

must reaffirm our support for the vital work they have done and continue to do. Like many of my friends here, I was a Boy Scout many years ago.

As a result of the great work they do, I am pleased to be an original cosponsor of S. 642, the "Support Our Scouts Act of 2005", a bill that reinforces our strong commitment to the Boy Scouts.

In fact, I had at one time considered introducing my own bill on this very important matter. However, I was so pleased with the substance of this bill that I was proud to add my name as a cosponsor, and I thank my leader, Senator FRIST, for his efforts on this issue.

This bill addresses efforts by some groups to prevent federal agencies from supporting our Scouts. This bill would remove any doubts that Federal agencies can welcome Scouts and the great work they do from camping on Federal property to hosting the national jamboree every 4 years at Fort A.P. Hill.

As Senator FRIST has said, this legislation will specifically ensure that the Department of Defense can and will continue to provide Scouts the type of support it has provided in the past. Moreover, the Scouts would be permitted equal access to public facilities, forums, and programs that are open to a variety of other youth or community organizations.

Regrettably, as we all know, in recent years, the Boy Scouts have come under attack from aggressive liberal groups blatantly pushing their own social agendas.

In particular, Scouts have been the target of lawsuits by organizations that are more concerned with pushing these liberal agendas than sincerely helping our youth.

For instance, the Federal government is currently defending a lawsuit aimed at severing traditional ties between the Boy Scouts and the Departments of Defense and Housing and Urban Development.

What is more, Scouts have been excluded by certain State and local governments from utilizing public facilities, forums and programs, which are open to other groups.

It is certainly disappointing and, frankly, frustrating that we have reached a point where groups like the ACLU are far more interested in tearing down great institutions like the Boy Scouts than helping foster character and values in our young men.

I am tired of these tactics. It is very disturbing to me that these groups unabashedly attack organizations, regardless of the good they do or the support they have from the vast majority of Americans, simply to further their own subjective social agendas.

I for one, am saddened that the Boy Scouts of America has been the most recent target of these frivolous lawsuits. I reject any arguments that the Boy Scouts is anything but one of the greatest programs for character development and values-based leadership training in America today.

We must coalesce around those values that are so important to our soci-

ety. We should seek to aid, not impede, groups that promote values like duty to God and country, faith and family, and public service and sacrifice, which are deeply ingrained in the oath of every scout.

To fail to support such values would allow the very fabric of America, which has brought us to this great place in history, to be destroyed.

Today, with more than 3.2 million youth members, and more than 1.2 million adult volunteers, we can certainly say that the Boy Scouts of America has positively impacted the lives of generations of boys, preparing them to be men of great character and values. Remarkably, Boy Scout membership since 1910 totals more than 110 million.

I am proud to report that in Oklahoma we have a total youth participation of nearly 75,000 boys, and in Oklahoma City alone, we have about 7,000 adult volunteers.

These young men have helped serve communities all over our State with programs like Helping Hands for Heroes, program where Scouts help military families whose loved ones are serving overseas. These young men have cut grass, cleaned homes, taken out the garbage and walked dogs. What a great service for our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines and their families. Our Boy Scouts have also to served as ushers and first aid responders at the University of Oklahoma football games for more than 50 years.

Notably, Scouts in my State have also shared a long and proud history of cooperation and partnership with military installations in Oklahoma.

Given all this, I hope my colleagues will join me in defending this organization and others like it. We must not be afraid to support our youth and organizations like the Boy Scouts that support them.

LIVING STRONGER, LONGER

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize National Public Health Week and its important theme of "Living Stronger, Longer." Today, seniors are leading active and healthy lifestyles unmatched by previous generations. They are working longer, eating better, and utilizing medical advances that detect and treat illnesses before it is too late. But as our aging population doubles within the next decade, new challenges await us in ensuring that supply can meet an increasing demand.

This week marks the 10th Annual National Public Health Week, focusing on Living Stronger, Longer. I am proud to join the organizations involved that advocate for seniors every day and bring vital issues to the forefront during this week-long public information campaign promoting long and healthy lives for all Americans.

Public health advancements and new treatment options are enabling Americans to live longer and longer, but many older Americans still continue to

suffer from preventable and treatable health problems such as diabetes, high blood pressure and heart disease. Americans can prevent and treat many of the common health problems that hinder the enjoyment of later years if they have access to affordable health care.

I know that as I travel throughout Wisconsin, speaking to seniors' groups and individuals, I often hear their concerns about the rising costs of health care and prescription drugs. As the lead Democrat on the Senate Special Committee on Aging, I am committed to protecting seniors' access to quality health care and I am committed to making sure that Medicare is preserved as a vital health program for seniors.

