

in our country the incentives to invest in alternative fuel—sun, wind, geothermal, biomass? We need this to be done on a multiple-year basis. So those are three important things we need to do.

I have had a number of conversations with my Republican colleagues. Senator DOMENICI and Senator LOTT—there are others with whom I have spoken—but just in recent days I have spoken to them. I spoke this morning with Leader PELOSI, the Speaker of the House. She wants to go to conference on this issue. One Republican Senator said: I understand you don't want to go to conference. The Speaker wants to go to conference. I want to go to conference. We would like to be able to do a bill, and we are going to do our very best to do that.

We are going to include the Republicans on anything we do. We know we cannot do a bill unless we include the Republicans in it, and we are going to do that. We are going to do our utmost to come up with a strong bill, one that is in keeping with the needs of this country.

Madam President, everyone is occupied on that side of the aisle, but I am going to, in the near future, when we have a Republican who can come to the floor, ask consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 340, which is H.R. 3221, which is the House Energy bill. And I will move that we go to conference on it. I will come out this afternoon, as soon as we can, and offer this unanimous consent request.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

---

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008—Continued

AMENDMENT NO. 3374, AS MODIFIED, TO  
AMENDMENT NO. 3325

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, I send a modification to the desk of amendment No. 3374 and ask for its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HARKIN], for Ms. COLLINS, for herself, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. CARDIN, and Ms. SNOWE, proposes an amendment numbered 3374, as modified, to amendment No. 3325.

The amendment, as modified, is as follows:

On page 64, line 5, insert before the period the following: “*Provided further*, That \$2,000,000 of the amounts appropriated under this heading shall be made available to carry

out dental workforce programs under section 340G of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 256g)”.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 3353, 3333, 3354, AND 3374, AS MODIFIED, TO AMENDMENT NO. 3325 EN BLOC

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, I have four amendments that have been cleared on both sides, and I ask unanimous consent to call them up and have them considered en bloc. The amendments are amendment No. 3353, amendment No. 3333, amendment No. 3354, and amendment No. 3374, for which the modification was sent to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the four amendments will be considered en bloc and agreed to en bloc.

The amendments were agreed to, as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 3353

(Purpose: To provide funding for the ADAM Act)

At the appropriate place in title II, insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. Of the funds made available in this Act for subtitle B of title IV of the Cardiac Arrest Survival Act of 2000 (Public Law 106-505), \$200,000 shall be used to carry out section 312(c)(6) of the Public Health Service Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 3354

(Purpose: To provide for a Government Accountability Office report concerning State health care reform initiatives)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. (a) Not later than November 30, 2008, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report concerning State health care reform initiatives.

(b) The report required under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) An assessment of State efforts to reexamine health care delivery and health insurance systems and to expand the access of residents to health insurance and health care services, including the following:

(A) An overview of State approaches to reexamining health care delivery and insurance.

(B) A description of whether and to what extent State health care initiatives have resulted in improved access to health care and insurance.

(C) A description of the extent to which public and private cooperation has occurred in State health care initiatives.

(D) A description of the outcomes of State insurance coverage mandates.

(E) A description of the effects of increased health care costs on State fiscal choices.

(F) A description of the effects of Federal law and funding on State health care initiatives and fiscal choices.

(G) A description of outcomes of State efforts to increase health care quality and control costs.

(2) Recommendations regarding the potential role of Congress in supporting State-based reform efforts, including the following:

(A) Enacting changes in Federal law that would facilitate State-based health reform and expansion efforts.

(B) Creating new or realigning existing Federal funding mechanisms to support State-based reform and expansion efforts.

(C) Expanding existing Federal health insurance programs and increasing other sources of Federal health care funding to support State-based health reform and expansion efforts.

The amendment (No. 3333) was agreed to.

The amendment (No. 3374), as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, I don't think there is any further consideration to be had on these amendments. Are the amendments agreed to en bloc?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. HARKIN. I thank the Presiding Officer.

We are waiting for a Senator to come to the floor to speak on an amendment. I know of no other speakers yet today. Again, I would remind people that we will be here Monday, and we will be voting—I don't know if the time has been determined yet but probably around 5:30 or somewhere around there. We will probably be in late voting on Monday. We will have a whole lot of amendments on Monday night. The agreement was struck yesterday that we would finish this bill by noon on Tuesday and to get there, with all the amendments we have pending, there will probably be a number of votes on Monday night.

So with that, 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. HARKIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 3399

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, we have another amendment that has been agreed to on both sides, so I call up amendment No. 3399 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Amendment No. 3399 is pending.

