

It is this spirit of generosity that the Global Health Corps seeks to harness. America possesses a vast reservoir of talent, knowledge, and compassion that can help heal, both literally and figuratively, our global ties.

It was the famed violinist, Yehudi Menuhin, who said:

Peace may sound simple—one beautiful word—but it requires everything we have, every quality, every strength, every dream, every high ideal.

Providing health care services and training to those in need is one positive step we can take to demonstrate our goodwill and high ideals, and by doing so, plant the seeds of hope and peace.

The purpose of the Global Health Corps is twofold.

First and foremost, the Health Corps will help to improve the health, welfare, and development of communities in foreign countries and regions abroad.

In too many places, simple things like vaccinations, first aid, clean water, and hygiene are unknown or woefully inadequate. Men, women and children especially children—suffer terrible illnesses that can be easily prevented with basic health services.

The Health Corps bill seeks to provide a range of services from rapid relief, like what we saw following the tsunami, to long-term assistance to address endemic public health issues. It provides services such as veterinary care, which is very important in developing countries, where livestock are frequently a family's means of nutrition, commerce, and wealth.

A new Institute of Medicine survey issued today reports that one of the biggest obstacles to fighting HIV/AIDS in Africa is the severe shortage of medical personnel.

Sub-Saharan Africa has 25 percent of the world's HIV/AIDS cases, but only 1.3 percent of the world's health force. In Rwanda, for example, there are less than two doctors per 100,000 people.

If we are to maximize our help to these countries, we need to strengthen the medical delivery systems on the ground. HIV/AIDS medicine does no good sitting in boxes. Vaccines can't protect children from preventable diseases if there is no one to administer the shots. Strengthening the local infrastructure and teaching local citizens basic health skills will go a long way to addressing their medical needs.

The second goal of the Global Health Corps is to deploy health care assistance as a tool of public diplomacy. John F. Kennedy recognized that our assistance to other nations carries the most weight when it involves personal, intimate contact on the community level and provides tangible benefits to everyday people. This is why he established the Peace Corps, and why this bill taps into the Peace Corps for volunteers.

The new Global Health Corps will draw together health care professionals and volunteers from around the Na-

tion, from both the private and public sectors.

Some Health Corps volunteers will be seasoned doctors, nurses, and medical technicians. Others will enter the program with simply a passion for public health, a willingness to learn, and a desire to help others.

The U.S. Government is already doing a great deal of work in these areas. But the Global Health Corps will pull it all together, coordinate and focus our efforts, and tap into the private sector both private organizations and individuals—to multiply our efforts.

Like members of the Peace Corps and our many volunteers abroad, the Global Health Corps will serve as a shining example of the American people, our charity and goodwill.

In a speech in San Francisco on the eve of the 1960 Presidential election, John F. Kennedy made the stark but compassionate observation that:

There is not enough money in all America to relieve the misery of the undeveloped world in a giant and endless soup kitchen. But there is enough know-how and enough knowledgeable people to help those nations help themselves.

Indeed, as the famous proverb counsels:

Give a man a fish and he's fed for a day. Teach him how to fish and he will be fed all of his life.

I am proud that Senator LUGAR, Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, is co-sponsoring my bill. I urge my colleagues to join us in this vital mission.

In a world that is ever more connected by planes and computers, markets and movements, our fate is bound ever closer with that of our neighbors—near and far, wealthy and poor. I call upon my colleagues to advance our common humanity. Helping heal others abroad—and showing them America's heart—will help all of us stay safer at home.

SUPPORTING COPS

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, combating violent crime, especially gun crime, requires that our law enforcement agencies are adequately staffed and equipped. I have been a strong supporter of the Community Oriented Policing Services, COPS, program. The COPS Program has been critical to our Nation's law enforcement community since its creation in 1994, and I am pleased to join Senator BIDEN as a co-sponsor of the COPS Reauthorization Act.

The COPS Program was designed to assist State and local law enforcement agencies in hiring additional police officers to reduce crime through the use of community policing. In Michigan alone, 514 local and State law enforcement agencies have received more than \$220 million in grants through the COPS Program since its creation. These grants have improved the safety of communities by putting more than

3,300 law enforcement officers on Michigan streets and by supporting other important programs. Nationwide, the COPS Program has awarded more than \$11 billion in grants, resulting in the hiring of 118,000 additional police officers.

