(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

TRIBUTES TO HON. JAMES M. TALENT

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

James M. Talent

U.S. SENATOR FROM MISSOURI

TRIBUTES

IN THE CONGRESS OF
THE UNITED STATES

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)



James M. Talent

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

S. Doc. 109–35

Tributes Delivered in Congress

James M. Talent

United States Congressman
1993–2001

United States Senator
2002–2007

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 2007

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

Compiled under the direction
of the
Joint Committee on Printing

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

CONTENTS

	Page
Biography	v
Farewell to the Senate	xiii
Proceedings in the Senate:	
Tributes by Senators:	
Alexander, Lamar, of Tennessee	4
Allen, George, of Virginia	5
Bond, Christopher S., of Missouri	8
Bunning, Jim, of Kentucky	17
Clinton, Hillary Rodham, of New York	11
Collins, Susan M., of Maine	18
DeWine, Mike, of Ohio	11
Dodd, Christopher J., of Connecticut	11
Dole, Elizabeth, of North Carolina	20
Durbin, Richard, of Illinois	6
Enzi, Michael B., of Wyoming	14
Frist, William H., of Tennessee	18
Hagel, Chuck, of Nebraska	3
Hatch, Orrin G., of Utah	12
Hutchison, Kay Bailey, of Texas	17
Kyl, Jon, of Arizona	11
Landrieu, Mary L., of Louisiana	11
Nelson, Bill, of Florida	5
Reed, Jack, of Rhode Island	4
Salazar, Ken, of Colorado	6
Snowe, Olympia J., of Maine	16
Stevens, Ted, of Alaska	18
Warner, John, of Virginia	7

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

Biography

Senator JIM TALENT was born and raised in Des Peres, MO. He graduated from Kirkwood High School in 1973 and attended Washington University in St. Louis, where he received the Arnold J. Lien Prize as the most outstanding undergraduate in political science. He graduated Order of the Coif from the University of Chicago Law School in 1981 and clerked for Judge Richard Posner of the U.S. Court of Appeals from 1982 through 1983. JIM and his wife, Brenda, were married in 1984. They have three children: Michael, Kate, and Chrissy.

In 1984, at the age of 28, Senator TALENT was elected to the Missouri House of Representatives, where he served for 8 years and succeeded in passing numerous pieces of legislation, including legislative efforts to build roads, toughen drug laws, secure taxpayer rights and reduce taxes. At the age of 32, Senator TALENT was unanimously chosen by his colleagues as the minority leader, the highest ranking Republican leadership position in the Missouri House. He served in that capacity until 1992 when he was elected to Congress from Missouri's Second District.

As a freshman Congressman, JIM TALENT introduced the Real Welfare Reform Act of 1994, which subsequently became the basis for the historic bipartisan welfare reform bill, the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Act of 1996. The legislation has resulted in 4.2 million people moving from dependency on the government to jobs and self-sufficiency.

Senator TALENT served for 8 years on the Armed Services Committee. In that capacity, he waged a long battle against both the Clinton administration and budget hawks in his own party to protect America's armed forces from cuts in size and funding. Also as a freshman, Senator TALENT formed a special congressional committee to address the decline in readiness of America's military.

Senator TALENT was a member of the House Armed Services Committee in 1997 when, in order to save money, the Republican leadership of that committee attempted to discontinue production of the Missouri-built F–18 Super Hor-

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

net. This carrier-based aircraft was the Navy's top acquisition priority for a number of years running and was considered the key to the ability of the United States to project power through its aircraft carriers in the decades to come. The effort to discontinue the aircraft succeeded in subcommittee, but Senator TALENT led an initiative against his own party leadership to restore the aircraft in full committee. That effort succeeded on a close, bipartisan vote, as the full committee overruled its own chairman and subcommittee—a highly unusual outcome in Congress.

The F–18 Super Hornet has since exceeded all expectations and has become the linchpin of naval aviation. The aircraft continues to earn the wholehearted praise of Navy pilots for its performance off the USS *Abraham Lincoln* and in the skies over Iraq. The Super Hornet directly employs nearly 10,000 people in Missouri and Senator TALENT's initiative helped sustain and create thousands of jobs for Missourians.

For 8 years, Senator TALENT served on the House Small Business Committee. In 1997, he was named chairman of the committee where he was the youngest chairman in Congress. In that capacity he fought successfully for tax and regulatory relief for small business people across America. In particular, he succeeded in permitting small business men and women to deduct the cost of their health insurance, restoring the tax deduction for those operating businesses at home, helping women start their own businesses and bolstering loan programs to help individuals who want to start their own small businesses. During this period the Congress also took the first steps toward eliminating the estate tax—one of Senator TALENT's priorities.

He twice passed out of the U.S. House of Representatives Association Health Plans legislation that would permit small business people to join together and buy health insurance through their trade associations—legislation that would reduce by millions the number of uninsured people in the country without any cost to the taxpayer.

Under Senator TALENT's leadership, the Small Business Committee became the most bipartisan in the House. Senator TALENT constantly promoted the idea that small business is the avenue of opportunity for people of all backgrounds and socio-economic status. In addition, as chairman, Senator TALENT was scrupulous in respecting the prerogatives of all the members of the Small Business Committee, including those of the other party. As a result, the committee passed an overwhelming number of bills without a single dis-

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

senting Democrat vote, which made Senator TALENT's committee one of the most effective in the 106th Congress.

Senator TALENT fought to preserve and protect Social Security and voted to strengthen and save Medicare. He voted to make prescription drugs affordable and available for all seniors. In addition, Senator TALENT was an original cosponsor of the first Patients' Bill of Rights that passed the House in 1998, and was selected to serve on the Patients' Bill of Rights conference committee in 2000.

For 6 years Senator TALENT served on the House Education and Workforce Committee. He was a consistent advocate of safe schools and empowering parents and teachers through greater local control. In 2000, Senator TALENT passed legislation to allow public school authorities to remove from the classroom students who possessed or used illegal drugs or committed aggravated assault in school.

Senator TALENT believes that the American dream is real for everyone, and he has worked to keep the commitment made to veterans for their service to America. Senator TALENT introduced legislation that now offers small business loans to more than half a million Missouri veterans and 24 million veterans nationwide. He championed the Missing Service Persons Act that expanded the legal rights of the families of POWs and the missing in action, so that the Department of Defense must on a regular basis reexamine each individual case.

Senator TALENT joined with former Representative J.C. Watts (R–OK), former Representative Floyd Flake (D–NY), and Representative Danny Davis (D–IL) to design the most comprehensive anti-poverty initiatives ever considered by Congress. The Community Renewal Act was crafted to empower local neighborhood groups, pastors and community leaders by providing the tools they need to create good jobs, decent housing, new businesses and safe neighborhoods. After 5 years of hard work, the legislation was signed into law by President Bill Clinton who lauded Senator TALENT for his bipartisan efforts to reduce poverty in America.

Senator TALENT led the effort to allow our producers to add value to their commodities through innovative agriculture enterprises. He fought for agriculture assistance centers and tax incentives that would aid our producers, help bolster the economy and create jobs in rural America.

Senator TALENT has been a leader in the fight for important transportation and infrastructure projects in Missouri and he has succeeded in raising the visibility of the road

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

issue as a safety issue. He spearheaded efforts to secure the construction of four Missouri levees and to improve Mississippi River infrastructure in the State's Second Congressional District.

Senator TALENT campaigned for the U.S. Senate on a platform of health care, job creation, economic growth and national defense. Missourians elected him to serve the State in the U.S. Senate in November 2002. Previously, Senator TALENT served 8 years in the U.S. House of Representatives (1993–2001) and 8 years in the Missouri House (1985–1992). During his service in the Senate, Senator TALENT passed over 30 pieces of bipartisan legislation into law.

Senator TALENT served on four key Senate committees: Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry; Armed Services; Energy and Natural Resources; and the Special Committee on Aging.

As a freshman Senator, he held numerous Senate leadership positions. Senator TALENT was the chairman of the Armed Services Seapower Subcommittee and the chairman of the Agriculture Committee's Subcommittee on Marketing, Inspection, and Product Promotion. In addition, Senator TALENT was a member of President Bush's Export Council, the Senate Republican Task Force on Health Care Costs and the Uninsured, and he was elected to serve as a deputy whip.

As Missouri's health care Senator, TALENT introduced the Small Business Health Fairness Act to increase access to health care for small business owners and their employees through Association Health Plans (AHPs). The bill would provide health insurance for millions of uninsured Americans by allowing small business men and women to purchase health care plans for themselves and their employees through trade associations.

