

shined during the most difficult days. They understood if they were serious about creating this Constitution, they would have to work together and consider and respect each other's differences.

In the end, the Constitution was the work of those for it and those against it. They came to many compromises in order to make the final product that all could live with. John Adams described the Constitution as:

If not the greatest exertion of human understanding, the greatest single effort of national deliberation that the world has ever seen.

Although I serve as chairman of the National Republican Senatorial Committee, I have always prided myself on reaching across the aisle to work for the common good. For example, my home State of Nevada has greatly benefited from the work Senator REID and I have done together on several public lands bills. He brings certain people to the table who trust him; I bring others to the table who trust me. We encourage a dialogue that has resulted in crucial legislation for our State. I imagine this is the kind of give and take that made the Constitution possible.

Another important lesson from the Constitutional Convention was the understanding of the implications that our leaders' words have around the world. There were people who were completely opposed to the Constitution, but they knew how damaging their opinions could be, especially if those opinions were made overseas.

Benjamin Franklin stated:

The opinions I have had of its errors, I sacrificed to the public good. I have never whispered a syllable of them abroad. Within these walls they were born and here they shall die.

I think this is a critical flaw that is too often made in this body today. Our words have consequences. Today, it is much more difficult to contain what we say. Technology ensures that our enemies have access to the same television shows, Internet sites, and newspapers that our citizens have today. It is naive to think that a debate on the floor about retreating from Iraq has no impact on those plotting against us. It absolutely feeds into their strategy and their hope for our failure and our demise. We should all remember Benjamin Franklin's approach of working to contain our opinions that may be harmful to our Nation.

Finally, there comes a time after a contentious issue when we must come together and move forward. Abraham White, a fierce opponent to the Constitution, gave his word that he would work to convince his constituents to submit to the new law of the land and to live in peace under it.

Mr. President, 220 years ago, the States were in the midst of deciding whether they would ratify the Constitution. It was the pinnacle of a turbulent summer that left many of our delegates amazed at what they had actually achieved. George Washington called it "little short of a miracle."

The entire effort, from the first days of the convention to the parades that celebrated the United States and its Constitution, was in fact a miracle. Benjamin Rush, a Philadelphia physician who signed the Declaration of Independence, described the unparalleled emotion that was shared by all during the Philadelphia celebration of the Fourth of July—even greater than at any wartime victory. His description included the words: "We have become a Nation."

It is overwhelming to think about the work that was done hundreds of years ago so that we could continue to live and uphold the tenets of an enduring Constitution today. What a remarkable tribute to the delegates of the Convention and to the leaders whose vision led to the ratification of our Constitution.

I hope we can keep in mind the many hurdles overcome in 1787 by the Constitutional Convention and the men who were gathered there and come together in drafting a real supplemental that will fund our troops, give our military leaders the tools they need, and show the Nation we are united and that we are committed together in this global war against radical Islamic extremists. We have a tremendous legacy on which to continue building. Let's commit to doing that.

I yield the floor.

THE MERIDA INITIATIVE

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, the fiscal year 2008 supplemental appropriations bill provides \$450 million for the Merida Initiative, including \$350 million for Mexico and \$100 million for Central America, Haiti, and the Dominican Republic. This is the first installment of an ongoing commitment to help our neighbors to the south respond to the growing violence and corruption of heavily armed drug cartels. It represents a tenfold increase in assistance for Mexico in a single year.

The Merida Initiative is a partnership, and we recognize that achieving its goals presents an extraordinarily difficult challenge. The United States is the principal market for most of the illegal drugs coming from Mexico and Central America. We are also the source of most of the guns used by the Mexican and Central American cartels. Each country contributes to this problem, and we each have to be part of the solution.

President Calderon and President Bush deserve credit for the Merida Initiative. Better and more cooperative relations between our countries are long overdue.

It is unfortunate, however, that neither the Mexican or Central American legislatures, nor the U.S. Congress, nor representatives of civil society, had a role in shaping the Merida Initiative. There was no refinement through consultation. I first learned of it from the press, as did other Members of Congress.

As we have come to expect from this administration, the White House reached a secret agreement with foreign governments calling for hundreds of millions of U.S. taxpayer dollars, and then came to Congress demanding a blank check.

