

Springs; Theodore Holder, of Littleton; Michael Shackelford, of Grand Junction; Gregory Rund, of Littleton; George Geer, of Cortez; Lizbeth Robles, of Colorado Springs; Steven Bayow, of Colorado Springs; Derrick Lutters, of Burlington; Travis Anderson, of Hooper, in my native San Luis Valley in southern Colorado; and Charles Wilkerson, of Colorado Springs; along with Paul Christopher Alaniz and Landon Giles, whose families live in Colorado today.

Each of them served with honor and distinction and we are all forever grateful for the sacrifice each of them made on behalf of all of us. Their names will not be forgotten, and our prayers will remain with their loved ones.

One of our greatest Supreme Court Justices and a Civil War veteran, Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr., used to spend his Memorial Days just a few miles from where we stand now, in Arlington National Cemetery. He would walk among the gravesites, reflecting on the sacrifices of so many, including the countless, nameless souls who laid beneath.

Justice Holmes once observed:

At the grave of a hero we end, not with sorrow at the inevitable loss, but with the contagion of his courage. . . .

Heroism is not in the deed itself, but in the courage to act. We have heroes because they chose to act, to step forward in the call to action. In this Senate, we are blessed with a history of service to our Nation. Outside of this building, however, is where true heroes of our military reside: men and women in uniform, our veterans who have stood watch before them, and those who have laid down their lives so that we can have freedom.

I encourage everyone over this weekend to take time out from the parades and barbecues and family gatherings to thank our veterans and service members. They stand ready to defend the freedoms we take for granted, without seeking thanks or praise. This heroic act deserves our thanks, for it is by grace that they keep us safe.

In the Book of Matthew we are taught: "Blessed are the peacemakers: for they shall be called the children of God."

Through their service and sacrifice, they have earned that distinction.

May God bless our service members and our veterans.

May the families of those who have given their lives for our freedom know the depth of our appreciation. And may we never forget the importance of their sacrifice to our work here in the U.S. Senate.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

#### A HISTORIC COMPROMISE

Mr. PRYOR. Madam President, I rise today to discuss something that happened this week in the Senate, some-

thing I was involved in, and something that received quite a bit of notice outside this Chamber, and that is a compromise that was reached. I think it was a historic compromise. I think it is a very good thing for the Nation. In fact, I would say it was a win for Democrats, a win for the Republicans, and, most importantly, it was a win for the American people.

Some in my party, some in the other party, may disagree with what I just said, but I think when you look back through American history—and you can look at all the major legislative accomplishments that have occurred—most of those have occurred in this body.

This body is known for its ability to compromise. I look at these chairs and these desks in this body, and I can see the faces of my colleagues and of those who have departed this Chamber. This is a body that has a very special role in American history and in American Government.

I have heard some say they do not like compromise. In fact, I must say I was disappointed—I was listening to talk radio yesterday, and someone said some of us Senators who compromised are in the middle, and no one supports the middle. I cannot disagree more. I think people all over this country are looking for Senators to show leadership, to find common ground. I think that is one result that has been sorely missing in the Congress. When you talk to people outside of the Beltway, that is one result they are hoping for, that we will find that common ground and we will have leadership in Washington that understands you do not have to sacrifice your principles in order to find common ground.

In fact, in the very famous book written by John Kennedy, "Profiles in Courage," he says:

We should not be too hasty in condemning all compromise as bad morals. For politics and legislation are not matters for inflexible principles or unattainable ideals.

This is politics. This is a human institution. This is Government. I feel those 14 Senators who reached this agreement—13 of my great colleagues who reached this agreement—took one of the most contentious issues in recent years off the table. Hopefully, they took it off for the remainder of this Congress. I feel as though we took it off for the remainder of the Congress because I sat in those rooms, I talked to my colleagues, and I know the high level of trust we have with one another.

This entire agreement is based on trust. It is an example that amazing things can happen when Senators talk to each other—just talk to each other. I feel that is why the people of Arkansas sent me to Washington, to try to be a bridge builder, to try to be a peacemaker, to try to find common ground on a wide variety of issues that are best for Arkansas and best for the Nation and, in some cases, best for the world.

