

President of France presented Mr. Buckles with the Legion of Honor at a ceremony honoring World War I veterans at the French embassy here in Washington, DC. And he has been the subject of feature stories in USA Today, the Charleston Daily Mail, and "America's Young Warriors," and a number of other newspapers and magazines.

Mr. President, on this Armed Forces Day, I salute this brave and patriotic American. And I again salute and thank all those men and women serving in our Armed Forces today for their commitment and their sacrifice.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. President, this Saturday, May 19, is Armed Forces Day. Celebrated annually on the third Saturday of May, this is a day for all of us as Americans to rally around our military members—wherever they are serving—and thank them for their patriotism and duty to country. This day has a long and proud history. With President Harry S. Truman leading the effort for this holiday, it came to fruition just a few years after the close of World War II. It was at the end of August 1949 that Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson announced the creation of Armed Forces Day to replace separate days of celebration for the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force. While the roots of this celebration may have resulted from the unification of the Armed Forces under the Department of Defense, it serves much more than a consolidative purpose.

The account of the first Armed Forces Day is particularly riveting—as recorded in a page on the official web site of the Department of Defense: "The first Armed Forces Day was celebrated by parades, open houses, receptions, and air shows. In Washington DC, 10,000 troops of all branches of the military, cadets, and veterans marched pas[t] the President and his party. In Berlin, 1,000 U.S. troops paraded for the German citizens at Templehof Airfield. In New York City, an estimated 33,000 participants initiated Armed Forces Day "under an air cover of 250 military planes of all types." In the harbors across the country were the famed mothballed "battlewagons" of World War II, the *Missouri*, the *New Jersey*, the *North Carolina*, and the *Iowa*, all open for public inspection. Precision flying teams dominated the skies as tracking radar [was] exhibited on the ground. All across the country, the American people joined together to honor the Armed Forces."

It is that last sentence that stands out to me: "All across the country, the American people joined together to honor the Armed Forces." Let this Saturday be another one of those days. Wherever our brave military men and women are this Saturday—be it on the front lines in Iraq or Afghanistan, stationed along the DMZ that divides North and South Korea, on the open sea across the globe, or training in the great American skies above, let's honor them. Let us not forget their service

and dedication to protecting our freedoms and defending our way of life this Saturday and every Saturday, this day and every day.

To all our brave men and women in uniform and your families: thank you for your selfless service and sacrifice.

---

#### WE THE PEOPLE: THE CITIZEN AND THE CONSTITUTION NATIONAL TEAM

Mr. REID. Mr. President, from April 28 to 30, 2007, approximately 1,200 students from across the country participated in the national finals of We the People: The Citizen and the Constitution, an educational program developed to educate young people about the U.S. Constitution and Bill of Rights. The We the People program is administered by the Center for Civic Education and funded by the U.S. Department of Education through an act of Congress.

During the 3-day competition, students from all 50 States demonstrated their knowledge and understanding of constitutional principles. The students testified before a panel of judges in a congressional hearing simulation focusing on constitutional topics. I am pleased to announce that Damonte Ranch High School from Reno, NV, won their statewide competition and earned the opportunity to compete in the national finals.

The names of these outstanding students from Damonte Ranch High School are as follows: Fabien Dior-Siwajian, Ashley Fanning, Morgan Holmgren, Stephanie Kover, Tony Miller, Amy O'Brien, Stephany Pitts, Austin Wallis, and Eben Webber.

I would also like to commend the teacher of the class, Angela Orr, who donated her time and energy to prepare these students for the national finals competition. Also worthy of recognition is Marcia Stribling Ellis, the state coordinator, and Shane Piccinini, the district coordinator, who are among those responsible for implementing the We the People program in Nevada.

Please join me in congratulating these students on their outstanding achievement at the We the People national finals and wish them the best of luck in the years ahead.

---

#### COPS IMPROVEMENTS ACT

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, this Congress has been making important efforts to show our support and commitment to our Nation's law enforcement officers. This week marks the 44th year that we have celebrated National Police Week. On May 1, the Senate passed a resolution sponsored by my colleague Senator SPECTER, the ranking member of the Judiciary Committee, and myself, marking May 15, 2007 as National Peace Officers Memorial Day. Earlier this week, I was honored to participate in that ceremony here at the Capitol hosted by the Grand Lodge of the Fraternal Order of Police and its auxiliary. As we do each year, we gathered with

the families of those who lost loved ones in 2006 while serving in the line of duty. We commemorated their sacrifice to keep us safe and secure.

