

Senate, more often than not we end up with minibuses or omnibuses. We roll tremendous appropriations bills one into the other, pass them at the end of the night, and find out weeks later what is in them. That is not good regardless of your party, and it is certainly not good for the United States of America.

I come to the floor this morning to talk about some suggestions that have been made by some very distinguished and learned Members of this body on both sides of the aisle about opening our appropriations process, diagnosing the problems with it, and fixing it statutorily.

I particularly call the attention of the body to Senator DOMENICI from New Mexico, one of the longest serving Members of the Senate. He will be retiring at the end of next year. He has introduced consistently every year a biennial budget. The idea is that we appropriate in 2-year bites rather than a 1-year bite, and we do oversight in the second year.

Think about this for a second. What if the Congress did appropriations bills in odd-numbered years, meaning we spent the money in odd-numbered years and in even-numbered years, the same year we are up for reelection, we do oversight. So all of a sudden our debate and races are not about what we are going to spend but how our money is being spent. That is responsible, it is smart, and it makes sense.

Those who object will jump up and say: Oh, well, then we will just have a lot of emergency appropriations bills. Give me a break. Have you seen how many emergencies we have done in the last 2 years? We have emergencies come up all the time. Of course, you are going to have those. The emergency that exists is not the fear of having an emergency but the fact that once again this year we have gone past the end of the fiscal year, and we are operating under a continuing resolution. The United States has an untold number of issues that must be dealt with, and we are on cruise control in terms of the appropriations of our country. It is not right.

Now, I have voted for some appropriations bills, and I have voted against some appropriations bills. I am glad we have gotten seven done. But we have five out there that all of a sudden are probably going to get rolled in with about three or four others, get vetoed, and then get rolled into an omnibus. We will fly in here in the dead of night, have a document on our desk that is probably as thick as five or six concrete blocks stacked on top of one another, in very fine print, and we will be asked to cast a vote on how we are going to spend the money of the taxpayers of the United States. It is not right.

We need to look at new and creative ways to run the Government of the United States and its fiscal affairs. I commend Senator DOMENICI's appropriations recommendation and the idea

of the biannual budget, and I encourage this body to start looking at a constructive solution like that. Senator VOINOVICH, who ran the State of Ohio—he has been a Governor—and is as sound a fiscal person as you want to find in this Senate, pointed out as well yesterday that the whole situation is just broken. We have entitlements on cruise control, discretionary spending in a continuing resolution, and we in the Congress fight over little tiny parts of the appropriations process when we ought to be considering it in its totality. We should take each of the 12 budget units, bring them to the floor, debate them, pass them, and send them to the President. Do them responsibly, as we are expected to do.

When the announcement was made that we are not going to get to five appropriations bills this year, there was also an announcement that we are going to have an Omnibus appropriations bill. We are going to roll all the bills into one, not debate them, not make decisions based on their soundness, and not even, for most of us, have a say in it; certainly not have a say during prime time or a say on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. President, I come today to talk about responsibility on behalf of our body and responsibility on behalf of the people of the United States, and I urge the majority to join with us to seek out recommendations such as those of Senator DOMENICI, seek out the sound advice of Senator VOINOVICH, and let's get our fiscal affairs in order. If we don't, we are going to waste more and more tax dollars and we are going to have more and more programs that go without oversight and we are going to spend dollar after dollar after dollar on old problems while our new problems and new challenges go unmet. It is not right for me, it is not right for you, Mr. President, and, most importantly, it is not right for the people of the United States.

I yield the floor, and 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. BROWNBACk. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. BROWNBACk. Mr. President, how much time remains on our side of the aisle on morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 14½ minutes remaining.

Mr. BROWNBACk. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

REMEMBERING SENATOR PAUL WELLSTONE

Mr. BROWNBACk. Mr. President, I want to speak from the heart on two matters: one on my good friend, Paul

Wellstone, who died in a plane crash 5 years ago. Several speakers have spoken already, very eloquently, about Paul Wellstone, a wonderful man.

