

In July 2005, ASEAN forced Burma to forgo its scheduled rotation as chairman of the organization.

On December 16, 2005, the U.N. Security Council debated the situation in Burma for the first time.

Next week, United Nations Undersecretary for Political Affairs will brief members of the Security Council on his meeting with Suu Kyi, her first meeting with a foreigner since 2004.

Why would we turn back now when the military junta is increasingly isolated and the plight of the Burmese people is on the agenda of the international community?

Indeed, while we are far from our goal of a free and democratic Burma, we are making progress and we should stay the course.

I remind my colleagues that under the provisions of this legislation, we will have the opportunity to debate sanctions on Burma every year. That is how it should be.

Sanctions are not a panacea for every foreign policy dispute. But, when they are backed by a robust international response, they can be effective and they can compel change.

Archbishop Desmond Tutu has rightly said, "As long as [Suu Kyi] remains under house arrest, not one of us is truly free".

Today I urge the SPDC to release Aung San Suu Kyi, recognize the 1990 elections, and engage in a true dialogue with the National League for Democracy.

I urge the United Nations Security Council to debate and pass a binding, non-punitive resolution on Burma that recognizes the threat the regime poses to the region and calls for Suu Kyi and all prisoners of conscience to be released.

And, finally, I urge United States Senate to renew the sanctions on Burma for another year.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 496—COMMENDING THE KANSAS CITY KANSAS COMMUNITY COLLEGE DEBATE TEAM FOR THEIR NATIONAL CHAMPIONSHIP VICTORIES

Mr. BROWNBACK (for himself and Mr. ROBERTS) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 496

Whereas, in 2006, the Kansas City Kansas Community College debate team won, for a third consecutive year, the 3 national championships in collegiate debate among community colleges;

Whereas the team won a third consecutive national championship at the Phi Rho Pi national tournament for community colleges in 2006;

Whereas, at the 2006 Phi Rho Pi national tournament for community colleges, the team achieved more debate victories per tournament than any other team in the esteemed history of the tournament;

Whereas the team won championship awards in the Policy Team Debate, Lincoln-Douglas Debate, and Overall Sweepstakes at the Phi Rho Pi national tournament for community colleges in 2006;

Whereas the team won a third consecutive national championship for community colleges at the Cross Examination Debate Association National Tournament in 2006; and

Whereas the State of Kansas is privileged to benefit from the dedication to education and intercollegiate debate of Kansas City Kansas Community College team head coach Darren Elliot, assistant coaches Skippy Flynn and Adrian Self, and team members Ashley-Michelle Bruce, Ryan Coyne, Clay Crockett, Peter Lawson, Candace Moore, Amanda Montee, Deandre Tolbert, and Garrett Tuck; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) commends the extraordinary contributions of the Kansas City Kansas Community College debate team to the city of Kansas City, Kansas, and the State of Kansas;

(2) congratulates the team for their national championship victories; and

(3) offers its best wishes to the team for future success.

SENATE RESOLUTION 497—RELATIVE TO THE DEATH OF EDWARD ROY BECKER, CHIEF JUDGE OF THE COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE 3RD CIRCUIT

Mr. SPECTER (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. HATCH) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 497

Whereas Edward Roy Becker was born on May 4, 1933, in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania;

Whereas Edward Roy Becker enjoyed an extraordinary career as a leading jurist in the United States;

Whereas Edward Roy Becker graduated Phi Beta Kappa from the University of Pennsylvania in 1954 and received his law degree from Yale Law School in 1957 with academic distinction;

Whereas, following his graduation from law school, Edward Roy Becker managed a distinguished law practice at the partnership of Becker, Becker, and Fryman with his father and brother-in-law;

Whereas Edward Roy Becker was active in politics, and followed his father as a Republican committeeman;

Whereas, at the age of 37, Edward Roy Becker was appointed to the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania in 1970, was then elevated to the Court of Appeals for the 3rd Circuit in 1982, was Chief Judge of the Court of Appeals for the 3rd Circuit from February 1998 until May 2003, and served as a Senior Judge until his passing on May 19, 2006;

Whereas, while serving as Chief Judge of the Court of Appeals for the 3rd Circuit, Edward Roy Becker authored many innovative and important opinions;

Whereas, in 2002, Edward Roy Becker received the coveted Edward J. Devitt Distinguished Service to Justice Award after being selected as the most distinguished Article III Judge in the United States "whose career has been exemplary, measured by [his] significant contributions to the administration of justice, the advancement of the rule of law, and the improvement of society as a whole";