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, I call up that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It was previously proposed.

Is there further debate on the amendment?

If not, without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 3399) was agreed to.

Mr. HARKIN. I thank the Presiding Officer. 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. CORNYN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 3381

(Purpose: To provide for the continuing review of unauthorized, Federal programs and agencies and to establish a bipartisan commission for the purpose of improving oversight and eliminating wasteful Government spending)

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I have conferred with the bill managers.

I ask unanimous consent to call up amendment No. 3381 and to set aside any pending amendments.

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

The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN), for himself, Mr. VOINOVICH, and Mr. CHAMBLISS, proposes an amendment numbered 3381.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Text of Amendments.")

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, first, I thank Senator HARKIN and Senator SPECTER for working with us on this bill, this important piece of legislation, and for the opportunity to offer this amendment.

It is my intention, at the end of my remarks, to seek to withdraw the amendment because there are some procedural objections under rule XVI of the Senate rules.

I think this is an important amendment and an important matter for us to consider at the appropriate time. I hope my colleagues will work with me, as well as Senator VOINOVICH and Senator CHAMBLISS, who are cosponsors of the amendment, to find a way to address the urgent matters contained within the scope of the amendment.

Specifically, we ought to be good stewards of the taxpayers' money. Unfortunately, due to the size and scope of the Federal budget, there seems to be precious little attention given to ways to make sure that we spend the taxpayers' money efficiently. While we debate the necessity of appropriations, and we should continue to try to cut back on the unnecessary expenditures wherever possible, I think it is imperative that Congress do the appropriate oversight on existing Federal programs and appropriations and ways to look for both cost savings and efficiencies.

I think we ought to ask the fundamental question every time we are asked to appropriate money for a particular agency—we ought to ask this question: Is this agency or program still needed?

What has led me to offer this amendment arises out of some good work being done by the OMB. As a matter of fact, they have published this brochure called: "Expect More." You could go on line to expectmore.gov on the Internet and see what I am talking about. Specifically, they have a tool called "the program assessment rating tool," which helps the Office of Management and Budget assess whether a particular Government program is working.

The Office of Management and Budget has recently reviewed over a thousand programs. As this chart indicates, upon a review of 1,016 Federal Government programs, they have concluded that 22 percent of those programs rated either as ineffective or they are unable to determine whether they are effective. In other words, they are unable to find evidence that they are effective. They have not conclusively determined them as ineffective, but they have con-

cluded that 22 percent of the Federal Government programs are either ineffective or the results are not demonstrated. Anybody who is interested anywhere in the world—certainly in the United States—can look at the information on this expectmore.gov Web site and inform themselves, as I am sure they would want to, about what the Federal Government is doing and not doing on their behalf.

As part of the review, the OMB looked at 35 programs within the Department of Labor, totaling almost \$15 billion. They identified \$2 billion that could be saved out of that \$15 billion on programs that are not meeting expectations and are not effective. Some of these programs include the Office of Disability Employment Policy, Trade Adjustment Assistance, and part of the Workforce Investment Act. Certainly, these programs have the potential to help people and strengthen our country. But my hope is we will look at these programs and not necessarily decide they are not necessary—because they may be—but, rather, give the appropriate oversight and come back and try to do what is necessary to make them effective or, if they simply cannot be rehabilitated or made effective, we ought to eliminate them.

The fact is we can look to our State governments and State laws for mechanisms that we could use to make sure we spend the taxpayers' dollars only on needed programs and in the most efficient ways possible.

I look to my State of Texas. Since 1971, we have had something called the Sunset Commission, which periodically—about every 10 years—reviews State programs and State spending to decide what the answer to the question is that I posed earlier: Is this agency or this program still needed? Is the money being spent effectively?

Here in Washington, we could learn from the State sunset commission process, which I know happened in Texas and which also is reflected in the laws of many of our State governments but which we do not have here at the Federal level.

A study by the Congressional Budget Office found that Congress spent almost \$160 billion in 2006 on agencies and programs that were not, in fact, authorized. In other words, while the authorizing committees had previously authorized it, those authorizations had lapsed, indicating a lack of continued oversight and authorization by Congress. Yet money was continuing to be appropriated and spent on these programs. This list includes hundreds of accounts, both big ones and small ones, ranging from the Coast Guard, \$8 billion, to the Administration on Aging, \$1.5 billion, to section 8 tenant-based housing, \$15.6 billion, to the foreign relations programs, which is \$9.5 billion. Many of these programs and agencies, perhaps most, deserve reauthorization. I am not saying they do not. But reauthorization no longer means what it should. It means we have conducted

the appropriate investigation and oversight to determine whether the programs are meeting current needs or whether they are no longer necessary. Congress should make sure we are only spending money on programs that can and are justified.

