

assumption variables in the study, and it would continue to protect a number of its product lines where the U.S. stands to gain the most from market access. The proposal of the G-20 group would yield an extra \$7.5 billion per year, a bare minimum.

Moreover, the benefit to U.S. production agriculture from increased earnings under the U.S. proposal would provide latitude for writers of the next farm bill to adjust domestic programs to accommodate two important realities. Some of our domestic programs have been ruled trade-distorting under the WTO. Ultimately we will have to reform these programs. Either we change our farm programs now by negotiation in the WTO where we can get something in return for them, or we will be forced to change them by litigation by which we don't get anything for them. Here is the perfect opportunity, where we can gain market access and income to offset changes made domestically.

The second reality is the cost of farm programs. That cost may not seem like much in years of little budget competition. But today we are in a budgetary climate where any policy that depends on government financing is subject for review. There is strong competition for public outlays, and an effort to reduce the deficit places new scrutiny on all programs.

We all have just experienced the budget reconciliation process in Congress. In agriculture, we were obligated to find \$3 billion worth of savings to accommodate budget targets. That is just the beginning, and we are well advised to know the alternatives available to us to make adjustments in important programs in advance of the need. This WTO negotiation provides the U.S. with the opportunity to convert its aggressive proposal for reform into real income for farmers and agribusiness. For instance, if the U.S. program crops like wheat, corn, rice, and soybeans continue to be under pressure in the WTO for the portions of their domestic subsidy programs that "distort" trade, the advent of the next farm bill provides us a chance to convert supports for those crops into a format that conforms to WTO guidelines. In return, we gain the market access from our trading partners to sell them U.S. fruit and vegetables, meat and dairy products, and other specialty crops not previously allowed into their markets in sufficient quantity.

If we don't succeed in opening those opportunities for U.S. agriculture, we will have nothing with which to persuade our producers to give up the expensive domestic subsidies to which they have become accustomed. Another expensive, non-innovative, and divisive farm bill might unfortunately be the result. Mr. President, a great deal is riding on the success of the Doha Round.

#### REPRESENTATIVE JOHN MURTHA'S SPEECH

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about Representative JOHN MURTHA's statement on Iraq. JOHN MURTHA is right. We need an exit strategy from Iraq. The administration should have had one before the war.

As I and other Members of Congress consistently requested before Operation Iraqi Freedom, OIF, began, it was imperative for the administration to have a plan for both entering and, now more importantly, for exiting Iraq. We are 2 years into OIF with no clear end in sight. There is no excuse for not having one now.

We must provide the Iraqi people with the tools necessary to stand on their own. Only the Iraqi people can rebuild Iraq. Only the Iraqi people can defend Iraq. We cannot do it for them. We cannot want it more than they want it. What we must do is provide them with the means to accomplish this, but what we are unable to do is to give them the will.

Whether we leave Iraq tomorrow, or in 6 months, or longer, the President needs to tell the American people when and how we will be able to withdraw our troops. We cannot afford to lose more Americans in Iraq.

JOHN MURTHA is a great patriotic American. His service in the military and in the U.S. Congress cannot be measured. Those who disparage him tarnish only themselves.

Everyone who knows JOHN MURTHA knows that he believes in his heart and soul in the American military and he will do everything he can to help them. He should be listened to for what he has done, for who he is, and because he is right.

#### NATIONAL SECURITY PERSONNEL SYSTEM REGULATIONS

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I am very disappointed with the U.S. Department of Defense and Office of Personnel Management's final regulations for the National Security Personnel System, NSPS, that will affect more than 350,000 defense civil service employees throughout our Nation. What makes the new system dangerous is that upon a cursory glance, it would almost appear "acceptable" in the name of national security. Scratch the surface, however, and it becomes very alarming.

The rhetoric does not match reality. U.S. Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld in public testimony stated that these new regulations "would not end collective bargaining," but, rather, would "bring collective bargaining to the national level" to avoid duplication and inefficiency. This has not occurred, nor do I believe there is a sincere interest in the Pentagon to pursue national collective bargaining. In fact, I would suspect that the Pentagon's plan is just the opposite—to substantially remove from the table the num-

ber of subjects for good faith collective bargaining.