Senators here in Washington, unfortunately, in the last few years have gotten into the habit of talking about each other and not talking to each other. I hope one of the results that comes from this agreement is a new spirit of bipartisanship, a new commitment that we can reach across party lines, reach across the aisle, to try to work together to solve the challenges that are facing America.

There are many sensible voices in the Senate. Many, many, many—in fact, all—have reasonable minds. And one thing I found a little bit humorous, some of the press coverage about this agreement was that they said these were moderates who reached this agreement. Let me tell you, some were moderates, but many in this group were not moderates, and they would be offended if we called them moderates. In fact, I heard a number of them say "I don't ever want to be considered a moderate," for one reason or another. But they demonstrated a spirit of bipartisanship that I think should be applauded.

Sometimes when you make a compromise, you are taking the easy way out. But this was a compromise that required courage. This compromise required a lot of courage on behalf of all my colleagues, especially—especially, might I underline—the seven Republicans who entered into this agreement. It was very hard for Democrats and Republicans to do. But I will tell you, I know my seven Republican colleagues who did this, who demonstrated their trust, not just of each of us but of this institution, demonstrated a lot of courage. I take my hat off to them in appreciation.

Two more points I would like to make on this issue.

First, I need to thank three people; that is, my wife Jill, my son Adam, and my daughter Porter. For all I know, they may be watching right now. It is getting pretty close to bedtime around our house. But they made the sacrifice, too, so I could be part of this Senate and be up here away from home. But also, Dad was not home a lot in the last few days because I was here trying to work through this agreement as best I could and trying to get this done. So I thank them.

But in a broader sense, I did this agreement for them because I was very concerned that when you looked at the nuclear option, if that trigger was pulled, you had a nuclear winter that would follow. I was very concerned that the Congress, particularly the Senate, would not get very much done this session.

I thought that would be a huge disservice to the American people. I thought it was time for reasonable minds to come together to try to work something out. In fact, in the Book of Isaiah, it says: "Come now, let us reason together." And maybe that should be something we should take to heart. The people of our States, every State in the Union, only get to send two Senators to Washington.

I think they expect us to exercise good judgment and exercise our discretion and also, from time to time, exercise courage to try to do the right thing.

So I commend my 13 colleagues who entered into this agreement. They took a lot of time and made a lot of sacrifice, and it took a lot of courage. Many of them have taken a lot of criticism for doing this. I want to say publicly that I thank them and I appreciate them and I am proud of them for what they did.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized.

Mr. DODD. Madam President, before our friend from Arkansas leaves the floor, let me also say, if his children are watching, they should be very proud of their father. I have had the privilege of serving with the Senator's father. In fact, we sat next to each other as I arrived here as a freshman Senator. The Pryor and Dodd families go back for some time.

I want you to know that what you and your 13 colleagues did last week—and nobody can say for certain where this is going to lead, but you have given this institution an opportunity to continue its tradition of providing the one place in Government where all voices can be heard. That is not true in anyplace in the executive branch, necessarily, or the judicial branch. And even in the legislative branch, in the other body, the majority rules.

The Senate is the one place where all voices must be listened to. Because of what you and our 13 other colleagues—6 other Democrats and 7 Republicans—were willing to sit down and try to fashion, we have been given a chance to live up to the longstanding, historic traditions of this place in which we have been privileged to have been elected to serve. There have been 1,884 of us in 218 years who were chosen by our States to represent their interests and the Nation in the Senate. I can just say to my friend from Arkansas, you will be involved in a lot of issues during what I hope is a long career for you here in the years ahead. You will look back, and there will only be a handful of moments that will stand out, and I am willing to predict that what you, Senators MCCAIN, NELSON, LIEBERMAN, COLLINS, BYRD, WARNER, GRAHAM, SNOWE, DEWINE, LANDRIEU, SALAZAR, CHAFEE, and INOUE have done will remain one of the important memories. You will look back and think of the things you have been involved in and, hopefully, the list will be long.

