

I am hopeful we will have an opportunity to place this good legislation in a situation where we can forge a compromise that will give us not everything I want, not everything the Senator from Connecticut wants, not everything the Representative in the House who is leading the effort on the House side wants, not what others want, but that we can arrive at a compromise in a bipartisan way to allow this bill to provide remedies for the needs of our society by getting this bill passed and signed into law.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 7

I ask unanimous consent that the Finance Committee be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 7, the charitable giving bill, and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

I further ask unanimous consent that all after the enacting clause be stricken, that the substitute amendment, which is the text of S. 476, the Senate-passed version of the charitable giving bill, be agreed to; that the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table; further, that the Senate insist on its amendment and request a conference with the House; that the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees with a ratio of 3 to 2; and that any statements to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. Objection.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, if I can conclude and then I would be happy to let the Senator speak, I will submit for the RECORD a letter from Senator LIEBERMAN and I to the conferees on the FSC/ETI bill. We believe this is an important enough measure that we should pass it this year. If we are not able to go to conference and work out differences, Senator LIEBERMAN and I may ask the conferees on this tax bill to please consider the Charitable Giving Act as part of the FSC/ETI conference. I hope if this is not the vehicle, we can get it to conference another way.

I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC, July 22, 2004.

DEAR CONFEREES: We are writing on behalf of the charitable community, large and small, across this country seeking to aid families and better their neighborhoods and communities by helping those in need. As you know, both the Senate and the House of Representatives have passed legislation in this Congress with overwhelming bipartisan support that provides significant additional incentives for charitable giving around the country and additional resources for efforts to help those in need including innovative Individual Development Accounts (IDAs), increased Social Services Block Grant (SSBG) funding, and the Compassion Capital Fund.

The Charity Aid, Recovery, and Empowerment Act (CARE) passed the Senate on April 9, 2003, by a vote of 95-5. The House of Representatives passed companion legislation, the Charitable Giving Act, on September 17, 2003, by a vote of 408-13.

Since both the Senate and the House have strongly supported charitable incentives, and since both the Senate and House FSC-ETI (JOBS) bills include charitable reforms which limit existing practices, inclusion of a package of charitable incentives in the FSC-ETI conference is appropriate and within the scope of the conference for this Congress. Furthermore, we believe that any revenue raised through constructive reforms impacting charities should be dedicated to expanding charitable giving incentives in order to help those in need.

We strongly urge the conferees to work with the many sponsors and supporters of the CARE Act in the Senate and the Charitable Giving Act in the House to include the significant provisions shared by both bills and full and fair consideration of those that differ—for the benefit of all Americans. The time has come to expand the tools of generosity and increase resources for those in need in a bipartisan fashion.

Thank you for your consideration of this request. We look forward to working with you in this important effort.

Sincerely,

RICK SANTORUM,
JOSEPH LIEBERMAN,
U.S. Senators.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I just came to the floor after having presented an award to Senator GORDON SMITH. The Suicide Prevention National Organization gave him an award, which is the No. 1 award that this organization can present. GORDON SMITH'S son took his own life at age 22. We passed in the Senate in recent days—in fact, on Garrett Smith's birthday—the Garrett Smith Suicide Prevention Act.

The reason I mention that is that matter was passed and is going to become law. The President will sign it any day.

As a result of what I suggest to my friend from Pennsylvania happened in this instance, we are not objecting to the passage of this bill. We have never objected to the passage of this bill. We are simply saying that it be handled in the way the Garrett Smith legislation passed, and let the House take whatever action on it and we bring it back. If we like what they have done, we will take it; if not, we will amend it and send it back to them.

We have had numerous bills enacted into law without using a conference to negotiate differences between the House and the Senate. I say numerous; I don't say several. I say numerous. I have not counted these, but I assume there are about 100 pieces of legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SANTORUM). The time is under the control of the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak in response to the Senator from Pennsylvania for up to 10 minutes. I will be happy if the Senator wants me to speak afterwards, whatever he wants

me to do. I know we have a recess to take place at 12:30. I want to give fairness, and I should have the opportunity to respond.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, the Senator from Nevada may wish to speak after I speak. I will be covering some of the same ground. I will be making a unanimous consent request.

Mr. REID. Would the Senator allow me to respond to him and Senator SANTORUM'S unanimous consent request following his statement?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, if there is to be an agreement soon, I would like to be a part of that agreement. I would like to offer a unanimous consent request to set a date for a vote on the reimportation of prescription drugs. If we reach an agreement, I would like to be a part of that so I can offer a unanimous consent request that the Senate be able to consider that issue.