He and I disagreed on many issues in this body, and yet we had a wonderful relationship because of the nature of the person he was. He practiced the art of disagreeing without being disagreeable. It is a tough art to do, particularly in legislative bodies it can be very difficult. But he did it, and he did it very well. And he had a number of friends on both sides of the aisle from wide across the political spectrum.

Because of that attitude—and here is something I really want to say to my colleagues—Paul and I could get together on what I deemed to be the most important piece of legislation that I have been a part of here, as far as a primary sponsor, and that is the human trafficking work that he and I started—actually, his wife got him focused on it, and she was killed in the same plane crash—where we started seeing people trafficked into the United States and different places around the world, and we wondered what is going on with this dark underside of the globalization that is taking place. The way they saw it was his wife first started to see Ukrainian women trafficked into Minnesota and showing up at battered women shelters. They had been trafficked into prostitution in the United States and then had shown up at battered women shelters. And they said, how did you get here? Then they started backtracking the trail through gang activities, criminal activities, organized crime activities, that moved them from the Ukraine into the United States, into brothels, and then they were battered.

As they started to piece this together, they were seeing organized crime which now we know is in many cases involved in human trafficking around the world and is the third leading source of income for organized crime now—trafficking. Much of it is women or young girls, in many cases if not most, that they are trafficking and trafficking into prostitution.

Paul's wife first observed this. Paul got involved in it. I got involved in it, seeing it from another angle, and we were able to put together a coalition around that issue of human trafficking at an early phase, before we noticed that much. That included people from across the political spectrum. Paul and myself—he a dedicated liberal, myself a conservative—we had Gloria Steinem and Chuck Colson in this coalition, pushing for a bill against human trafficking, the first legislation we did here on that topic.

Because we were able to work together and reach out across the aisle and disagree about a lot of things but not be disagreeable and find common cause, we were able to deal with something that is a scourge on this planet. As we globalize, walls come down, people are moved, many times illicitly, in many cases brutally, and in a lot of

cases are killed in the process, or seen as disposable people—which is a term of art used by one of the authors, experts on this topic, who has written a book called “Disposable People.” These are people who have been trafficked. Then after they get diseased or run down, they are thrown out on the street as a disposable person. It is a very ugly thing.

Paul, with his heart of gold, saw this. I remember him complaining to me one day as I was coming out on the Senate floor. He came charging up to me and he said: You do this to me.

I said: What?

He was showing me the rankings and he was only the second most liberal in the Senate. In the prior years he was the most liberal. He said: You did that to me. If I hadn't been working with you, I would be the most liberal still. He had that kind of sense of humor about him that he would blame me.

He came up to me one day, where I was talking about life being sacred and precious, and I was saying I believe all life is sacred, it is precious, a child of a loving God, and that includes Paul Wellstone and TED KENNEDY too. He came out and said I like your line on this, even if I don't agree with your position on life. He enjoyed life. He lived it well. I think he has also taught a good lesson for the rest of us about core convictions. There is no problem with having core convictions. It is a good thing to have core convictions and to stand by those. It is also a good thing to recognize when it is that the topics you are talking about are not your core convictions, so you can reach out across the aisle. I think maybe 30 percent of the topics around Washington, maybe more, could be less, are divisive ones, where there are divisions on both sides. But there is 70 percent we can work on. The country is desperate to see us make Washington work, to see us reach across the aisle, to see us make it work on core topics.

JOE BIDEN and I held a press conference in Iowa about a political solution in Iraq, and people were stunned, saying this is what we want to see; we want to see our country work on tough topics. We can do that on issues such as cancer, the war on cancer—there is no division between the parties on that—and reaching across the aisle we can show the American people a government that works. That is something we need to do. That is something I think would be in Paul Wellstone and his wife's legacy.

I remember them today and I hope all of us will remember them in our prayers, about what they gave to us. I often say you can't measure a tree very well until it is on the ground. Unfortunately, that is the case with Paul, a wonderful guy with a wonderful heart. I disagreed with him on a number of political issues, but I loved his style and loved the way he lived life.

