

organizing a 17-man patrol, he immediately advanced upon a strategic slope essential to the security of his position and, boldly defying intense mortar, machinegun, and rifle fire which struck down 13 of his men, drove relentlessly forward with the remnants of his patrol to seize the vital ground. By his indomitable leadership, daring combat tactics, and valor in the face of overwhelming odds, Capt. Wilson succeeded in capturing and holding the strategic high ground in his regimental sector, thereby contributing essentially to the success of his regimental mission and to the annihilation of 350 Japanese troops. His inspiring conduct throughout the critical periods of this decisive action sustains and enhances the highest traditions of the U.S. Naval Service.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.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

APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, as we bring this week to a close and look back, I am pleased with the progress that has been made on the Energy bill which we have completed, in essence, except for final passage which we will do Tuesday. Then we are ahead of what I initially anticipated, having proceeded to our first appropriations bill, the Interior appropriations.

The bill, as has been mentioned, is an excellent bill. I congratulate both the leaders on that bill, the chairman and the ranking member on the Interior Subcommittee, for their superb shepherding of this bill through their subcommittee, and now bringing it to the floor. I also thank the committee for reporting a bill that keeps to the spending allocation under this year's budget resolution.

As we travel back home, and as we will see when we go back during the Fourth of July recess, the American people expect us to adhere to that budget, a very strict spending budget, a budget on which Chairman GREGG led, and we passed, the fastest budget we have ever passed but, more important than that, a budget that shows fiscal discipline. Indeed, the ranking member and chairman of the subcommittee adhered to that allocation throughout. Senators BURNS and DORGAN have worked hard to be responsible stewards of American taxpayer dollars. At the same time it is reflected in the bill the importance of being stewards of the natural wonders and the heritage and the beauty of our great country. I thank Senator BURNS and Senator DORGAN for their hard work.

It is our first bill as we approach the appropriations process. It is the first of 12 newly constituted appropriations bills that we will consider. It is my hope to see all 12 of these bills passed. We need to do our very best to avoid

the scenario that has unfolded all too often in recent years. Come November or December, we should not have to resort to an omnibus bill that lumps all of these individual bills that we wouldn't have been able to pass into a single bill. We are going to do everything possible to systematically address each one of these bills as they come along, and then be able to pass them to avoid coming to what has almost become customary, and that is an omnibus process.

It has been a decade, 10 years, not since 1995, since all appropriations bills were wrapped up before beginning the fiscal year. Over that last decade, the average was sending only 2.1 appropriations bills to the President for his signature before the beginning of the fiscal year, only 2. Actually it was 2.1, as I mentioned, appropriations bills.

We need to do better. We can do better, and we will do better. We need to get the job done—get every bill done right and done on time. I am very optimistic we can do that. This year, we passed the budget, as I mentioned, in the fastest time in history. That budget establishes an overall 2006 spending ceiling for all appropriations bills. And because of that ceiling, because of all of us working together, and by working together, I am hopeful that the process will proceed smoothly. We have initiated that process today with the Interior Appropriations bill. As we considered the bill before us today, I want to leave with a special place I think of when I contemplate what my vote on this bill means for America.

On a second issue, as we look to the appropriations bill that is likely and almost certain to follow the Interior Appropriations bill, I want to comment very briefly and introduce what we will see at the end of next week, and that is a comment on homeland security.

As September 11 so tragically demonstrated, protecting our borders—whether by air, by sea, or by land—has taken on a level of urgency and importance as never before. When you are talking to people at home, it arises again and again—it is almost the first, second, or third question at every town meeting we hold—border security.

Border security is no longer just an immigration issue or a customs issue. Border security must be a unified and coordinated strategy to thwart terrorism, which is something we didn't think about prior to September 11 nearly as much as we do today—thwarting terrorism and enforcing the laws.

Next week, we will debate the Homeland Security Appropriations bill, and we must include the necessary resources to meet these challenges.

This bill will address concerns regarding insecurity of our borders, which we know in fact does threaten national security. It is time to address that issue. We will again do that next week.

As we all know, each year thousands of people cross our borders illegally.