As one Senator who was not involved in the negotiations you went through but was watching them carefully—and again, we cannot say with certainty where it is going to lead—I commend you and history will commend you for what you are doing. I love the idea that you did it for your family and your children. They will look back with pride on the service of their father.

Mr. President, we went through a little bit of a turmoil here. Obviously, coming in the wake of this negotiation, I suppose some people's eyebrows may be raised, wondering how can we do that compromise and then end up with an awkward situation on the Bolton nomination, which became contentious for a few minutes. I will add my voice to that.

My fervent hope is that people will not misunderstand the intentions of 24 Senators, and others, when we raised the question going back to April 11 about certain information. All of my colleagues are not familiar with all of the details of the case, although the Presiding Officer was very much a part of the discussion we have had over the last couple of months. Whether we are for or against the nomination, the point I was trying to make is that an institution—the Senate—has a right to certain information when it involves a pertinent matter before it.

It has been a historic struggle between the executive and legislative branches. There is always that tension between these two branches of Government over access to information. Regardless of one's political affiliation, whether you are in the majority or the minority, no matter what administration is in the White House, my experience over 2½ decades, serving under every imaginable configuration, is that it is always healthy to insist on information that the institution thinks is important for its consideration of a matter—be it substantive or the executive branch calendar.

I want to say to my colleagues, those who have gone through this process of negotiations that avoided the constitutional crisis regarding extended debate, what happened here in the last few hours is not in any way disruptive of what occurred during those negotiations. It is my strong hope and desire that the information we seek will be forthcoming in the next few days, that the committees can analyze it all, and when we return to this body after the break, the matter of John Bolton can come before this body and we will have an up-or-down vote on the nomination, as it should be. It is my strong desire that that be the outcome.

That was not intended, in any way, to engage in a filibuster but strictly to determine whether this institution would say to the executive branch, respectfully: This is information we believe we need. We are asking you to provide it in an orderly way to those Members who are entitled to this information—the chair of the Intelligence Committee, the ranking Democrat, the chair of the Foreign Relations and ranking Democrat—for them to determine whether there is relevancy to this information as it pertains to this nomination.

Again, I thank the majority leader. It probably doesn't help his cause to hear this, but BILL FRIST made a serious effort over the last couple of days, not that he necessarily even supported

the request, but he certainly conveyed the request in a serious way to leaders within the executive branch. I thank him for that. He didn't have to do that, and he did. I regret that the administration didn't reply in an orderly way, which could have avoided all of this in the last 48 hours. I hope they will take this seriously. I say to my friends on the majority side, having been in your shoes in other administrations, it can happen.

There is always this tension between these two branches of Government about information. We need to be clear about it. We have a constitutional responsibility, where appropriate, to seek information that is important for our consideration.

So it is my fervent hope that we go away for a few days and recognize, as so eloquently Senator SALAZAR said, speaking about his father, a World War II veteran, insisting upon being buried in his uniform, that we recognize those who have given a lot more to provide the freedoms we enjoy as Americans, that we are very much living up to what they fought and died for over this Memorial Day break as we recognize their contributions. They fought and died for exactly what we are doing here.

This doesn't happen miraculously. A democracy is won by each and every generation in this country. There is no guarantee that it exists in perpetuity. Each generation of Americans will confront, one way or another, a challenge to our democratic values and principles. Certainly, the generation that fought and died for this country over the years has proven that categorically.

We are going to be challenged as well from time to time. So I fervently hope—and Members who have served with me know I am the least comfortable with getting involved in opposing a nominee. The only trouble I have gotten into in nominations is when I have been for nominees to the disappointment of colleagues on this side. I was told I had no business to be for John Ashcroft and John Tower. I am not comfortable not being for somebody. I took the position I did, and I hope we can resolve this matter over the next few days and get back to the business of voting up or down and move on to other business that is important to our constituents.

I was heartened to hear that Democrats and Republicans were able to work out differences on an energy bill. That is going to be exciting to deal with; it is an issue in which our constituents are interested. I would be remiss in not recognizing the Presiding Officer in the tremendous work he has done, along with Senator JEFFORDS and Senator REID and Senator BAUCUS. There is a lot of work in front of you. Those are the issues we need to work together on here. So while there may be some bruised feelings right away over a vote we just took, I hope we can put those behind us and resolve the

matter and get about doing the business the people sent us here to do.

