

so that States are not constantly challenged by funding shortfalls? No. Finally, will we have done anything to cover kids out there who are not covered today? The answer is no. No, no, no, no. Is that responsible? No. It is continuing current law. Let me emphasize, it is a continuation of the current law that is the irresponsible thing to do. The program is broken as evidenced in just one way: the 3 out of 50 States covering more adults than kids, in some instances covering adults who don't have any kids.

The program has strayed. It needs fixing. In fact, the bipartisan agreement follows the path laid down by the President himself. I have said this repeatedly. The President made a promise at the Republican Convention in New York:

We will lead an aggressive effort to enroll millions of poor children who are eligible but not signed up for the government's health insurance programs.

President Bush said that. An extension of current law will not do that. He may not want to hear this quote again and again, but until he honors the commitment he made in that speech by making a proposal to cover more low-income kids, I intend to keep repeating it.

The President can keep his commitment by signing the bill we passed last week. But if he is going to veto it, he owes those of us who tried to keep his commitment with our bill a sense of what serious policies Congress can adopt to cover more kids.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak in morning business for 2 minutes to pay tribute to a great Louisianan who passed away.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has that right. We are in morning business.

Ms. LANDRIEU. And that Senator HARKIN would follow me for 15 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, first let me associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Iowa who just spoke so eloquently, strongly, and forcefully about the need for our children's health program in the country. I will be speaking later on that subject throughout the week as we all battle to get a better plan to cover more children at such a critical time now in that debate.

TRIBUTE TO HARRY LEE

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to speak just very briefly about a loss Louisiana has suffered—and, in many ways, the Nation—of a great political leader, a great political figure, and a friend to many.

Earlier this morning, Sheriff Harry Lee of Jefferson Parish passed away after a battle with leukemia. As my colleagues know, I come from a place of rich political heritage, colorful characters, and of amazing and fantastic stories at times about our political figures. Among the most colorful, though, was Sheriff Harry Lee, who stood out and stood tall for so many years. He served the people of Jefferson Parish since 1979 as their sheriff, but he started life in Louisiana in a much more humble way.

Harry was born in the back room of a Chinese laundry in downtown New Orleans to immigrant parents, Bing and Yip Lee, who instilled in him a strong and very determined spirit that would serve him well and serve all of us well for the rest of his life.

After a promising educational start at Francis T. Nicholls, where he served as both senior class president and student body president, Harry went on to college at Louisiana State University in Baton Rouge. He joined the ROTC Program there and was recognized early on as an outstanding cadet. He didn't stop there, though. His next step was to serve the country in the Air Force during the height of the Cold War. He served in the famous Strategic Command. His Air Force career led him to make a great decision in life, and that was to marry Lai Beet Woo, his wife of 40 years.

When Harry returned to Louisiana, he took over the family restaurant and convinced his father to allow him to attend law school. He excelled and became the first Federal magistrate for the Eastern District of Louisiana. He soon then, through many political contacts and his great spirit and gregarious nature and classwork, became parish attorney for Jefferson Parish.

Then, in 1975 and shortly thereafter, he was elected sheriff, a post he held for more than two decades, and he became a household name in Louisiana. This story has probably been tracked by others, but for Harry Lee, who comes from a Chinese-American background, at the time he was elected sheriff I think he was the highest ranking Chinese official and the only Chinese-American sheriff in the country. He was always extremely proud of that, proud of his heritage, always reminding us of that singular accomplishment.

After being a larger-than-life force in the realm of criminal justice for over 30 years, as I said this morning, he finally lost his own battle with leukemia. He had fought and won many battles on the streets in Jefferson Parish, in the courtrooms, and also in the court of public opinion.

Harry Lee's success says something important about our country—the son of immigrants who goes on to not only serve his parish, his city, his region, but went on to befriend Presidents, Republicans and Democrats, being the go-to person when people of great political distinction would come to our State.

They always wanted to see and talk with Harry Lee.

Like all of us in public life, his tenure was not without controversy, but he was fiercely loyal to his deputies. There are thousands of deputies, current and former, who are mourning his passing today.

Looking back on a life like this, you can only think that his father and mother, Bing Yip Lee, who have long passed away, must have looked down and smiled on their son's accomplishments.

The loss of this singular figure in Louisiana politics is not only a loss to Jefferson Parish and to the State of Louisiana, but it is a loss to this great country that we all try our best to serve.

I want to extend my heartfelt condolences to the Lee family, to the deputies, to the law enforcement officials of Jefferson Parish in our State who are mourning this loss today. I hope we will all take some solace from the fact that they are being joined by so many mourners who recognize and appreciate a life well lived.