One of the key components to living longer, healthier lives is access to life-saving prescription drugs. I have long been concerned about the high cost of prescription drugs, which can make it hard for Wisconsinites to afford the medicines they need to stay healthy. Today, Americans pay substantially higher prices for the same medicines that are far less expensive in many other countries. It is not fair to ask Americans to pay higher prices for the same medicines that cost a fraction of the price in other countries. That is why I support legislation to allow Americans to take advantage of lower drug prices found in other countries by legalizing the importation of FDA-approved drugs from other countries. I also support legislation to change a troublesome feature of the new Medicare prescription drug law that prohibits the Government from utilizing the tremendous purchasing power of the Medicare Program to reduce prices.

I am also concerned about the rising premiums seniors are facing in the Medicare Program. In addition to lowering the cost of prescription drugs, I will also continue to fight inefficiencies in Medicare and work to make Medicare affordable and fair for all Wisconsin seniors.

But there also benefits that are available through Medicare that seniors simply are not utilizing. In fact, one in three older Americans do not get all recommended screenings. In Wisconsin, only 44.4 percent of men and 40.6 percent of women 65 and older are getting the selected preventive services provided, recommended, and covered by Medicare. We need to encourage seniors to take advantage of the opportunities that are available to take the steps necessary to stay strong and healthy longer.

We are lucky enough to live in the most medically and economically advanced country in the world, where we have the ability to protect our citizens, prevent illness and disease, and plan ahead for a more prosperous future. There is work to be done, but as long as we can work together, solutions can be obtained and Americans' quality of life improved for generations to come.

RETIREMENT OF PROFESSOR
ALAN WERTHEIMER

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, Vermont is a State filled with extraordinary people who lead extraordinary lives. We take great pride that despite our modest geographical size, Vermont produces people whose voices, commitment and accomplishments transcend our borders and leave a lasting impact on the world in which we live.

Later this spring, one such Vermonter will be moving on to a new chapter in his life. Professor Alan Wertheimer, the John G. McCullough Professor of Political Science at the University of Vermont, will be retiring after over 35 years of teaching.

Professor Wertheimer is a distinguished scholar, having authored a number of highly acclaimed books. He has taught thousands of students over the years, including many members of my staff. He has been active in the affairs of the university and the community. His wife Susan and their children have been by his side every step of the way.

The role of scholars in shaping our society has been debated for thousands of years. Professor Wertheimer leaves in his wake a whole generation of students who he helped grapple with some of the most difficult and complex political and philosophical questions of our time, in a relevant, provocative and memorable style.

We in Vermont owe an enormous debt to Professor Wertheimer. He chose to grace our State university with his presence for his entire academic career. Thousands of Vermonters and students from all over the country and the world have had their lives enhanced by his dedication and scholarship.

I ask unanimous consent that a recent article in the Vermont Quarterly about Professor Wertheimer be printed in the RECORD.

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

WHAT DOES PROFESSOR WERTHEIMER THINK?

(By Kevin Foley)

Bright as they are, try as they will UVM's first class of Honors College students can't always figure that one out, but they just might learn to define and defend their own thoughts in the process. Inside the Honors Ethics Seminar, where a college's debut is sparked by a venerable professor's swan song.

Alan Wertheimer's method is the question, and right now, as a high-wattage October sun pours in and illuminates the buttery walls of his Allen House honors college seminar room, the question is this: "Is Alan Wertheimer tall?"

Well, no, not in modern-day America. But in the 18th century? Among the diminutive Bayaka, a Central African pygmy tribe? Among political theorists, where Wertheimer cuts a large figure because of decades of work illuminating crucial concepts in ethics and law like coercion? Who is to say? Perhaps Wertheimer, who goes about five-seven in his teaching clogs, really is tall.

But there's no time for that now. The professor has moved on to another proposition, another question.

Wertheimer, who is the John G. McCullough Professor of Political Science to his colleagues and "Big Al" to his honors students (offering another data point on the contingency of height), is ending his 37-year career at the University with a beginning: Along with philosopher Don Loeb, Wertheimer, who is retiring at the end of this academic year, developed a two-semester course in ethics that all 90 students enrolled in the new Honors College are taking. (See "Your Honor," below.) The idea is to provide these talented first-year students, a diverse group of future environmental engineers, doctors, English teachers, and software developers, a shared intellectual experience that cuts across every academic discipline and profession.

But the universal applicability of ethics—we all, after all, have strong notions of right and wrong, fair and unfair, whether to hand back the overpriced grocery store's miscounted change or keep it—is also a potential trap, at least if you've got a group of 15 very young, very bright, and very vocal students. Loeb puts it this way: "When you teach particle physics, nobody tries to come in with equally valid opinions on whether mesons have mass." Ethics is different: whether or not protesters should mass inspires more passionate opinions than the properties of sub-atomic matter.