For this reason, I am pleased that the employee unions have gone to Federal court to challenge the regulations, in the same fashion that they challenged the Department of Homeland Security regulations. I hope they will prevail in their call for injunctive relief, as they did in the Homeland Security case, as well as to prevail in the final disposition of both cases.

While I would be the first to say that the Federal civil service system is not perfect, it is a system that has withstood the test of time as fair and impartial. To overhaul it in favor of vesting the subjective power to hire, fire, discipline and promote in the hands of a few political appointees is very dangerous. At this point, the "seemingly acceptable" national security rationale for the wholesale stripping of employees' rights fast begins to lose its luster. It is no longer reasonable. There seems to me to be an inherent conflict. In the name of national security, this administration is willing to deny its own workers a small modicum of security—employment and family security—especially when I do not believe it is necessary to achieve our goal of national security. I call into question the motivations behind their actions.

My position on the Pentagon's issuance of the NSPS regulations is what I believe any decent fellow would say: Now is the time for our Nation to come together in support of our armed services abroad. To do so, we must stand behind our civilian defense workforce from whom we are demanding great productivity in support of our troops.

Now is not the time to be divisive and punitive of our Federal workforce. It creates low morale, mistrust, and a decreasing level of respect between worker and management. The consequences stemming from such instability, could be dire. For me, the stakes in terms of human lives are too high to be taking such a gamble. United we stand—civilian and military together. Divided we could fail.

#### NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I rise to speak in favor of my amendment No. 2528, unanimously adopted into the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2006, to provide targeted size standard relief for small U.S. contractors incurring extraordinary security and protection costs on foreign battlefields in the global war on terror.

Right now, in Iraq and Afghanistan, there are many brave, small contracting businesses working alongside our uniformed soldiers in many cases. Employees of these small contracting firms get shot at and encounter roadside bombs, suicide attacks, ambushes, and kidnappings. Yet, in order to provide our military with desperately needed goods and services, these small

battlefield firms diligently endure these daily risks.

These daily dangers force small conflict zone firms to hire well armed, private security guards, and to incur extraordinary security expenses in order to protect their employees. The violence towards civilian contractors in Iraq and Afghanistan has become so prevalent that the government often requires companies to provide security services, and treats these extraordinary security costs as reimbursable contractor expenses. These security expense reimbursements do not increase or expand small contracting firms' core business capabilities. Instead the money the government pays to small battlefield contractors for security expenses is passed directly through to the security subcontractor providing protection to the small firms' employees.

Unfortunately, the Government's valid reimbursement of conflict-zone security expenses artificially inflates the size of many small battlefield firms causing them to out grow the Small Business Administration's small businesses size standards. It is important to understand that the SBA size standards were established on the basis of normal revenues for small businesses operating in North America. But, currently, these domestic size standards are penalizing our small contractors operating outside the U.S. and in war zones by eliminating their ability to obtain crucial small business contracts and loans once they exceed the domestic standards.

Our most reliable and dependable small battlefield firms, because they operate overseas, are in danger of artificially outgrowing the SBA's domestic size standards. Not only does this artificial growth hurt small business ability to survive, it also harms the U.S. Government's ability to secure contracts for much needed goods and services that are used to support our troops in war zones. This ultimately reduces the Federal Government's access to experienced small contractors and hampers the Government's efforts to comply with the Government's annual statutory small business contracting goals.

My amendment directs the SBA to conduct a study and provide a report to Congress on the fairness of exempting reimbursement for subcontracts for private security services from the size standards caps applicable to small firms that perform contracts and subcontracts on overseas battlefields. I urge my colleagues to support our small battlefield contractors currently in harms' way by retaining this important amendment in the Defense authorization conference report.

#### SCIENCE, STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE APPROPRIATIONS

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, earlier this week the Senate passed the conference report accompanying H.R. 2862, the Science, State, Justice and Commerce Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2006.