In closing, a not-so-secret hobby of Harry's was singing. I cannot say he would have ever made records, but he tried and he sang with great zest. At many jazz fests, he would be tempted to the stage by his friend Willie Nelson. They would often sing together. His favorite song was "Welcome to My World." I would like to say to Harry today: Thank you for welcoming us to your world, Sheriff Lee. You served us well, and you will be missed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the closing of my remarks, the Senator from Montana, Mr. TESTER, be recognized.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, how much time do I have?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senator has 15 minutes. The majority side has 22 minutes 40 seconds remaining.

GUARD AND RESERVE FAMILIES AMENDMENT

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I thank my colleagues for accepting my amendment to support the families of those National Guard and Reserve individuals serving in Iraq and Afghanistan. I thank Senator LEVIN and Senator MCCAIN for their support and assistance in including it as part of the National Defense Authorization Act, on which we will be voting on final passage later today.

This is a new era for our National Guard and Reserves. They are shouldering a huge share of the combat burden in Iraq and Afghanistan, plus a

stepped-up role here in homeland security. It speaks volumes that more than four times as many Guard members have been killed in Iraq as during the entire Vietnam war.

With many Guard and Reserve members on their third or even fourth deployment, and with some deployments being stretched to at least 16 months, the stresses on their families are acute. Their children are at greater risk for depression, behavioral disorders, and academic problems. Long family separations often result in financial difficulties and troubled marriages.

Earlier this year, I introduced the Coming Together for National Guard and Reserve Families Act, which is the heart of this amendment. That amendment was accepted by the majority and the minority. The amendment does a number of things: It strengthens the family assistance program to ensure there are adequate resources for Guard and Reserve families throughout the deployment cycle. It provides special attention for the children of deployed servicemembers, who often react to parental separation with acting-out behaviors, anxiety, and depression. Finally, the amendment ensures that Guard and Reserve families receive appropriately timed information about the psychological symptoms that can appear long after coming home—such as anger, depression, alcohol abuse, or post-traumatic stress disorder—to help them take advantage of the services and support they may need.

Shortly after introducing the bill, I received a letter from the fiancé of an Iowa Guard member deployed in Iraq. It was one of many letters I received. I cannot read them all. I thought this portion of it summed it up:

I received a letter from you today about the S. 902 bill that would help National Guard families, and I just wanted to say thank you. I cried when I first read this; for the first time in 2 years I feel like someone heard me. I hope this bill is passed and carried out. My fiancé is in Iraq with the 133rd Infantry of the Iowa National Guard. He was due home in March but now will be there until August. To say the least, I was devastated when I heard that he was extended, and honestly believe that it is such a terrible thing. Since he has been extended, many of his friends in the unit have tried to commit suicide and even more are deeply depressed. More times than not, I hear him saying how he wishes he could just have his life back. And I ask that you keep fighting for this because our soldiers' lives are hanging in the balance. My soldier and I will have to deal with the long-term consequences of his being in a war zone for so long for the rest of our lives, and we have to stop this before our children and grandchildren have to deal with this as well. . . . I am proud to live in the United States of America. However, my fiancé has done his part; he has protected this country for 22 months and he has been away from my side for that long. Let him come home, give us our lives back.

Mr. President, one happy result is that the brave men and women of the 1st Battalion of the 133rd Infantry of the Iowa National Guard—the same soldiers who inspired this amendment—returned home in July after

serving as part of the longest continuous deployment of the Iraq war, spending nearly 2 years in active duty and 17 months in Iraq.

Senator GRASSLEY and I passed a resolution earlier honoring the service and sacrifices made by these brave soldiers and their families. But there is more we can do. Of course, I am working with my colleagues on this side of the aisle, and others, to begin the long, overdue process of redeploying our troops out of the civil war in Iraq. I hope we can make real progress on this in the coming weeks.

Until we are able to accomplish that, we must do everything we can to make sure the loved ones and family members of our deployed soldiers receive the support they need and deserve.

These families, many of whom are just starting their lives together, are dealing with tremendous stress. They include many small children who have grown up while their mothers or fathers were away.

Mr. President, this is a quiet crisis that we don't read about in the morning newspaper, but it is a crisis nonetheless. This amendment addresses that crisis by strengthening family assistance programs and doing outreach to parents and professionals who serve children—including mental health counselors and teachers—to alert them to the special needs of kids in military families, especially those with a parent in a war zone.

This amendment also ensures that families receive support after soldiers come home. The amendment ensures that families receive mental health information for up to 6 months post deployment so they can have access to the services and support they need.