I support the goals of the Merida Initiative, and this bill provides a very generous downpayment on what I believe will be a far longer commitment than the 3-year initiative proposed by the administration. It will take longer than 1 year just to obligate and expend the \$350 million for Mexico in this supplemental bill, and the President has requested another \$477 million for Mexico in fiscal year 2009.

In addition to appropriating the funds, most of which may be obligated immediately, we require the Secretary of State to determine and report that procedures are in place and actions are taken by the Mexican and Central American governments to ensure that recipients of our aid are not involved in corruption or human rights violations, and that members of the military and police forces who commit violations are brought to justice.

This is fundamental. For years we have trained Mexican and Central American police forces, and it is well known that some of them have ended up working for the drug cartels. It is common knowledge that corruption is rampant within their law enforcement institutions—the very entities we are about to support.

It is also beyond dispute that Mexican and Central American military and police forces have a long history of human rights violations—including arbitrary arrests, torture, rape and extra-judicial killings for which they have rarely been held accountable. Examples of army and police officers who have been prosecuted and punished for these heinous crimes are few and far between. Mexican human rights defenders who criticize the military for violating human rights fear for their lives.

Some, particularly the Mexican press, argue that conditioning our aid on adherence to the rule of law is somehow an "infringement of sovereignty," "subjugation" or "meddling," or that it "sends the wrong message." I strongly disagree.

Since when is it bad policy, or an infringement of anything, to insist that American taxpayer dollars not be given to corrupt, abusive police or military forces in a country whose justice system has serious flaws and rarely punishes official misconduct? This is a partnership, not a giveaway. As one who has criticized my own government for failing to uphold U.S. and international law, as has occurred in Guantanamo, Abu Ghraib, and elsewhere, I believe it is our duty to insist on respect for fundamental principles of justice. I am confident that the Mexican and American people agree.

Mr. President, like Senators DODD, REID, MENENDEZ and many others here, both Democrats and Republicans, I

have long urged closer relations with Mexico. We have much in common, yet throughout our history U.S. policy toward Mexico has been far more one of neglect than of mutual respect and cooperation.

Whether it is trade and investment, immigration, the environment, health, science, cultural and academic exchange, human rights, drug trafficking, weapons smuggling and other cross border crime and violence—our contiguous countries are linked in numerous ways. We should work to deepen and expand our relations.

The Merida Initiative is one approach, and while I and many others would prefer that it encompassed broader forms of engagement, it is a start. Most of the funds are for law enforcement hardware and software, which is necessary but insufficient to support a sustainable strategy. As we have learned from successive costly counterdrug strategies in the Andean countries that have failed to effectively reduce the amount of cocaine entering the United States, we need to know what the Merida Initiative can reasonably expect to achieve, at what cost, over what period of time.

Senator GREGG as ranking member, and I as chairman of the State and Foreign Operations Subcommittee had to make difficult choices among many competing demands within a limited budget. We had to find additional funds to help disaster victims in Burma, Central Africa, Bangladesh and elsewhere, whom the President's budget ignored. We had to find additional funds for Iraqi refugees and for crucial peacekeeping, security, and nonproliferation programs. We could not have funded virtually any program at the level requested by the President without causing disproportionate harm to others, and we sought to avoid that.

Considering the amount we had to spend, the Merida Initiative received strong, bipartisan support. Again, this is not simply a 3 year program as the administration suggests. It is the beginning of a new kind of relationship, and we need to start off prudently and with solid footing.

That means the direct participation of the Congress and of civil society and attention to legitimate concerns about human rights, about monitoring and oversight, about rights of privacy, due process, and accountability. How these issues are resolved is critical to future funding for this program, and we need to work together to address them.

MATTHEW SHEPARD ACT OF 2007

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the need for hate crimes legislation. Each Congress, Senator KENNEDY and I introduce hate crimes legislation that would strengthen and add new categories to current hate crimes law, sending a signal that violence of any kind is unacceptable in our society. Likewise, each Congress I have come to the floor to highlight a

separate hate crime that has occurred in our country.