Whereas, among his landmark decisions, the Supreme Court adopted 3 opinions rendered by Edward Roy Becker relating to cutting-edge issues, including the reliability of scientific evidence, the rationale of class ac-

tion certification, and the standards of review relating to the Employee Retirement Income Security Act;

Whereas the University of Chicago Law Review has consistently recognized Edward Roy Becker as among the 3 circuit judges who are most often cited by the Supreme Court;

Whereas Edward Roy Becker handed down approximately 2,000 judicial opinions;

Whereas Edward Roy Becker devoted countless hours and a tremendous amount of effort for almost 3 years as an assistant to the Senate in drafting asbestos reform legislation, writing most of S. 852 (109th Congress) (commonly referred to as the "Fairness in Asbestos Injury Resolution Act of 2005"), and holding over 50 meetings in Washington, D.C., with stakeholders and Senators;

Whereas President George W. Bush inscribed a tribute to Edward Roy Becker on the face of S. 852 (109th Congress) by designating it as the "Becker Bill"; and

Whereas Edward Roy Becker undertook that arduous extra assignment in addition to his judicial duties, all while undergoing treatment for prostate cancer; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(a) honors the life and accomplishments of Edward Roy Becker; and

(b) extends its condolences to the family and friends of Edward Roy Becker.

SENATE RESOLUTION 498—DESIGNATING THE WEEK BEGINNING MAY 21, 2006, AS "NATIONAL HURRICANE PREPAREDNESS WEEK"

Mr. VITTER (for himself, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. SHELBY, and Mr. LOTT) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 498

Whereas the President has proclaimed that the week beginning May 21, 2006, shall be known as "National Hurricane Preparedness Week", and has called on government agencies, private organizations, schools, media, and residents in the coastal areas of the United States to share information about hurricane preparedness and response to help save lives and protect communities;

Whereas the official Atlantic hurricane season occurs from a period beginning June 1, 2006, and ending November 30, 2006;

Whereas hurricanes are among the most powerful forces of nature, causing destructive winds, tornadoes, floods, and storm surges that can result in numerous fatalities and cost billions of dollars in damage;

Whereas, in 2005, a record-setting Atlantic hurricane season caused 28 storms, including 15 hurricanes, of which 7 were major hurricanes, including Hurricanes Katrina, Rita, and Wilma;

Whereas the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration has predicted that between 13 to 16 storms will occur during the 2006 Atlantic hurricane season, with between 8 to 10 storms becoming hurricanes, of which between 4 to 6 storms could become major hurricanes of Category 3 strength or higher;

Whereas the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration reports that over 50 percent of the population of the United States lives in coastal counties that are vulnerable to the dangers of hurricanes;

Whereas, because the impact from hurricanes extends well beyond coastal areas, it is vital for individuals in hurricane prone areas to prepare in advance of the hurricane season;

Whereas cooperation between individuals and Federal, State, and local officials can help increase preparedness, save lives, reduce the impacts of each hurricane, and provide a more effective response to those storms;

Whereas the National Hurricane Center within the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration of the Department of Commerce recommends that each at-risk family of the United States develop a family disaster plan, create a disaster supply kit, and stay aware of current weather situations; and

Whereas the designation of the week beginning May 21, 2006, as "National Hurricane Preparedness Week" will help raise the awareness of the individuals of the United States to assist them in preparing for the upcoming hurricane season: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the goals of the President in proclaiming the week beginning May 21, 2006, as "National Hurricane Preparedness Week";

(2) encourages the people of the United States—

(A) to be prepared for the upcoming hurricane season; and

(B) to promote awareness of the dangers of hurricanes to help save lives and protect communities; and

(3) recognizes—

(A) the threats posed by hurricanes; and

(B) the need for the individuals of the United States to learn more about preparedness so that they may minimize the impacts of, and provide a more effective response to, hurricanes.

NOTICE OF HEARING

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that a hearing has been scheduled before the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

The hearing will be held on Monday, June 12, 2006, at 2:30 p.m. in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Building.

The purpose of the hearing is to receive testimony regarding the implementation of Sections 641 through 645 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005, the Next Generation Nuclear Plant Project within the Department of Energy.

Because of the limited time available for the hearing, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, those wishing to submit written testimony for the hearing record should send two copies of their testimony to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, United States Senate, Washington, DC 20510-6150.

For further information, please contact Clint Williamson at (202) 224-7556 or Steve Waskiewicz at (202) 228-6195.