In my home State, the Detroit Police Department, DPD, used a COPS grant to hire additional officers that were needed to implement a 5-year community policing plan. Prior to the COPS grant award, the DPD lacked sufficient personnel to effectively cover high crime areas. The community policing plan placed teams of officers in neighborhoods to combat rising crime rates and work with residents to develop crime reduction strategies. The plan resulted in a drop in the number of reported violent crimes as well as improved police-community relations. The success of the Detroit Police Department illustrates the important role that COPS grants play in the safety of communities around the country.

Unfortunately, authorization for the COPS Program was permitted to expire at the end of fiscal year 2000. Although the program has survived through the annual appropriations process, it has received significant funding cuts. In fact, the Fiscal Year 2005 Omnibus Appropriations Act included only \$606 million for the COPS Program, \$142 million below the amount appropriated in 2004. In addition, President Bush's fiscal year 2006 budget would completely eliminate the COPS hiring grants. Despite the important positive impact of the COPS Program in Detroit and across the country, the President justified his cuts by calling the program "nonperforming" and not having "a record of demonstrating results." Our State and local law enforcement agencies know better and we should listen to them.

The COPS Reauthorization Act would continue the COPS Program for another 6 years at a funding level of \$1.15 billion per year. This funding would allow State and local governments to hire an additional 50,000 police officers over the next 6 years. In addition, the bill would modernize the COPS Program by authorizing \$350 million in law enforcement technology grants to assist police departments in acquiring new technologies for the analysis of crime data and the examination of DNA evidence, among other uses. The COPS Reauthorization Act would also build upon the accomplishments of the original COPS Program by authorizing \$200 million in community prosecutor grants. These grants would be used to hire community prosecutors trained to work at the local and neighborhood level to prevent crime and improve relations with residents.

At a time when we are asking more of our police departments than ever before, I believe we should be devoting more resources to the COPS Program, not less. The increased threat of terrorism as well as the continuing epidemic of gun violence underscores the

need for more resources for our law enforcement agencies. Recognizing this, we must build upon the past success of the COPS Program and continue to work to provide police departments with the tools and resources they need to help keep our families and communities safe.

LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2005

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I speak about the need for hate crimes legislation. Each Congress, Senator KENNEDY and I introduce hate crimes legislation that would add new categories to current hate crimes law, sending a signal that violence of any kind is unacceptable in our society. Likewise, each Congress I have come to the floor to highlight a separate hate crime that has occurred in our country.

Last month, a fifth person was arrested and charged with beating up a teenager because of his sexual orientation. The victim, an 18-year-old from Virginia, was at a gathering at his cousin's home. Late that night, the five assailants repeatedly kicked and hit the victim with a chair because he was gay.

I believe that the Government's first duty is to defend its citizens, to defend them against the harms that come out of hate. The Local Law Enforcement Enhancement Act is a symbol that can become substance. By passing this legislation and changing current law, we can change hearts and minds as well.

JUDICIAL NOMINATIONS AND THE NOMINATION OF MICHAEL SEABRIGHT

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, so far this year the Senate Republican leadership has called up one judicial nomination. That is right, despite the fact that other nominations are on the Senate Executive Calendar and ready to be confirmed, it is the Republican leadership of the Senate that is delaying action on judicial nominations.

When the Senate finally turned to the nomination of Paul Crotty to be a U.S. district court judge for the Southern District of New York on April 11, that nomination was confirmed 95 to 0. All Democrats present voted in favor of confirmation. Indeed, Senator SCHUMER and Senator CLINTON came to the floor to speak in favor of the nominee. That is the only judicial nomination Senate Republicans have been willing to consider all year. There has been no filibuster of judicial nominees. Instead, it is the Senate Republican leadership that, through its deliberate inaction, is keeping judgeships unnecessarily vacant for months. With the Crotty nomination, I was the one asking for months for the nomination to be considered, debated, voted on and confirmed.

At the time, I noted that another noncontroversial nomination was ready for Senate action. More than a

week ago, I called upon the Republican leadership to proceed to the confirmation of Michael Seabright to the District Court of Hawaii. I renew that plea.

All Democrats on the Judiciary Committee have been prepared to vote favorably on this nomination for some time. We were prepared to report the nomination last year but it was not listed by the then-chairman on a committee agenda. I thank Chairman SPECTER for including Mr. Seabright at our meeting on March 17. The nomination was unanimously reported and has been on the Senate Executive Calendar for more than a month. It is Senate Republicans who are resisting a vote on this judicial nominee, not Democrats. I understand that Mr. Seabright has the support of both of his home State Senators, both distinguished and highly respected Democratic Senators.

Once confirmed, Mr. Seabright will be the 206th of 216 nominees brought before the full Senate for a vote to be confirmed. That means that 830 of the 875 authorized judgeships in the Federal judiciary, or 95 percent, will be filled. As late as it is in the year, we would still be back on pace with that set by the Republican majority in 1999, when President Clinton was in the White House. That year, the Senate Republican leadership did not allow the Senate to consider the first judicial nominee until April 15. Two judges were confirmed in April and the third was not confirmed until June.

Of the 46 judicial vacancies now existing, President Bush has not even sent nominees for 28 of those vacancies, more than half. I have been encouraging the Bush administration to work with Senators to identify qualified and consensus judicial nominees and do so, again, today. The Democratic leader and I sent the President a letter in this regard on April 5, but have received no response.

It is now the third week in April, we are more than one-quarter through the year and so far the President has sent only one new nominee for a Federal court vacancy all year—only one. Instead of sending back divisive nominees, would it not be better for the country, the courts, the American people, the Senate and the administration if the White House would work with us to identify, and for the President to nominate, more consensus nominees like Michael Seabright who can be confirmed quickly with strong, bipartisan votes?

I commend the Senators from Hawaii for their efforts to work cooperatively to fill judicial vacancies. I only wish Republicans had treated President Clinton's nominees to vacancies in Hawaii with similar courtesy. Had they, there would not have been the vacancies on the Ninth Circuit and on the district court. The work of the Senators from Hawaii is indicative of the type of bipartisan efforts Senate Democrats have made with this President and remain willing to make. We can

work together to fill judicial vacancies with qualified, consensus nominees. The vast majority of the more than 200 judges confirmed during the last 3½ years were confirmed with bipartisan support.

The truth is that in President Bush's first term, the 204 judges confirmed were more than were confirmed in either of President Clinton's two terms, more than during the term of this President's father, and more than in Ronald Reagan's first term when he was being assisted by a Republican majority in the Senate. By last December, we had reduced judicial vacancies from the 110 vacancies I inherited in the summer of 2001 to the lowest level, lowest rate and lowest number in decades, since Ronald Reagan was in office.

The Hawaii judgeship at issue here has been vacant for more than 4 years, since December of 2000 when Judge Alan Kay took senior status. President Clinton made a nomination to that seat in advance of the vacancy, but the Republicans in control of the Senate refused to act on it. They preserved the vacancy for a Republican President.

In 2002, President Bush nominated James Rohlfing to the vacancy. That nomination failed, however, because in the view of his home State Senators and the American Bar Association, he was not qualified for the position. It took the White House more than two additional years to agree. Finally, in May 2004 that nomination was withdrawn by President Bush.

The administration finally got it right after consultation with the Hawaii Senators. The President sent Michael Seabright's name to the Senate last September. An outstanding attorney who has experience in private practice as well as a sterling reputation as an assistant U.S. attorney, Mr. Seabright merited consideration and swift confirmation. Despite his reputation as a law-and-order Republican, Republicans would not move on Mr. Seabright's nomination last Congress. The President took his time renominating Mr. Seabright and even then it took repeated requests to get his nomination included on the agenda of the committee. When he was considered on March 17 he was reported with unanimous support. Senate Democrats have long supported and requested action on this nomination.

I have been urging this President and Senate Republicans for years to work with all Senators and engage in genuine, bipartisan consultation. That process leads to the nomination, confirmation and appointment of consensus nominees with reputations for fairness. The Seabright nomination, the bipartisan support of his home State Senators, and the committee's action by a unanimous, bipartisan vote is a perfect example of what I have been urging.

I have noted that there are currently 28 judicial vacancies for which the President has delayed sending a nominee. In fact, he has sent the Senate