Again, why is the amendment necessary? It became clear, after visiting with families of these National Guard troops and reservists who were overseas in Iraq that we have one set of family services and intervention and support for families of regular military personnel in the Army, Marines, Navy, and Air Force, but don't have the same support services for National Guard and Reserves. Many times in our small towns and communities you have one or two families who have a husband or a father overseas in the National Guard for an extended time, but those families don't get the same support and services as a family with a loved one in the regular Armed Forces, either throughout the deployment or when the soldier returns. Perhaps this made sense in the past. But the line between the Reserves and National Guard and the regular forces has become very blurred with the war in Iraq. So we see the National Guard carrying out what normally would have been done by the Active-Duty military. That is why this amendment, providing Guard and Reserve families with this support, is so important.

On a final note, the benefits of this amendment will apply to all Guard and Reserve troops, as well as their fami-

lies—and I might point out, even those who disagree with President Bush and Vice President CHENEY. They can disagree and this amendment will still apply to them. I feel obliged to say this because a prominent conservative leader, Rush Limbaugh, of radio infamy, said men and women in uniform over in Iraq who oppose the war are “phony soldiers,” and are presumably unworthy of the American people's support.

Earlier today, I was here and I heard Senator REID, our majority leader, speak about this. This statement is outrageous and despicable. Our men and women in uniform in Iraq have made extraordinary sacrifices. 3,800 have been killed and nearly 28,000 have been wounded, many with amputations and brain injuries they will live with for the rest of their lives. Our troops live in constant danger. Meanwhile, their families at home have had to cope with repeated separations and with the constant dread of bad news from Iraq. The very thought of Rush Limbaugh sitting in his air-conditioned broadcast studio and ranting about “phony soldiers” in Iraq who dare to speak their mind is just shameful. Perhaps in Mr. Limbaugh's case the correct word is “shameless.”

I realize he and some other extremists on the right hold the view that you are either with us or you are against us; you are either a good American or a bad American, depending upon whether you agree with the conservative Republican line. But that is not the way most Americans think. We respect disagreement. We value dissent. We don't resort to name-calling when our fellow Americans—especially those in uniform—express a differing point of view.

For the record, by labeling as “phony soldiers” those who disagree with the war or the President's comments, that denigrates many thousands of our Armed Forces serving in Iraq. Listen to this. A December 2006 poll conducted by the Military Times found that fully 42 percent of servicemembers disapproved of President Bush's handling of the war, while just 35 percent supported it.

In other words, our men and women in uniform are not much different from the rest of the American people, the majority of whom also disagree with Mr. Bush's conduct of the war. Frankly, it increases my respect for those soldiers' professionalism and sense of duty. They disagree with their Commander in Chief, but they continue to perform their jobs with enormous courage, confidence, and commitment. That is cause for admiration and praise, not name-calling and denigration.

I must add, as a veteran, I find it offensive that Rush Limbaugh, who never put on the uniform of this country, would attack the patriotism or dedication of any soldier fighting in Iraq. I have often said about someone like that, before they drape themselves in the flag of this country, they ought

to put on the uniform first to defend it. In Limbaugh's case, he would not do that.

Well, I also find it disturbing that his offensive comments have not been condemned by our Republican colleagues, or by the Commander in Chief, all of whom were so quick to condemn a similar personal attack on General Petraeus several weeks ago.

The Boxer-Levin-Durbin Amendment to the Defense authorization bill said the Senate "strongly condemns all attacks on the honor, integrity, and patriotism of any individual who is serving in the Armed Services." I just point out that all but two Republican Senators voted against this amendment. Will any one of them stand up and be brave enough to take on Rush Limbaugh? Will anybody on that side of the aisle take on Rush Limbaugh for this statement? We have not heard anything yet, but I hope they do.

The silence from President Bush and the Republican leadership is simply deafening. Is this because they agree with Mr. Limbaugh, or they don't want to risk angering such a prominent conservative by taking him to task.

Mr. President, in August, seven soldiers published an op-ed in the New York Times criticizing the current strategy in Iraq. Tragically, two of those soldiers were subsequently killed in action, making the ultimate sacrifice for their country.

I only can assume by Mr. Limbaugh's definition that they, too, were phony soldiers. What is most despicable, Rush Limbaugh says these provocative things to make more money. So he castigates our soldiers. This makes more news. It becomes the news, more people tune in, he makes more money.

I don't know, maybe he was high on his drugs again. I don't know if he was or not. If so, he ought to let us know. That shouldn't be an excuse.