To help more than 70,000 individuals, mostly African Americans, with Sickle Cell Disease, Senator TALENT and Senator Chuck Schumer passed into law the Sickle Cell Disease Treatment Act to help expand treatment and services for patients with this disease. This legislation was called the most significant Sickle Cell Disease legislation passed in a generation.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee, Senator TALENT led efforts to increase defense spending and provide for our men and women in uniform.

Senator TALENT and Senator Lieberman led the successful fight to save the C–17 Globemaster Program. The C–17 is the finest military transport in the world. It is able to carry troops, vehicles and supplies to any point on the globe mak-

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

ing its reliability and versatility unmatched. The Senators worked across the aisle to secure $2.1 billion for the purchase of 10 additional aircraft to extend the production line, saving thousands of Missouri jobs.

In addition, Senator TALENT, along with Senator Hillary Clinton, passed the Military Health Readiness Act which required pre- and post-deployment screenings for our troops. This law addresses a major health care issue that arose from the first Gulf war, in which some service men and women returned home with symptoms of an illness commonly referred to as Gulf war illness. The Talent-Clinton measure provides a before and after snapshot of the medical fitness of every service member deployed to a theater of war so the results can then be compared to help determine whether or not an individual, or their unit, was exposed to a dangerous substance or pathogen.

Senator TALENT and Senator Bill Nelson passed into law the Servicemembers Anti-Predatory Lending Protection Act which stops predatory payday lending practices targeted at our service men and women by limiting the rate that payday lenders can charge soldiers and their spouses for a loan. A coalition of more than 75 veterans, civil rights, and consumer organizations supported the legislation.

To ensure our Nation is able to produce the most up-to-date equipment for the men and women who defend the United States, Senator TALENT introduced and passed legislation directing the Army to develop a comprehensive plan to modernize the munitions production facilities in the United States. Much of the materiel and manufacturing equipment at our Nation's munitions facilities is more than 60 years old. This legislation called on the Army to develop a strategic plan to modernize these important manufacturing facilities to increase capacity, further improve quality, and ensure their continued reliability.

Senator TALENT sought to increase transportation infrastructure funding by partnering with Senator Ron Wyden to push their $50 billion Build America bonds legislation. They successfully included $15 billion in highway infrastructure bonds in the 2005 highway bill, which will provide innovative financing for some of the Nation's most challenging and critical transportation projects.

A member of the Senate Agriculture Committee, Senator TALENT was a champion of measures to encourage the production of alternative fuels to decrease America's dependence on foreign oil and encourage investment and job creation in

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

rural America. Senator TALENT and Senator Blanche Lincoln passed legislation expanding the small ethanol producer tax credit to those who produce up to 60 million gallons of ethanol annually and establish the tax credit for small biodiesel producers who make up to 60 million gallons of biodiesel per year. He also worked closely with Senator Barack Obama to pass a law to encourage greater availability of alternative fuels.

As a member of the Energy Committee, Senator TALENT supported a pro-jobs, pro-growth energy bill to help stimulate the economy, reduce energy prices, and increase our energy independence. In summer 2005, Senator TALENT led the fight to add a renewable fuels standard to the energy bill. Senator TALENT succeeded and now 7.5 billion gallons of renewable fuels like ethanol and biodiesel must be added to the Nation's fuel supply by 2012, decreasing America's dependence on foreign oil and creating thousands of jobs.

Working with Senator Dianne Feinstein, Senator TALENT succeeded in passing the toughest, most comprehensive anti-methamphetamine bill ever enacted into law. The Combat Meth Act restricts nationally the ingredients needed to cook methamphetamine. It also provides critical tools to help law enforcement fight meth in our communities. The President signed the Talent-Feinstein Combat Meth Act into law in 2006.

Senator TALENT successfully passed a measure as part of the bankruptcy reform law that prevents corporate officers who commit fraud in running a corporation and others from defrauding their creditors in so-called "asset protection trusts." Prior to the passage of TALENT's law, if a corporate executive was convicted of a crime, victims were virtually helpless to go after resources transferred into a trust. TALENT's amendment allowed victims to go after any resource transferred into the trust by a corporate criminal, preventing fraudulent transfers to these trusts.

Senator TALENT and Senator Christopher Dodd introduced and passed out of the Senate the Emmett Till Unsolved Civil Rights Crime Act to create a "cold case" unit within the Department of Justice to investigate and prosecute unsolved murders from the civil rights era. The legislation was supported by civil rights leaders including Alvin Sykes and the family members of victims who have actively sought justice in these cases.

Minority small business owners who have often been on the losing side when it comes to competing for Federal Gov-

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

ernment contracts got some relief due to legislation sponsored by Senator TALENT and signed into law. Senator TALENT's legislation saves minority small business owners thousands of dollars by lifting a very significant paperwork burden off of minority contractors who wish to do business with the Government. Because of TALENT's efforts, once a disadvantaged small business is certified at the Federal level it no longer will have to go through recertification at the State and local levels. This new law specifically applies to small businesses who qualify for the Small Business Administration's Section 8(a) Program, a business development program to help small disadvantaged businesses compete in the American economy and access the Federal procurement market.

Senator TALENT successfully fought to reauthorize the Nation's welfare programs based on the sound values of healthy families and work participation. The reauthorization of Temporary Assistance for Needy Families passed in 2006 and increased work participation by requiring 50 percent of the current caseload to be engaged in work activities. Most States had met the targets of the 1996 law and by 2006 had no incentive to extend the benefits of work to able-bodied people who remain on the rolls. This enhancement would help more individuals achieve independence through work. The law also provides millions for healthy marriage promotion over the next 5 years, strengthening American families.

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

Farewell to the Senate

Thursday, December 7, 2006

Mr. TALENT. Mr. President, my great friend and colleague from Missouri [Mr. Bond] has an Intelligence Committee meeting to go to. So he went ahead and gave his kind tribute [see page 8] before I give my speech, and those who are not aware of that may have thought that maybe they would be able to get in short tributes and avoid the long farewell speech. That is not true.

I will devote my time to a substantive and very important subject—the appropriate level of funding for America's military. It is an issue that I have worked on and fought for since I went to the House of Representatives in 1993.

I am grateful for my friend's remarks, and I want to say that I have always enjoyed serving in legislatures, in part because of the collegial nature of the service. When you are done, yes—it is the legislation that you worked on that you want people to remember, but what you remember are the friendships and the associations and the bonds that you have made. And, fortunately, those do not end with your service. I look forward to continuing to visit with my friends in the Senate for years to come. I hope to be able to work with them in other venues on issues of importance to America. Nothing is more important for America than her security.

Mr. President, America has the most capable military in the world by a large margin; in fact we have the best military that has ever served any nation at any time in human history. We should be proud of that; we should especially be proud of the men and women who make America's military what it is. But it would be wrong for us to believe that because our military is the best in the world or even the best ever, that it is as capable as it needs to be. True, America is many times stronger than other nations, but its responsibilities are many times greater as well. If Denmark's military is inadequate, it doesn't matter that much, even to Denmark; if America's military is inadequate, it matters tremendously, first to America, but also to the hopes and aspirations of people throughout the world.

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

We must understand the importance of this issue very clearly, without the distortions of ideology, politics, expediency, or wishful thinking. Like it or not, the progress of the international order toward peace and democracy depends on the reality and perception of American power. Like it or not, America is the first defender of freedom in the world and therefore always a prime target for those who hate freedom. And like it or not, while there are many tools in the basket of western diplomacy, the underpinning of them all is an American military establishment which the world knows is capable of swiftly, effectively and at minimal cost defeating every substantial threat to our security and to our freedom.

Judged by this standard—the only appropriate standard—the situation is very grave. I have substantial doubt—as good as the men and women are—whether our current military establishment is strong enough. Because of decisions over the last 15 years driven more by budgetary than military considerations, our Army and Navy may well be too small, and much of the equipment in all the services is too old and increasingly unreliable.

Whatever the current status of the military may be, there can be no doubt that without a substantial increase in procurement spending beginning now and sustained over the next 5 to 10 years—an increase, I suggest to the Senate today, that must be measured not in billions but in tens of billions of dollars above current estimates every year—our military will be set back for a generation. We will not be able to modernize our forces to the degree necessary to preserve our security with the necessary margin of safety.

I said that our current military is too small and inadequately equipped to execute the national military strategy. I will not go into detail on this point because my main focus is on the future, but a brief explanation is warranted. The world is, on balance, at least as dangerous today as it was at the end of the cold war. And we may thank God we are no longer in danger of a massive nuclear attack from the former Soviet Union, nor is a major land war in Europe likely.

Against this, however, we are engaged in a global war on terror that will continue for years to come. The end of the cold war led to the emergence of dangerous regional conflicts, such as the conflicts in the Balkans. We are in greater danger today of a rogue missile attack than ever before, and China is emerging as a peer competitor much faster than anyone believed.