On Thursday evening, May 15, 2008, in Sacramento, CA, a 23-year-old man was sitting in his car at a gas station when he was approached by three men. According to police, one of the men asked him if he was gay and he responded that he was. When the man then exited the car, he was attacked by the three men as they yelled homophobic slurs. Micah Jontomo Tasaki, 21, Gregory Lee Winfield, 20, and Robert Lee Denor, 19, were arrested at the gas station where the attack occurred in connection with the assault. Luckily for the victim, he did not sustain injuries serious enough to necessitate a hospital visit. A Sacramento police officer investigating the crime has called it a "gay bashing" and a hate crime.

I believe that the Government's first duty is to defend its citizens, to defend them against the harms that come out of hate. Federal laws intended to protect individuals from heinous and violent crimes motivated by hate are woefully inadequate. This legislation would better equip the Government to fulfill its most important obligation by protecting new groups of people as well as better protecting citizens already covered under deficient laws. I believe that by passing this legislation and changing current law, we can change hearts and minds as well.

SOLUTIONS TO CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, earlier this spring, I introduced legislation to address the challenge of how to deal with greenhouse gases. The bill is called the Greenhouse Gas Emissions Atmospheric Removal Act, or the GEAR Act.

Members of this body have discussed various proposals to regulate the output of greenhouse gases. Some advocate doing it through a cap-and-trade approach. Others have advocated a carbon tax. Such proposals are aimed at limiting future carbon output into the atmosphere. Many proposals have been introduced and debated using this approach of dealing with carbon output.

We want to protect our environment and we want a strong economy. The way to have both is by thinking anew and acting anew. It is time to use our untapped human potential and the American spirit to develop the technologies we need.

The Senate will soon be debating climate legislation. I believe we should identify solutions through imagination, innovation, and invention, not through limits.

It is my hope and my goal that the GEAR Act will foster the kind of solutions that we need to address the concerns about climate change.

Recently, there was a very thoughtful editorial which was printed in "Wyoming Agriculture," which is published by the Wyoming Farm Bureau Federation.

The editorial was written by Ken Hamilton. Ken is the executive vice

president of the Wyoming Farm Bureau. I believe he does a terrific job of summing up the feelings of Wyoming people on the need to find practical "real" solutions to climate change.

I recommend it to my colleagues and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

YOU CAN'T HAVE YOUR CAKE AND EAT IT TOO

(By Ken Hamilton, WyFB Executive Vice President)

One of the first little sayings you probably heard when you were growing up was that you can't have your cake and eat it too. Generally everyone will agree that this is self evident, but that doesn't stop Americans (and probably people in other countries) from always trying to have it both ways.

This is never more evident than the actions surrounding global warming. We are continually being bombarded by pronouncements about man caused global warming (it's hovering around 4 degrees with a 25 mph breeze blowing as I write this). When I was discussing this global warming issue with a friend, he said what people need to do is stop arguing with the activists over whether there is man caused global warming and start asking them what their solutions are going to be.

The more I thought about it the more I realized the whole global warming debate is absent any discussion of real solutions. We hear vague pronouncements about a greenhouse gas tax, but not much else. And none have enough details to fully analyze what the impact will be on people. There are numerous shows on television where people are talking about reducing their "carbon footprint", but most of these solutions revolve around still living the lifestyle you want while feeling good about using a material someone has pronounced as "green."

For instance, one of the new "green" materials for flooring in houses now is bamboo. Why someone feels this is greener than oak or pine is beyond me, but nevertheless apparently it is. The interesting thing is that while everyone is talking green, they are busy building a house that's twice the square footage of a generation ago. Our grandparents lived in a house where one or two rooms had heat part of the time. In today's modern homes there is heat running to every room, plus a television set in half of them, a minimum two-car garage (heated of course) and appliances that grandma couldn't even dream about. All of these, of course have some "green" marketing gimmick attached to them, so, you guessed it, people can live in even bigger houses while feeling good about doing their part.

But if meaningful curbs in greenhouse gases must occur as they profess, then there shouldn't be houses with two-car garages. You don't find those sorts of things in third world countries where the people's carbon footprint is less than here. Dishwashers must go as well as washing machines, dryers, and central heating. In third world countries where they don't have such a big carbon footprint, health clubs are not needed, nor are double ovens.

Arnold Schwarzenegger, who is in a panic over global warming, should stop driving around in his Humvee. In fact, to adequately address this issue, he should stop driving period.

But we don't see any of this happening and probably won't in the future. The people worried about global warming are still driving to work every day. They come home to heated and air conditioned homes, turn on