SUDAN

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I wish to talk about the situation in Sudan. The situation in Darfur has been widely noted and known. It is deteriorating. It is deteriorating slowly. We want to get the factions back together to try to talk about what it is we can do to bring some stability.

Something that is not widely followed right now is the deteriorating situation between the north and south. We have had a long-term peace agreement in place now for a couple of years between the north and south that ended the longest running civil war in Africa. It had been going on for 20 years. Two million people were killed. Now the south has backed away somewhat from the government. The north government is not complying with the peace agreement. I will be bringing out a more full statement to my colleagues. This is very dangerous, as far as the situation that now we could get back into a problem between the north and the south again, and have two fronts going.

In the south, long term, there was a genocide going on there before it took place in Darfur. We have to be vigilant toward the Sudanese Government, which is the problem. This is a genocidal government in Khartoum. We have to get on top of that situation and make sure it doesn't deteriorate between the north along with what is taking place in the west and Darfur. It could well be that Sudan in the future is a country that breaks up into three or four different countries because of the way the Khartoum government is trying to force people into their ideological box. It is a militant Islamist government started by Osama bin Laden, this iteration. It is the problem, but we have to deal with it, where it is in this situation. I don't want us to take our eyes off the ball.

In the south, where there has been a lot of work over a long period of time to get that peace, I hope that we not lose that peace in the overall situation.

Finally, the President of Congo is in Washington now. I met with him yesterday, along with a number of my colleagues. One of the issues I want to bring up here, and I will be developing some legislation, is that a number of radical militant groups are raiding in the eastern part of the Congo. They are dislocating nearly 450,000 people now. In these guerrilla movements, what they do is get control of an area and then they get mineral rights for individuals or to groups to come in and mine things, such as coal. It is a particular metal used in making cell phones. That is how they finance their rebel movement. We saw this in the blood diamond issue in western Africa. What we did then was put a certification process together, that you had to certify that the diamonds came from legitimate means, and that shut the financing down.

My hope is we can do something similar in the Congo, where we can

have a certification on minerals like the coal and then shut the financing down for these groups that run civilian populations out of an area. I think that is something we can do credibly. Our markets and our economy are our key foreign policy tools. Here is a place where we can use the U.S. market to try to help bring stability to a region that is key for stability throughout Africa. If we get stability in the Congo it might bring stability throughout the region. I hope we can do those things.

I appreciate my colleagues' time and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

REMEMBERING SENATOR PAUL WELLSTONE

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, someone asked me once how I would describe my politics. I told them: I believe in the Gospels of Saint Paul. Paul Douglas. Paul Simon. And Paul Wellstone.

They were, in my opinion, three of the best public servants I have known. I had the privilege to know each of them and be inspired by them. Not a week goes by that I do not draw on some lesson or some truth they taught me.

Today, I find myself thinking especially of Paul Wellstone. It was 5 years ago today that Paul and his wife Sheila died in a plane crash in heavy fog in the Iron Range of northern Minnesota. The information reached us in Chicago a few hours later. I was asked to comment on local television station. I am sure that the emotion in my voice betrayed my real feelings about this great man, and Sheila.

Also lost in the crash were Paul and Sheila's daughter Marcia; their friends and campaign workers, Will McLaughlin, Tom Lopic and Mary McEvoy; and the plane's pilots, Richard Conroy and Michael Guess.

To understand who Paul Wellstone was and what he meant to so many people, listen to this story from John Nichols, the Washington correspondent for “The Nation.”

Two hours after the plane crash, he had just finished delivering a keynote speech to about 150 family farm activists in a small town in Wisconsin when the conference organizer whispered the news to him. These were people who knew Paul Wellstone as the college professor who was willing to march with them—and even to be arrested with them—to protest family farm foreclosures. When he was elected to the Senate, they thought of Paul Wellstone as their Senator, whether or not they lived in Minnesota.

When they learned that he had died, John Nichols wrote: “Cries of ‘No!’ and ‘My God! My God!’ filled the room, as grown men felt for tables to keep their balance, husbands and wives hugged one another and everyone began an unsuccessful struggle to choke back tears. The group gathered