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

These conditions either did not exist, or like the conflicts in the former Yugoslavia, were suppressed during the cold war. As a result, the operational tempo of our conventional forces—and that means the rate, intensity and duration of their deployment—was far higher beginning in the mid-1990s, even before September 11, than it had ever been during the cold war. Yet at the beginning of the 1990s, our forces were 30 to 40 percent bigger than today. For example, the active-duty Army was cut from 18 divisions at the time of Desert Storm to only 10 divisions by 1994. Don't we wish that we had those additional divisions today to relieve the pressure in Iraq? The Navy has gone from 576 ships in the late 1980s to 278 ships today.

At the same time, procurement budgets have been cut substantially, far greater than the cuts in force structure warranted. The contrast in the average annual procurement of major equipment from two periods—1975 to 1990 and from 1991 to 2000—is startling. For example, we purchased an average of 78 scout and attack helicopters each year from 1975 to 1990, and only 7 each year from 1991 to 2000. We purchased an average of 238 Air Force fighters each year from 1975 to 1990, and an average of only 28 each year from 1991 to 2000. We purchased five tanker aircraft each year from 1975 to 1990, an average of only one per year from 1991 to 2000.

The implications for these dramatic reductions are profound. Older platforms—that is what the military calls ships, planes, and vehicles—are rather tired and not replaced, which means that force structure is reduced. Military capabilities are reduced. If platforms are not replaced, the average age of the fleet increases, readiness levels drop, and the cost of maintaining the smaller, older inventory climbs rapidly because maintenance costs increase.

For these reasons, I suggest that the current force today is too small and its equipment too old, relative to the requirements of our national military strategy. That strategy calls for a military capable of defending the homeland, sustaining four peacekeeping engagements, and fighting two large-scale regional conflicts, at least, at approximately the same time. We are supposed to be able to do all that at once. I believe the requirements of our military are actually greater than this, but in any event, we cannot execute even these commitments, and we certainly will not be able to do so in the future, within an acceptable level of risk, unless at least the Army is made bigger and unless all three services have

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

the money to robustly recapitalize their major platforms with the most modern equipment.

For years, the various services, in response to pressure from political authorities to reduce the budget below what they needed, have delayed or cancelled new programs. They have been reducing the number of new ships or planes they say they need, kicking crucial decisions down the budgetary road, robbing Peter to pay Paul, and otherwise trying to avoid confronting the approaching funding crisis.

That crisis is upon us now. We are entering the crucial phase of recapitalization. Beginning with the next budget and intensifying over the next 5 to 10 years, the services are scheduled to bring online the new platforms that will anchor American security for the next generation. No one can say these programs are unneeded. The Navy must buy new destroyers, must ramp up procurement of Virginia-class submarines, must finalize the design and buy large numbers of Littoral Combat Ships and design and build a new CG–X cruiser.

The Air Force must buy large numbers of the F–22. That is our new air-superiority fighter. We must maintain the ability to have complete air superiority over any combat theater. The Air Force must buy large numbers of Joint Strike Fighters or equivalent aircraft. In addition, the Air Force must buy out its airlift requirement. That is how we transport personnel, equipment and supplies from one place to another in the world. It must build a new generation of tankers, must design and build a long-range strike bomber to replace the B–52. Our B–52 inventory is 45 years old.

The Army must rebuild, modernize or replace almost its entire capital stock of ground combat and support vehicles including many of its tanks.

The current procurement budget for all three services is $80.9 billion. Simple budgetary mathematics tells us that the services cannot possibly meet their crucial requirements without an average budget over the next 5 to 10 years that I estimate is at least $30 billion higher than what we are now spending.

Perhaps I have gone into more detail than the Senate is willing to indulge me in already, but I want to look at some depth at the situation of the Navy. Here I speak from what I know because I have been the chairman of the Subcommittee on Seapower for the last 4 years. Currently, there are 278 ships in the U.S. Navy. The Navy shipbuilding plan calls for 326 ships by the year 2020, eventually settling down

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

to an average of 313 ships. The plan actually calls for fewer aircraft carriers, a substantial drop in attack submarines, and fewer major surface combatants, but it attempts to make up for these reductions with modern destroyers, more capable submarines and what it calls pre-positioning ships that allow us to establish sea bases from which to project forces ashore, as well as a whole new class of smaller multi-mission modular vessels called littoral combat ships. There is no margin whatever for error in this plan. It is, at best, the minimum necessary for our security.

The Chief of Naval Operations—that is the admiral who leads the Navy—has estimated the plan will require a shipbuilding budget of $13.3 billion for fiscal year 2008, the upcoming budget year. That is $5 billion more than what was spent this year on shipbuilding. His plan calls for that figure to escalate to $17.5 billion by 2012. I believe these figures are too conservative. It is a good-faith effort to calculate what we need but too conservative. I think the plan will require billions more each year to execute. Both the Congressional Budget Office and the Congressional Research Service agree. In any event, I say on my oath as a Senator, that it will be utterly impossible, at current levels of defense spending, for the Navy to reach and sustain the $13.3 billion figure, to say nothing of the even higher sums required in the out-years of the 5-year defense plan and beyond.

Beginning no later than 2009, there will be a growing shortfall in the shipbuilding accounts, in addition to an annual shortfall of $1 billion to $2 billion in Navy aviation procurement. I expect the total deficiency to be no less than $45 billion over the fiscal year 2008 to fiscal year 2016 period; and remember, this assumes that the 313-ship Navy is sufficient to protect American security, an optimistic assumption.

Lest the Senate get lost in all the figures, let me sum it up this way. The Navy, responding to budgetary pressure, has formulated a plan for a 313-ship Navy in the future which, frankly, may be inadequate; the Navy estimates a figure for funding the plan which independent authorities, using long-term historical cost data, believe is far too low. And yet without substantial increases in the Navy's procurement budget, it is a dead certainty that even that figure cannot be sustained.

As a practical matter, the expected shortfall means the sacrifice of two to three attack subs and two to three surface combatants, a reduction in purchases of the littoral combat ships, and delays to the Sea Basing Program and the new

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

CG–X Cruiser Program, which is necessary for missile defense.

The short of it is that the Navy needs at least an $8 billion increase per year in procurement above current estimates. The Marines need about $3 billion more. It is not necessary to go into the same level of detail with regard to the budgetary picture for the other services. The pain has been spread fairly evenly across the service, so they are in roughly in the same situation. That means a procurement shortfall over the next 10 years of at least $30 billion per year adjusted for inflation. Most independent experts believe the number is far higher.

For example, the CBO estimates that the overall defense budget shortfall will be no less than $52 billion per year. We should add to this the fact that the active-duty Army is clearly too small, as we have learned in Iraq. Even in an age of transformation and nonlinear battlefields, there are still times when America needs to put large numbers of boots on the ground, particularly in the post-September 11 period. The United States needs the ability to carry on sustained, large-scale peacekeeping or low-intensity combat operations, without having to send the same units three or four times to a combat theater over the duration of a mission. A nation of our size and strength should not have to use essentially its whole active-duty Army, much of its Marine Corps, and many of its Reserves to sustain 130,000 troops over time in a combat view.

In 1992—which was right after Desert Storm—the Defense Department stated a requirement of 12 active duty Army divisions. That was before the increases in operational tempo of the 1990s and before the global war on terror. The Army should surely be at least 12 divisions today. It costs approximately $2 billion to stand up and sustain an addition to the Army or Marine Corps of division strength so we need to invest $4 billion per year in increased force structure for the Army, in addition to the $30 billion more in new procurement funding.

So to sustain our military over the next generation at the appropriate level, we need to increase procurement spending and spending on the size of the Army by about $34 billion per year. And that is above current baseline estimates. It would have to be sustained over the life of the current defense plan and beyond.

I want to emphasize that this is, of necessity, a ballpark figure. It is always difficult to predict precisely the cost of

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

new programs—some of which are in the design phase, particularly given the uncertainties associated with developing technologies. We will be acquiring this equipment over the next 10 to 20 years and needs in technology are going to change. We must confront the fact that whatever the necessary amount turns out precisely to be, the procurement budgets we are projecting today are fundamentally inadequate. We have to ramp up spending. We must begin now. And we have to accept the fact that it will not be cheap.

I also want to make clear that this additional $34 billion must come from an increased overall defense budget. There may be some who say that it is possible to cannibalize the rest of the defense budget to produce all or most of this additional procurement funding. That is a dangerous fantasy. The money cannot come from the supplemental appropriations bills. Those are necessary to pay the day-to-day costs of the war and may not have been adequate to do that. The money cannot come from reducing the readiness budget because that budget is overstressed already. It cannot come from reducing the number of service personnel because the military is already too small. It can't come from reducing salary and benefits. We have to retain the best people. Besides, Congress is far more likely, and properly in my view, to increase personnel benefits rather than reduce them. Take a look at the last 7 years. Total spending on defense health care, for example, increased from $17.5 billion in fiscal year 2000 to $37 billion in fiscal year 2006—an increase of more than 100 percent over the last 7 years, appropriately so.