My amendment would take what I think is a great experiment, which has shown tremendous success on the State level in places such as Texas, and create a bipartisan Federal sunset commission to review the efficiency of all Federal programs but will focus their work on ineffective and unauthorized programs and will make recommendations to Congress about how to improve them, if they can be improved, or whether we should just eliminate them altogether.

To me, this is a shocking figure, when our own Federal Government concludes—the executive branch, the Office of Management and Budget—that almost 25 percent of Federal programs are not delivering for the American taxpayers.

My amendment would create, as I said, a bipartisan U.S. authorization and sunset commission that would be composed of four Members of the House and four Members of the Senate. The commission would issue a schedule-and-review proposal to Congress at least once every 10 years, as well as issue reports on the way to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of Government programs and agencies.

The schedule-and-review proposal is where the commission would review and analyze at least 25 percent of unauthorized Federal programs and 25 percent of the ineffective programs as identified by OMB and would do so on a rolling or ongoing basis. In other words, we have to start somewhere, and that is where they would start, but we would continue until all Federal agencies and programs would be subject to this sort of scrutiny and review.

Unlike most commissions, Congress cannot simply ignore the commission's work under my amendment. Rather, the amendment would provide an expedited procedure that would force Congress to consider and debate the commission's work and then vote up or down on whether to accept it.

Simply put, this commission would help Congress do what we should already be doing; that is, providing the necessary oversight to make sure every dollar of the taxpayers' money is being spent wisely. The commission will help Congress answer the simple but powerful question I posed at the outset, and that is: Is an agency or program still needed? It seems like common sense to me.

I know some will argue this is why we have authorizing committees, but I believe the commission would add greater focus to the budget and appropriations process on saving taxpayers money as opposed to how can we come up with new ways to spend more money, which tends to dominate the appropriations process, and how can we

improve Government accountability and provide for greater openness and transparency in Government decision-making?

This concept, as I said, is not new or even revolutionary. My home State of Texas has had a sunset commission in place for 30 years, in which time it is estimated the Texas taxpayers have been saved more than \$700 million by eliminating ineffective or unnecessary programs, starting with a zero-based budget during the sunset commission reviewing process and justifying each and every dollar that is added to pay for that program if reauthorized.

The tendency in Washington, unfortunately, is to take an existing program and see it grow incrementally each year. Indeed, once a Government program is created, it tends to create a constituency that will come to Congress and argue that it should not be eliminated—not only should it not be eliminated, it should grow by a certain percentage each year.

As this and other appropriations bills come before the Senate, I ask my colleagues to keep in mind the extent of waste we already see in Government programs. Rather than allowing these programs to continue endlessly with no real purpose and no real means of accomplishing their goals, it is time we took a closer look at and acted on our responsibility to eliminate wasteful Washington spending. Before we raise taxes and before we mindlessly appropriate money for another batch of potentially ineffective and outdated programs, we should take a hard look in the mirror on how we spend the hard-earned money of the beleaguered American taxpayers. No one wants higher taxes, and our first defense against higher taxes ought to be greater efficiency and money savings by eliminating wasteful programs. Our primary means of ensuring this efficiency would be through this bipartisan sunset commission.

I hope all of our colleagues will seriously consider this proposal for a Federal sunset commission. It is important, before we look at raising taxes and growing the size of Government, that we look at ways to eliminate waste and unnecessary programs, and that is exactly what this amendment would do.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 3381 WITHDRAWN

I understand this particular amendment, being legislation on an appropriations bill, will be subject to a point of order. Rather than pursue that issue and require the procedural ruling on that decision, I now ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

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

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I thank the bill managers and my colleagues for indulging me on this point. This is not an issue that is going to go away. I am not going to go away when it comes to urging greater efficiency and elimination of wasteful Washington spending.

We have a tremendous responsibility, those of us who have been sent to Congress to represent our States and our districts, the least of which ought to be being good stewards of the taxpayers' money. It is time to take the Federal budget off autopilot, to see the Government grow and grow and grow without any real oversight, particularly when it comes to these programs which have been demonstrated either as ineffective or where it is impossible for the Federal Government to conclude that the evidence justifies the continued existence of these programs.

