

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time. I see the ranking member on the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. VOINOVICH. Mr. President, thank you for allowing me to speak on behalf of a very deserving person from the State of Ohio, as the Senate considers her nomination to the Federal bench. I am here to express my strong support for Judge Sara Lioi, who the President has nominated to serve on the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Ohio.

Judge Lioi has a distinguished and impressive record as an attorney in private practice, as an Ohio Court of Common Pleas Judge, and as a community leader in Stark County, Ohio, where she has deep roots.

A native of Stark County, Judge Lioi graduated from GlenOak High School and from Bowling Green State University, where she graduated summa cum laude and earned the distinction of Phi Beta Kappa.

Later, Judge Lioi went on to attend my law school alma mater, the Moritz College of Law at the Ohio State University, receiving her law degree in 1987. After graduating from law school, Judge Lioi joined the law firm of Day, Ketterer, the oldest law firm in Stark County, Ohio, as an associate. Judge Lioi was later recognized by her colleagues when they elected her to the firm's partnership in 1993.

As an attorney, she represented individuals, schools, and other institutions of higher learning, cities, small businesses, and multinational corporations. While in private practice, she represented clients at both the trial and appellate levels.

In November 1997, when I was Governor, I appointed Judge Lioi to fill a vacancy on the Stark County Common Pleas Court. Since then, Stark County voters have twice reelected her.

Since ascending to the bench, Judge Lioi has disposed of over 9,500 cases and conducted over 350 trials, over 335 of which were jury trials. In sum, she has broad courtroom experience, both on and off the bench. This extensive experience will serve her well as a Federal trial court judge.

Judge Lioi has also earned the respect of her colleagues and fellow attorneys. During her time as a practicing attorney, she served on the Supreme Court of Ohio Board of Commissioners on Grievances and Discipline, and for over 10 years, Judge Lioi has served on the Supreme Court of Ohio Board of Commissioners on Character and Fitness, including the last 5 as the Chair of this Commission.

I believe her service on these important commissions evidences the high esteem in which members of the Ohio bar hold her, and is testimony of her excellent character.

Judge Lioi's legal credentials are not the only reasons I support her nomination. Today, too many people do not take the time to become involved in

their communities; however, Judge Lioi remains involved in a number of civic organizations. A graduate of Leadership Stark County, she has remained active with that program, as well as other not-for-profit community agencies, including Community Services of Stark County, Stark County Humane Society, Walsh University Advisory Board, and the Plain Local Schools Foundation. We need judges who not only have exceptional legal skills, but who also recognize how the law impacts individuals and communities, and involvement in one's community facilitates this understanding. Judge Lioi has this understanding because she is participating in her community every day.

As a result of Judge Lioi's fine academic and professional achievements, I am not surprised that the American Bar Association unanimously found her well-qualified to serve as a Federal district court judge.

In reviewing Judge Lioi's academic and professional record, it is clear that she is well-qualified to serve as a judge on the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Ohio, and I urge my colleagues to vote to approve her nomination to the Federal bench.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I am willing to have a voice vote if nobody wants a rollcall vote.

Mr. VOINOVICH. I agree that we can have a voice vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Sara Elizabeth Lioi, of Ohio, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Ohio.

The nomination was confirmed.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. LEVIN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the President will be notified of the Senate's actions.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now return to legislative session.

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

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

IMPROVING AMERICA'S SECURITY ACT OF 2007—Continued

Mr. REID. Mr. President, there will be no more votes tonight. We are work-

ing to try to come up with a schedule tomorrow. As soon as we have one, everyone will be notified.

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.

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

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

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I rise for the purpose of speaking about two amendments. I wish to say that I really appreciate the efforts of the Senator from Connecticut and the Senator from Maine, who have literally been on this floor all day. As you can tell, the Senator from Maine has been struggling with a cold through the week. She has been as brave as she can, trying to get this important bill passed even though she doesn't feel at her best. The Senator from Connecticut has been working hard.