The men and women of America's military deserve good salaries and benefits, and so do those who are retired. The savings from base closing is not going to supply the additional funds. Those are highly speculative. They will not occur, if at all, for many years, and they are unlikely to be more than a billion dollars per year.

Some say we can save money by reducing congressional earmarks or additions to the defense budget, and within limits that is true. But the total of such earmarks is no more than $3 billion to $4 billion per year. Realistically, Congress is not going to give up all of them, and at least some number of them are clearly justified because they simply restore to the budget items that our service chiefs desperately wanted and omitted only because of budgetary pressure.

Still others will say we can get the necessary additional funding by lowering the cost of new programs through procurement reform. I am all for procurement reform. I have

been for it ever since Secretary Bill Perry, who was a great Secretary of Defense, proposed it over 10 years ago. We have had several waves of procurement reform since then. Several Defense Secretaries have all championed its virtues. We continue to hold oversight hearings to pressure the defense industry to lower costs. We keep trying to catch people in the Department who might be violating procurement regulations. I have chaired some of those hearings.

Meanwhile, the cost of new programs keeps going up. I suggest the reasons have less to do with deficiencies in the procurement system, bad as it is, than with the stress on the industrial base and on the military caused by the budgets that are consistently too low and unstable.

One of the arguments supporting reductions in force in the past has been that transformational technology and tactics can empower the military to do more with less. The idea is to make each service member, each plane, ship, and vehicle less vulnerable so we lose fewer of them, and more lethal so we need fewer of them. Within limits, that is sometimes true. But the best technology costs money, and changing technology, tactics, and doctrine makes it more difficult to fix stable requirements. Program instability costs money, too.

Here is an example. The Navy originally planned to procure 32 DD(X) next-generation destroyers. The ship has a truly advanced design. It is a marvel of transformational technology. But its unique capabilities have driven the per ship cost to about $3 billion. As a result, the Navy plans to procure only seven new destroyers. The problem is that the complexity of the ship's design, the unprecedented capabilities of the vessel, and the high price of the best technologies, have all driven up cost to the point where the ship is impossible to procure in sufficient numbers at current budget levels.

Another example: The Air Force desperately needs more air lift, and it also needs a new tanker aircraft. The Air Force shoulders much of the mobility mission, and it also performs the mid-air refueling mission. Normally, the Air Force would simply buy more C–17 aircraft. It is a perfectly good, modern cargo aircraft. Then the Air Force would design and procure a new tanker. But because the service is under tremendous pressure to save money, it has decided to develop a cargo-tanker, combining the two missions into one aircraft. The service assures us that it is not going to have any bells and whistles on the new plane, and the aircraft will be low in cost.

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

Surely, the concept of a cargo-tanker allows the Air Force to claim that it will be able to perform both of these missions while relieving some of the pressure on its budget. But, again, reality must and will eventually bite. As requirements build and changing technologies force changes in design, the odds are very high that the cost of the new aircraft—if it is to do the combined mission it is supposed to do— will go up substantially.

The problem of cost is exacerbated by the stress on the defense industrial base. Procurement budgets have been too low for 15 years and because of budgetary pressure they constantly change. The Department regularly projects what it intends to procure in the out-years of its defense plan but then often makes last-minute cuts and changes.

Under those circumstances, it is no surprise that contractors are not investing sufficiently in the defense industrial base. It is shrinking, and it is undercapitalized. That means fewer competitors, more sole-source contracts, less research, and, therefore, higher costs. No amount of oversight, reform, or pressure on procurement officials can change that.

The good news is that a robust and consistent commitment to adequate funding would soon begin to reverse these trends. Again, I am all for improvements in the way we design and build new systems, and those improvements can save money. But they cannot work miracles. Sufficient and stable funding is not only consistent with transformation and efficient use of the taxpayers' dollars, it is necessary to both. If Congress were to commit to my proposal, for example, the service chiefs and the defense industry would know that substantial new money was coming—enough to make it at least plausible they could produce and acquire the systems they need. They could budget for the long range, knowing that funding would be stable. They could work together in a way that would reduce costs instead of trying to pull money away from other services or maneuver year to year just to keep vital programs alive, and often in a way that ends up costing the taxpayers more in the long run.

We must stop thinking that facing reality and funding our military adequately is beyond the reach of this great Nation. Yes, the Federal Government has fiscal problems. Yes, the two major parties have very different views on what to do about those problems, but nobody can or does claim that the defense budget is the cause.

Right now, we are spending 3.8 percent of our gross domestic product on the regular defense budget. That is a very

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

low percentage historically, far less than we spent at any time during the cold war. Under President Carter, we spent 4.6 percent of the GDP on national defense.

If we spent only 4.2 percent now, we could easily fund what I have proposed. We would have a fighting chance to support our service men and women with the equipment they need and deserve. We could sustain the military power that the last two Presidents have used to protect our freedom and stabilize the post-cold-war world. We would send the clearest possible message to both our friends and enemies, and to those nations who are deciding now whether they are going to be a friend or enemy, that whatever happens, whatever the direction our foreign policy takes, the United States has the ability to sustain our freedom and the hope of freedom for the world.

To those who worry about the price of strength, I say there is a greater price to be paid for weakness. How many conflicts will we invite, how much instability will we engender, if we allow this restless and troubled world to doubt America's ability to defend herself?

Let's look at the risks of alternative courses of action. If we adopt the course I suggest, and it turns out that I was wrong, all we will have lost is a fraction of our wealth that would be spent in this country on products produced by our workers, for a margin of safety that, in the end, we did not need. But if we stay on our current course, and it turns out that I was right, how much will we pay then in lost lives and treasure, fighting in conflicts that a policy of strength would have deterred?

How big will the deficit become then, in a world made less stable by American weakness? What effect will that have on the economy, and not just the economy, but on the hopes and opportunities of the next generation—our children and our grandchildren—who have the right to expect that we are looking out for them?

Twenty-five years ago, our country was also in a difficult situation. Our enemies doubted American resolve. They were challenging us on a number of fronts. We had just gone through a period of chronic underfunding of the military, probably worse than what has happened recently. As a result, the force was hollow, unable to reliably perform the missions necessary to protect America. That is why the tragic Desert One Mission went so wrong in the desert during the Iranian hostage crisis.

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

When President Reagan assumed office, he faced the situation squarely and honestly, and with the support of a Democratic House and Republican Senate, he secured two double-digit increases in the overall defense budget, and reasonable increases for several years thereafter. On the strength of that bipartisan commitment, America's service men and women and America's defense industrial base transformed our military into the truly dominant force that fought and won Operation Desert Storm.

A united government sent the message to friend and foe alike that whatever our differences about foreign policy, America was still willing to pay the price of freedom. It is not too much to say that the decisions made in 1981 and 1982 laid the basis for the collapse of the Soviet Union, the success of Operation Desert Storm, and the benefits of peace and security that we enjoyed throughout the 1990s.

With this speech, I bring my career in the Senate to a close. I believe I can do no greater service to my country than to urge Senators not to be dissuaded by the counsels of those who say that what I have proposed cannot be done.

At the beginning of my remarks I stated that America's service men and women are the finest who have ever served in any military on behalf of any nation at any time. I should have included their families as well. I realized that when today, just a few hours ago, I had the privilege of meeting with Dana Lamberson and her two children, Kelsi and Evan.

Mrs. Lamberson's husband, SFC Randall Lamberson, was killed in Iraq only 8 months ago. Mrs. Lamberson told me that before her husband deployed, their family openly discussed the sacrifice which he, and they, might be called on to make. I asked her how she was able to bear her grief with such grace and fortitude. She told me that when she was tempted to be discouraged, she remembered what her husband had always said when times were tough: that "life is only as difficult as you make it."

Mr. President, I have met thousands of Americans over the last 4 years like the Lamberson family, not just soldiers and their families, but people from every walk of life, who live each day with courage, resilience, and optimism. Because of them, I believe with all my heart that America's time of leadership is not done.

I ask the Senate to honestly face the true cost of defending this Nation. If we do, if we carry that burden with confidence, we will find the weight of it to have been a small thing compared to the blessings of peace and liberty we will

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

secure for ourselves, and the hope we will give to freedom-loving people all over the world.

Mr. President, I cannot close without thanking my dedicated staff who served the people of Missouri so well over the last 4 years, who have kept me going, kept me on time, who are largely responsible for the many pieces of legislation which Senator Bond was kind enough to mention. I just ask the Senate to indulge me for another moment or two because I am going to read their names. I think they deserve it: Mark Strand, my chief of staff; Cortney Brown, my scheduler; Les Sealy, our great office manager who always got us what we needed; Brian Anderson, our IT manager. I am glad he understood it because I never do.