The vast majority seek little more than better lives for their families, which we understand. But some do bring drugs. Some do traffic in human beings. Some may even have ties to terrorist groups. We don't know exactly how many come or will come. We don't know exactly what their backgrounds are. We don't know who might harm us. In today's time, that is wrong.

We know one thing: If drug dealers and human traffickers can operate on our borders, terrorists can as well. Our national security requires a safer and more secure border, and it is up to us to deliver that.

We face a crisis. Over 7,000 miles of land stretch across our borders. If you look at our ports, they handle as many as 16 million cargo containers; and 330 million noncitizens—students, visitors, and workers—cross our borders each year; 330 million noncitizens go back and forth across the borders. An unprecedented flow of illegal immigrants, criminals, terrorists, and unsecured cargo crosses our borders.

As representatives of the people, we need to focus on the rule of law. We will be focusing on that rule of law. This Nation is founded on the concept that all men are created equal and all have the inalienable right to be free. But those freedoms are protected by our institutions and these institutions require respect for the rule of law.

Those illegal immigrants who may wish us no harm have still violated our rule of law. We must remember this as this debate unfolds on border security next week.

Finally, America has always opened our doors to immigrants. We must continue to do so and we will continue to do so. People come to America looking for a better life, and we live better lives because of them. They contribute to our economy. They help weave that rich cultural fabric that makes up our society. But we must ensure that immigrants who come to America come here legally.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for such time as I may consume.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator is recognized.

MONTANA'S ROCKY MOUNTAIN FRONT

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I rise to address an amendment that is very important to me and my State relating to Montana's magnificent Rocky Mountain front. I filed the amendment to the Energy bill and, even though we are not on the bill at the moment, I will talk about the amendment. I will speak about what it would have accomplished because I will not press for action on this amendment. Rather, I will offer it at a later time.

So what is the front? The front, as we call it back home, is one of the largest

and most intact wild places left in the lower 48 States. We call it a front because that is what it is. It is a front.

Anybody driving across the State of Montana westward, coming in from the east, first encounters open plains and prairies; they are vast. And then, suddenly, out in the distance the Rocky Mountains, the Continental Divide, jumps out of the plains. That is what we call the eastern front.

It is amazing and it astounds me every time I drive across the State and see it from a distance. It is special to Montanans and it is sacred to the Blackfeet Indian tribe. It is home to the Nation's largest population of big horn sheep, and the second largest population of elk, as well as deer, grizzly bear, and countless other species of fish and wildlife. In fact, the front is the only place in the lower 48 where grizzly bears still roam the plains, just as they did when Lewis and Clark passed through the area 200 years ago.

Because of this exceptional wild space, which includes Glacier National Park, millions of acres of wilderness and the Blackfeet Indian Reservation, the front offers unsurpassed hunting, fishing, and recreational opportunities.

Sportsmen, local landowners, local elected officials, hikers, Tribal leaders, local communities, and many other Montanans have worked for decades to protect and preserve the front for future generations. I have hiked in the front many times, including to the top of Ear Mountain. It's special to me personally.

Most Montanans believe very strongly, frankly, that oil and gas development and the front just don't mix.

The front is too wild and too precious to subject it to roads, pipelines, noise and other such development activities. In addition, surveys of the area indicate that there just isn't that much oil and gas in the front, certainly not enough to justify disturbing this pristine area.

That is why it has been well over a decade since any development activity occurred there at all, and why this administration last year halted an environmental impact study in the Blackleaf Area of the Front. The administration conceded that the time and expense associated with evaluating drilling options in the front was not the best use of taxpayer dollars.

They conceded that this area might indeed be one of those special places where the benefits of oil and gas development do not outweigh its costs. Even the administration understands that it's highly unlikely that any leaseholder will ever be able to drill in the front.

I couldn't agree more.

That's why I filed an amendment to the energy bill that offers a permanent solution to the century-long conflict over development on the front.

My amendment would establish a voluntary program allowing leaseholders in the Badger-Two Medicine or Blackleaf Areas of the front to cancel

their leases. In exchange, leaseholders could receive rights to drill elsewhere in Montana, or bidding, rental or royalty credits for existing leases in Montana, or a tax credit.