Mr. ENZI. I am going to object to giving some leeway to the Senator from Nevada to give some kind of response because we are going to be asking unanimous consent. But I have listened for the last 2½ hours to comments from the other side that I have not been able to respond to. To give unlimited additional time to the other side to again make comments that we obviously would like to comment on, too, isn't reasonable at this point in time. We are already into the time of the policy meetings, so we are extending beyond that time. We are having to take that time in order to use our allotted time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Wyoming.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—
H.R. 1261

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I have heard a lot of talk by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle about jobs and workers. But I have to tell you that their actions don't match their words. It is a little disingenuous to come talk about jobs and then block a job training bill.

I point out one very important program we have that helps American workers improve their skills and get a new or better job so they can make a better life for themselves and their families. It is the nation's job training program created under the Workforce Investment Act. This job training legislation would help over 900,000 unemployed workers each year get back to work.

We keep talking about jobs and work, but we haven't been able to get this important bill into conference.

If the other party really wanted to provide working families with the help they need, they would be a lot less talkative, and they would be a lot more active when it comes to moving this bill on job training to conference and enacting it into law.

This obstruction by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle hurts our workers, it hurts our businesses, and it hurts our ability to compete in the global marketplace.

Let us look at the facts. The economy has shown 12 straight months of job gains. Last month, payroll employment increased by 144,000 jobs. Nearly 1.7 million new jobs have been created over the past year. The unemployment rate fell to 5.4 percent.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask for regular order.

Mr. ENZI. I believe under regular order that for our time we have up to 60 minutes, that there was no set time for adjourning for the policy committees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. I say to the Democratic whip that the time is now controlled by the Republicans. We are under a unanimous consent agreement that time was divided between the two sides. There is 41 minutes 19 seconds on the Republican side.

Mr. REID. I apologize to the Chair. I thought we were going out for our recess. So how much time is left for the Republicans?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is now 41 minutes 8 seconds on the majority side. There is no time left on the minority side.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I apologize for interrupting my friend.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, we have laid the groundwork for the economic recovery we are experiencing today. President Bush's economic policies continue to create new jobs and move the economy forward. This all adds up to good news for the American people; not good news if you do not have a job. But this is a job-training program I am talking about so you can get a job, or if you have a job and want a better job, you can get skills improvement. We have weathered the storm and we are poised to enter a new period of prosperity.

However, I have to caution you about some serious roadblocks that stand in the way of prosperity for our workers and businesses alike. The first roadblock is a gap between the skills our workforce has and the skills our employers need. The second roadblock is the Democrats' obstruction of the job-training legislation that will help close this skills gap.

First I will talk about the skills gap so you can understand just how damaging the Democrats' obstruction is to our workers and our economy.

It may surprise you to learn that many good jobs in this country will remain unfilled because employers cannot find workers with the skills they need. This skills gap is not about politics; it is about education and training; it is about demographics; it is about America's competitiveness in the global marketplace.

This chart shows the expected labor force and labor force demand from 2002 to 2031. You can see the line with the boxes on it which shows the labor that is going to be needed. You can see the

other less-increasing line that shows the labor that will be available. You can see the gap we will have between the number needed and the number available. We will not have enough workers to fill our jobs and we will not have enough workers with the right skills for those jobs. And we do not right now.

According to a 2003 survey by the Center for Workforce Preparation, an affiliate of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, half of the employers reported difficulty in finding qualified workers. The problem is greatest for small employers. Small business—our greatest source of economic growth—cannot create jobs if they do not have skilled workers to fill them.

The gap between the demand for high-skilled workers and the supply will only widen in the future. Looking ahead 2 years, only 30 percent of the employers surveyed by the Center for Workforce Preparation believe the skills of their workers will keep pace. As policymakers, we too must look ahead to the growing skills gap that demands our attention and our action now.

Another chart shows the projected skilled- and unskilled-worker gap in 2010 and 2020. In 2010, the skilled-worker gap will be 5.3 million; by 2020, it will be 14 million. The unskilled-worker gap will move from 1.7 million in 2010 to 7 million in 2020. That is 7 million total by 2010, and 21 million total by 2020.

This skills gap blocks the way to better jobs and better lives for American workers and their families. This skills gap also threatens the ability of American businesses to compete in a more complex, global economy. In the book called "The Jobs Revolution," by Steve Gunderson, Robert Jones, and Kathryn Scanland, they describe the impact of this skills gap:

Every unfilled job translates to products and services we cannot deliver to the global market and, therefore, dollars we cannot return to the U.S. economy. Almost certainly, jobs unfilled in the U.S. will go elsewhere and not return.

Now, we can change this outcome. We can keep jobs and prosperity in America. But we must act now to close the skills gap by improving our education and our job training system.

When Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan testified before the Senate Banking Committee, he said:

[W]hat will ultimately determine the standard of living in this country is the skill of the people.

Why is effective workforce training so important? Because in an increasingly knowledge-based economy, people—their talent and their ideas—make the difference. People are a company's most important resource. The skills and ingenuity of the American workforce will drive our economy in the 21st century and beyond. If we want to keep high-paying jobs in America, our challenge is to equip our workers with skills the global economy demands.

We used to manufacture buggy whips. We do not make them anymore, or hardly any of them. The workers who

made buggy whips had to learn new skills. The new economy creates new jobs and those new jobs demand new skills.

We cannot turn back the clock. To quote again from "The Jobs Revolution":

We'll never return to the days before satellites hovered over the globe and the Internet wove us together. We need to go forward, guided by a plan that reflects a new set of American priorities. The plan will marry education and employment. In the old, pre-revolutionary model, we went to school for a dozen or more years and then we went to work. After this revolution we'll need to keep learning to keep working. Education and re-education will be the dominant strategy by which we land and hold our jobs.

Unfortunately, the current workforce development system is not up to the task. It is not effectively equipping our workers with the relevant skills. Without any action, technology and other advances will outpace the ability of American workers and businesses to update skills needed to compete.

We must improve the Nation's job-training system under the Workforce Investment Act to better prepare American workers for the good jobs of today and tomorrow. Only a systematic reform of our Nation's job-training system will enable American workers and businesses to compete and succeed in the global economy.

There is good news. We have a bill that does this. It is a bipartisan bill that reauthorizes and improves the Nation's job-training system. It will help retrain workers to fill the jobs needed in this country now and in the future. It will link workforce development with economic development, recognizing that job training and job creation go hand in hand. It will partner the public workforce system with private sector employers—including small businesses—and with training providers to better prepare workers for high-wage, high-growth jobs.

The good news is that we have bipartisan legislation that does all of this—legislation that passed out of the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee unanimously, legislation that passed on the floor of the Senate last November unanimously. That does not happen with controversial bills. Where is the bill now?

Here is the bad news. Here is the roadblock. The Democrats will not let us send this important job-training bill to conference. They are stopping progress by refusing to appoint a conference committee, which is a committee made up of both Republicans and Democrats who would meet with Republicans and Democrats from the House to work out the differences between the House and the Senate versions of the bill—a very common procedure in past years, obviously not in this year.

This is an important jobs bill, a bill that will help American workers and

businesses, and it is being held hostage to election year politics. If we really care about keeping good jobs in this country, we need to send that job-training legislation to conference and then to the President to become law.

I owe my constituents more. I think we all do. We owe the American people an open legislative process, a process they expect and deserve from us. This is not just an academic question of Senate rules and procedures. A bill that would help put Americans back to work or find better jobs now lies in legislative limbo. Whether a company decides to open a plant in Cheyenne or China depends upon a qualified local workforce. A skilled workforce can make the difference between success and failure in the new, global economy. It will make the difference for our workers, for our companies, and for our future.

There is an American dream. It is to have a family, a nice home, and a good job to support that home and family.

Prior to my coming to the Senate, my wife and I owned some shoe stores. As a small-business owner, I saw firsthand the impact of job training in achieving that dream. We had an employee, a Vietnam veteran, who went to work through a workforce training course and ended up managing and then buying two stores from us. He is an example of what you can do with effective job training if you teach workers to dream at the same time.

We have to give workers and businesses the tools to turn those dreams into reality. Job training under the Workforce Investment Act can turn the dream into reality for millions of American workers. By blocking legislation that improves job training, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are blocking the way to new and better jobs for American workers. They are blocking the pathway to prosperity for American families and American companies.

The job training bill known as the Workforce Investment Act is a central part of a combination of Federal education and training programs that provides lifelong learning for the workforce of today and tomorrow. In this technology-driven global economy, everyone is a student who must adapt to changing workforce needs by continuing to pursue their education. In turn, Congress must ensure that education and job training are connected to the needs of business, including small business, now and in the future.

I urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to allow the appointment of conferees to the job training legislation known as the Workforce Investment Act. The cost of this obstruction is the loss of important legislative efforts that will benefit the American people as it harms the integrity of the legislative process itself. I hope our bipartisan efforts on this bill can continue. I hope regular order is restored to the appointment of conferees so we can craft the final version of legisla-

tion. If we wanted to keep good jobs in this country, the Democrats would agree to send this important bill to conference.

And a conference isn't the last opportunity to obstruct or to filibuster. After the conference, if the Democrats don't like the results they participated in—and that is a key part to this, in conference both sides participate, as I mentioned before—then they can filibuster. This is embarrassing because we passed it unanimously last November. We asked for more job training last November. It is almost November again. And in fact, if a conference committee were appointed, there isn't time for that, it would be a bipartisan effort. It would be continuing work on the job force because there isn't anything a conference committee now could do that could affect this election. They have already held out long enough to affect this election and to restrict jobs in the economy.

I am pushing for a conference committee that could meet, that could resolve the small differences there are between the House and Senate bills. We have already talked about what those are and what the changes would probably be. I resolved about six of the issues that were brought up before, and we are down to some very minor ones. They need to be fixed by a conference committee.

There is no reason a conference committee should not have been appointed last year—not this year, but last year. This should have been worked out and people should already be in training for these jobs—900,000 of them a year.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the House message to accompany H.R. 1261, the job training bill, also known as the workforce investment legislation, which is at the desk; provided that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request for conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, and the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate with a ratio of 5 to 4.

Mr. REID. Reserving the right to object, this bill has already passed. We are waiting for the House to get together on an amendment to send back to us. As I indicated, we have passed numerous bills by using this procedure. My dear friend, the Senator from Wyoming, for whom I have the greatest respect, is crying these big crocodile tears. We have passed numerous bills by doing the very same thing, sending a bill over to the House. This can be done without a conference.

I repeat for the third time, I have the greatest respect for the integrity of the Senator from Wyoming. I am sure if we shook hands on a deal he would go to whatever bounds necessary to fulfill that agreement. But I have to say that on the most important bill, the highway bill, another Senator and I shook hands, a Republican with me, indicating that if this bill is going to go to conference, if there was something in it

he didn't like, then I wouldn't sign my name to the conference and vice versa. That was done in a personal meeting between myself and the other Senator. Then it was put in writing by the two leaders confirming the agreement we had reached.

Suddenly, we are told all bets are off. That deal is no good. So the conference is going on with none of us attending. There are meetings going on, but we are not part of the conference.

This is what has happened around here. That is the embarrassment. The conference process I have been involved in for 22 years has been turned on its head. Conferences are called in name only. You don't know what conference is being held, where it is being held, because you are not told. And not only that, what happens to many of these bills is other items are inserted that have nothing to do with the issue about which the conference is taking place.

I know the sincerity of the Senator from Wyoming. We know the importance of this legislation. We want it to pass also. But it has passed. We want it to be signed into law. The best way to accomplish that is to do what we have done on so many different bills that have been enacted into law without using the conference to negotiate the differences between the House and the Senate; that is, to work it out between the two bodies. We have done it many times. We can do it on this.

I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TALENT). Objection is heard.

The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. I am deeply disappointed. I am not surprised that the other side objects to sending this important jobs training bill to conference. I am a little disappointed in the comments I just heard which try to give some credibility to my not being trusted. I don't remember any handshake I have made on any bill that hasn't turned out to be that way. I was not a part of that transaction.

I am on the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee.

Mr. REID. Will my friend yield for a comment?

Mr. ENZI. Yes.

Mr. REID. I want the record to be spread: I accomplished directly the opposite of what I wanted. I would never, ever question at any time the veracity, the honesty, the handshake of the Senator from Wyoming. Out of courtesy, because the other Senator was not on the floor, I did not want to mention his name. But it had no reference to you. We had a situation where Senator DASCHLE and I agreed to a conference on a handshake and, in my opinion, the handshake meant nothing.

It had no bearing whatsoever on the Senator from Wyoming. I want the Senator from Wyoming to know—everybody in Wyoming—I have never known a more ethical person in Government than the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. I thank the Senator from Nevada for his comments. I assure people that the Health, Education, Labor,

and Pensions Committee is one of the more controversial committees of the Senate. If I didn't have some credibility of following through on the things I have talked about in the process, that would not have gotten out of committee unanimously, had that not had the same kind of confidence on what I would do if a conference committee were appointed. And we talked about what kind of differences there are. The House had already passed their bill. If they didn't have some confidence in me that what I had said would happen would happen, it would not have gotten through the Senate floor unanimously. That doesn't happen often with Health, Education, Labor, and Pension bills.

This has been a very important bill for the workforce of America, and we had great agreement and cooperative work on it, recognizing what would probably be done in conference committee. Now, we could probably send this over four or five times to the House—which there is not time to do—and resolve some of the differences in each of those. Had I known this was going to happen, I would have started that process much earlier so we would have had time to send an important bill like this back and forth.

The way this has always been done with the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee bill—that is the committee I have been on ever since I got here—is that we held conferences. Yes, some of them had a lot of animosity, but we worked them out and got bills finished. When you have difficult issues, the best thing is for people to sit down with each other. I have always invited the other side to any conference committee I have been on, and we have listened to both sides. What we have usually come up with, instead of one side or the other, was a third way. That is what ought to be done on this bill.

We ought to be reaching an agreement so we can get 900,000 people a year trained to fill the skills gap we were talking about before. We are not just going to have a lack of jobs, we are going to have more jobs than we can fill—provided we have people trained to fill them. If we don't train the people, those jobs are going overseas and we will never see them again. It has been critical for this year, the year that is just about over. We cannot afford to do this again next year and wait a year or 2 years to reach an agreement to get people trained for jobs. That is what is happening.

If we have to go until the first of the year, all these bills start all over again. Everybody's ideas come back in again, we redraft and start again, and we get to conference—maybe. But there is no assurance of that. We are at the point where we can have a conference committee. If we have a conference committee, then there can be agreement or disagreement. If there is disagreement, there is an opportunity to filibuster at that point. Senators

who cannot filibuster a bill through the rest of the session, as short as it is going to be now, probably ought to be worried about their senatorial capability.

Our workers and our companies deserve more than election year political obstruction. They deserve the tools needed to keep American workers and businesses the best in the world. They deserve to see us act in a bipartisan manner and send this bill to conference.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield the remaining time on the Republican side?

Mr. ENZI. Yes.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, morning business is now closed.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will stand in recess until the hour of 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:53 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m., and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. VOINOVICH).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

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

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

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we proceed as in morning business for the following two items: That Senator DORGAN be permitted to proceed after the Senator from New Mexico for 5 minutes to speak as in morning business, and the Senator from New Mexico be recognized for 7 minutes to speak as in morning business, and that those are the only two speakers to be permitted as in morning business at this point, and that is for debate only.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I also seek the same 7 minutes.

Mr. DOMENICI. With the same conditions.

Mr. DORGAN. Yes.

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

Mr. DOMENICI. So we have 7 minutes each, speeches only as in morning business, and that is all we have agreed to at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. DOMENICI. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. DOMENICI pertaining to the introduction of S. 2818 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, beyond the statement of my friend from New Mexico and Senator DORGAN, is there any other time that has been allocated?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No, there is not.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak for 3 minutes to respond to my friend from New Mexico. Also, Senator NELSON is in the Chamber, and if there is a Republican who wants to speak—we are as in morning business, are we not?

Mr. DOMENICI. We are, but I cannot do that because we carved this out without our leadership. The Senator on his side is indicating he did not want us to do that, but he agreed to our two. We will soon agree with him, but at this point I cannot. Senator DORGAN is entitled to speak next, and I will inquire about Senator REID's and Senator NELSON's requests very shortly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

UGLINESS OF AMERICAN POLITICS

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, first, I am proud to be in the Senate. I have always been proud to be a part of our political system. It is a remarkable privilege to participate in this system of ours. I have run for Statewide election 11 times, since I was in my midtwenties. I must say there are times when I see and hear things in American politics that fill me with disgust.

Two years ago, we had a colleague, Max Cleland, who sat in that desk near the door. Max Cleland was charged in his campaign with lack of commitment to our country's national security. They ran an ad against Max Cleland that had an image of Osama bin Laden and Saddam Hussein. This is a man who left three limbs on the battlefield. He sat in this Chamber missing two legs and an arm. Back home on television, he was accused of not standing up for this country's national security. It stretches my threshold of forgiveness to excuse those who do that to someone like Max Cleland, who went to Vietnam, came back, and wrote a book entitled "Strong at the Broken Places." He ran for the Senate to become a U.S. Senator, only to be attacked that he was not somehow standing up for the national security interests of this country. Shame on them.

This Sunday, I saw that ugliness again raise its head. It is the worst of American politics, in my judgment. This is a newspaper called the Rapid City Journal. I have it because this comes from a neighboring State of