

HONORING THE LIFE OF ELVIN
OREN CRAIG

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I would like to honor the life of a special Idahoan who is also the father of my colleague from Idaho, Senator LARRY CRAIG. Elvin Oren Craig, who passed away last week, left many legacies and will be missed by many people. In Idaho, he served as a lifelong advocate for Idaho agriculture, and a leader in Washington County, Midvale and Weiser. He also was very active in his local VFW Post in Midvale, ID. At 87 years old, he had remained active despite a diagnosis of prostate cancer. In fact, he worked until only about 6 months ago when he decided it might be time to let up a little bit. Elvin Craig's legacy also lives on in my colleague and in Senator CRAIG's consistent and honorable service to Idahoans over his years in public office. I know that Elvin was proud of his son's service to Idaho and the country—first in the Idaho State Senate, then in the U.S. House of Representatives, and now in the U.S. Senate.

Elvin's family and friends know of his community service and his persistent commitment over many years to Idaho's farmers and ranchers and his own family. He worked hard while maintaining his sense of humor. His full life was an outstanding example of what it means to be an Idahoan. I am pleased to pay tribute to a remarkable man, Elvin Oren Craig, and to share my condolences to my friend, LARRY CRAIG, and his family upon the passing of a great man.

SECOND AMENDMENT PROTECTION
ACT OF 2005

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce a bill that would withhold United States contributions to the United Nations if the U.N. interferes with the second amendment rights guaranteed by our Constitution.

The U.N. has no business interfering with the second amendment rights guaranteed by our Constitution. That is why I am introducing legislation to safeguard our citizens against any potential infringement of their second amendment rights.

In July, 2001, the U.N. convened a conference, known as the "Conference on the Illicit Trade of Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects in July 2001." One outcome of the conference was a resolution entitled, "The United Nations Program of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects." This resolution calls for actions that could abridge the second amendment rights of individuals in the United States, including: (1) national registries and tracking lists of legal firearms; (2) the establishment of an international tracking certificate, which could be used to ensure U.N. monitoring of the export, import, transit, stocking, and

storage of legal small arms and light weapons; and (3) worldwide record keeping for an indefinite amount of time on the manufacture, holding, and transfer of small arms and light weapons.

The U.N. also wishes to establish a system for tracking small arms and light weapons. How would they do this? It would be done by forcing legal, licensed gun manufacturer's to create identifiable marks for each nation. The gun manufacturer's lists would then be provided to international authorities on behalf of the U.N.

Who would maintain these intrusive lists? Would it be the World Customs Organization, which the U.N. has suggested as a possible vehicle? That organization counts Iran, Syria, China, and Cuba among its membership. Would all World Customs Organization members have access to such lists? In the event that those with access to such information abuse or misuse it, what would be the remedy? How would we prevent unauthorized persons, perhaps criminals and terrorists, from acquiring such information from rogue nations who have declared the United States an enemy?

Some at the U.N. have suggested that tracing certain financial transactions of a legal and law abiding gun industry could be a useful tool in tracking firearms. What would such tracing entail? Does the U.N. expect to receive private U.S. banking records of a legal and law abiding industry?

Furthermore, the U.N. has encouraged member States to integrate measures to control ammunition with regard to small arms, and some members have expressed a desire to tax international arms sales. The U.N. has no legal right or authority to collect a tax from American citizens to further any agenda, especially gun control measures.

The U.S. Constitution has guaranteed our citizens the right to keep and bear arms. I intend to help protect that right with this legislation. I urge my colleagues to support the Second Amendment Protection Act of 2005.

LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT
ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2005

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

Last year, an African-American transgender woman was brutally beaten, raped, and strangled in a San Francisco hotel. The murder is under investigation and anti-transgender bias has been looked into as a motive.

I believe that the government's first duty is to defend its citizens, to defend

them against the harms that come out of hate. The Local Law Enforcement Enhancement Act is a symbol that can become substance. I believe that by passing this legislation and changing current law, we can change hearts and minds as well.

CONGRESSMAN JOHN LEWIS AND
THE VOTING RIGHTS ACT

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, last month, the debate over the nomination of Judge William Pryor to the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals included a discussion of Judge Pryor's call to repeal section 5 of the Voting Rights Act—the centerpiece of that landmark statute—because, as he asserted in congressional testimony, it "is an affront to federalism and an expensive burden that has far outlived its usefulness." His testimony demonstrated that Judge Pryor is more concerned with preventing an "affront" to the States' dignity than with guaranteeing all citizens the right to cast an equal vote.

In the Republican defense of Judge Pryor, it was suggested that Congressman JOHN LEWIS, a stalwart leader of the civil rights movement, somehow agreed with Judge Pryor's opposition to section 5 of the Voting Rights Act because of a statement Congressman LEWIS had made about a specific redistricting plan.

Congressman LEWIS has made clear many times, most recently in a July 14 letter to me, his disagreement with the views of Judge Pryor and his strong support for the Voting Rights Act—and particularly section 5. Congressman LEWIS wrote:

Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act must be renewed. There is a continued, proven need for the pre-clearance provisions of the Voting Rights Act, which ensure that local and state jurisdiction do not develop laws that intentionally or unintentionally discriminate against groups who may have little or no voice in the establishment of those laws.

His statements of support for one particular redistricting plan in no way diminish his commitment to the Voting Rights Act.

Congressman LEWIS believes, as do I, that the Voting Rights Act is our most important protection guaranteeing that no individuals or groups are without a voice in this democracy. As he so eloquently noted:

The history of the right to vote in America is a history of conflict, of struggling for the right to vote. Many people died trying to protect that right. I was beaten and jailed because I stood up for it. For millions like me, the struggle for the right to vote is not mere history; it is experience. The experience of the last two presidential elections tells us that the struggle is not over and that the special provisions of the Voting Rights Act are still necessary.

I ask unanimous consent that Congressman LEWIS's letter be printed in the RECORD at the end of my statement.

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

(See exhibit 1.)