#### FUNDING FOR DEAFBLIND SERVICES

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, in America, there are over 10,000 children like 11-year-old Nate Newton of San Antonio and 7-year-old triplets Zoe, Emma, and Sophie Dunn of Houston, who are both deaf and blind. The increase in the number of deafblind children in America is fueling a growing demand for qualified teachers to work with deafblind children.

Texas Tech University is one of the few universities in the United States that offer graduate training in deafblind education. To date, the Department of Education has provided funding from the special education national activities account to train teachers with deafblind children in their classes on how to educate and include these children in daily classroom activities. Yet Federal funding for this program has remained level at \$12.8 million for nearly the past 20 years.

The House-passed version of the Labor-HHS appropriations bill includes a modest increase of \$2 million in funding for deafblind services. I think this is a reasonable increase and would request that the conference committee accept the higher level of funding.

Mr. HARKIN. I appreciate the Senator raising this issue and will do what I can to ensure that we accept the higher number when we go to conference on this bill.

Mr. SPECTER. There are over 300 deafblind children in Pennsylvania, so this is an issue that also affects a number of families in my State. I thank Senator CORNYN for calling this issue to our attention. I will do what I can when we go to conference to try to keep the funding for deafblind services at the higher level.

#### 1945 TRINITY TEST

Mr. BINGAMAN. Madam President, I rise to discuss a matter of great importance to my State with the chairman of the subcommittee, Senator HARKIN. As he is aware, New Mexico was host to the Nation first test of a nuclear weapon on July 16, 1945—the “Trinity” test. At the time, this test, like the entire Manhattan Project, was classified, with a public cover story of an ammunition magazine exploding at Alamogordo Air Force Base some 40 miles to the south of the test. The surrounding communities were not told that this was a nuclear weapons test until after the detonation of the “fat man” bomb over Nagasaki nearly 1

month later. In fact, the decision was knowingly made by the Army not to give any advance warning or evacuate any of the surrounding communities. The radioactive fallout from this test traveled northeast for at least 100 miles, and the effects were felt all around my State and beyond. Communities 96 miles north in Vaughn, NM, were affected; windows in Silver City, 120 miles west, were shattered. For 4 or 5 days after the test, the surrounding communities northeast to the test reported a “white substance like flour settled on everything.” Cattle that grazed on Chupadera Mesa suffered beta radiation burns and loss of hair, indicating levels of radiation exceeding today's permissible dose by factors of several thousand. The government made no effort to monitor for contamination the bodies of members of the public. A recently released CDC study, “Los Alamos Historical Document Retrieval Project,” indicates that the towns of Bingham to the northeast and Carrizozo 30 miles to the east of the test received external doses of radiation far exceeding today's maximum allowable doses. The absorbed ground level radiation 14 days after the test in Bingham was approximately 13 times what the Nuclear Regulatory Commission allows today for emergency life-saving. The CDC report quotes documents reporting that a Geiger counter in Carrizozo went “off-scale” at 4:20 p.m., 11 hours after the test. There is evidence that the fission products from this test were detected as far as Indiana, where a Kodak film plant observed spotting on their film from contaminated intake water used to make the paper pulp to store the film.

Mr. HARKIN. I am well aware of the problem of compensating workers affected by radiation from my efforts to secure a special exposure cohort under the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program at the Iowa Army Ammunition Plant. Have these local communities received any sort of compensation to date?

Mr. BINGAMAN. No. While the local communities surrounding the test in my State have talked of illnesses such as thyroid cancer for years, the recent CDC study is the first technical compilation of historical documents in the technical files of Los Alamos National Laboratory. Detailed technical dose reconstructions must first be attempted to take place to show the probable cause of the illnesses. I would like to request that the managers of this bill work in conference to insert the strongest possible language to have the National Cancer Institute undertake a study that estimates the number of fatal and nonfatal radiogenic illnesses compared to a baseline of what would be expected to occur naturally. This analysis must be completed by the National Cancer Institute with the utmost urgency given that, as the chairman knows well from the Iowa Army Ammunition Plant, many of the affected population are reaching an advanced age.

Mr. HARKIN. I will work with my colleague Senator SPECTER, the ranking member of the subcommittee, to urge the National Cancer Institute to make this matter a high priority. Does the Senator agree?

Mr. SPECTER. Yes, I will support that effort.

Mr. BINGAMAN. I thank both managers of this bill for their willingness to work with me on this important issue.

I thank the Chair. 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. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

---

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST—  
H.R. 3221

Mr. REID. Madam President, I had indicated earlier today that I was going to move to go to conference. The record should reflect that Speaker PELOSI and I have talked about this matter and we think it would be appropriate to go to conference. It is my understanding we are close to being able to do that. That would be good.

