

Marine GySgt John Basilone was 1 of 10 children of an Italian-born tailor, Salvatore Basilone, and his wife Dora. He was born in Buffalo, NY and raised in Raritan, NJ.

He enlisted in the Army when he was 18 and served in the Philippines, where he picked up the nickname "Manila John." He fought as a light heavy-weight prizefighter in the Army, going undefeated in 19 fights. He received an honorable discharge after completing his 3-year enlistment, returned home, and worked briefly as a truckdriver.

In July 1940, sensing war clouds on the horizon, John Basilone enlisted in the Marine Corps. In October 1942, he was serving with the 1st Battalion, 7th Marines, 1st Marine Division, on Guadalcanal. For 6 months, the Army and Marines had fought a bloody battle to hold a critical airfield on that island. On October 24, GySgt John Basilone and 14 other marines were ordered to hold back many times that number of elite Japanese troops.

A private first class serving under him would later recall that, "Basilone had a machine gun on the go for three days and three nights without sleep." He fired machine guns, fixed guns, and crawled repeatedly through Japanese lines to get more ammunition. When the sun rose the next morning, the marines still held the airfield, and John Basilone was credited by his men with giving them the will to fight on the most terrifying night of their lives.

For his heroism at Guadalcanal, John Basilone was awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor and ordered home to take part in a war bonds tour. The tour brought in \$1.4 million in pledges. He crisscrossed the country, met Hollywood startlets, and even met his wife, another marine, at Camp Pendleton. He could have remained stateside for the remainder of the war but, he turned down the bars of a second lieutenant because, he said, he didn't want to become "a museum piece." In his words, "I'm a plain soldier, and I want to stay one." So just before Christmas 1944, he kissed his new wife goodbye and rejoined his "boys" in the Pacific.

On February 19, 1945, SGT John Basilone was serving with the 1st Battalion, 7th Marines, 5th Marine Division during the first day of the invasion of Iwo Jima. He was on the island less than 2 hours when an enemy artillery round exploded, killing Basilone and four members of his platoon. He had just destroyed an enemy blockhouse, enabling the marines to capture another critical airfield. On his left arm were tattooed the words "Death before Dishonor." John Basilone was 27 years old.

He was awarded the Navy Cross and Purple Heart posthumously, making him the only enlisted marine in World War II to be awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor, the Navy Cross, and the Purple Heart. He was also awarded the American Defense Service Medal, American Campaign Medal, Asiatic-Pa-

cific Campaign Medal, World War II Victory Medal, Presidential Unit Citation with Star, and Presidential Unit Citation with Bar.

After the war, John Basilone was reburied at Arlington National Cemetery. In 1949, the USS Basilone, a destroyer, was commissioned in his honor. Today, a life-sized bronze statue of him watches over his hometown of Raritan, NJ, and in 1981, Raritan began a parade in his honor. It remains the only parade in the Nation dedicated to the memory of one veteran.

The National Italian American Foundation, the Order of the Sons of Italy of America, the Sergeant John Basilone Foundation, and veterans and marines organizations worked long and hard to see this "plain soldier," as John Basilone called himself, included among the marine heroes honored on the new stamps. We thank them for helping to make a new generation of Americans aware of the service and sacrifices of this son of an Italian immigrant, a true American hero.

When he died, The New York Times noted in an editorial that there always had been Americans like John Basilone, willing to fight for their country even when they knew their luck wouldn't last. "The finest monument they could have," the newspaper said, "would be an enduring resolve by all of us to this time fashion an enduring peace."

Let us never forget how much we owe John Basilone and all those who have given so much, over so many generations, so that we can live free.

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

PRIVATE FIRST CLASS DUSTIN YANCEY

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, today I address the Senate in tribute to PFC Dustin Yancey, originally from Cedar Rapids, IA and more recently from Goose Creek, SC. Private First Class Yancey was tragically killed on November 7, 2005 during Operation Iraqi Freedom. His Humvee was struck by an improvised explosive device and both Private First Class Dustin Yancey and Captain James M. Gurbisz were killed. Private First Class Yancey served with the 26th Forward Support Battalion, 2nd Brigade, 3rd Infantry Division based in Fort Stewart, GA. He was only 22 years old.

I ask that the Senate, the people of Iowa, and all Americans stand today and recognize the sacrifice that Private First Class Yancey made yearlier this month. Our country has survived throughout the centuries due to the brave men and women who have composed our Armed Forces, and I am saddened to announce to the Senate that another of our bravest will be buried in Arlington National Cemetery.