But in the Honors College, emoting is not thinking. Opinion is not analysis. Instructors need to spark a lively discussion (generally an easy task with this crowd, even when the subject is Plato's *Crito*), but also to manage it, keeping the conversation aligned with the readings, and helping members of the class interrogate their classmates' ideas, and their own. Voicing your thoughts is great; defending them well is something else entirely. Something better. And putting logic into opinions is where Wertheimer's teaching excels.

The professor proffers another statement to the class, "It is not wrong to download music even if it violates the law." The students are supposed to reply true, false, or don't know, but once again, a statement quickly morphs into an interrogatory and the discussion surges. Passions rise—was that a telltale flash of porcelain iPod earbuds in the messenger bag across the table?—as the first-years come to a somewhat sheepish consensus: when it comes to illegally downloading music, fine, true, cool. Wertheimer winces. It is early in the semester, after all. (Or was that a smile?) The seminar soon rumbles on to categorizing a statement about the existence of God. The group opinion here, just barely, is "don't know."

Questions, questions, questions. But few answers from Wertheimer: none today, in fact. At a different time, in the more relaxed confines of his corner office on the top floor of Old Mill, the professor sits under a Chicago Art Institute poster depicting a bright horseracing scene, and explains why.

"The job is not to answer the question," he says. "It's to get them to think about it more rigorously."

AN ORDERLY MIND

The method is the question: *Reading Consent to Sexual Intercourse*, Wertheimer's most recent book and a tome far less racy than its title might imply, illustrates the power of carefully chosen, interlocking queries. With a characteristic intellectual flip, Wertheimer's discussion is not so much about the obvious "when does no mean no?"—that's morally clear, he thinks, or should be—but when does yes really mean yes.

Think about that: when does yes really mean yes? It can make your skull vibrate, even before the professor launches into near-

ly 300 pages of tricky cases and complicated theories. Can a retarded person truly consent to sex? A coerced one? Someone deceived, egregiously or subtly? Someone drunk? And those scenarios are only the beginning.

Wertheimer doesn't present a grand theory, an overarching vision, a huge program for social change. That's not his style. Instead, he offers a lot of thorough discussion of complicated cases, and some focused theories for hashing through them. This is not to say that the book lacks moral vision, however. Wertheimer's philosophical peregrinations leave him convinced that sexual deception, a matter largely ignored by the law, needs to be taken more seriously. Why should the law say so much about commercial deceits, when dollars are at stake, and so little about sexual lies, which cost so much emotionally?

Lawyers like to say that "hard cases make bad law," and they well may, but Wertheimer's gifts for sustained, precise and dispassionate analysis at least makes them into compelling theories. The books that Wertheimer built his intellectual reputation with, *Coercion* and *Exploitation*, take similarly knotty philosophical areas and methodically think through them in ways that are useful to political theorists, philosophers, and lawyers. More than useful: One reviewer said of *Exploitation* that "no one interested in the topic will be able to ignore this classic work." Wertheimer's scholarly appeal, says his colleague Robert Pepperman Taylor, a fellow political science professor and dean of the Honors College, comes down to the clarity and rigor of his approach.

"These are issues which people tend to wax rhetorical about, but Al brings his extremely clear analytical mind to bear on problems that can raise a lot of heat, a lot of passion, a lot of rhetoric," Taylor says. "He insists that we speak clearly about these things and understand them clearly."

Wertheimer's career, unlike his writing and thinking, hasn't always taken the clearest and most logical path from point A to B. The professor, in fact, attributes many of his professional breakthroughs to good fortune; a fellowship at Princeton led to his first book, a semester spent teaching law at the University of San Diego contributed to his latest book. Now, after stepping down from his full-time duties at UVM, Wertheimer will spend a year at the National Institutes of Health, working on issues of coercion and consent in medical research.

"Things happen," he says. "Truth be told, that's the story of a lot of my career—anybody's career—things happen. Each opportunity led to new opportunities. I suppose it's true that the rich get richer; and, while I'm not exactly rich, I have gotten intellectually richer."

SHARING THE WEALTH

In casual conversation, Wertheimer is genial and amusing, fairly soft-spoken, prone to answer questions after one of the stretches of contemplation that make him a formidable bridge player. In the classroom, he's loud and kinetic ("I think he shocks the kids a little," a colleague says, "because he is passionate—very passionate—about things that maybe they never know anyone cared about") as he explores and tests his students' logic.

"To make a class of the kind I teach go well, you need at least four or five articulate, bright students," Wertheimer explains. "One or two isn't enough: You need a critical mass. If you have that, you get the others going."

In the honors seminar, Wertheimer has his requisite fluent five and then some, and while the discussions are lively, the conversation isn't always totally satisfying for