This is a bill that needs to be done and can only be done if Democrats and Republicans agree. The majority of us in this body are Democrats, but it is a slim majority. So everything we do, I need to get 20 percent of the Republicans to move forward on legislation. Hopefully, we can do that and have a real good conference on this matter.

As I indicated this morning, there are a number of issues that are important: A renewable portfolio; it is important we do something about CAFE; It is also important we do something about taxes so we can have the great entrepreneurs of America have the ability to invest in renewable energy. Right now the ability to do that is very limited because we have only given them a year, 2 sometimes with the tax credits, and they can't plan ahead for that. So those are the three things we need to work on.

There is much more, but that gives us an idea of what we need to focus on, and it is not easy because the House did not have CAFE, we did not have the renewable portfolio. So it is going to take some mathematical moving around to get this done because we need to work it out, I would hope, so we can do CAFE in both bodies and renewables in both bodies. Anyway, we need to give this a valiant try, and that is what conferences are all about.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 340, H.R. 3221, the House Energy bill; that all after the enacting clause be stricken and the text of the Senate engrossed amendment to H.R. 6 be inserted in

lieu thereof; that the bill be read a third time, passed, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table; that the Senate insist on its amendment, request a conference with the House, and the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees and that the title amendment at the desk be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, reserving the right to object, I had talked to the majority leader before he propounded the unanimous consent proposal. As we have discussed, we are trying to clear any objections on our side. Given the fact it is Friday and Members are traveling, we are having a few difficulties doing that. But it is my hope we can continue to work through it and resolve those so the unanimous consent request can proceed without any objection.

At this point, because of those challenges we have, while we are continuing to work in good faith to resolve them, I must respectfully object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. REID. Madam President, we have had a good couple of months here in the Senate. We have accomplished a lot, working together. Hopefully, on this momentous piece of legislation, we can continue to do that.

As I indicated this morning, we had a number of conversations yesterday, Republican Senators that want to move this forward, and I think there is a real possibility we can get a conference and move forward on this and come up with legislation where this body agrees with the House as to how to proceed.

I understand that is the case, and I understand why the junior Senator from Texas had to object. It is Friday afternoon. Hopefully, maybe next week, we can appoint conferees and move forward.

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. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

---

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to a period of morning business with Senators allowed to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

---

CONGRATULATIONS TO SENATOR KLOBUCHAR

Mr. REID. Madam President, the current Presiding Officer joins a very elite group of freshman Members who have achieved the distinction of presiding in the Senate for over 100 hours.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. REID. I am so happy to announce that Senator KLOBUCHAR achieved this distinction today an hour and 5 minutes ago. I congratulate her. I am embarrassed to say that as a freshman, we had a large freshman class, but I didn't preside for this long. I thought I was here all the time. It is really quite a nice award. It is something one can keep forever. We have gone to some length to make sure it looks good. For the time that I presided over the Senate as a freshman, I really learned a lot. One learns Senate procedures, different personalities of Senators who come to the floor.

The Senator from Minnesota is to be commended. She takes good care of her State. She goes back often. She has a wonderful family. She does it all. She sets a great example for the rest of the people in America, but especially she has added so much to the Senate.

When I first came here, the woman was MIKULSKI. The woman still is MIKULSKI, but she has a lot of people to help her now. The Senate is a much better place with more women. Someday—it won't be in the immediate future but not in the distant future—we will have a body that will have an equal number of women as men. When that happens, the Senate will be a better place. Congratulations.

---

THE PASSING OF MAYER “BUBBA” MITCHELL

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I rise today to share with my colleagues the sad news that Mayer “Bubba” Mitchell, a great American and a great humanitarian, passed away on September 26, 2007.

I was lucky to know Mayer for many years. He was a successful businessman from Alabama, a philanthropist who supported groundbreaking cancer research and a strong voice here in the Halls of Congress. An advocate for a strong friendship between the United States and Israel, Mayer served a term as president of the American Israeli Public Affairs Committee, AIPAC, and he impressed all who met him with his clear and passionate convictions.

I had the honor of attending Mayer's memorial service last month, in the USA Mitchell Center at the University of South Alabama in Mobile, AL. I heard many moving tributes from many distinguished guests. But there was one that stood out to me above the rest, so much so that I wish to share it with my fellow Senators.

My good friend Howard Kohr, the executive director of AIPAC, delivered the following remarks at Mayer's memorial service. Howard so aptly described the man we had all come to know and love that I would like to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD his words.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows: