek to use MCC funds as an offset for other priorities.

This bill contains numerous policy initiatives, most notably the bipartisan Stabilization and Reconstruction Civilian Management Act, which was developed in the Foreign Relations Committee and included in last year's bill. The bill before the Senate also includes a 10 percent increase in danger pay for State Department employees who serve in dangerous posts overseas, funding for refugee assistance, and provisions designed to improve protections for women, children, and other vulnerable populations in the context of war or disaster.

Since the mid-1980s, Congress has not fulfilled its responsibility to pass an Omnibus Foreign Assistance Act. Several discrete measures, such as the Millennium Challenge Account, the global AIDS bill, the Freedom Support Act, and the Support for Eastern European Democracy Act, 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. Appropriators have kept our foreign assistance programs going, but in many cases, they have had to do so without proper authorization. In some years, the Congress 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.

Passing a comprehensive Foreign Affairs authorization 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 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 can be undermined by what happens overseas. It recognizes that American prosperity is far more likely to be sustained if we are successful in spreading democracy, stability, and free market principles.

I thank the members of my committee for their hard work during the authorization process. Members on both sides of the aisle devoted many hours and much thought to constructive approaches to a number of very difficult foreign policy questions. Although this is a new bill developed during the last several months, it reflects

much work that has been done by the Committee during the previous Congress. Committee hearings during the last 2 years on post-conflict stabilization and reconstruction, U.S. policy in the Middle East, developments on the Korean peninsula, relations between India and Pakistan, public diplomacy, foreign assistance, and numerous other topics have been well attended. In fact, no Senate committee held as many hearings or met as often as the Foreign Relations Committee during the last Congress.

I especially thank the ranking member of the Foreign Relations Committee, Senator BIDEN, for his 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. We have always shared the common goal of bringing good legislation to the floor for the Senate's judgment.

It has long been my intent that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee approach foreign policy problems in a bipartisan spirit. This legislation reflects the committee's success in that regard. Republicans and Democrats have worked together closely to seek consensus, reason together, make compromises and craft excellent legislation. Our committee is united in the belief that passing a comprehensive Foreign Affairs authorization bill will enhance U.S. national security.

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

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SUNUNU). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 266

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. LUGAR] proposes an amendment numbered 266.

Mr. LUGAR. I ask unanimous consent further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To strike the amendment to the limitation on the United States share of assessments for United Nations Peacekeeping operations)

On page 55, strike lines 3 through 11.

Mr. LUGAR. I rise to offer an amendment that strikes section 401, a section which establishes a permanent cap of

27.1 percent on the American share of cost of U.N. peacekeeping operations. The Helms-Biden legislation passed in 1999 anticipated the U.S. share of peacekeeping dues would decline to 25 percent in total. This remains an important goal of the U.S. policy toward the U.N.

This issue has raised strong feelings on both sides of the aisle. I appreciate the perspective of Senators who want to preserve a 27.1-percent cap as well as those who want the cap to be reduced to the 25 percent level in accordance with the Helms-Biden legislation. We would all like to see American financial responsibilities at the United Nations reduced.

We should acknowledge that existing U.S. law sets 25 percent as our target for peacekeeping contributions. I believe we should give the U.S. negotiators the most leverage possible to attain the U.S. goals. Passing a permanent 27.1-percent cap in this bill at this moment might reduce that leverage.

In coming weeks Congress will have further opportunities to work with President Bush to craft the most effective means possible of reducing the U.S. share of peacekeeping assessments. I believe this is an issue on which further consultation with the executive branch is certainly warranted. This is particularly true at a moment when the Secretary General has recently put forward a substantial United Nations reform plan, and the President's nominee to be U.S. Ambassador to the U.N. is pending before the Senate.

After discussions with the majority leader and other Members, I have come to the conclusion that we will facilitate further consultations on the peacekeeping cap with the administration and improve prospects for passage of the underlying legislation if we strike this provision. Consequently, I am hopeful Senators will join me in passing this amendment.

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

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

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside in order that I may send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 267

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. McCAIN], for himself and Mr. DEWINE, proposes an amendment numbered 267.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To authorize the extension of non-discriminatory treatment (normal trade relations treatment) to the products of Ukraine)

On page 277, after line 8, add the following:

**TITLE XXIX—TRADE TREATMENT OF UKRAINE**

**SEC. 2901. FINDINGS.**

Congress finds that Ukraine has—

(1) made considerable progress toward respecting fundamental human rights consistent with the objectives of title IV of the Trade Act of 1974;

(2) adopted administrative procedures that accord its citizens the right to emigrate, travel freely, and to return to their country without restriction; and

(3) been found to be in full compliance with the freedom of emigration provisions in title IV of the Trade Act of 1974.

**SEC. 2902. TERMINATION OF APPLICATION OF TITLE IV OF THE TRADE ACT OF 1974 TO UKRAINE.**

(a) PRESIDENTIAL DETERMINATIONS AND EXTENSIONS OF NONDISCRIMINATORY TREATMENT.—Notwithstanding any provision of title IV of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2431 et seq.), the President may—

(1) determine that such title should no longer apply to Ukraine; and

(2) after making a determination under paragraph (1) with respect to Ukraine, proclaim the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment (normal trade relations treatment) to the products of that country.

(b) TERMINATION OF APPLICATION OF TITLE IV.—On and after the effective date of the extension under subsection (a)(2) of nondiscriminatory treatment to the products of Ukraine, title IV of the Trade Act of 1974 shall cease to apply to that country.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, as we all know, the recent Orange Revolution in Ukraine marked a huge victory for the advancement of democracy in the world. The Ukrainian people made clear that they would not stand idle as a corrupt regime sought to deny them their democratic rights. Now that the people of Ukraine have seized control of their destiny, the United States must stand ready to assist them as they do the hard work of consolidating democracy.

The purpose of the amendment is to repeal the so-called and well-known Jackson-Vanik amendment, for it to be terminated with respect to Ukraine. At his appearance yesterday with President Viktor Yushchenko, President Bush pledged to seek the termination of Jackson-Vanik. In a White House statement yesterday, both Governments stated that they support "immediately ending the application of Jackson-Vanik to Ukraine." We should all agree. This 31-year-old legislation is, with respect to Ukraine, now anachronistic and inappropriate. I am pleased to offer this amendment along with Senator DEWINE. And I know there will be others.

Specifically, this amendment would authorize the President to terminate the application of Jackson-Vanik,

which is title IV of the Trade Act of 1974, to Ukraine. Ukraine would then be eligible to receive permanent normal trade relations tariff status in its trade with the United States. Several Members in the Senate and House have also introduced legislation to terminate Jackson-Vanik, and these bills in the Senate have been pending in the committee since the start of this session. I am hopeful that today the Senate will agree to adopt this amendment.

Beyond any benefits to our bilateral trading relationship, lifting Jackson-Vanik for Ukraine constitutes an important symbol of Ukraine's new democracy and its relationship with the United States. In February, along with three other Senators and six representatives, I went to Kiev, where we met with President Yushchenko, Prime Minister Tymoshenko, and students who led protests in Independence Square. I was struck by the great enthusiasm for democracy and freedom that has taken hold in Ukraine, and I know we all wish the new leaders all the best as they begin the challenge of governing. I pledged to them that we would work toward the lifting of Jackson-Vanik on Ukraine, and today I am happy to move toward that end.

Tomorrow, President Yushchenko will address a joint session of Congress, an honor which we bestow on few foreign leaders. As we have the privilege of welcoming this true hero of democracy, I can think of no better gesture than today terminating the anachronistic and inappropriate Jackson-Vanik restrictions on Ukraine.

I note the presence of my most respected colleague, Senator LUGAR, who has gained the respect and appreciation of all of us with his knowledge and expertise on issues of national security and foreign affairs and his chairmanship of the Foreign Relations Committee. I hope he would see his way clear to have a look at this amendment, and I would obviously seek his support.

Mr. President, we who follow events in that part of the world were thrilled at the Orange Revolution. We saw a flawed election that was repudiated by the people of Ukraine in a peaceful manner. It was one of the remarkable events in that part of the world.

I remind my colleagues that Ukraine is a very pivotal and important country in its own right, one with a tragic history of bloodshed and sacrifice but also, when its geostrategic location is considered, a very important part of the world. Dr. Henry Kissinger once was quoted as saying: Russia with Ukraine is a Western power, without Ukraine is an Eastern power.

I fully agree with our President's stated commitment yesterday for repeal of Jackson-Vanik as far as Ukraine is concerned.

Jackson-Vanik was a very incredibly important tool in asserting our support and advocacy for human rights in then-Iron-Curtain countries. I think it is

very clear that neither Senator Jackson nor Congressman Vanik envisioned this anachronistic provision to apply to a country that is now on the verge of a functioning democracy in a free and exuberant nation.

I am told by my staff that somehow the chairman of the Finance Committee, or probably more likely one of his zealous staffers, has said they would object to this provision because of the fact there are certain problems with intellectual property or other reasons. I would hope that assertion of jurisdiction, or reluctance to approve of this, particularly in light of this particular moment, would disappear in light of the priorities that this repeal of Jackson-Vanik would send as a sign of strong support and advocacy for democracy and process of an open and free society which is obviously taking place in Ukraine.

So if there is a problem that we have with Ukraine, I would think the President of the United States would have articulated those views in his meetings with President Yushchenko yesterday. And if the President had a problem, he certainly would not have come out after the meeting and advocated the repeal of Jackson-Vanik.

Not many Americans even know what Jackson-Vanik is. But a whole lot of people in these countries that this law still applies to are very aware of it. I think it would not only be appropriate to send a signal with the repeal of Jackson-Vanik as far as Ukraine is concerned, but I think it would be a slap in the face to the new Ukrainian Government and people because some committee of the Senate asserted its jurisdiction at a time when we should be providing as much encouragement as we can to the process of democracy and freedom, which has exhilarated all of us as we watched this marvelous transformation take place.

So I urge adoption of the amendment. I hope we can dispose of the amendment today. If the chairman of the Finance Committee or any of his staff would like to debate this issue, I would be more than happy to engage in that at their convenience and have a recorded vote, which I think would carry overwhelmingly in the Senate.

I again recognize the leadership and dedicated hard work on this legislation by our distinguished and respected chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Arizona for his very thoughtful comments about my work in the Foreign Relations Committee. I thank him for offering this amendment.

Let me point out, as the Senator from Arizona has already, a number of bills attempting to achieve repeal of Jackson-Vanik have been introduced in both Houses. But they have not come to conclusion, and apparently today that will happen.

I am one of the authors of one of those bills, S. 632, which authorizes the extension of permanent normal trade relations treatment with Ukraine. As the Senator from Arizona has pointed out, unfortunately Ukraine is still subject to the provisions of the Jackson-Vanik amendment to the Trade Act of 1974, which sanctions nations for failure to comply with freedom of emigration requirements. My bill, and I believe Senator McCAIN's bill, would repeal permanently the application of Jackson-Vanik to Ukraine. As has been mentioned by the distinguished Senator, that bill has been referred to the Finance Committee, which still has it under consideration.

But I would offer this argument. In the post-Cold-War era, Ukraine has demonstrated a commitment to meeting the requirements for the lifting of Jackson-Vanik and, in addition, has expressed a strong desire to abide by free market principles and good governance.

Last November 21, I served as President Bush's personal representative to the runoff election between Prime Minister Yanukovich and Viktor Yushchenko. During that visit, I promoted free and fair election procedures that would strengthen worldwide respect for the legitimacy of the winning candidate. Unfortunately, that was not possible at that time. The Government of Ukraine allowed, or aided and abetted, wholesale fraud and abuse that changed the results of that November 21 election. It is clear that Prime Minister Yanukovich did not win that election.

In response, however, the people of Ukraine rallied in the streets and squares and demanded justice. After tremendous international pressure and mediation, Ukraine repeated the runoff election. It was held on December 26. A newly named Central Election Commission and a new set of election laws led to a much improved process. International monitors concluded the process was generally free and fair. Viktor Yushchenko was inaugurated as President of Ukraine, and tomorrow he will address a joint session of our Congress.

Extraordinary events have occurred in Ukraine over the last several months since the December 26 election. A free press has revolted against Government intimidation and reasserted itself. An emerging middle class has found its political footing. A new generation has embraced democracy and openness. A society has rebelled against the illegal activities of its Government. It is in our interest to recognize and to protect these advances in Ukraine.

The United States has a long record of cooperation with Ukraine through the Nunn-Lugar Cooperative Threat Reduction Act.

Ukraine inherited the third largest nuclear arsenal in the world with the fall of the Soviet Union. Through the Nunn-Lugar Program, the United States has assisted Ukraine in elimi-

nating this deadly arsenal and joining the nonproliferation treaty as a non-nuclear state.

One of the areas where we can deepen United States-Ukraine relations is bilateral trade. Trade relations between the United States and Ukraine are currently governed by a bilateral trade agreement signed in 1992. There are other economic agreements in place seeking to further facilitate economic cooperation between the United States and Ukraine, including a bilateral investment treaty which was signed in 1996 and a taxation treaty signed in the year 2000. In addition, Ukraine commenced negotiations to become a member of the World Trade Organization in 1993, further demonstrating its commitment to adhere to the free market principles of fair trade.

In light of its adherence to freedom of immigration requirements, democratic principles, compliance with threat reduction, and several agreements on economic cooperation, the products of Ukraine should not be subject to the sanctions of Jackson-Vanik.

There are areas in which Ukraine needs to continue to improve. These include market access, protection of intellectual property, and reduction of tariffs. The United States must remain committed to assisting Ukraine in pursuing market economic reforms. The permanent waiver of Jackson-Vanik and establishment of permanent normal trade relations will be the foundation on which further progress in a burgeoning economic partnership can be made.

My colleagues on the Finance Committee have committed to joining me in supporting this important legislation. It is essential that the Finance Committee and the full Senate act promptly to bolster this burgeoning democracy to promote stability in this region. I am most hopeful that in the course of the day, we will take favorable action on this amendment.

For the moment, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LUGAR. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I rise for the point of giving information to all Senators about the legislation we have in front of us. As the Chair has observed, several minutes have passed without activity. We have through staff attempted to notify all Senators who might be anticipating offering amendments or action on this bill. This will be an excellent opportunity to do so prior to the time the two party luncheons are held and a recess for that reason is called. We know that following lunch, there will be two important amendments offered, and we welcome those. I would like to proceed to

our debate and votes, with disposition of amendments that are now pending.

I simply mention, Mr. President, that I recognize, as does the Chair, many Senators are under some urgent requirements in terms of scheduling in this particular week, as we mourn the death of Pope John Paul II. Some Senators are contemplating potential travel to the funeral of the Pope. Others have other requirements. So it would be my intent, as we conclude these amendments that are available, to move for final passage of the bill, to conclude activity on this bill today and as early today as possible.

My understanding is a potential debate on the Social Security issue will ensue at some point this evening after we have concluded activities on the authorization bill. So we might make that more readily available and that time more certain. I mention this because for Senators who do have amendments, even if they are not completely formulated, I request they bring those to the floor so that staff on both sides of the aisle can work through those amendments to find an acceptable form. It would be at least our general view of a liberal policy of adopting amendments that enhance the authorization process and do no violence at least to the foreign policy objectives of the United States.

With that in mind, hopefully those listening to the debate will hear our plea, proceed with amendments, and help us with the activities.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. DURBIN. Having spoken to the chairman of the committee, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for no more than 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

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

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURR). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LUGAR. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

AMENDMENTS NOS. 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, AND 277, EN BLOC

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I send to the desk a group of amendments to S. 600 that have the approval of the managers of the bill. The package has bipartisan support. I intend to ask they

be agreed to by unanimous consent as soon as the ranking member has joined me in the Senate.

I have received word that the presence of the ranking member will not be required. Staff on both sides of the aisle have cleared these amendments; therefore, I ask they be agreed to en bloc by unanimous consent.

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

The amendments were agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To permit grants to be used for broadcasting outside the Middle East region)

On page 59, strike lines 16 through 25 and insert the following:

“(a) AUTHORITY.—Grants authorized under section 305 shall be available to make annual grants to Middle East Broadcasting Networks for the purpose of carrying out radio and television broadcasting.

“(b) FUNCTION.—Middle East Broadcasting Networks shall provide radio and television programming consistent with the broadcasting standards and broadcasting principles set forth in section 303.

(Purpose: To limit the compensation paid to employees of the Middle East Broadcasting Networks)

On page 60, between lines 20 and 21, insert the following:

“(c) not more than 5 officers or employees of the Middle East Broadcasting Networks may be provided a rate of basic compensation at such rate authorized for Level II of the Executive Schedule provided in section 5313 of title 5, United States Code, and such compensation shall be subject to the provisions of section 5307 of such title.

(Purpose: To require payments from the Broadcasting Board of Governors for costs resulting from the creditable service of employees of the Middle East Broadcasting Networks)

On page 64, strike lines 3 through 6, and insert the following:

(4) CREDITABLE SERVICE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 8332(b)(11) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting “the Middle East Broadcasting Networks;” after “the Asia Foundation;”.

(B) OTHER REQUIREMENTS.—With regard to creditable service with the Middle East Broadcasting Networks, the Broadcasting Board of Governors shall—

(i) pay into the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund an amount determined by the Director of the Office of Personnel Management to be necessary to reimburse such Fund for any estimated increase in the unfunded liability of such Fund that results from the amendment made by subparagraph (4), computed using dynamic assumptions; and

(ii) pay the amount required by clause (i) in 5 equal annual installments, together with interest on such amount computed at the rate used in the computation required by such clause.

(Purpose: To extend the United States Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy until 2008)

On page 110, between lines 4 and 5, insert the following new section:

**SEC. 812. UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON PUBLIC DIPLOMACY.**

Section 1334 of the Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6553) is amended by striking “October 1, 2005” and inserting “October 1, 2008”.

(Purpose: To clarify Foreign Service Grievance Board procedures in the case of an alleged overpayment of an annuity)

On page 47, line 13, strike “and”;

On page 47, line 15, strike the period at the end and insert as semicolon and “and”.

On page 47, between lines 15 and 16, insert the following:

(3) by striking “or allowances” and inserting “allowances, or annuities”.

(Purpose: To limit the availability of funds authorized for contributions for international peacekeeping activities)

On page 12, strike lines 11 through 13, and insert the following:

(2) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—

(A) FISCAL YEAR 2006.—Fifteen percent of the funds appropriated pursuant to paragraph (1) for fiscal year 2006 are authorized to remain available until September 30, 2007.

(B) FISCAL YEAR 2007.—Fifteen percent of the funds appropriated pursuant to paragraph (1) for fiscal year 2007 are authorized to remain available until September 30, 2008.

(Purpose: To provide a short title)

On page 1, after line 2, insert the following:

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

This Act may be cited as the “Foreign Affairs Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 2006 and 2007”.

