

friends on the other side. The most important point is that two central provisions of the bill are opposed by two of their own chairmen. In this morning's Albuquerque Journal, we learned that the Democratic chairman of the Senate Energy Committee does not like the so-called windfall profit tax. He called it "arbitrary."

Now, we know this is a bad idea that does not work. The last time a windfall profits tax was tried in the 1980s, it reduced domestic production and actually increased our reliance on foreign oil, just the opposite of a rational policy to reduce gas prices to make America more energy independent.

In the Wall Street Journal, we learned that the senior Senator from New York, the chairman of the Joint Economic Committee, is raising the alarm about another central tenet of the Democratic energy proposal, the energy futures trading provision. The Journal reports the chairman is saying the energy futures trading provisions, as written, would send the bulk of the trading that is now done in America, and thus American jobs, to markets overseas.

I agree with both of these chairmen. Two years have passed since Congressional Democrats said they had a "commonsense plan" to address high gas prices. This week Senate Democrats finally unveiled that plan, and their own chairmen do not seem to like parts of it. It is predictably high on taxes, more bureaucracy, and continued dependence on OPEC.

Their proposal would do nothing to lower the price of gas. It will only serve to further reduce domestic supplies and increase our dependency on foreign oil at a time when we are trying to make America more, not less, energy independent.

Republicans believe we should increase our supply of American energy to bring gas prices down and to create American jobs. Apparently our friends across the aisle believe we should continue to ask OPEC to increase its supply, while opposing additional production of American energy.

We will have an opportunity to vote on Monday on the proposal that the majority of Members on my side think would make an actual difference in the coming years. It is a fundamental difference of opinion. We can either proactively increase our domestic production or we can place greater dependence on foreign suppliers and further delay energy independence. Given the choice, I would rather produce more American energy and create more American jobs.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The assistant majority leader.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to respond in leader time in the absence of Senator REID.

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

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, Senator REID could not be here this morning

and asked me to come to the floor if a response was necessary, and a response is necessary.

There are two fundamentally different approaches when it comes to America's energy futures between the Democratic side and the Republican side. The Democratic side believes that first we have to do everything we can to protect consumers of America from price gouging. We know what is happening. We cannot go to Illinois, Arkansas, Kentucky, or Colorado and not run into people saying we cannot understand why gasoline prices are so high. We know the price of a barrel of oil has gone up to record high levels because of price manipulation by the Saudis, OPEC, and other countries, and the Republican approach to this totally ignores it. We know the oil companies across the United States last week reported record profits in the first quarter of this year. Since President Bush came to office, the profits of the oil companies have more than quadrupled and the price of gasoline has more than doubled.

Does the Republican approach even address this? The answer is no. We have, in the Democratic approach, a windfall profits tax, which says to these oil companies: There is a limit beyond which you cannot go in gouging consumers and overcharging them for your products. As airlines are faced with bankruptcy, as truckers cannot afford to fill their rigs on the highways, as the cost of energy is passed on to us as higher food prices and the like, it is absolutely unconscionable that the oil companies continue to show record profits quarter after quarter, year after year, at the expense of our economy.

The Democratic approach deals with that. We go to the fundamentals. The windfall profits tax says to the oil companies: There is a limit to what you can take. Beyond that, the Government is going to tax you and make it clear to you that raising prices is not the answer.

Second, we are going to stop putting more oil at high prices into the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. If there ever was a time we should not be taking oil off the market, this is that time. We also provide in our bill for going after this OPEC coalition, the price collusion that is going on at the expense of the American economy.

We deal with price gouging to make sure the companies that engage in it know they are going to pay a heavy price for that kind of conduct. And we go after speculation, if it is excessive, to try to make sure we fuel any fires of speculation that might be adding to the cost of energy.

What do the Republicans offer in return? Drilling, drilling, drilling. They do not understand one fundamental fact: The United States has within its grasp, in our territory and territory we control, only 3 percent of the world's supply of oil—3 percent. Each year, we consume 25 percent or more of oil pro-

duced. We cannot drill our way out of this situation.