A PRODUCTIVE WEEK

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, over the next 20 minutes or so, we will be wrapping up what has been a very busy but very productive week, moving to a period which will begin with the celebration of this weekend, in the sense that a lot of people will be with families back at home, back with their constituents, back in their communities,

but we will move very quickly to our Memorial Day recess. I will have a few statements to make, a few words to say on what will be going on, on Monday.

We have had a very successful week in the sense that we have completed another nomination thus far. We will have a few more in a little bit that we have agreed to on both sides. We have completed an immigration bill that we worked on for about a month—initially, for 2 weeks, then a pause, and then for the last 2 weeks—a bill that, as I said yesterday, does reflect the will of this body. Not everybody agrees with it. Not anybody, I think, agrees with everything in that legislation. But it is comprehensive legislation that demonstrates that we are governing, addressing the very real problems, real challenges that face us in America today.

MARRIAGE PROTECTION AMENDMENT

Mr. FRIST. When we come back we will deal with a range of issues. I will have a little more to say about that in a bit, but the first issue we will come back to has to do with another institution, the institution of marriage.

Throughout human history and culture, the union of a man and a woman has been recognized as the essential cornerstone of society. For millennia, marriage has served as a public act, a civil institution to bind men and women in the task of producing and nurturing their offspring. In some eras it has existed apart from romance, love, and mutual regard. In ours, we have embraced the ideal of marriage that deepens and enriches the bonds of love, that grows with every shared memory, endeavor, and challenge: husband and wife, father and mother, building a family and a community over a lifetime.

At its root, marriage is and always has been a public institution that formalizes that family bond—its intent to further the community's interest in successfully rearing the next generation of healthy and prosperous citizens. But now, this fundamental institution is under attack. There is a concerted effort underway to redefine marriage against millennia of human experience and against the expressed wishes of the American people. Activist courts are usurping the power to define this social institution. And if marriage is redefined for anyone, it is redefined for everyone.

The threat is real. Just last year voters in 13 States passed by enormous margins State constitutional amendments protecting marriage; 19 States have State constitutional amendments also to protect marriage, and 5 more States have amendments pending. In total, 45 States have either State constitutional amendments or laws to protect marriage.

Tennessee will give voters the opportunity to voice their opinions on the sanctity of marriage this November. It

is one of seven States with similar amendments pending to their constitutions. If a marriage protection law passes in Tennessee, we will join those 45 other States that have approved legislation that defines marriage as a union between a man and a woman and, indeed, no State has ever rejected an effort to protect traditional marriage when it has been on the ballot.

So with this progress at the State level that expresses the overwhelming support of the American people, what is the problem? Why does it need to come to the floor of this body?

Voting for marriage on the State ballot is not enough to protect the institution. I need to explain. Because same sex marriage advocates cannot win at the ballot box, activists are continuing their campaign to convince State and Federal courts to rewrite traditional marriage laws. Currently, nine States have lawsuits pending challenging marriage laws. In five States, courts could redefine marriage by the end of the year—California, Maryland, New Jersey, New York, and Washington.

In California, Maryland, New York, and Washington, State trial courts have already followed Massachusetts and found the definition of marriage in their State constitutions unconstitutional. All these cases are on appeal.

Already we have seen a Federal judge in Nebraska overturn a democratically enacted Nebraska State constitutional amendment protecting marriage. That ruling is now under appeal in the Eighth Circuit. Another Federal case in Washington challenges the constitutionality of the Federal Defense of Marriage Act. The case is stayed, pending resolution of litigation in the Washington State Supreme Court.

Because of these attempts to overturn State laws and constitutional amendments, this Senate needs to act. The American people deserve a full debate on this foundational issue before marriage is redefined for everyone. That is why, when we return from the Memorial Day recess, I will bring the marriage protection amendment to the Senate floor to ensure the definition of marriage endures and remains true to the wishes of the majority of the American people.

The amendment is straightforward. The amendment is simple. It reads:

Marriage in the United States shall consist only of the union of a man and a woman. Neither this Constitution, nor the Constitution of any State, shall be construed to require that marriage or the legal incidents thereof be conferred upon any union other than the union of a man and a woman.

That is it. It is simple, straightforward—it is two sentences. The truth is, on the question of marriage, the Constitution will be amended. The only question is whether it will be amended by Congress as the representative of the people or by judicial fiat. Will activist judges amend the Constitution or will the people amend the Constitution to preserve marriage as it has always been understood?