As the ranking member on the Appropriations Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, and Science, I rise today to explain how this legislation is critical to spurring economic innovation in our Nation and how the bill protects communities and saves lives and livelihoods.

I believe this appropriations bill is an important step in making our country more competitive in the global economy. The future of our economic security as well as our national security will depend upon our ability to innovate. This bill is a major Federal investment in innovation through science and technology, and it will help make America stronger by investing in our future.

Innovation begins with basic research. H.R. 2862 funds the National Science Foundation, NSF, at \$5.6 billion, a \$180 million increase over last year.

The key to innovation is investing in basic research in the physical sciences—biology, chemistry, physics and the cutting edge interdisciplinary initiatives in nanotechnology, biotechnology and information technology. The National Academy of Sciences, the Council on Competitiveness, and numerous other organizations have all called for a substantial increase in our investment in basic scientific research. This bill makes a downpayment on that investment.

The technology of tomorrow will create the jobs of tomorrow. But if we don't invest in research, the technology and the jobs will go overseas.

But it is not just about investing in research, we also have to invest in education. This bill preserves funding for graduate student stipends at \$30,000 per year. NSF funds critical programs to improve the teaching of math and science and to improve science and math curriculum in our schools. We must increase the number of math and science teachers as well as the number of math and science students.

In addition, government and the private sector must work together to spur innovation in our economy. That is where the National Institute of Standards and Technology, NIST, comes into play. NIST invests in new technologies that lead to new breakthroughs that create jobs to make our nation more competitive. NIST also sets industry standards so that American business can be competitive abroad. H.R. 2862 funds NIST at \$761 million, a \$62 million increase over last year.

This legislation also funds other important agencies that are on the cutting edge of science and technology that can save lives and communities.

The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, NOAA, is responsible for the National Weather Service as well as critical research into oceans, fisheries and the Earth's atmosphere.

For NOAA, we have provided \$3.9 billion, a \$20 million increase over last year. Whether it is warning us about

severe weather so we can secure our property and get out of harm's way, or helping to restore our fisheries that are so critical to our economy, NOAA saves lives and communities every day.

In space, this appropriations bill fully funds the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, NASA, and the cutting edge scientific and technological research that only NASA can do.

For NASA, we have provided \$16.4 billion, which is a \$260 million increase over last year. This includes \$271 million for the Hubble Space Telescope, \$50 million over the President's budget request to accommodate a servicing mission to Hubble, should the Administrator determine that the space shuttle is safe to use.

The servicing of Hubble will involve replacing batteries, gyroscopes and installing new scientific instruments to make Hubble more powerful than ever. Hubble is the very symbol of innovation and discovery that are hallmarks of America's space program.

We continue our investment in the Mars program and fully fund the next generation of launch vehicles to replace the space shuttle.

All major science programs are funded at the President's request level or higher including the Living With A Star program which is crucial to understanding the Sun's effects on the Earth.

While NSF, NOAA, NIST and NASA are all integral to our nation's ability to innovate, along with our other federal agencies, it is the private sector that is responsible for most of the innovation that drives our economy.

The Patent and Trademark Office, PTO, plays a central role in protecting our nation's valuable intellectual property. The PTO has a backlog of applications waiting to be processed. H.R. 2862 funds the PTO at a record \$1.7 billion, a 30 percent increase over last year.

This record increase will go a long way towards helping the PTO reduce the backlog of patent applications so we can properly protect our intellectual property and maintain our competitiveness.

But as we invest in our future, this legislation also takes care of our day-to-day needs especially when it comes to protecting our neighborhoods and communities.

In making our country safer, the Department of Justice is our front line. This bill provides \$21 billion to the Justice Department, \$800 million more than last year. The Justice Department accounts for almost 50% of the entire bill. This includes funding for the FBI, DEA, ATF, U.S. Marshals, U.S. Attorneys as well as the Federal Prison System.

The Justice Department provides assistance to our state and local law enforcement and help communities fight gang violence. It also protects us from terrorists and protects our neighborhoods and communities. Specifically, the FBI will receive \$5.7 billion in 2006,