We have to stop price gouging on consumers. We have to hold oil companies accountable, and I think the Republican approach does neither. I am looking forward to this debate. I assume that by early next week we will have a vote and the American people will see where we stand.

WELCOMING THE GUEST CHAPLAIN

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, it is with great pleasure and pride that I rise to recognize and welcome the guest Chaplain for the Senate today, Pastor Brian Severin, who is the pastor of Victory Christian Fellowship Church, Greeley, CO.

Pastor Severin has served in the full-time ministry for 23 years. He was born and raised in northeastern Colorado before attending and graduating from the University of Northern Colorado, which is also located in Greeley.

Prior to coming to Greeley 6 years ago to minister to Victory Christian, he was the founding pastor for Church Alive in Sterling, CO, and served as pastor to New Life Fellowship in Yuma, CO.

He is joined today by his wife of 27 years, Joslyn Severin, along with 14 members of his congregation. My colleagues and I very much appreciate Pastor Severin taking time away from his duties in Colorado to help guide us through our deliberations today in the Senate.

May Pastor Severin's words of inspiration this morning make us wiser and kinder to each other as we go about conducting the people's business today.

I yield the floor.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to a period of morning business for up to 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with the Republicans controlling the first half and the majority controlling the final half.

The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, let me make one observation, that the guest pastor got his training at Rhema Bible College at Broken Arrow, OK. I was mayor of Tulsa, he reminded me, back at that time. So he had good training.

DOMESTIC ENERGY PRODUCTION ACT OF 2008

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, let me respond, firstly, if I can, to the assistant majority leader. First, it is easy to point the finger at oil companies. That is the easiest "out," because everyone has this perception that all oil companies are doing great.

Here is the problem you have. If you were to take all profits from oil companies—let's forget about windfall profits; take it all, do not leave any at all for anything else, other than what they are putting into exploration—it would amount to 28 cents a gallon.

If you slashed their profits in half, as they are proposing to do, that would be 14 cents. Fourteen cents does not help a lot, at least my wife says it does not. And I think you know we are kidding ourselves. There are solutions to this problem, but that is not one of them.

Then as far as the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, we are putting about 50,000 barrels per day in there right now. If we were to halt that, over the course of a year it would equal less than one day of U.S. consumption. That is not what I call a fix. Fourteen cents a gallon is not a fix, one day of cents is not a fix.

But there are some things we can do. We do have an amendment, amendment No. 4720. It is by our leader, Senator MCCONNELL, and by Senator DOMENICI. This actually was a bill. It was going to be the Domestic Energy Production Act of 2008, but we are offering it now as an amendment. This would handle a lot of the problems. First, if we had all of the production out there that we needed to take care of America's needs, we still could not do anything, because we do not have the refining capacity. Two years ago I introduced the Gas Price Act. I could not believe it went down right on party lines. The Democrats flat do not want to increase our refining capacity. This happened in the Environment and Public Works Committee. It was actually a pretty smart approach to it. We were taking a lot of the closed bases and using them and allowing EDA grants to take place so that adjoining communities could turn those into refineries, and also streamlining the process and all of that.

Well, it went right down on party lines. So this amendment we are going to be talking about is one that will do something about the refinery capacity. The one we introduced, the amendment, streamlines the permitting process so there would be a maximum on any new refinery of 360 days on a new refinery or an expansion of 180 days.

We have not increased our refining capacity. We have not had a new refinery in 30 years. Other countries are doing it. China is doing it. Mexico is doing it. But we are not. So that is the first thing we need to do, increase refining capacity.

Secondly, everybody hold on, because this is something I know is very foreign to our thinking nowadays, it is an old concept called supply and demand. We have a lot of demand for gas out there. We know that. We know when we go to the pump. The problem is the supply. I hate to say it. Is there a chance? I am kind of excited that the public now has the attention of the high prices and realizes we are going to have to do something besides the gimmicks the assistant majority leader

talked about. That would be to increase our drilling capacity. We could do it on ANWR. People talk about the fact that this is pristine wilderness. First of all, I challenge anyone to look at this area. It is not a pristine wilderness. The main thing is, if you take that little area that we have, with huge reserves, we have been trying to do something with it. It compares as a postage stamp does to a football field. It is such a small amount. All the Natives there want it. All the Alaskans want it. It is their land. That would be the first thing we should do to increase our capacity.

We tried this. We passed this 10 years ago. Then President Bill Clinton vetoed it. If he had not, that would be flowing today. All the people who are complaining about that are the same ones who complained about the Alaska pipeline. They said it was going to kill all the caribou. Go up there now during the summer months, and they have increased the number of caribou up there primarily because in some parts of Alaska, the only shade they can find is the Alaskan pipeline. They are all lined up there. So it is not a problem.

The other major area of production potential would be to go offshore. It is interesting. One of the things in this amendment is to allow States to determine what they want to happen offshore. It is interesting, some of the States, such as Virginia, south of where we are standing right now, very much wants to. I have talked to Senator WARNER. They are talking about allowing production offshore. Several other States have wanted to do that. It is a wake-up call we have right now that we are going to have to do some of these things. It is interesting that Canada allows offshore drilling in the Pacific, the Atlantic, and the Great Lakes. Cuba is also looking to expand drilling, which could occur 45 miles off parts of Florida. If this happened, they would be doing it with technology that is much less environmentally friendly than we have right now. So we have the possibility the Cubans are going to be doing something without any emission controls, without any environmental precautions, and we would be allowing it.

Another part of this amendment is to repeal section 526. This is something that should not have been in before. This was actually put in in the Energy bill that was passed in December of 2007. Section 526 prohibits Federal agencies from contracting to produce nonconventional alternative fuels that emit higher levels of greenhouse gas emissions than conventional petroleum sources. The scope of the fuels that could be prohibited is left wide open to interpretation, including fuels such as Canadian oil sands, E85 ethanol, the coal and natural gas-to-liquids fuels. This was an experiment I had something to do with, as did the occupant of the chair, in the Senate Armed Services Committee. We now have a B-52H bomber that is actually running on

gas-to-liquid fuel. So we know this is something that works. We know it can help our situation.

What I don't have time to get into because I only had 5 minutes, but I wish to do it later, is the ethanol mandate that came with the December of 2007 bill. Right now we know that ethanol—and quite a few of the far-left environmental extremists were behind this thing to start with; in fact, former Senator Al Gore, Vice President Al Gore has stated he cast the deciding vote to allow ethanol in the first place—is not environmentally sound. It is expensive. It is not good on engines, and it is competing. In my State of Oklahoma, our livestock people say we can't continue to have the biomass fuels competing with our feedstocks. Almost everything you see that is high priced now in the grocery stores you can trace back to the ethanol mandate. One of the things we will be wanting to do—and I will elaborate on it later—is to exercise the part of that bill that gives the EPA the opportunity to be involved in a waiver of the ethanol mandate.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, the American Energy Production Act of 2008 is being offered as an amendment to the flood insurance legislation before us today. I am an original cosponsor of the American Energy Production Act.

The thrust of this legislation is expanding American energy supply through many different avenues. I view this amendment as an essential step forward in both addressing the short-term as well as the long-term American energy supplies. I also view this amendment as the right policy to deal with today's high price of energy. America needs to advance its energy policy, and this amendment deserves immediate consideration.

There are many excellent provisions of the amendment that is before us. I am particularly interested in a provision to ramp up production of 6 billion gallons of fuel derived from coal. The provision would start with a mandate of 750 million gallons of alternative coal-to-liquid fuels and then ramp up by a similar amount over the following 7 years, beginning in year 2015. Analysts estimate this provision will result in a reduction in the amount of oil America is projected to import.

Simply put, coal is an abundant, affordable, reliable, and secure source of energy. Coal can also be a clean energy source. These coal-to-liquid fuels would likely be used first by our military. The Department of Defense would be allowed to sign longer contracts for synthetic fuels. The duration of the contracts would be expanded from the current 5 years to 25 years. By doing that, this simple provision provides great potential because it adds certainty to the market and provides another incentive to develop coal-to-liquid facilities. In a time of soaring

prices at the pump, this provision deserves serious debate, serious consideration.

The fundamental energy issue before us is one, as we have heard from all speakers, of supply and demand. It is a time for Congress to take action, action that can have a real important impact on America's energy supply.