Any canceled lease would be permanently withdrawn from future leasing and oil and gas development activity. This withdrawal provision would also apply to a lease canceled for any other reason, including as the result of a private buy-out.

To encourage leaseholders to take advantage of the program, it would expire at the end of 2009. Finally, it would provide economic development grants to Teton County, Montana, to compensate the county for the loss of any potential revenue from these leases.

This is a win-win proposal that provides leaseholders value for their investment, while providing permanent protections for the front. Because it's a purely voluntary program, leaseholders don't have to participate, but there will be a strong incentive for them to do so—they know that their leases will probably never be developed, given the intense local opposition and the expense and time involved with trying to drill in the front.

Unfortunately, Mr. President, the time was not right for me to call for a vote on an amendment, but I thought it was very important to share it with my colleagues. I will work hard in the coming months to build support for my proposal, which I think is critical to ending the conflict over the front and preserving its beauty and wildlife for future generations.

AMERICA'S PLACE IN THE WORLD

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, a little less than 2500 years ago, in Athens, Pericles the king looked out from the Acropolis. In the bay beyond the port city, he saw some of Athens's 200 ships, which brought peace, commerce, and Athenian pottery to a free-trade area of more than 100 Greek city-states. Pericles boasted: "The wares of the whole world find their way to us."

Pericles stood astride one the wealthiest, most culturally-advanced states of his time. Greeks had vanquished the evil empire of Persia to the east. Pericles had transformed the Delian League, a defensive alliance formed to contain Persia, into an Athenian empire. And Pericles advanced the world of ideas, advocating the new idea of democracy.

Said Pericles: "Athens alone, of the states we know, comes to her testing time in a greatness that surpasses what was imagined of her. . . . Future ages will wonder at us, as the present age does now."

Pericles had every reason to believe that Divine Providence had smiled on him and on his city.

A little less than 500 years ago, in Aachen, Charles V looked up to receive the crown of Germany. Charles had become the most powerful ruler in Chris-

tendom: Holy Roman Emperor and sovereign over what is now Spain, Central Europe, southern Italy, and Spain's new overseas colonies. Sir Walter Scott said: "The sun never sets on the immense empire of Charles V." Charles sought to unite his empire into a universal, multinational, Christian empire. His motto was: "Even further."

Charles had every reason to believe that divine providence had smiled on him and on his empire.

A little more than 150 years ago, in London, Queen Victoria, adorned in pink, silver, and diamonds, escorted by a troop of the Household Cavalry, rode in a closed carriage from Buckingham Palace to Hyde Park to see the Great Exhibition at The Crystal Palace. Trumpets flourished, and a thousand voices greeted her, singing Handel's Hallelujah Chorus.

She walked through the Exhibition, a world's fair, and saw exhibits displaying the riches of Britain's far-flung colonies: carved ivory furniture from India, furs from Canada, hats made by convicts from Australia. The theme of the Exhibition was one word: "Progress."

Victoria saw exhibits representing an England that was industrially supreme. England controlled one-third of the world's international trade. The English merchant navy handled three-fifths of the world's oceangoing tonnage. Senator Daniel Webster called the English empire: "A power which has dotted over the surface of the whole globe with her possessions and military posts, whose morning drumbeat, following the sun, and keeping company with the hours, circles the earth with one continuous and unbroken strain of the martial airs of England."

Victoria had every reason to believe that Divine Providence had smiled on her and on her empire.

The citizens of Periclean Athens, Habsburg Spain, and Victorian England each could feel that their nation had reached the zenith of human endeavor. From where they stood, Pericles, Charles, and Victoria were the most powerful leaders of their time. Their centuries belonged to them.

Pericles looked to "future ages." Charles envisioned going "even further." And Victoria saw ever more "progress."

But within a century, each nation had been eclipsed.

Periclean Athens fell victim to war. Not long after Pericles's death, the devastating Peloponnesian War with Sparta weakened Athens. Within a hundred years, the great city was dominated by a little known northern country called Macedonia.

Charles V, seeking to harness a new technology of shipbuilding and royal navies, incurred spiraling defense costs. Charles's wars caused him to pledge his revenues to bankers for years into the future. By 1543, two-thirds of his ordinary revenue went to pay interest on past debts alone. Not