For some reason, we just can't seem to get a vote on two amendments that are very important to Louisiana. These amendments have been cosponsored by Senator VITTER, of course, from the State of Louisiana, and myself. Both of these amendments have been cleared on the Democratic side now for some time. We continue to have opposition, and we are not even sure where the opposition is coming from because the person who is holding it or the reasons cannot be made clear publicly, so I am not exactly sure what the opposition is to these two amendments.

I thought, while we were pondering about what to do, I would just talk again about what these amendments do and why they are so important.

AMENDMENT NO. 295

The first amendment is amendment No. 295, which has been pending for 2 weeks. I understand some colleagues may want to vote no. That most certainly is their prerogative. I bring this amendment to the floor with many cosponsors, Democrats and Republicans, but it is being held up on the Republican side tonight. It has been cleared on the Democratic side.

This amendment is to allow a waiver of the 10-percent match that has been required of Katrina and Rita recovery efforts. The reason we are asking that, as this board very dramatically shows, is the scale of this disaster is so far above any disaster, natural or otherwise, that we have experienced in this country that without this relief, the recovery is in jeopardy. That is not just because of the amount of money that has to be put up by local governments that are struggling to literally barely keep the lights on but also because of the redtape involved in this required match.

I understand the principle of a match. In principle, I agree that when you have a disaster, the local area and the State should put up some money and the Federal Government should

pick up the bulk of it. That is normally what is done. But as you can see here, for Hurricane Andrew, which was the most expensive storm prior to Katrina and Rita, the per capita impact was \$139. The per capita impact was \$139 for Hurricane Andrew. In the World Trade Center attacks, which, of course, were not a natural disaster but a terrorist attack, it was \$390 per capita. But for Hurricanes Katrina and Rita, the first and third most costly storms in the history of the Nation, the per capita hit to Louisiana is \$6,700. That is to say that, literally, this storm is off the chart. We have never attempted to recover from a disaster such as this, and the tools we have are insufficient. They were insufficient the day before the storms hit. They were insufficient the day after the storm hit. Eighteen months later, they are still insufficient.

We have made some progress but not nearly enough progress. It is not just the amount of money, which is a staggering amount—\$110 billion—but most of that money, because it was sent through poorly designed bureaucracies, never reached the end. Part of it was siphoned off by contractors who made huge profits at the expense of the victims of the storm. I can go on and on. There have been well-documented failures.

The bottom line is the recovery is still underway, and it is being hampered tonight—today—because this 10 percent match is being required. It is our State's No. 1 request of this Congress, and it is justified. It has been done in the past. It was done for Hurricane Andrew. It was done for the World Trade Center attacks. Why would anyone on the Republican side of this Senate tonight hold up an amendment that would give us the same coverage or same treatment? Not any more. We are not asking for anything more than what has been done—for Louisiana and for Mississippi and for Florida, which were extremely hard hit in the last hurricane seasons.

We have over 23,000 project work orders pending. Every one of those project work orders in all of the parishes and counties that were hard hit—23,000 is a lot of requests—every single one needs to have a 10-percent match, which requires certain reviews. Sometimes they are done by one Federal agency. Sometimes they are done by another Federal agency. It is slowing down the recovery. Every day this recovery is slowed down, every day this redtape persists—it is normally a nuisance. Normally, redtape is a nuisance in normal, regular life in America. In the gulf, it is a noose. It is strangling people. It is sucking the life out of them.

We cannot rebuild under these conditions. The storm was too great. The disaster was too big. The damage was too broad. We are not saying we can't rebuild and are not willing to use some of our own money, but we cannot come up with this 10 percent match, particu-

larly under the conditions which the current law requires. It must be changed. As I said, the tools that were given to us are insufficient. I promise, as sure as I am standing here, when this 10 percent is waived and these projects go forward and the gulf coast rebuilds, the taxes generated from this region will more than pay back the money that has come to us over time.

This storm, hopefully, will not hit again for another hundred years or 50 years. There are 50 years of good work and a hundred years of good work. By that time, we will have a lot of our wetlands and levees rebuilt. So it is in some ways like a temporary loan, if you will, to over 30 million people who live in the gulf coast, to say: We believe in you, we know you can rebuild, we know you can create these jobs, so get about the business of doing it, and the country will benefit in the long run.