America's coal is vital to our Nation's economic prosperity and our Nation's security. Coal is a crucial part of America's energy portfolio. Coal provides a foundation for a competitive economy, a secure future, and a prosperous information technology sector. Wise use of natural resources drives America's innovation and our economic success. From the steam engines of yesterday to the superconductors of the world, coal has powered this Nation. Now is the time to support the technology and development of coal to liquids. This will allow coal to be an important contributor to America's transportation fuel. After all, coal is strategically found in States throughout the Nation, both in the East as well as the West.

The countries competing with us economically—India, China—rely heavily on coal. They are poised to exploit coal's many benefits. In order for us to sustain America's current economic leadership, we must continue to harness the vast potential of coal. Energy sources often face challenges. You know what they are: reliability, security, economic competitiveness, ease of conversion, impacts on food supply, and environmental considerations. Coal provides an essential on-demand energy supply in the United States, and coal is a low-cost energy source. Coal has enormous potential to be converted into transportation fuels. At a time when America faces record prices at the pump, coal should be used to produce gasoline, diesel fuel, and jet fuel. Several provisions in the American Energy Production Act of 2008 move America's use of coal and domestic energy in the right direction. America's energy and economic security will depend on promoting technologies that are related to coal. The time to act to expand America's energy portfolio is now.

I urge adoption of the amendment when it comes up for a vote.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. May I ask how much time remains in morning business on our side.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. There are 15½ minutes.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oklahoma and the Senator from Wyoming for their excellent remarks on the energy crisis. I want to focus attention on a couple of numbers this morning.

The first number is \$3.65. This is the average price of a gallon of gasoline now for sale across America. Contrast that with the figure of \$2.33. That

shows how much the price of gasoline has gone up across the country since January 4, 2007. If we extrapolate what that means for the average American family, they have seen a decrease in their standard of living or an increase in their cost of living by roughly \$1,400 a year as a result of this increase in gasoline prices.

Another figure I wish to mention is the figure 745. That was 745 days ago, when Speaker NANCY PELOSI, before she was Speaker, said that if she and her fellow Democrats were given the majority, they would come up with a commonsense plan to reduce gas prices. That was 745 days ago. Notwithstanding the fact that they announced a plan yesterday—I will talk about that in a minute—we are still waiting for a commonsense plan to bring down gas prices at the pump.

Here is the quote:

Democrats have a commonsense plan to help bring down skyrocketing gas prices.

This was the Speaker of the House, April 24, 2006. As I said, we are still waiting for that plan.

You heard both the Senator from Oklahoma and the Senator from Wyoming talk about some aspects of the legislation, the so-called Domenici amendment, which we will vote on, on Monday, and of which I am a proud co-sponsor. But let me focus on the plan announced by Majority Leader REID and the Democratic leadership yesterday. First, we will find some very familiar elements to this plan rolled out by the Democratic leadership. It bears some remarkable resemblance to previous plans they have rolled out. The No. 1 element is it produces not one single drop of additional oil or gas or energy, not one drop. The other characteristic it bears a remarkable resemblance to in terms of past proposals is that they basically suggest we tax, we litigate, and we investigate our way to greater energy independence. This is a formula which, although familiar, is one that has not shown itself effective, obviously, in bringing down the pain at the pump, the price of gasoline.

First, they said: We are going to investigate price gouging by the oil and gas industry. We have seen investigations by the Federal Trade Commission. We have had numerous hearings that have found basically no substantiation for so-called price gouging. In fact, the cost of oil and gasoline has been related to unrest around the world in dangerous parts of the world where the supply may be in question, whether it is the Middle East or elsewhere.

They found that the failure of Congress to remove the regulatory burden to construction of new refinery capacity has led to a bottleneck when it comes to refinery capacity where that oil is then transformed into gasoline that we burn in our gas tanks.

Then, of course, there is the fact that we cannot repeal the law of supply and demand, and that unless we are going to do something about increasing the

supply of oil, that if we fix the amount of oil available worldwide because we refuse to open America's own natural resources in order to expand that supply, that rising demand for oil by countries such as China and India—which have more than a billion people each who want the kind of prosperity and enjoy the sort of economic vitality the United States has—they are going to place greater demands on that fixed supply of oil so they can benefit, as America has, from having access to low-cost—relatively low-cost—energy for a long, long time.

So price gouging is something for which we have had investigations in the past. We have had hearings in the Senate Judiciary Committee, on which I am proud to serve. The Federal Trade Commission has investigated it until they were blue in the face and found no real evidence of price gouging but, rather, a deficit of supply when it comes to increasing demand as the most likely cause.

Now, the second element of the Democratic leadership's so-called energy policy is litigation. In other words, we are going to sue the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries.

Now, I have heard some of our colleagues talk about another context: We need to engage countries such as Iran and Venezuela and talk to them directly about geopolitical matters and about security matters.

This is the first time, really, I have heard them talk about suing countries such as Iran and Venezuela and the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries. The irony of it is, what are we going to sue them for? We are going to sue them for, presumably, more oil or make them turn the spigot open even wider, ironically forcing us to become more dependent on imported oil from dangerous regions across the globe and from people who are not our friend—President Ahmadinejad in Iran, head of an Islamic extremist government on the terror watch list of the State Department as a state sponsor of international terrorism in the Middle East; and then there is Hugo Chavez in Venezuela, somebody who is not our friend, somebody who harbors narco-terrorists in the FARC and other organizations in his country. These are the kinds of people we are going to continue to depend more and more on by somehow filing a lawsuit against them and forcing them to sell us more of their oil? How is that going to make us more energy independent? How is that going to enhance our national security and our economy?

Well, then there is the other answer we have heard in the Democratic leadership plan they proposed—this one, again, is a familiar solution, or I should say a nonsolution—and this has to do with the so-called windfall profits tax.

Well, I think we ought to learn from history or else we will be condemned to relive it. Over the entire 1980 to 1986 period, in which the U.S. Government

had a windfall profits tax, it, in fact, reduced domestic production from between 320 million barrels and 1,268 million barrels. That is almost 5 percent of overall production. If you think about it, there is an easy way to understand that. If you put an increased tax on American producers—because, of course, we cannot put an increased tax on OPEC, on Venezuela, on Iran, and these state-owned oil companies—the fact is, we put an increased tax burden on our own domestic producers.

Of course, we find that the Congressional Research Service has found that last time we tried a windfall profits tax, it decreased our domestic oil production. Why in the world would we want to do that? How does that help increase the supply of America's natural resources, which can help ameliorate some of this pain at the pump by increasing supply and thus bringing down, hopefully, the cost of a barrel of oil and then the refined product of gasoline?

Well, the last suggestion has to do with the strategic oil reserves. That is a final answer, by eliminating the 70,000 barrels a day that we put into the strategic oil reserves. Now, I think there may be a case for reducing or eliminating the 70,000 barrels of oil a day that go into the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. But I have to tell you, the world consumes roughly 85 million barrels of oil a day—85 million barrels of oil a day. What effect is 70,000 barrels a day that would not go into the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, what impact would that have on reducing the price of oil globally or bringing down the price at the pump? Well, my calculation is that by reducing the amount of oil going into the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, we could bring down gas prices maybe 2 cents or 5 cents per gallon. Maybe that would be welcomed but hardly adequate to deal with the high gas prices we have sustained and are experiencing today.

But I want to take that one step further. If our Democratic friends believe reducing the amount of oil that goes into the Strategic Petroleum Reserve by 70,000 barrels a day is a good idea because that might reduce, although infinitesimally, the cost of gasoline, how much more sense would it make to explore and develop the million-barrel-a-day capacity that is located in Alaska in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge? If you take the million barrels of oil a day that could be produced from ANWR, then you are talking about—according to the same calculation I just used on the Strategic Petroleum Reserve—reducing the pricing of gasoline, by an additional million-barrel supply of American oil a day, by 85 cents to \$2.14 a gallon. Now, that would be a real impact, to be able to bring down the price of gasoline by 85 cents to \$2.14 a gallon.

I just mentioned the ANWR reserves. But it is estimated if we were actually to open not only Alaska to environmentally responsible development of

those oil and gas reserves located there and produce an additional million barrels a day of oil, that if we were also to leave up to the States—States such as Virginia and other States, Alaska—the option to open their Outer Continental Shelf to oil reserves, to further production, if we were to open some of the oil shale and oil sands out in the West to production, we could develop another 3 million barrels of oil capacity right here in America without having to depend more and more on foreign sources of oil.

If you take the same argument our friends have offered on the impact of reducing deposits of oil in the Strategic Petroleum Reserve and that that would actually have an impact on price, how much more would it have a beneficial impact on lowering the price if, in fact, we were to open up America's natural resources here at home?

We will have an important vote on Monday where the so-called Domenici amendment—which I am proud to join—will be offered for a vote, where the Senate can go on record in showing where they stand when it comes to this effort to help bring down the price at the pump, which Speaker PELOSI announced 745 days ago. The highlights, as I have already mentioned, of that bill are opening portions of the Outer Continental Shelf, as we have the Gulf of Mexico 300 miles offshore from the State of Texas. I tell you, you cannot even see the drilling activity out there 300 miles offshore. Indeed, the drilling activity could occur in the Outer Continental Shelf beyond the horizon in a way that is not even visible to people on shore.

I mentioned the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. Tapping into that oil and gas, which we know is there, would immediately produce—once it is done—huge volumes of oil that could help relieve our dependence on imported oil.

We know that building additional refineries would help relieve some of that bottleneck when it comes to refining the oil into gasoline. Of course, 70 percent of the price of gasoline is the price of oil, but another part of it is the burden we put on the permitting process for the construction of new refineries or expanding refinery capacity.

My colleague from Wyoming talked about coal, and I agree with him that we ought to use good, old-fashioned American ingenuity in our research and scientific ability to figure out, how do we use this coal—we are the “Saudi Arabia” of coal—how do we use it in a way that is compatible with a good environment? The technology has already been demonstrated, things such as coal-to-liquids technology, coal gasification, which can capture the carbon, deal with the environmental concerns, and yet provide us access to energy which can help drive our economy and help make us less dependent on imported oil and gas from other parts of the world.

So, Mr. President, I hope our colleagues on the other side of the aisle

will come forward with additional ideas. I have explained how the proposals they have made would have no impact, would provide no supply but would really just rehash old, tired themes which have been shown not to work in the past. But I think the debate is an important one, and I look forward to continuing it.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Jersey.

60TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF ISRAEL

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I rise to honor and celebrate Israel's 60th anniversary. On a sad note, this is the first year that we honor Israel's anniversary without my friend and former colleague, Congressman Tom Lantos, former chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee. Mr. Lantos was the only Holocaust survivor to ever serve in Congress, and his recent passing has left a hollow void for all of us.

Mr. President, on April 22 of this year, the Senate unanimously adopted a resolution expressing our unwavering commitment to the sovereign and independent State of Israel.

Sixty years after its founding, we now witness a strong nation, a steadfast ally and strategic partner of the United States, a dynamic democracy with a thriving economic, political, cultural, and intellectual life, that survives despite the heavy costs of war, terrorism, and unjustified diplomatic and economic boycotts.

We now witness an innovative nation which has developed some of the leading universities in the world and produced eight recipients of the Nobel prize.

We now witness a compassionate nation, which regularly sends humanitarian aid, search-and-rescue teams, mobile hospitals, and other emergency supplies to help victims of disasters around the world and which has taken in millions of Jews from countries around the world, often fleeing those countries and persecution. These accomplishments have followed one of the most tragic events in human civilization: the slaughter of more than 6 million European Jews during the Holocaust.

We are reminded that, as I have said many times before on this floor, the events of the Holocaust are not distant and are not buried in the past. Today, those who survived the camps live to tell us their story, the stories of their families and their lives before the Holocaust. Their children and grandchildren are here with us too. They are living testimony to the strength, the courage, and optimism of their parents and grandparents. But in their hearts and in their souls they feel the pain and suffering of those who raised them. In them, too, the past is present.

Echoes from that tragedy still rattle our world in other ways. Every time a hateful slogan is spray-painted on a