I thank our legislative staff: Brett Thompson, legislative director; Faith Cristol, our great legislative counsel; and my legislative assistants: Lindsey Neas, Katie Smith, Heath Hall, Jesse Appleton, Katie Duckworth, Christopher Papagianis, Shamed Dogan, and John Cox, who works so hard and so well on veterans issues, a man who has served this country in many different venues; Andy Karellas, Martha Petkovich, and Sarah Cudworth, who did legislative correspondence, grants, and case work; Peter Henry, who managed the mail; Sarah Barfield, my staff assistant; two great Navy fellows: CDR Dan Brintzinghoffer and LCDR Lori Aguayo, two patriots and both outstanding officers; and Mark Hegerle, my energy fellow who came over from the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission just in time to help me make a real difference on the energy bill.

I want to thank our press shop: Rich Chrismer, my great communications director; Erin Hamm, and Andrew Brandt.

Casework—we handled over 10,000 cases. I am a big believer in casework. This is a big government, and navigating it is hard, and if we could help, we wanted to help. I thank Nora Breidenbach, Jenny Bickel, Abby Pitlick, Debbie Dornfeld, and Jessica Van Beek.

And the State staff, we always tried to integrate the work of the State staff and the Washington staff, and I think we did it. I thank Gregg Keller, our State director; in St. Louis: Kacky Garner, my district director; Peggy Barnhart; Rachel McCombs; and Angel McCormick Franks; in Kansas City: Joe Keatley, my great district director; Danny Pfeifer; Emily Seifers; Greg Porter; and Erick Harris; in Jefferson City: Donna Spickert, who was the State capitol director; and Becky Almond, my in-State scheduler, as well as a great staff assistant; in Springfield: Terry Campbell, the district

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

director; Christopher Stone; and Coriann Gastol; and in Cape Girardeau: Jeff Glenn, who directed that office; and Liz Mainord.

I also want to thank, as other Senators have done, my family, my wife, obviously, in particular, who has shared the highs and lows of this job, and my wonder kids.

Mr. President, it remains only for me to thank my colleagues in the Senate for the many kindnesses, personal and professional, which they have shown me and my family over the last 4 years.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

TRIBUTES

TO

JAMES M. TALENT

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

Proceedings in the Senate

TUESDAY, *December 5, 2006*

Mr. HAGEL. Mr. President . . . As we recognize, it is a distinct privilege and high honor to serve our country in any capacity, and certainly none higher than in uniform. But it is especially important that we recognize those who have given years of their lives, sacrificing their families, their own time, to help make a better world for all of us. I know of no capacity in which we serve our country that has given those who have had this rare opportunity to serve in the Senate anything more noble than trying to shape a better world from this Senate.

These individuals who will leave the Senate, some on their own terms, some on the terms of the election, but, nonetheless, in their own specific way have contributed a great deal to this country.

I take a few minutes to recognize each. . . .

Senator JIM TALENT from Missouri has had 14 years of service in the House and Senate. I worked very closely with Senator TALENT on his bill, the Combat Methamphetamine Act. I believe it is one of the most significant, relevant, important bills to pass the 109th Congress. He, too, will be missed. No one worked harder than JIM TALENT for the interests of his State. He understands agriculture, he understands energy like very few in his State. He began his service to his country and to the State of Missouri at the age of 28, when he was elected to the House of Representatives. We will continue to hear more from JIM TALENT. . . .

Mr. President, in conclusion, it is not easy to put one's self on the firing line and offer one's self as a candidate for any office. It takes a certain amount of courage and, I suspect, a little dose of insanity. But nonetheless individuals who believe deeply enough to commit themselves to a cause greater than their own self-interests need to be recognized. Having nothing to do with me or you or any one individual, but it is the essence of our country, it is the very fabric of our democracy that makes it all work and probably gives rise to,

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

more than any one reason, why we have been such a successful nation for over 200 years—because people from all walks of life, in every community, in every State, offer themselves for office. Whether it is a mayor, a Governor, city councilman, county official, a sheriff, these individuals deserve recognition.

We all make mistakes. That is who we are. But in the end, it is not unlike what Teddy Roosevelt once referred to in his magnificent quote about the man in the arena. And it is the man and the woman in the arena who change our lives. It makes a better world that shapes history, that defines our destiny. And for these individuals who will no longer have that opportunity to serve our country in the Senate, we wish them well, we thank them, and we tell them we are proud of them and their families and wish them Godspeed.

Mr. President, I thank you for the time and yield the floor.

WEDNESDAY, *December 6, 2006*

Mr. REED. Mr. President, this is an opportunity to recognize the service of several of our colleagues who are departing from the Senate. To Senator Jeffords, Senator Frist, Senator DeWine, Senator TALENT, Senator Santorum, Senator Burns, and Senator Allen, let me express my appreciation for their service to their States and their service to the Nation and wish them well. . . .

To all my colleagues who served and conclude their service, let me once again express deep appreciation for their friendship and for their service to the Nation.

I yield the floor.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, we are coming to the end of the session and 10 of our colleagues are retiring. I want to say a word about them . . .

Or JIM TALENT, who was the outstanding political science student at Washington University in St. Louis when he was there. No one would be surprised to learn that. . . .

When the most recent class of Senators was sworn into office nearly 2 years ago, in the gallery were three women. One was the grandmother of Barack Obama. She was from Kenya. One was the mother of Senator Salazar, a 10th generation American. One was the mother of Mel Martinez, the new Republican National Committee chairman, who, with her husband, put her son on an airplane when he was 14

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

years old and sent him from Cuba to the United States, not knowing if she would ever see him again.

In a way, each one of us who is here is an accident. None of us knew we would be here. Each of us is privileged to serve, and one of the greatest privileges is to serve with our colleagues. We will miss them and we are grateful for their service.

I yield the floor.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, as the time for my departure from the Senate draws near, on behalf of the greatest blessing in my life, my wife Susan, and on behalf of myself, I thank all of my colleagues for their many courtesies and friendships that have been forged during the past 6 years. I offer a few concluding reflections about our time here together, as well as about the future of our Republic. . . .

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, I see others who wish to speak, and I will make a couple of brief comments.

In the comments of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Allen], his final couple of comments recalled for me a statement made in the closing of the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia, when on the back of the chair of the presiding officer was a sunburst. Someone opined in that Constitutional Convention: Dr. Franklin, is that a rising sun or is it a setting sun? And Franklin ventured to say that with the birth of the new Nation, with the creation of the new Constitution, that he thought it was a rising sun.

Indeed, it is that hope of which the Senator from Virginia has just spoken that motivates this Senator from Florida to get up and go to work every day, and to look at this Nation's challenges, not as a Democratic problem or a Republican problem, but as an American problem, that needs to be solved in an American way instead of a partisan way.

We have had far too much partisanship over the last several years across this land, and, indeed, in this Chamber itself. And of the Senators who are leaving this Chamber, I think they represent the very best of America, and on occasion have risen in a bipartisan way. It has been this Senator's great privilege to work with these Senators: Allen of Virginia, Burns of Montana, Chafee of Rhode Island, Dayton of Minnesota, DeWine of Ohio, Frist of Tennessee, Jeffords of Vermont, Santorum of Pennsylvania, Sarbanes of Maryland, TALENT of Missouri.

As the Good Book in Ecclesiastes says: There is a time to be born and a time to die. There is a time to get up, and a

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

time to go to bed. There is a time for a beginning, and there is a time of ending.

For these Senators who are leaving, it is clearly not an ending. It is an ending of this chapter in their lives, but this Senator from Florida wanted to come and express his appreciation for their public service, to admonish those where admonishment is needed when this Chamber, indeed, this Government, has gotten too partisan, but to express this Senator's appreciation for the quiet moments of friendship and reflection and respect in working together, which is the glue that makes this Government run.

Whether you call it bipartisanship, whether you call it friendship, whether you call it mutual respect, whatever you call it, the way you govern a nation as large and as complicated and as diverse as our Nation is—as the Good Book says: Come, let us reason together—that is what this Senator tries to be about. And that is what this Senator will try to continue to do in the new dawn of a new Congress. So I wanted to come and express my appreciation for those Senators who will not be here, for the great public service they have rendered.

Mr. President, I am truly grateful for their personal friendship and for their public service.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DURBIN. . . . I wish all of my colleagues who are retiring well as they begin the next chapters of their careers.