That is what one of the amendments does. For some reason—I want to make it perfectly clear tonight, this amendment has been cleared on the Democratic side—It is being held up. I don't know why or by whom.

I thank Senator COBURN publicly because he had some concerns about this amendment but, with a very appropriate modification to the amendment which says that this loan forgiveness will sunset 2 years after it goes into effect—he had some objection to it going on indefinitely. Senator VITTER and I accepted that amendment to this amendment. So his objections have been met.

Senator SESSIONS had some concerns. His objections have been met.

There is some other hold on it. I just wanted to speak publicly, again, about the importance of getting this 10 percent waived. Again, it was done for Hurricane Andrew and it was done for the World Trade Center towers. You can see the scope of this disaster for the people of the gulf coast.

AMENDMENT NO. 296

The second amendment, briefly, which is an amendment I offered with Senator VITTER and others—and we have Republican and Democratic colleagues on this amendment—is a loan forgiveness amendment. This is a very touchy point for us on the gulf coast. I wish I had this list blown up. I do not. Of course no one can read it because it is too small to be seen, but we will get it blown up as soon as we can.

What I am holding here is a list of loans that have been taken out. This is just for Louisiana, but there is a Mississippi list just like this. There are community disaster loans that are taken out, like for the city of Harahan, the city of New Orleans, St. Bernard Parish, St. Bernard Parish School, Cameron Parish, which was almost totally destroyed. Of course, when these parishes are almost totally destroyed, they cannot go to banks to borrow money. No bank will lend it to them. The only people they can borrow from is themselves—the Federal Govern-

ment. We lend money to communities all the time, and we lend money to them under longstanding practices. This has been going on way before I got to the Senate—for decades. Sometimes those loans are forgiven, and sometimes they are not forgiven. It is up to the administration, the agency, to evaluate. If you can repay the loans, then you repay them. If you can't, you do not.

Last year, or 18 months ago, when we had this tragedy happen to us, under the last Congress we had many Republicans who supported our effort but not quite enough because there was a group in the House, led by sort of a conservative caucus over there, that said this: We will lend you money, but we are taking away your right to have repayment waived even if you deserve to have it waived. Even if your situation is worse than that of anybody else we have ever seen, we are removing that right.

I objected then; I did not think it was right. But we were voted down. So we have lived under this new rule, which was made only for Mississippi and Louisiana, because when the act was passed 18 months ago, over my strenuous objection, everything in the future could be forgiven, everything in the past had the option to be forgiven, but for the good people of Mississippi and Louisiana, for some reason we were carved out, to say: We will lend you the money, but you will pay it back no matter what. I objected to it then, and I object to it tonight.

The amendment Senator VITTER and I have submitted is to just put us back where everybody else is—not any more, not any less. Just give us the option to have these loans forgiven. Many of these loans will be paid back. They are substantial loans. Some of them are \$120 million, some of them are \$2 million, some of them are \$22 million. Some are just \$100,000 loans, depending on what a sheriff or school board needed. But, again, this disaster was unprecedented in American history. Many of these loans will be paid back, but that is for the administration to decide. If they believe these entities in Mississippi and Louisiana cannot repay these loans, then they will waive them. But under the current laws, as passed in the last Congress—particularly driven by a group on the House side—that forgiveness option was removed.

The two amendments are to waive the 10 percent, which we think is justified—more than justified—by this chart and many other facts that have been submitted to the record—and to go back to the regular routine law that says: If you borrow money you, of course, must pay it back. But if you cannot, we retain the option to forgive you. That is all we are asking for Gulfport, for Biloxi, for Pascagoula, for New Orleans, for Cameron, for Creole, for little cities—Thibodaux and Houma and cities that have borrowed money that might be able to pay it back, but then again they might not.

For the millions of people who live on the gulf coast, we may not be a fancy coast like the east coast or the west coast, but we are a working coast, and we are proud of it. We are fighting hard to come back, and we are contributing as much money as we can to the effort. People are working hard—wealthy, middle-income, and poor people, Black and White, Hispanic and Asian are working hard to come back.

We cannot come back if the rules keep changing for us. If the hurdles get higher, we cannot jump them. Leave them the same as everyone else, and we will be happy to rebuild our communities. We are building them stronger and smarter than ever before.

But when you have had most of your schools destroyed, most of your libraries destroyed, most of your universities damaged, it is an unbelievable situation to have to come back from. I know we have some work to do on many items. But at least the Federal Government can keep the rule book the same for everybody. We are happy to play by those rules.

On behalf of the people I represent, I strongly object to these new rules that are placed on us, for taking away options that others have enjoyed and used for their benefit. I am reminded of the disaster in North Dakota, Grand Forks. I did not visit North Dakota, but I have heard a lot about it. I have read about it.

That town of 50,000 was just about destroyed by the water that came through. Because there was a little different attitude in Washington, Grand Forks has been rebuilt. It is bigger than it was. It is stronger than it was. The people have their jobs back. That is what the Federal Government is about. The Federal Government should have the same attitude with the people in Louisiana and Mississippi in our time of need.

We most certainly can afford this after spending \$400 billion helping 23 million people who live in Iraq achieve democracy. We most certainly can support 30 million people to keep the democracy they have and have had for 226 years.

I hope tomorrow morning, when I come back to this floor, these amendments have been cleared on the Republican side of the aisle. If not, at least the person who is holding it up will have the guts to come to the floor and debate me on it and let us have a vote. I am happy to have a vote. I am happy to debate. If my colleagues, after hearing this, say: Senator, you are just wrong, the facts are not on your side, then I am fine. I would lose the vote.

But please let the people of Louisiana and Mississippi have a chance. That is why I guess we are stopped, because we cannot get a vote on these two amendments. They are not that complicated. I think people understand them. I hope we can get these two amendments passed. If someone has strong objections, I am happy to stay here tonight to debate. I will come early in the

morning. I will stay all weekend. I do not have to go anywhere this weekend. I am happy to stay and talk about it for as long as I need to.

I tried to speak about it privately with my colleagues. Now I am doing it rather publicly. I wanted to express that and let people know all the facts as I know them. I hope we can get these amendments voted on sometime tomorrow.

I yield the floor.

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

IRAQ RECONSTRUCTION

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. President, I rise today because a daunting task lies before us in Iraq. That task is the reconstruction of a war-torn and bruised nation. Let's put the battle over a troop surge or increased funding aside and join together in a strategy to one day leave Iraq, a free Iraq, in a place better than we found it. And not better by our standards, but better for the people and future of Iraq.

Last week, a group of airmen from Nellis Air Force Base in my hometown were recognized with Bronze Stars for their courageous efforts in Iraq. As part of an Explosive Ordnance Disposal team they have done remarkable work saving lives. CAPT Brian Castner was awarded the Bronze Star after a 6-month tour—his third tour in Iraq. His wife, Jessica, said of his mission:

My grandparents fought in World War II and, because of that, Japan is our friend. And we just hope and pray at night that 30, 50 years from now that for our children and our grandchildren that Iraq will be our friend, and if his efforts today keeping people safe does that, it makes every sleepless night worth it.

If we are going to succeed at making a future friend and ally out of Iraq, then we need a new direction forward. Our new military strategy must be paired with a new reconstruction strategy in order to cool off the vitriolic hatred and violence that has consumed Iraq, and this new direction must be based on realistic goals.

When we first liberated Iraq from the brutal dictatorship of Saddam Hussein, we were disgusted by the ruler's palaces and extreme wealth in contrast with the deplorable conditions of those he ruled. We were anxious to give the Iraqi people all that they had lacked. While our intentions were good, our expectations were unrealistic and our performance failed to deliver.

We looked to build a self-sufficient democratic nation in the Middle East with an accompanying civil society, responsible and just court system, representative government, responsive police units, a respected, and a protected border. We wanted to create a model to which people of other states in the region could aspire.

In hindsight, we should not have imagined that building a democracy would be so simple. It never has been.

We simply did not have the strategy and tactics properly prioritized, maybe building the roof before the foundation. It is no wonder why our efforts were unsuccessful. But it is not too late to regroup. A great deal depends on our new direction being successful.

Our policy needs to change from lofty aspirations to a focus on providing, as a minimum, the basic services that were available during the Saddam Hussein era. At the same time, we need to communicate that we are laying the groundwork for future opportunities that were unimaginable under that barbaric regime. We need to redirect our efforts to vital services such as water and waste water systems, irrigation canals, and a reliable electricity supply. Concentrating our resources on improving everything simultaneously is foolish and ends up being far less efficient. The laundry list of what we initially tried to accomplish in Iraq is what scholar Amitai Etzioni calls a "scattergun approach." We tried to do too many things at once, and did none of them really well. Instead, Mr. Etzioni suggests, we need a "triage" approach. We need to make services such as water, sewers, and electricity a priority. We work on them until they are successfully completed, and then we turn to the next project. While the building of banks and schools are important, if Iraqi families can't get running water in their homes or more than a few hours of electricity a night, why should they trust us? The less tangible gifts of a free democratic system are meaningless to a mother caring for her sick child in the darkness.

While our priorities have been part of the problem, our attitude may have also been a source for our difficulties. A Marine reservist from Nevada, Jon Carpenter, who served two tours in Iraq and whose brother is there now, told me about the approach taken by those around him to the Iraqis. "Sir, this is your country. What problems do you see that need to be addressed and what can I do to assist you in these problems," they would ask. "I may have some monetary resources coming, some people with skill sets to help you, and my time and energy to make the solutions happen. Where would you like to begin?"

If it had been the policy of all our military leaders on the ground to give that kind of deference to the local Iraqis, we may have been able to build a greater deal of good will and success. And don't get me wrong, our men and women in uniform have made tremendous progress in Iraq. They have worked tirelessly and have been committed to the cause, but we need to understand the importance of successfully delivering the most basic services to the Iraqi people as part of their path to self sufficiency. It will also create a situation where there is no tolerance for insurgents or their efforts to destroy what belongs to the Iraqi people.

In order for the Iraqi Government to become self-sufficient, Iraq's potential

for producing oil also must be realized. Currently the Iraqis are producing roughly 2.1 million barrels of oil a day. This is down from the 2.5 million barrels of oil a day produced during the previous regime. We need a plan that will reliably deliver 3 million barrels a day. At \$60 per barrel, the incremental 900,000 barrels per day generates nearly \$20 billion per year. This would go a very long way toward funding many of the improvements that are mandatory to stabilize the situation in Iraq.

As report after report indicates, one of the challenges to building Iraq's oil revenues has been insurgent attacks against oil infrastructure. As Senator CLINTON and I wrote in the Wall Street Journal, we believe a distribution of revenues to all Iraqis through an Iraq Oil Trust would mean they would have a greater incentive to keep the oil flowing, help the economy grow, reject the insurgency, inhibit corruption and commit to the future of their nation. An Iraq Oil Trust, modeled on the Alaskan Permanent Fund, would guarantee that every individual Iraqi would share in the country's oil wealth. Oil revenues would accrue to the national government and a significant percentage of oil revenues would be divided equally among ordinary Iraqis, giving every citizen a stake in the nation's recovery and political reconciliation and instilling a sense of hope for the promise of democratic values.

I know there are plans that distribute the oil revenues to the different provinces, but I firmly believe that each Iraqi citizen must receive a share—it means a path to opportunity for these people. With that share, an Iraqi citizen can make money, invest in a business, use it for collateral for a home, or build savings. With that share in an Iraq oil trust comes hope for the future.

There is still reason to hope for success in Iraq. Our new military strategy is showing progress on the ground, but we must continue to give our men and women in uniform the tools they need for the monumental task at hand. A focused plan for "triage" in the reconstruction of Iraq, coupled with a strong military strategy, will boost our credibility and secure Iraq for their future and for ours. If we don't succeed on the battleground and in the reconstruction efforts, we risk creating an enemy state that will be a safe haven for terrorists and a grave threat to generations of Americans.