To my colleagues, I wish them a healthy, happy, and safe Memorial Day, and I look forward to seeing them on our return here and moving forward with the business at hand.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INHOFE). The Senator from Alaska is recognized.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I am sorry that our colleague from Arkansas has left the floor because I was sitting there listening to his comments and his recognition and acknowledgements of the 14 Senators who worked on the compromise this past week and all the efforts they had made.

I commend him and all the others of that group and all those who encouraged us as a body, as Senators—not as Republicans, not as Democrats but as Senators—to move forward so that we could get through what I certainly believe was a great impasse in this body, to work through the issues, to get us to the point where we cannot only move through the President's judicial nominees, but that we can do the rest of the work with which the Senate is tasked.

The good Senator from Connecticut has just mentioned the Energy bill and the Transportation bill—these issues the country is waiting for, the country is asking for, and the work that is incumbent upon us as a body to get to.

So I am pleased that we are at the point where we are, not spending hours on the floor today to discuss nuclear options or constitutional options, but that we are talking about the work before us as we look forward to these upcoming months. I do see a sense of compromise that will be necessary if we have any plans at all to accomplish that which I think this country expects us to do.

I am pleased that we have gotten through to this point. I do recognize the bump in the road we just had this afternoon, but I believe that with the same amount of determination that got us to a resolve on the judicial nominees, we will be able to do the work of the country.

BRAC

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I rise this evening for just a few minutes to talk about the upcoming BRAC and the impact we are seeing in my State of Alaska, up in the interior, in the communities of Fairbanks and North Pole. They call this the golden heart of the State of Alaska.

The people of Alaska are strong and very consistent supporters of a strong national defense. They are even stronger supporters of the men and women who serve in our military and their families. In a State where support for our servicemen and servicewomen and their missions is both given and constant, the golden heart of Alaska probably beats strongest in the areas of Fairbanks and North Pole.

So on the morning of May 13—Friday the 13th, oddly enough—the people of

the interior of Alaska awoke to the news that the Department of Defense had proposed to realign Eielson Air Force Base. Under the terms of this realignment, all of the Air Force active-duty operations would be transferred elsewhere. The realignment would cause the relocation of about 2,800 Air Force personnel and 3,300 dependents. It would cause the loss of 4,700 jobs, both military and civilian jobs, within the Fairbanks area. It would mean the full transfer of A-10 and F-16 aircraft to bases in the lower 48. It would wreak havoc on the local economy and force major changes upon the Fairbanks North Star Borough School District.

To the people of interior Alaska, they do not look at this as a realignment. It sounds to them, to us, exactly like a closing.

Two weeks after the fact, the people of interior Alaska are still scratching their heads and wondering why, what is going on here, what has happened up here? General Billy Mitchell prophesied back in 1935. He said:

In the future, he who holds Alaska holds the world.

General Mitchell characterized Alaska as the most important strategic place in the world, and this is as true today as it was in 1935.

Alaska is closer to the European and Pacific theaters by air than perhaps any other place in North America. Our armed services can deploy forces from Alaska to Asia much more quickly than units on the west coast of the United States. And if future developments limit overseas basing, Alaska will be even more critical in America's ability to respond to a crisis within a specific area of responsibility.

Yet 2 weeks after we learn of this news, the Air Force cannot—or will not—tell the people of Fairbanks why. Immediately after the BRAC list was released, my staff contacted appropriate staff members in the Office of Legislative Liaison for the Secretary of the Air Force. We asked for a copy of the entire administrative record which supports their recommendation to realign Eielson.

For the better part of 2 weeks, there was no response to that request. Then suddenly this week, we get an e-mail from an Air Force legislative liaison saying the material could not yet be provided because it is undergoing what they call security review. The Air Force legislative liaison could not hazard a guess on when the material would be released.

They are still in no position to explain to me or to the people of interior Alaska why a base that we thought was of such strategic importance to our Nation's defense would become little more than a refueling station for fighter aircraft based somewhere else.