(Purpose: To require a determination to provide assistance for destruction of small arms and related ammunition)

Beginning on page 150, strike line 18 and all that follows through page 151, line 4, and insert the following:

(a) CLARIFICATION OF AUTHORITY.—Section 551 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2348) is amended by adding at the end “Such assistance may also include assistance for demining activities, clearance of unexploded ordnance, destruction of small arms and related ammunition when determined to be in the national security interest of the United States, and related activities, notwithstanding any other provision of law.”.

(Purpose: To require a determination to provide assistance for the safeguarding, removal, or elimination of conventional weapons and related ammunition)

On page 272, line 15, strike “weapons,” and insert “weapons and related ammunition when determined to be in the national security interest of the United States,”.

(Purpose: To waive the passport fees for a relative of a deceased member of the Armed Forces proceeding abroad to visit the grave of such member or to attend a funeral or memorial service for such member)

On page 74, between lines 2 and 3, insert the following new section:

**SEC. 603. PASSPORT FEES.**

Section 1 of the Act of June 4, 1920 (22 U.S.C. 214) is amended in the third sentence by striking “or from a widow, widower, child, parent, brother, or sister of a deceased member of the Armed Forces proceeding abroad to visit the grave of such member” and inserting “or from a widow, widower, child, parent, grandparent, brother, or sister of a deceased member of the Armed Forces proceeding abroad to visit the grave of such member or to attend a funeral or memorial service for such member”.

Mr. LUGAR. I simply point out these are amendments that followed the consideration of the bill in the Committee on Foreign Relations and were suggested by the administration. They have been carefully considered over the course of several days, and there has been unanimous consent on the list that was agreed to.

I encourage Senators who have amendments, once again, to come to

the Senate to make their presence known so we can work with them. It would be our hope we could accept most of those amendments or work on modifications so they can be part of the legislation, as has been the case with the package we just agreed to.

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

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

#### RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the hour of 12:30 p.m. having arrived, the Senate will stand in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:32 p.m., recessed until 2:16 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. VOINOVICH).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

#### TRIBUTE TO SENATOR HOWELL HEFLIN

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I rise today with a heavy heart to pay tribute to the passing of my good friend, our former colleague, Senator Howell Heflin.

Judge Heflin, as we often called him, was a stalwart in the Senate, devoted to improving my State of Alabama and the Nation with each decision he made and I believe every vote he cast.

When I first entered the Senate in 1987, Judge Heflin was the senior Senator from my State of Alabama. I considered him a good friend and colleague over the 18 years he served here. I always appreciated his humor and his solid values. I believe he will be remembered as one of Alabama's most respected politicians.

Judge Heflin was a strong voice for Alabama in the Senate. He served as chairman of the Senate Ethics Committee and as a member of the Senate Judiciary Committee. He worked to ensure that Alabama was indeed well represented in this body.

He was deeply devoted to his job, and, as we know, often spent dinners out that were meant to be time off as an opportunity to help his constituents who happened to be at the same restaurant.

Howell Heflin was born June 19, 1921, in Poulan, GA, to Reverend Marvin Rutledge Heflin and Louise Strudwick Heflin. He graduated from Colbert County High School in Leighton, AL, and Birmingham Southern College in Birmingham, AL.

Following his graduation from Birmingham Southern College in 1942, Judge Heflin enlisted in the U.S. Marine Corps. His military service during World War II took him to the Pacific

Theater, where he was wounded twice and awarded the Silver Star for bravery. He was also awarded two Purple Hearts.

Upon his return from World War II, he attended the University of Alabama School of Law and was admitted to the Alabama State Bar in 1948. From 1948 to 1971, Judge Heflin was an attorney in Tuscumbia, AL.