I wish to make it clear that I respect Mr. Limbaugh's right to say whatever he wants, but we also have a right. We have a right not to listen to him.

So I think the best thing to do for him is to tune him out, tune out Rush Limbaugh and listen to more responsible talk show hosts in this country.

I think that it is time, again, for us to stand up for our troops, as we have, I think, in the past, to give them every bit of support and give their families support. That is what my amendment does. I am pleased this amendment has been included in the National Defense Authorization Act, because it is an important step toward ensuring that our National Guard and Reserve families receive the kind of support the families of our regular forces also receive.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Montana.

TRIBUTE TO JOE PAPEZ

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute and thanks to Joe Papez, Technical Sergeant, U.S. Army retired.

Joe is a veteran of World War II. In fact, he is believed to be the oldest living Purple Heart recipient in the United States, and he is one of the brave men who answered the call of their country and who helped the "greatest generation" earn that title.

Joe was injured three times during his stint in the Army, where he served in both Africa and Italy, in the campaigns of 1943 and 1944. He earned three Purple Hearts fighting in Casablanca, on the island of Sicily, and in Italy. But it was his last wound by a German artillery shell during the fierce fighting at Anzio, Italy, that earned him a free ticket back home.

The way Joe tells the story, after he was wounded in Anzio, he was put on a ship and sent home, but he doesn't remember the trip. He woke up in Virginia. After a while, he was shipped to Denver, where he recovered in a hospital. Then he was shipped to Oregon and finally to Santa Barbara.

When he finally got back on his feet, he kept on serving his country by caring for German prisoners of war in Utah, where he remained until the war was over.

Following the war, Joe returned to Red Lodge, MT. Disabled from his war wounds, he was unable to get a job. He made a drawing for a homestead in Powell, WY, but was told he was too sick to have it. However, with help from his brothers and a bank loan, he got into farming and ranching.

On December 19, Joe Papez will turn 100 years old or, should I say, 100 years young. He will turn 100 in the same town in which he has lived for nearly his entire life. Although he was born in Franklin, KS, the State of Montana is proud to claim Joe as one of our own.

Joe's family moved to Red Lodge when he was a year old. Residents of Red Lodge know he is a fixture in the town's Memorial Day parade, he is a regular in the Fourth of July parade, and even at his age, he marches in these parades to remember his brothers in arms with whom he served. And they will always remember him. Fittingly, the Billings chapter of the Military Order of the Purple Heart is named for Joe Papez.

Joe is spry and healthy and said he would serve his country again if he could. Joe Papez has served his country and his community, and he has done it very well.

So today we give thanks to him and Dorreen, and we pray for more folks just like Joe.

I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be per-

mitted to speak as in morning business for 10 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AWARENESS MONTH

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, today marks the beginning of domestic violence month, and it marks a time when we look at the progress we have made in this area and what challenges remain.

As a former prosecutor, I am well aware of the tragedies we see every day in this country from domestic violence. But it is also a time in our State where we look back at the lives of Paul and Sheila Wellstone, who devoted their time, their passion, and their energy to doing something about a problem that so often is overlooked or about which people do not want to talk.

This is, in fact, a few weeks on the calendar before their tragic death in a plane crash. Today we are going to welcome their son, David Wellstone, to the Capitol, and there will be a quilt displayed in the Russell rotunda, a quilt made by women and children from 13 different domestic violence centers across this country.

At the event today, we are going to have in Paul and Sheila's honor—we are not just going to look back on all they accomplished and stood for, but we are also going to look ahead to the work we all must do to carry their legacy forward, especially that commitment they had to ending domestic violence.

It is hard to believe it has already been nearly 5 years since we lost Paul and Sheila. It feels both so long ago and yet not that long ago. But we know their dreams and passions remain alive in each one of us, and that is why we are gathering tonight.

For me, I get my own special reminder of Paul Wellstone every day. His family gave me the flags that hung in his office. I am also reminded every day by ordinary people in the Capitol when I say I am from Minnesota—the tram drivers in the basement or the police officers or the secretaries in Senate offices who, when you say you are a Senator from Minnesota, they remember Paul, and they remember how well he treated people and the dignity with which he treated people every day.

Above all, I keep in mind, in front of my mind, the fundamental values for which he fought and struggled—being a voice to the voiceless, bringing power to the powerless, bringing justice to those who suffered injustice and above all, bringing hope to all of us that we can change the world and make it a better place.

There is no better way to honor Sheila's groundbreaking work in domestic violence than to mark the beginning of Domestic Violence Awareness Month with that quilt hanging in the Capitol.