The people of interior Alaska deserve to know why, and I certainly deserve to know why. The answers to these questions are more than just academic interest. On June 15, the Base Realignment and Closure Commission will con-

duct a hearing on the recommendations pertaining to Eielson Air Force Base. The community has enlisted the president of the University of Alaska, retired Army MG Mark Hamilton to take the lead in presenting its case. The community is working very hard at this moment to put together a very thoughtful and well-researched presentation.

At this point, we are less than 30 days, a couple of weeks from the date upon which that presentation, that do-or-die presentation, must be delivered to the BRAC Commission. And yet still the Air Force cannot release the detailed analysis which supported their recommendations.

This is unfair to the community that has offered nothing but unconditional love and support for the military. It goes beyond conscionable.

So I have joined with Senator SNOWE from Maine, as well as other colleagues, to tell the Defense Department that their lack of candor with the community that will suffer under the BRAC process has worn thin. I am proud to join with Senator SNOWE and other colleagues to sponsor legislation that requires the Department of Defense to turn over the records supporting its BRAC recommendations and particularly the information supporting its conclusions as to the military value of the bases on the list.

We expect through this legislation that this information will be provided to the Congress within 7 days of the passage of the legislation. If the Defense Department cannot do this, then the legislation requires that the BRAC process should stop.

Also this evening, I signed onto a letter to Secretary Rumsfeld, cosigned by a number of my colleagues who are expressing the same concern, seeking full justification for base closures in their areas. I would like to read one paragraph of this letter:

The failure of the Department of Defense to provide all of the justification data used to recommend closing or realigning installations in a timely fashion is anything but "fair, open or equitable." The Department of Defense has had over two years to review and collect this data and people associated with the installations selected for closure should have at a minimum two weeks to review prior to any BRAC hearings or site visits. Sufficient time to review this data is necessary to ensure they can make an appeal based on the criteria established by the Department of Defense.

Again, yet one more effort from Senators, from those who are concerned about the effect that BRAC closures will have on our respective communities, a request for information, a request for the data that is supposed to be provided to us. We have to sign on to letters, we have to sign on to introduce legislation saying you must do this within this time period or the close BRAC process stops. We should not have to be going to these measures to get the information.

The BRAC commission process was never intended to be a rubberstamp of

the Department of Defense recommendations. The Congress intended that it be an open process, a thoughtful process, but most importantly an intellectually rigorous process.

While the economies of many of our communities are at stake, this is not the most important reason that we have a BRAC process. This process is intended to assure the Congress and the people that our national security objectives are not compromised in the quest to save money. We know the BRAC process is well underway. It is high time that the Defense Department shed some sunlight on the reasons for their recommendations. The good people of interior Alaska should not be left in the position of defending the future of Eielson Air Force Base on June 15 with both hands tied behind their back, and they should not have to be burning the midnight oil in the hours leading up to that hearing studying material that should have been provided weeks earlier. They do not deserve it, we do not deserve it, and our Nation's security certainly deserves better than this.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The majority leader is recognized.

#### DEMOCRACY IN LEBANON

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, this Sunday the people of Lebanon will go to the polls to vote in their first truly free election in three decades. Since 1990, Lebanon has been occupied by Syrian forces, but this spring the people of Lebanon made history. On March 8, hundreds of thousands of people descended upon Martyrs Square in Beirut, Lebanon's capital, and inaugurated what has become known around the world by people who viewed it as the Cedar Revolution.

For 2 weeks the word spread from city to city and to the countryside. It was clear that freedom was on the march. On March 18, 10 days later, a crowd of 1.5 million people, nearly half of the Lebanese population, gathered in that very square, Martyrs Square, to demand, to insist upon, the withdrawal of Syrian troops and its intelligence apparatus from Lebanon.

These brave and proud citizens of all ages, religions, and ethnicities stood shoulder to shoulder waving their nation's flag in solidarity. Together, with the support of freedom-loving democracies everywhere, they brought an end to Syrian occupation. In less than 2 months, 20,000 Syrian troops pulled out of the country. It was an astonishing wave of events broadcast on television sets and computer screens around the globe.