Instead, let us work together to ensure that 50 years from now, our friendship with the people of Iraq will be thriving. We owe it to our brave men and women, like Captain Castner, to make that vision a reality.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, 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. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period of morning business with Senators allowed to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

PENNSYLVANIA ANTI-CRIME AND YOUTH INITIATIVE

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, youth violence is an enormous problem across America, including Pennsylvania. Regrettably, the city of Philadelphia had more homicides last year than any major city.

This is a problem that has been present in major American cities, and Philadelphia specifically, since the days when I was Philadelphia's district attorney. A great number of those homicides are related to youth violence.

On January 19 of this year, I convened a meeting that was attended by Mayor John Street; District Attorney Abraham; U.S. Attorney Pat Meehan; and representatives of Governor Rendell, with whom I discussed the matter specifically. There was a followup hearing attended by Senator CASEY and myself on February 19, where we addressed the subject with a focus on trying to find mentors for these at-risk youth.

We are searching for long-range solutions to the crime problem, the underlying causes of crime—which is obviously very complicated and very long term—such as education, training, job training, decent housing, and a whole host of factors that lead to crime. It is a matter I have been working on for decades, since my days as an assistant district attorney in Philadelphia. Regrettably, we don't seem to be much further along on attacking those underlying causes of crime, or dealing with the problems of criminal recidivism, after people are released from jail. It is no surprise that if we release a functional illiterate from jail, they will go back to a crime of violence. Without being able to read or write and not having job training, there is a very high degree of recidivism. We are trying to push the so-called second offender law to give people rehabilitation after the first offense.

Senator CASEY and I believe that addresses the issue in the short term, but it is not the answer, because there is no absolute answer. However, short-term help could be provided if we could find mentors to team up with at-risk youth on an individual basis. Many of these at-risk youth come from broken homes and have no parental guidance. If there could be a mentor, or "substitute parent," in the short term, I think that could be helpful.

We have also worked with the superintendent of schools of Philadelphia, on

some ideas he has about trying to give motivation to high school students, to put them on a path of going to college. We are working to have some early determination from the many colleges and universities in the Philadelphia area, to try to encourage these young people to be motivated to finish high school with the prospect of college.

Regarding the mentoring program, we are asking the universities also to see if they can provide mentors from their student body or faculty and, in the case of students, to give them course credit. We reached out to the athletic teams in Philadelphia, including the 76ers, the Eagles, and efforts are being made to include the Philadelphia Phillies as well, because it is well known that young people are interested in role models and might be willing to follow that lead.

We have also moved forward on trying to improve the situation in the city of Reading, which has been designated as the 21st most violent city in the United States. Toward that end, on February 23, with the cooperation of one of Reading's leading citizens, Al Boscov, we convened a meeting with the U.S. Attorney's Office, the FBI, the Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, the Drug Enforcement Agency, the State police, the local chief of police, the local sheriff, the school superintendent, and with citizens to again look at the crime problem. We intend to follow up in Reading to try to get additional personnel to assist that city, because it is, as I said, the 21st most dangerous city in the United States.

We have similar meetings planned for Lancaster and York next Monday, on the 12th. We also intend to go to Allentown and other cities. In Pittsburgh, we plan to convene a meeting on April 5, looking for ways to bring more Federal resources to bear on this crime problem. We are looking to the upcoming budget to try to provide more funds, similar to the \$2.5 million grant we obtained for the U.S. Attorney for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania to service the corridor from the Lehigh Valley through Reading and through Lancaster.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement be printed, with understanding that there will be some repetition in the written statement of what I have presented extemporaneously.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR ARLEN SPECTER—PENNSYLVANIA ANTI-CRIME AND YOUTH VIOLENCE INITIATIVE

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I seek recognition to discuss my recent efforts to address the crime and youth violence issues facing cities in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Pennsylvania is making great strides in revitalizing its cities through economic and community development. Unfortunately, the same cities that are investing substantial human and economic capital in revitalization efforts are also facing increased levels of crime. For example, Philadelphia had the highest homicide rate of all