We could all learn from the patriotism and spirit of Private First Class Yancey. His cousin, Brian Yancey of Cedar Rapids, IA, remembered that Private First Class Yancey "was very

much a patriot, very much a military man. He was a person who wanted to do what he could for his country."

We must remember Private First Class Yancey's family, in both Georgia and Iowa, and stand with them during this time of loss and grief. The thoughts and prayers of countless Americans go out to Private First Class Yancey's family and friends. He did not die in vain, but rather gave his life for the promotion of freedom and security around the world. He will be sorely missed, but will also be an inspiration for future brave Americans for years to come.

U.S. MILITARY PERSONNEL SERVING IN IRAQ

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I rise today to share with my colleagues another positive story from a member of the U.S. Armed Forces currently serving in Iraq. His story, once again, depicts the frustration that so many of our servicemembers have with the lack of public attention in the U.S. to the humanitarian and military successes of their work in Iraq.

I recently received a letter in the mail from Ms. Ann Sensenich of Boiling Springs, PA. Ms. Sensenich wrote to me:

DEAR MR. SANTORUM: Enclosed is a copy of a letter I received from one of our soldiers serving our country in Iraq. I am forwarding this to you as I feel this is a letter that should not be viewed by only my eyes.

I have been sending packages to my employer's son in Iraq and he forwards them on to his soldiers and this is one of the responses I received.

Please share this letter with anyone you feel would appreciate the service of this and all our U.S. soldiers defending our country and keep in mind he indicated he would go back seven times before he would let terrorists on our soil.

Thank you for reading this and please share his words with others.

Sincerely,

ANN B. SENSENICH.

Attached to Ms. Sensenich's correspondence is the letter that a deployed servicemember wrote to her when her package was shared with fellow servicemembers. He wrote:

DEAR ANN SENSENICH, I am deployed with the 3/3 ACR. We received your package, and I just wanted to take a little bit of my time to say thanks.

Your package helped with the morale of a lot of soldiers. Due to the negative feedback we get from the media and people back home, it is nice to receive a package from someone who supports us and what we do.

People like you are the reason why we fight this war. We sit over here day to day risk getting shot at or having mortar rounds dropped in on us so that the people back home (like yourself) can keep on enjoying the freedoms that a lot of people take for granted everyday. I, myself used to take those things for granted also until I was deployed to fight for our freedom. This is my second deployment, and this is the first time that we have received a package from someone in the states. So, thank you for your unselfishness, and don't ever feel bad for the soldiers that are over here fighting this war. This is our job! This is what we were trained

to do. I would come back over here seven more times before I let these terrorists on our soil. You can sleep safe in your home tonight, enjoy every warm meal you have, enjoy your warm shower tonight, and wake up to a free world tomorrow because we are over here fighting for you and your family.

Once again—Thanks! I just wanted you to know that your package that you sent did not go unnoticed.

Mr. President, these stories need to be told. Our soldiers are sacrificing their lives for us; they are putting themselves in harm's way each and every day over there, and missing valuable time with their families and loved ones. They need to know that we support them, and that their bravery and hard work is not going unnoticed.

We cannot allow critics here in the United States to influence the mentality of our troops. They need to know that we stand with them and that we support their invaluable mission.

WHAT'S AT STAKE FOR U.S. AGRICULTURE IN THE NEXT TWO MONTHS?

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, our top U.S. trade negotiators traveled this week and last in Europe, Africa, and Asia. They are making a concerted effort to encourage certain influential countries among our 148 trading partners in the World Trade Organization to put meaningful agricultural offers on the table in Geneva. We are coming down to the wire in the most recent round of multilateral trade negotiations, referred to as the Doha Development Round. The offers that our trading partners put on the table in the next month or two are the starting point for agricultural negotiators. That deal in agriculture will be combined with the results of similar negotiations in the manufacturing and services sectors of the economy. Together, they constitute the outcome of the round that has been going on for the last 4 years. Without a deal in agriculture, however, the Doha Development Round will falter.

While bilateral trade agreements are beneficial to U.S. exporters, it is through multilateral negotiations that across-the-board tariff reductions can be achieved. That is why the Doha Development Round is so crucial.

The agricultural negotiations are significant to all of us representing states with agricultural constituencies. In the case of Pennsylvania, production agriculture generated \$4 billion in cash receipts in 2003, according to USDA statistics. That's \$4 billion for the producers of livestock and commodities in my State. Pennsylvania generates only 2 percent of agricultural cash receipts received by producers nationwide, so you can imagine how important agriculture is to the 31 States with larger agricultural economies. Then there is the added value to the Pennsylvania economy of further processing and manufacture of food products and their export. Virtually every State has a stake in these negotiations.

The producers of U.S. food and fiber no longer are producing for the U.S. market alone. Those days are gone forever. Our farmers are part of the global economy. In fact, because they are so efficient, they produce in excess of what the U.S. can consume and must gain access to global markets to expand sales opportunities.

Yet many markets overseas remain closed to U.S. producers because of high tariffs applied against U.S. exports. Particularly egregious are the tariffs imposed by the European Union and Japan among developed economies and by certain developing countries such as India and Brazil, where they continue to claim developing status despite making major advances in certain sectors of their economies.

These issues have been discussed at the WTO during the past 4 years of the current Doha Development Round, with little movement in agriculture. In an effort to move the round forward, the U.S. last month put forth in Geneva an aggressive proposal to jumpstart the stalled negotiations. Since U.S. tariffs already are low compared to our trading partners, there was little the U.S. could offer in market access to encourage comparable reductions. So the U.S. proposed to pull back its own domestic subsidies in exchange for significant cuts by our trading partners in the tariffs protecting their market access.

The rationale behind the offer is that U.S. producers are so efficient that they require minimal domestic subsidies, as long as they have unfettered access to expanding markets. Those markets increasingly are found overseas where the increased prosperity of growing middle classes demands the kind of dietary diversity and convenience we have long enjoyed. U.S. producers and food manufacturers can supply both that diversity and convenience and supply it year in and year out.

But not all agriculture is as efficient as that in the U.S. Rather than improve efficiency, some countries protect producers excessively with high tariff barriers to market access. And they are not forthcoming with offers of significance to begin the process of reducing those barriers. Frankly, there isn't much time left. The round ends at the end of 2006, and the initial offers for negotiation should be on the table this December at the Hong Kong ministerial meeting so negotiators are able to assemble the final package of tariff reductions and subsidy cuts in the next year. They will need every minute to do so.

After last week in Europe, the Secretary of Agriculture and the U.S. Trade Representative were far from optimistic that the Hong Kong ministerial meeting would grapple with the type of formulas to be used in cutting tariffs or with the number of "sensitive" products that countries could declare protected behind a high tariff.

And what happens if there is no agreement or a face saving agreement

with minimal substance? That's what worries me and should worry American farmers. U.S. production agriculture has been a partner in the international effort of our trade negotiators to gain market access. But how long can the partnership last if the round fails? Where do farmers and ranchers put their efforts if the latest round of negotiations fails to live up to its promise?

The European Union, for example, insists that dairy is sensitive and deserves special protection. How can the dairy farmers of the U.S. be convinced that overseas market access is the key to increased profitability if the European market remains unavailable behind high tariff walls? I am concerned that agriculture will lose patience with the trade negotiation process and return to familiar domestic farm programs to augment its income because the world market could not. What do responsible Members of Congress do then, facing the kind of fiscal constraints we do in 2006, just as existing farm programs expire?

There is real potential under those circumstances for backlash. Testimony by commodity groups earlier this month in the House has telegraphed that already. Wheat, corn, and soy producers all expressed reservations at the degree of ambition and commitment to trade liberalization shown by U.S. trading partners, particularly the European Union and the G-20 group of developing nations, as evidenced by their counter proposals to the U.S. proposal in the WTO. U.S. producers are savvy. They see the inadequacy of those offers by our trading partners and have no intention of venturing too far in the direction of liberalized trade alone without a very strong safety net. The weaker the commitment to reform among our trading partners, as evidenced by the degree of success in the Doha Development Round, the more expensive will be the net required by our producers. That's bad news for those in Congress wishing to lead their agricultural producers toward a more productive and profitable model based on increased markets overseas, where 95 percent of the world's consumers live.

A recent study by Australia, a leading member of the Cairns Group of trade-liberalizing nations within the WTO, underscores the potential loss if the more robust proposal of the U.S. in the WTO is not realized. Australia's agricultural economics bureau, ABARE, estimates the U.S. proposal would deliver an extra \$17.5 billion in gross income per year to U.S. farmers from increased exports. Much of that increase would flow to producers of meat and fruit and vegetables, who would benefit from increased market access. In fact, the U.S. proposal would benefit all efficient producers in the world, according to ABARE.

This is not the time to accept less than the U.S. proposal in the negotiations. ABARE estimates the European Union proposal would yield only about \$3 billion, barely enough to account for