Lebanon now joins the list of fledgling democracies taking their first bold steps into the future. All of this could not have happened without tremendous courage on the part of the Lebanese people. The determination and vision of one man, President Bush, made it possible. His commitment to democracy and unwavering belief in the fundamental equality of all human beings has wrought remarkable change indirectly, such as in Lebanon, and more directly around the world. Democracy is taking root in even the most inhospitable of lands.

By America's words and our deeds, we are emboldening those who seek freedom and peace. It is an unprecedented moment in the history of the Middle East.

I realized that yesterday as the President of the Palestinian Authority, Mahmoud Abbas, was in our office in this Nation's Capitol. We discussed the future and the hope and the opportunity. As noted scholar and Middle East expert Fouad Ajami says:

The entrenched systems of control in the Arab world are beginning to give way.

Indeed, it is the autumn of the dictators.

I mention Lebanon in part because it has been on my mind the last 4 weeks. It was about 4 weeks ago that I and a delegation had the opportunity, the privilege, of traveling to Lebanon during our April recess. While in Beirut, I had the opportunity to walk through that square, Martyrs Square. I met with leaders of the Cedar Revolution. They represented a diversity of parties and religious sects—Christian, Druze, and Muslim. These leaders were well versed in the requirements for a successfully functioning democracy. In particular, they discussed the needs to restore transparency and accountability, the rule of law, to secure an independent judiciary and to build, to construct, to reconstruct their economy so that the Lebanese people maintain a stake in the future. Their commitment to freedom, to the rule of law, and democratic governance was truly inspiring.

There are many challenges ahead. We share the concern that Syrian intelligence officials have not fully withdrawn from Lebanon. We also know that this election will not, in any shape or form, be perfect. Few elections in times of transition are. But seeing firsthand the determination of the Lebanese people was truly inspiring. I came away optimistic that this moment will lead to a new age of freedom and democracy for the Lebanese people.

In the words of Vaclav Havel, I urge the people of the region:

to never forget these days full of solidarity, hope and common quest for freedom and truth.

To the Lebanese people:

It may be a long and difficult road, but please have faith that the destination is well worth the journey.

#### SENATOR AND ERMA BYRD'S 68TH WEDDING ANNIVERSARY

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, on another issue, an issue that was discussed by several of my colleagues, most notably Senator STEVENS, our distinguished colleague from Alaska, the President pro tempore, I rise to honor now a very special day in the life of one of our most respected and venerable colleagues.

On Sunday, the distinguished senior Senator, ROBERT BYRD, celebrates his 68th wedding anniversary with his beloved wife and high school sweetheart Erma Ora James.

The courtship is well known to our colleagues. It is hard to do it full justice, but I will give it a try. The two met in Raleigh County over 7 decades ago, where Erma's father had been transferred from Virginia to work in the coal mines. Senator BYRD had a friend who brought pocketfuls of gum and candy to school, and each day the young ROBERT BYRD would wait at the schoolhouse door and ask his friend for a few pieces of candy. He put them in his pocket and at the first opportunity he would present the candies to Erma as a love offering.

Senator BYRD has said he wasn't really sure if his Erma knew that she was his sweetheart, but she must have found out because the couple ultimately was married in 1937. The day after their wedding, Senator BYRD gave his new bride his wallet which contained several hundred dollars that, over the days and weeks and months, he had saved. He told her that she would be the head of their family finances forever. To this day, Senator BYRD doesn't carry a wallet.

He has said that Erma has been his anchor all these years. They are truly blessed to have one another, their family, and a lifetime of shared memories.

The Bible says:

A man will leave his father and mother, and be united to his wife, and they will become one flesh.

For nearly 7 decades, Senator BYRD and his lovely wife Erma have lived up to the ideal of marriage. I commend them. I admire them. And I wish them both a very happy 68th anniversary.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### STEM CELL RESEARCH

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have had a number of conversations the last couple of days with the distinguished majority leader about this issue of stem cell research. Dr. FRIST—and I say Dr. FRIST because it relates to this matter—indicated he was going to study