He was elected as the chief justice of the Alabama Supreme Court in 1970. He was well known for his efforts to modernize Alabama's legal system. It was because of his profound work as chief justice that he became affectionately known as "The Judge" even after he became a Senator. He was elected first to the Senate in 1978, and was reelected to two more terms, for a total of 18 years of service—three terms—in the Senate.

In 1997, he left public life and returned home to Tuscumbia, AL, to enjoy time with his family.

Howell Thomas Heflin led a full life. Each chapter of his life—as a war hero, a jurist, and a public servant—was completed with great fervor and devotion. He did nothing halfway, and everyone who knew him recognized and appreciated that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I, too, wish to speak in morning business. What a passing of a great generation. I, too, want to pay my respects to Senator Heflin, an outstanding Senator, a wonderful Senator from Alabama. When I came to the Senate in 1987, he was one of the men of the Senate who welcomed me with graciousness. He introduced me to hand-pulled barbecue from Alabama. He also introduced me to the Marshall Space Program. I had the opportunity to work with him in terms of creating jobs in Alabama and also creating opportunity through the Space Program.

He embodied the qualities of hard work, honesty, humility, and humor, and he left this earth with a great legacy. Senator Heflin died on March 29, 2005, last week. He is survived by his wife Elizabeth Heflin; a son, Howard Thomas Heflin, Jr.; a daughter-in-law, Corneila Hood Heflin; grandson Wilson Charmichael Heflin; and a granddaughter, Mary Catherine Heflin.

Senator Heflin was devoted to his family, his State, and his country. As a World War II hero, he put his love of country above all else. He made remarkable contributions to Alabama and the Nation as a whole. His warm-hearted personality will be remembered by all who knew him well. We will all miss him. We will certainly miss him in the Senate.

I yield the floor.

#### FOREIGN AFFAIRS AUTHORIZATION ACT, FISCAL YEARS 2006 AND 2007—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, very shortly there will be a unanimous consent request on how to proceed on the Boxer amendment, which has not been introduced yet but will be spoken to shortly. I would like, with the permission of my friend from California, to make a brief opening statement relative to the overall bill.

Mrs. BOXER. Would the Senator also then make the unanimous consent request for the 40/20 so I know that is in line?

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I say to my friend, we are just clearing it with the leadership. We are working that out. I am sure we will be able to move the amendment immediately after my statement which I don't think will take more than a few minutes.

Mr. President, under the leadership of Chairman LUGAR, we tried very hard to move this bill in the last couple of years. I hope the third time is a charm. As I believe the chairman has explained, the bill contains the basic authorization for all the major foreign affairs agencies and programs at the Department of State, foreign assistance programs, the Broadcasting Board of Governors, and the Peace Corps.

The bill contains several initiatives I would like to briefly highlight.

I am glad the bill includes the Global Pathogen Surveillance Act, which we have been trying to enact over 3 years. In recent years, the SARS epidemic and the avian flu epidemic have made us acutely aware of how vulnerable the world is to a rapid spread of infectious diseases. We face that same vulnerability for diseases that might be used as weapons of bioterrorism.

The Global Pathogen Surveillance Act will combat the bioterrorism threat by improving other countries' capabilities to detect and limit disease outbreaks and by improving international investigation of disease outbreaks. Because these diseases—whether they are natural occurrences or man-made—have no respect for borders, we are only as safe as the weakest link in the chain is strong. This bill will go a long way to help other countries at an early stage detect the existence of these diseases, these potential bioterrorism threats that can be spread via what we call bioterrorism.

The majority leader, who cosponsored the original version of the act in 2001, is once again pressing for action on this bill. He added a very useful provision to the act, which Chairman LUGAR and I have happily endorsed, calling for the executive branch to develop a real-time data collection and analysis capability to serve as a warning sign for a possible bioterrorism event. With the majority leader's support, I hope and believe this year we will finally enact this important measure.

I am also proud of the work the committee has done, with the chairman's leadership, to help the U.S. Government strengthen its capacity to handle postconflict reconstruction.