Mr. SALAZAR. Mr. President, I rise today to bid farewell to several of my friends here in Washington. Too often we get caught up here in the back-and-forth of politics and lose sight of the contributions of those with whom we work every day. It is only at moments such as these, at the end of a cycle, that we have a moment to reflect on the contributions of our colleagues. And while we may not always see eye to eye, this Senate is losing several admirable contributors who have made many sacrifices to serve our democracy. . . .

A number of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will be departing in January, as well. There is our colleague from Virginia, Senator Allen, who wears, in my opinion, the second best pair of boots in the Senate. There is Senator Santorum of Pennsylvania, whose passion is admirable and whose energy is always enviable. Also leaving us is my colleague in the centrist Gang of 14 that helped bring this Senate back from the abyss; Senator DeWine of Ohio, who will head back to the Buckeye State with my respect and admira-

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

tion; and my friend Senator TALENT from Missouri, with whom I spent many hours in the Agriculture Committee working to level the playing field for America's farmers and ranchers. We will miss Senator Chafee of Rhode Island's independence and his clear voice for fiscal discipline in Washington. And we will miss Senator Burns of Montana, who shares my passion for rural America and who is headed home to Big Sky Country, back to the Rockies that I know we both miss so much. . . .

America, when held to its finest ideals, is more than a place on the globe or a work in progress. It is the inspiration to those around the world and here at home to seek out excellence within themselves and their beliefs. It has been a pleasure to work alongside each of these gentlemen, who have helped me as I have found my way, sometimes literally, through the halls of the Senate, in the pursuit of these greater ideals that we all share: security, prosperity, and an America that we leave better than when we arrived. These ideals will resonate here long after we all are gone and another generation stands in our place making the decisions of its day.

THURSDAY, *December 7, 2006*

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I have had the privilege of being here for the 28th year beginning shortly. I calculated not long ago that I have served with 261 individuals. I am not about to try and review all of the many magnificent friendships I am privileged to have through these years. Indeed, if one looks at the rewards, of which there are many serving in this historic institution, the Senate, it is the personal bonds, the friendships that we so firmly cement and that will last a lifetime as a consequence of our duties of serving the United States of America and in our respective States.

We are called "United States" Senators. I often believe it is the first obligation, our Nation, the Republic for which it stands. . . .

I would also like to pay tribute to nine other U.S. Senators who will retire from the Senate in the coming days. . . .

Now, I would like to take a few moments to salute our majority leader, Senator Frist, as well as Senators Chafee, Burns, Santorum, DeWine, Jeffords, TALENT, and Dayton.

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

Each and every one of these U.S. Senators has served his State and his country with great distinction.

Without a doubt, I could speak at-length in honor of each of these outstanding individuals. In light of time constraints, however, and the fact that so many of my colleagues wish to similarly pay tribute, I shall endeavor to keep my remarks brief. . . .

Over the past 4 years, I have been fortunate to have been given the opportunity to work closely with JIM TALENT on the Senate Armed Services Committee. Since his first day on the committee—JIM TALENT has been one of the hardest working committee members.

As chairman of the Seapower Subcommittee, Senator TALENT has been at the forefront of the committee's efforts to strengthen the Navy's shipbuilding program, working closely with the Chief of Naval Operations in the formation of the CNO's plan for a 313-ship Navy. He showed steadfast determination in working with the administration and the Congress to secure the funding required to build the future Navy; spearheading the effort to raise the top-line for shipbuilding by over 20 percent during the course of his tenure as Seapower chairman.

Senator TALENT has also been passionate in his support for the needs of our brave men and women in uniform; championing quality-of-life and quality-of-service initiatives. Most notably, he has been a strong advocate for legislation that will put an end to predatory lending practices against military personnel and their families. . . .

In conclusion, over the years I have served with each of these 10 Senators, each has not only been a trusted colleague, each has also been my friend. I will miss serving with each of them in the Senate but know that each will continue in public service in some capacity. I wish each and every one of them well in the years ahead.

Mr. President, I see a number of colleagues here anxious to speak, and I have taken generously of the time the Presiding Officer has allowed me to speak.

I yield the floor.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I rise on the floor to pay tribute to my very good friend and colleague, Senator JIM TALENT, who will be leaving the Senate next month.

I have known JIM for over 20 years, since he was minority leader in the Missouri House of Representatives. Throughout all these years, when he was in the State legislature and in the House as chairman of the Small Business Committee

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

when I was chairman of the Senate Small Business Committee, I found JIM to be unfailingly a man of honesty, integrity, and hard work. He has been a wonderful friend and colleague.

I am going to miss him very much, and many people in Missouri are.

We all know that Washington can change a person, but it hasn't changed JIM. JIM still has the same commonsense Missouri values he brought with him to Washington. He still has the same calm, polite demeanor. He still has strong convictions and a work ethic. As I said to our folks back home in Missouri, in an arena of show horses he has been a work horse.

I was with him on the night he got the news that he lost the campaign. He was a man of unfailingly good humor and courage. And still, he thanked his Lord, his friends, and graciously accepted his fate.

I have a feeling and hope that public service will see much more of JIM TALENT somewhere, sometime. And whatever he decides to do in the public or in the private sector, the qualities he has demonstrated to so many of us in the Senate will carry with him.

He served in the Senate for only 4 years, but when you look at his record of legislative achievements, he has had so many positive impacts on people's lives it is hard to believe he could cram all of that into 4 years.

He has been a leader on national security, energy, and criminal justice.

As a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, JIM worked to extend production of the C–17 line, allowing 30,000 workers across the country to keep their jobs, and more important, to give our military strategic lift capability which they need to move troops and equipment to very difficult to reach places.

JIM also cares about our troops in battle. He sponsored legislation to end predatory lending to active service members and their families. The new law just took effect 6 weeks ago. Some of our soldiers were paying almost 400 percent interest on money loaned to them. Thanks to JIM TALENT, the rates are now capped at 36 percent. I trust that applies to the Marines as well.

Last year, JIM worked very hard to include a renewable fuel provision in the energy bill. On a bipartisan basis, under his leadership, the United States will produce up to 7½ bil-

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

lion gallons of renewable fuels with ethanol and biodiesel. That will be implemented by 2012.

JIM's work in this area will only become more important as we see in the future America continuing to face high energy costs and our attempt to reduce our dependence on foreign oil.

Another accomplishment JIM will be known for is something which is extremely important in our State of Missouri, and this work—again on a bipartisan basis with the Senator from California—was to fight meth. Meth is a drug that has been destroying lives and communities across our State for many years and now even across the country.

The Combat Meth Act has helped stop the supply of meth ingredients to dealers through the ban on over-the-counter sales. You see a significant reduction in meth lab busts. It shows that we are finally beginning to make progress against this drug.

Obviously, I have to mention his other bipartisan successes, such as the sickle cell disease bill and the Emmett Till bill.

On a narrow focus, JIM and I have worked together on many transportation and economic development projects to serve our State of Missouri, including the Liberty Memorial in Kansas City, the Page Avenue Extension in St. Charles, and countless others throughout the State.

I should also mention that my friend JIM TALENT has put forward some terrific proposals that he has been working on that have been enacted. His effort to allow small business employers to pool together to form association health plans comes to mind, and those of us who have been working to change the law so that small business employees and their families will have access to the same kind of insurance benefits that employees of major corporations have will not give up the fight. We are going to continue with his great leadership in mind.

I am sure the next Congress will follow up. This idea should be central to any discussion of expanding health care coverage to the uninsured.

JIM, as we prepare to say goodbye to you now from this floor, thank you for your years of devoted service to our State, to our Nation. With heartfelt gratitude, on behalf of my wife Linda and I, we wish you, Brenda, and your children the very best in future endeavors. And I know for a fact that there will be great successes ahead.

I yield the floor.

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

Mrs. CLINTON. . . . Finally, I also wish the very best to my Republican colleagues who will leave the Senate at the conclusion of this Congress. The Senate, at its best, is a body that promotes bipartisanship, deliberation, and cooperation, and the dedication to shared values. It has been a privilege to work with my departing colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

FRIDAY, *December 8, 2006*

Ms. LANDRIEU. . . . To all of our retiring Members, I say thank you. Thank you for your efforts on behalf of my State when you were needed and thank you for your service to America.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I also will say a word about a couple of my colleagues who are leaving, and I will be brief. . . .

JIM TALENT from Missouri is another colleague from the House of Representatives. He is another serious and dedicated public servant whom I suspect we will see more of in the future. . . .

I know we all move on at some time and that none of us is irreplaceable. But by the same token, these colleagues of ours who will be leaving will be missed and they will be remembered for their great service to the Senate, to their States, and to the United States of America.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DEWINE. . . . Mr. President, I want to wish the best to all of my fellow Senators who were defeated this fall or who are retiring this year—Senators Frist, Santorum, TALENT, Burns, Allen, Chafee, Dayton, and Jeffords. They are all good people and all good friends. I wish them well. . . .

Mr. DODD. . . . Mr. President, today I pay tribute to my departing colleagues who have, for a time, lent their talents, their convictions, and their hard work to this distinguished body. I may have had my disagreements with them, but the end of a term is a time for seeing colleagues not simply as politicians, but as partners who have "toiled, and wrought, and thought with me." Each, in his own way, was distinctive; and each, in his own way, will be sorely missed. . . .

I would also like to recognize Senator JIM TALENT. Senator TALENT has been a lifelong resident of St. Louis; and even

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

when he was attending Washington University in his hometown, his outstanding intellect was on display as he was named the most outstanding undergraduate in political science. It was a sign of success to come. JIM TALENT was elected to the U.S. House in 1992 and served a total of 12 years in Congress, the last 4 representing Missouri in the Senate.

I was especially proud to work with Senator TALENT on legislation of the utmost moral importance: a bill that would establish new offices at the Department of Justice and FBI to investigate and prosecute civil rights-era murders. This legislation would help ensure that those who took the lives of civil rights workers, and have thus far escaped justice, never have another peaceful night of sleep. Senator TALENT said it eloquently:

> We want the murderers and their accomplices who are still living to know there's an entire section of the Department of Justice that is going after them. We need to unearth the truth and do justice because there cannot be healing without the truth.

Senator TALENT was also known for his work for renewable energy, his opposition to predatory lending, and his solid social conservatism. And though we didn't always agree, I am sure everyone who served with him has respected his intellect and his outspokenness. May he and his wife Brenda have many more years of happiness. . . .

Mr. HATCH. . . . Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to the accomplishments of Senator JIM TALENT from the great State of Missouri. I feel privileged to have worked with JIM on different pieces of legislation, and I greatly admire his dedication to his constituents and respect his many accomplishments during his time in public office.

JIM's official political career started when he was only 28 years old, after he was elected to the Missouri House of Representatives. He went on to serve for 8 years in that position, and he worked diligently to pass meaningful legislation which benefited the people of Missouri.

In 1992, JIM was elected to the House of Representatives from Missouri's Second District. JIM wasted no time in tackling important issues and introduced the Real Welfare Reform Act of 1994. Much of the ideas from this legislation were phased into the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Act of 1996, which I joined JIM in voting for. This historic piece of bipartisan legislation has had a profound positive impact and dramatically changed the way that this country helps its neediest citizens. According to the Depart-

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

ment of Health and Human Services, welfare caseloads in this country have declined 58 percent since the enactment of this legislation. These results show that, even as a new Senator, JIM had tremendous foresight in crafting meaningful ideas which addressed a serious problem in this country.

JIM also served on many important committees during his time in the House, including the Armed Services Committee, the Small Business Committee, and the Education and Workforce Committee. During his time on these committees, JIM continued to utilize his tremendous work ethic in reviewing and drafting important initiatives which benefited American citizens. In addition, JIM worked endlessly as an advocate for small business, which he recognized as the financial backbone of our country.

In November 2002, JIM began the next phase of his service after being elected to serve as Senator for his State of Missouri. Being born and raised in Missouri, JIM had a great knowledge base of the State and thus the background to recognize important issues which affected his constituents and the State as a whole.

I can truthfully say there has been no Senator in the history of this body who has worked harder to represent his State than JIM TALENT.

JIM served on four diverse Senate committees: Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry; Energy and Natural Resources; Aging; and the Armed Services Committee.

During this Congress, JIM and I worked together on the joint resolution which proposed an amendment to the Constitution authorizing Congress to prohibit the physical desecration of the flag of the United States. JIM and I were in complete agreement on this subject, and I greatly respected his steadfast support of this proposed legislation. During debate of this topic, JIM continually provided insightful commentary that showed his heartfelt support of a very important topic. JIM summed up his feelings with the following sentiment:

> The flag is the unifying symbol of our Republic. It represents that common history and heritage which holds America together notwithstanding religious, cultural, or political differences. Physical and public desecration of the flag degrades those values and coarsens America far more than any speech or political dissent possibly could.

We were both sorry to see the amendment narrowly miss passage, but I will always admire and respect JIM's unwavering support on this important topic.

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

A final item I would like to draw attention to is the Combat Meth Act that JIM drafted along with Senator Feinstein. Recognizing the disastrous effects that have been wrought on American neighborhoods and families due to this horrible drug, Senators TALENT and Feinstein wrote this new law aimed at making the ingredients used to cook meth less available to lawbreakers. While we didn't always agree on the approach to this effort, we were united in efforts to stop the insidious damage inflicted by this drug. I applaud JIM's efforts in drafting an incredibly important law that we all hope will have a significant impact on decreasing the amount of toxic meth labs in our communities.

As JIM embarks on the next phase of his career, I wish him luck in all of his future endeavors. I also want to extend my congratulations and appreciation for JIM's legislative achievements during his time in Congress. I am confident that his character and attributes will continue to steer him toward a life of accomplishment and benefit to those around him. . . .

Mr. ENZI. . . . Mr. President, soon the last remaining items of business on the legislative calendar for the current session of Congress will be completed and the current session will be brought to a close. When it does, several of our colleagues will be returning home and ending their service in the Senate. We will miss them, and we will especially miss the good ideas and creative energy they brought to their duties in the U.S. Senate.

JIM TALENT is one of those individuals we will miss because of his can-do spirit and his determination to make a difference. He cares a great deal about our country, and he came to the Congress determined to make this a better place for us all to live—especially our children and our children's children. That is why he has always been so focused on the future of our Nation and the need to solve the problems that face us before they overwhelm us.

I first met JIM when he was the chairman of the House of Representatives Small Business Committee. Coming from a small business background myself, I was determined to do everything I could to eliminate the redtape that too often serves to discourage instead of encourage the growth of our small businesses throughout the country.

At the time, JIM was working on a number of issues in his committee that I was working on with the Workplace Safety and Training Subcommittee of the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee. Together we began to focus on

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

some OSHA issues and other matters affecting the workplace that needed our attention. We came up with a plan to work them incrementally, and by taking them up piece by piece, bit by bit, we were able to get some things done that might have otherwise been put off for another day. Over a couple of years, we were able to pass into law some of the first changes in the history of OSHA. Each step was a small victory for the workers of America. Taken together, the results gave us both hope that we would collaborate on bigger and bigger things in the future.

Back then, JIM had a decision to make. He was very popular back home and he probably could have stayed in the House for quite a long time, but he decided he wanted to run for statewide office. That call eventually led him to run for the Senate. It was a difficult battle, but JIM emerged with a well-earned victory.

I was delighted by his decision to run for the Senate and even more enthused by his victory. It proved what I had always thought about JIM, that he is a hard worker and he is always there to fight for what he believes in.

During his service in the Senate, JIM has been a champion for the people of his State and an expert on health plans for small businesses. When he was in the House he had served on the conference committee for the Patients Bill of Rights. He got the health plan legislation we wanted in the report, but the report was never voted on. Now that he was in the Senate, he was working on a number of issues but none as hard or as focused as he was on passing the small business health plan into law that he had helped shape and draft.

In the end, we were able to get 56 votes in the Senate for our plan, but it takes 60 to force a matter to a vote. That meant we were just four votes short of the total we needed to pass this legislation and address the issue of health care for small businesses and people all across the country.

I know we will miss JIM's participation when we take up this issue next year, but I expect he will find a way to keep our feet to the fire and remind us that the people of this Nation are expecting us to get something done to help address their health care needs. I look forward to hearing from him with his suggestions and thoughtful comments about the bill that emerges from committee next year—how to improve it and, more important, how to pass it.

In the years to come, I know I will miss JIM and his creative ideas and enthusiasm for getting things done. JIM's greatest asset has always been his ability to listen to all

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

sides of an argument and create ways around the obstacles that were preventing us from taking action. He is a leader, an innovator, and most of all, a friend to all who have come to know him.

Thanks JIM, for your dedication, your persistence, your courage, and the many capabilities you brought to your work on the Senate. You will be missed around here. Good luck in whatever you choose to do in the days to come. You will always have our support and our appreciation for your determination to make this country's health care system work as it should.

Ms. SNOWE. ... Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to Senator JIM TALENT, my colleague and friend whose capacity for being a catalyst on issues that he holds dear is truly remarkable—and he will be missed in the U.S. Congress.

In his first term in the U.S. Senate from Missouri, otherwise known as the Show-Me State, Senator JIM TALENT has shown—not just me—but his colleagues and his constituents that he is a person who cares about health care, small business, economic growth, and defense. Whether during his 8 years in the U.S. House or his 4 years in the U.S. Senate, JIM TALENT has demonstrated the fortitude and will necessary to meet challenging issues with national implications.

In the U.S. House, as a freshman Congressman, he introduced the Real Welfare Reform Act of 1994, which became the basis for landmark, bipartisan welfare reform legislation. Never one to turn from a challenge, then-Congressman TALENT also managed to get association health plans legislation passed out of the U.S. House, not once but twice. And he built on that success by working on that same issue in the U.S. Senate—indeed, Senator TALENT was an essential proponent of this important effort to allow small businesses to pool their resources to lower skyrocketing health insurance costs.

I saw firsthand how the same indefatigable energy that was indicative of his commitment in the House was very much on display in the Senate as he worked tirelessly with our leadership, Labor Secretary Chao, the National Federation of Independent Business, and so many others on this critical issue. As we go forward to identify a path forward on this vital matter, Senator TALENT's acumen and will to move this issue will be missed in our Chamber.

I wish JIM TALENT and his entire family all the best for what I am certain will be a successful next chapter in his life. ...

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

Mr. BUNNING. Mr. President, I would like to pay tribute to the Republican Members of the Senate who will not be returning in the 110th Congress. Senators George Allen; Conrad Burns; Lincoln Chafee; Mike DeWine; Dr. Bill Frist; Rick Santorum; and JIM TALENT have served their constituents with honor and distinction during their tenure here in the U.S. Senate. All care very deeply for this great Nation and I hope they will have continued success in their future endeavors. . . .

Majority leader Bill Frist has run the Senate through difficult and trying times and he has done it well. Senator Mike DeWine, my neighbor to the north, has represented the Buckeye State with great distinction and has committed over 30 years of his life to public service. Senator George Allen represented the Commonwealth of Virginia in the U.S. Senate for 6 years, and he worked closely with me to make America safer by helping usher through important legislation to arm cargo pilots. Senator JIM TALENT has had a great career in Congress and wrote the blueprint to the welfare reform bill of 1996. And Senator Lincoln Chafee has continued the proud legacy set forth by his father and my friend, Senator John Chafee.

Mr. President, I would like to again commend all of our departing Republican Senators. I am proud of what they accomplished here in the U.S. Senate. They will all be missed, and I wish all of them the very best.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. . . . Mr. President, JIM TALENT has a long and honorable history of service to the people of Missouri.

In the House of Representatives, he introduced the bill that laid the foundation for historic welfare reforms.

In 1997, he became the youngest chairman in the House when he was named Chairman of the House Small Business Committee. Under his leadership, the committee passed many crucial reforms for small business owners, including tax relief and health insurance provisions.

When JIM joined the Senate in 2000, he continued serving his State while emerging as a powerful force for the good of his State and the Nation.

His work on the Energy Committee has shown great foresight and has galvanized our fight for energy independence.

I am proud to have served with JIM these past 6 years.

I expect great things from his continued efforts on behalf of the Midwest. . . .

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—TRIBUTES TO RETIRING SENATORS

Mr. FRIST. I ask unanimous consent that the tributes to retiring Senators be printed as a Senate document and that Senators be permitted to submit tributes until December 27, 2006.

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

WEDNESDAY, *December 27, 2006*

Mr. STEVENS. . . . Mr. President, Senator JIM TALENT has served the people of Missouri with great distinction. He is a hard worker, and while he never sought the spotlight, JIM quickly earned the respect of his colleagues in the Senate.

It has been my privilege to work with JIM on a number of issues. He understood the threat methamphetamine poses to our Nation and helped establish the Senate's anti-meth caucus to fight this epidemic.

JIM has also been a determined leader on defense and energy issues. We worked together to secure the funding required to modernize the Department of Defense and sought to ensure our troops have the resources they need. JIM also understands the importance of diversifying our energy resources. His leadership on renewable energy greatly benefited his constituents and the rest of our Nation.

We will all miss Senator TALENT's intelligence and knowledge of the issues. I wish him the best of luck in all of his future endeavors. . . .

Ms. COLLINS. . . . Mr. President, as the 109th Congress draws to a close, I want to say thanks and farewell to one of its hardest working and most dedicated Members, Senator JIM TALENT of Missouri.

I have had the privilege of working with Senator TALENT as a member of the Armed Services Committee and its Seapower Subcommittee, which he has chaired.

Working with Senator TALENT has always been rewarding. He has been a prodigious Senator and brings to bear on defense issues both detailed knowledge and long-range vision. His final speech on the floor of the Senate displayed those qualities, as he surveyed the state of readiness and equipment in our national defense, and persuasively warned of the dangers of under-investment in personnel and material.

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

Senator TALENT's focus on seapower issues may seem to go against type. Missouri does not spring readily to mind in a word-association test for "Navy" or "shipbuilding," as Maine or Mississippi might. But the Senator from Missouri has been as dedicated to working through seapower issues as any coastal Senator.

Senator TALENT was a key player in settling on a dual-lead shipyard strategy for the Zumwalt-class DDG–1000 destroyers, formerly known as the DD(X). As a Senator from a shipbuilding State, I am naturally well pleased with this policy. But as a U.S. Senator, I also share Senator TALENT's conviction that it is a wise national strategy to preserve shipbuilding capabilities in multiple locations. He has also been a leading voice in deliberations on the CGX ship class that will constitute our next generation of guided-missile cruisers.

Senator TALENT brought extraordinary intellectual gifts to the Senate. After distinguishing himself in undergraduate work at Washington University and in legal studies at the University of Chicago, he clerked for Judge Richard Posner of the Seventh Circuit and taught at the Washington University School of Law.

His academic prowess was reinforced with practical political experience. After winning a seat against long odds in the Missouri Legislature, he established himself as a popular and respected political figure. Moving on to the U.S. House, he was an early and influential voice in the debate that ultimately led to a fundamental reform of Federal welfare law. This combined 16 years of legislative service served him well when he took his seat in the Senate.

Besides his dedication to chairing the Seapower Subcommittee, Senator TALENT has been a leading advocate for promoting alternative energy, for helping small businesses form associations to buy health insurance, and for expanding the Federal fight against sickle-cell blood disease. To these and other issues he brings a powerful combination of intellect, research, deliberation, and collegiality.

In November, Senator TALENT lost a close contest for reelection in a difficult campaign year. We cannot quarrel with the decision of the voters, but we can respectfully regret that the Senate will lose the benefit of JIM TALENT's wise and gentlemanly presence. I join my colleagues in wishing him and his family well, and in expecting many more contribu-

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

tions to the public good from this man of many gifts and accomplishments.

MONDAY, *January 8, 2007*

Mrs. DOLE. Mr. President, it is an honor indeed to pay tribute to a number of fine individuals who I am fortunate to call not just my colleagues, but also dear friends: Senators Bill Frist, George Allen, Conrad Burns, Lincoln Chafee, Mike DeWine, Rick Santorum and JIM TALENT. . . .

Senator JIM TALENT has been an outstanding representative of the people of Missouri. A dedicated public servant, he served for 8 years in the State House of Representatives, as well as 8 years in the U.S. House. JIM was the lead author in the House of the landmark 1996 welfare reform bill that has moved more than 1 million Americans off welfare and into work and self-sufficiency.

JIM is man of impeccable character and a natural leader, and in the Senate he held a number of leadership posts in his freshman term—as the chairman of the Armed Services Seapower Subcommittee, as the chairman of the Agriculture Subcommittee on Marketing, Inspection, and Product Promotion, and as a deputy whip. He also demonstrated a remarkable ability to make things happen legislatively, with many of his bills passed by Congress and signed into law. JIM's amazing legislative record reflects not just his abilities but also the respect he earned from his colleagues.

JIM delivered on his promises to Missourians to help create jobs, grow the economy and strengthen our national defense. He also worked to improve health care, and he advocated on behalf of those who suffer from sickle cell disease and breast cancer.

It has been my pleasure to serve with JIM on the Senate Armed Services Committee. I have seen him in action and know that there is no one more committed to ensuring that our country's defenses remain strong. I was proud to work closely with him to enact legislation to prevent predatory lenders from targeting our brave men and women in uniform and their families. There is no question that he is a steadfast supporter of our service members, their families, and their livelihood.

This Chamber needs more Members like JIM, who understand that the only way to really make a difference is to put partisan concerns aside and work across the aisle. Through-

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

out his public service career, JIM TALENT has certainly made a positive difference, and he will surely be missed in the U.S. Senate.

As these men—Bill Frist, George Allen, Conrad Burns, Lincoln Chafee, Mike DeWine, Rick Santorum and JIM TALENT—conclude their service in the U.S. Senate, let me say that I am so proud to have worked with individuals of such character, strength, and intellect. Our Nation is grateful for their many contributions. And as they each will undoubtedly continue to contribute to our country's greatness, their leadership and vision will be missed here in the U.S. Senate.

○