On Tuesday, the House passed H.R. 1700, the COPS Improvements Act of 2007, by an overwhelming vote of 381 to 34. The Senate Judiciary Committee has voted to report the Senate's companion bill which I joined with Senator BIDEN to introduce. Despite tremendous support for this legislation, a Republican objection to passing the House bill has prevented this important legislation from passing the Senate. I am disappointed that Senate action on these vital improvements to the COPS Program has stalled, and I hope the objection is withdrawn so that the Senate can pass H.R. 1700.

This legislation would reauthorize and expand the ability of the Attorney General to award grants aimed at increasing the number of cops on the streets and in our schools. To accomplish this goal, this bill would authorize \$600 million in designated funds to hire more officers to improve and expand community policing, which will in turn help reduce crime. In Vermont, for example, passage of the COPS Improvements Act would likely mean that 110 new officers would be put on the beat. Additionally, the COPS Improvements Act would authorize \$200 million annually for district attorneys to hire community prosecutors and \$350 million annually for technology grants.

The COPS Program has been a resounding success, and the improvements to the program that are contained in this bill would help our State and local law enforcement agencies cope with the substantial reductions in funding they have endured in recent years. Despite these reductions in funding, law enforcement officers have an increased role in homeland security responsibilities. H.R. 1700 includes "Terrorism Cops," officers who are focused specifically on homeland security, and would also include the Troops to Cops Program to help soldiers returning from the battlefields of Iraq and Afghanistan. In short, this legislation gives our law enforcement officers the tools they need to reduce crime and protect our citizens.

The Government Accountability Office has reported that between 1998 and 2000, COPS hiring grants were responsible for 200,000 to 225,000 less criminal acts—one-third of which were violent. With violent crime on the rise and our State and local law enforcement officers stretched thin with new responsibilities, it is essential that we pass this legislation. I urge those on the other side of the aisle to withdraw their objections and support our State and local law enforcement agencies by passing H.R. 1700.

---

#### 340B PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT AND INTEGRITY ACT

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, this Chamber has spent a good deal of time

recently discussing an important topic that affects all consumers in this country—the high cost of prescription drugs. Not only do rising prescription drug costs contribute to all individuals' health insurance costs—but our health care providers feel the burden of these rising costs as well.

In my home State of South Dakota, rural hospitals serve as a lifeline to thousands of constituents living in medically underserved areas—and the rising cost of drugs continues to squeeze their budgets. As we continue to see in all regions of the country, cost directly impacts access.

In 1992, Congress created the 340B program under Medicaid to lower the cost of drugs purchased by a limited number of entities serving a high number of low-income and uninsured individuals—such as Federally Qualified Health Care Centers and nonprofit hospitals providing care to a disproportionate share of Medicaid patients. Under the 340B program, pharmaceutical manufacturers are required to provide these entities discounts on outpatient drugs as part of each manufacturer's Medicaid participation agreement.

This week, I was pleased to reintroduce legislation with my colleague from New Mexico, Senator BINGAMAN, to improve the 340B program and extend these discounts so that they not only apply to outpatient drug purchases, but also inpatient prescription drug purchases for qualifying hospitals.

Additionally, this bill would expand eligibility in the program to all critical access hospitals, as well as sole community hospitals and rural referral centers that serve a high percentage of low-income and indigent patients.

This legislation includes important provisions to improve the integrity of the program and generate savings to Medicaid. Specifically, the bill would generate savings for the Medicaid program by requiring participating hospitals to credit Medicaid with a percentage of their savings on inpatient drugs. Additionally, the bill seeks to enhance the overall efficiency of the 340B program through improved enforcement and compliance measures with respect to manufacturers and covered entities.

Hospitals serving predominately rural areas, such as the 38 critical access hospitals in South Dakota, play a crucial role in my State in providing care to patients in underserved communities. Extending the 340B drug discount program to these hospitals will help them to afford their prescription drugs—and at the same time lower the overall cost of care at these hospitals and to the Federal Government.

The 340B Program Improvement and Integrity Act of 2007 is commonsense legislation that reduces the cost of drugs for health care providers serving society's most vulnerable citizens. I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to get this bipartisan legislation passed and signed into law.

#### AGREEMENT ON TRADE

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, last week, amid great fanfare, several Members of the House and Senate announced they had reached an agreement with the administration on language that facilitates the implementation of two trade agreements, and paves the way for the possible consideration of additional trade agreements as well as the extension of so-called fast-track trade agreement implementing authority.

No sooner had the announcement been made than questions were raised about just what the agreement was. A comparison of the representations made by the parties to the agreement revealed several potentially contradictory interpretations of the deal. And when details of the agreement were sought, it was discovered that there really weren't any, that what the parties had agreed to was a set of principles. We now understand that the actual details of the agreement may not be fully spelled out until legislation implementing the trade agreements is presented to Congress for approval. Until then, everyone is free to spin this agreement as they wish.

Given the parties that were involved, hearing the announcement was a bit like hearing that the foxes and wolves had reached a deal on guarding the hen house. For the most part, the people who were negotiating this agreement have a nearly unbroken record of supporting the deeply flawed trade policies of the past decade and more. From the North American Free Trade Agreement, NAFTA, to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, GATT, which created the World Trade Organization, to granting China permanent Most Favored Nation status, to the more recent agreements like the Central America Free Trade Agreement, the actors in this deal have all been singing from the same hymn book. While I don't question the good intentions of those who were involved, no one should have expected last week's announcement to produce significant changes to that hymn book.

Our trade policy has been disastrous. It has contributed to the loss of several million family-supporting jobs in this country. It has left communities across my State devastated, and I know the same is true in communities around this country.

Our trade deficit reaches new heights every year, as we send more and more of our wealth overseas, much of it in the form of factories that provided entire communities with decent, good-paying jobs. I hold listening sessions in each of Wisconsin's 72 counties every year. This is my 15th year holding those listening sessions, listening to tens of thousands of people from all over Wisconsin. I completed my 1000th of those sessions last fall, and I can tell you that there is nearly universal frustration and anger with the trade policies we have pursued since the late 1980s. Even among those who would

have called themselves traditional free-traders, it is increasingly obvious that the so-called NAFTA model of trade has been a tragic failure.

I voted against NAFTA, GATT, and permanent most favored nation status for China, in great part because I felt they were bad deals for Wisconsin businesses and Wisconsin workers. At the time I voted against those agreements, I thought they would result in lost jobs for my State. But, as I have noted before, even as an opponent of those trade agreements, I had no idea just how bad things would be.

Nor does the problem end with the loss of businesses and jobs. The model on which our recent trade agreements have been based fundamentally undermines our democratic institutions. It replaces the judgment of the people, as reflected in the laws and standards set forth by their elected representatives, with rules written by organizations dominated by multinational corporations. Food, environmental, and safety standards set by our democratic institutions are subject to challenge if they conflict with those approved by unelected international trade bureaucracies. Even laws that require the government to use our tax dollars to buy goods made here, rather than overseas, can be challenged.

Our trade policy is a mess, and it needs to be fixed.

As bad as our trade policies have been, they have not been partisan policies. I wish they were. I wish I could lay the blame at the feet of our colleagues in the other party. But Members of both parties have aided and abetted these flawed policies. Presidents of both parties have advanced them, and Members of Congress from both sides of the aisle have approved them.

It should not come as a shock to anyone, then, that while the agreement announced last week was bipartisan, because it was negotiated by people who largely supported the flawed trade agreements of recent years, it fails to address in a meaningful way the concerns of those who have opposed those same agreements.

It is noteworthy that while the announced agreement is primarily related to enhancing international worker standards, not a single union has endorsed it. While the agreement reportedly enhances international environmental standards, no environmental groups have endorsed it. Nor have those business groups that have been critical of our trade policies.

We are making progress, albeit slow progress, in educating the public and policymakers on the true nature of our trade agreements. In the past, when opponents of these flawed trade deals raised questions about the actual provisions in those agreements, supporters were quick to play the free trade card and label those who questioned the agreements as "protectionist."

This charge resonated with many of our newspaper editorial boards, who