

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I join the remarks of the Senator from Ohio acknowledging the great contribution made to America by our men and women in uniform. I hope we can honor their service, not only by providing for them while they are at war but providing for them as well when they come home. I am sure the Senator joins me in believing that a new GI bill which will provide for those returning soldiers is a fitting tribute to their service and a great investment in our future.

Our initial GI bill after World War II was born in conflict. After World War I, those returning soldiers marched on Washington time and again, demanding some payment for their service to our country. They were rebuffed and even attacked at times by our then Army in uniform. By the Second World War, we understood that we owed a great debt to the 16 million men and women who served, and 8 million of them took advantage of the GI bill.

That GI bill was groundbreaking and revolutionary. It paid for their tuition, their books, their room and board, as well as a monthly allotment so they could go to school. Those graduates of the GI bill became the thriving middle class of America that built our great Nation in the late 1940s, 1950s, and 1960s. It was the greatest single investment in returning soldiers in our history, and it should be replicated.

Those who honor the armed services should also honor them when they come home, to make sure they receive all the health care and benefits promised and are given a chance to have a full life after having served our country so well.

I am happy to identify myself with the remarks of the Senator from Ohio.

REPUBLICAN FILIBUSTERS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I also want to say that this has been a week when we have achieved a few things in the Senate but not nearly enough. We started off the Senate with a historic occasion, one which is not likely to be remembered by great historians but should be remembered by all who follow the business of the Senate. As of this week, the Republicans, the minority in the Senate, have now engaged in 71 Republican filibusters. A filibuster is an effort to stop the business on the floor of the Senate or at least to slow it down. It is a time-honored tradition in the Senate, but it is a tradition which has not been overused until this session of Congress.

In the entire history of the Senate, the total number of filibusters in any 2-year period, the maximum, was 57. So far in this 2-year period, the Republicans have engaged in 71 filibusters, and, of course, we have another 6 or 7 months to go in this session of Congress. It is clear that their ambition is to stop the Senate from addressing the major issues facing our Nation, or at least to slow us down to a crawl.

We have what we believe are good ideas and good proposals to deal with the high gasoline prices facing America's families and businesses, farmers and truckers. We have good proposals to deal with tax breaks for working families so they can meet the needs of their families with escalating prices for food and health care and daycare and the cost of daily living. Again, the Republicans have done their best to slow us down, if not stop us.

It reached a point several weeks ago that was nothing short of ridiculous. The Republicans initiated a filibuster to slow down the consideration of a bill known as a technical corrections bill. That is a bill that takes care of spelling and grammar errors. They engaged in a filibuster to slow down the Senate so it would take us a whole week to finish a technical corrections bill. When we finally reached the point and asked them for amendments, they had three or four that could have been dispensed with quickly.

They are dragging their feet and slowing us down with this record number of filibusters. But that isn't it alone. There is also a device in the Senate known as a hold. Most every Senator has used a hold, either on a bill or a nomination. Some of the holds that have been applied recently are so-called secret holds. Senators don't step forward to identify why they have held up a nomination or bill.

I have used holds. I am currently using those. But I have been very public about it. I have said exactly why I am doing it and the conditions for my releasing the hold. For example, when the Department of Justice wanted the approval of the Deputy Attorney General Mark Filip, a good man from Chicago, I said I would hold his nomination until I had received responses to questions I had submitted to the Department months before. Well, to his credit, Attorney General Mukasey moved on it extremely quickly. Within 48 hours, I had the answers and withdrew the hold immediately as promised. I am sorry it reached that point, but after waiting months, I didn't know another way to turn to get answers to important questions. So holds can be used effectively and honestly and openly.

Then again, there are holds that have been applied that I think are almost impossible to explain or justify. For example, one of the Senators on the Republican side has put a hold on a bill which was not controversial and very bipartisan, which would establish in the United States a national registry of those who are suffering from a disease known as ALS, or Lou Gehrig's disease. It is a terrible, debilitating disease. It was the hope of the sponsor, Senator HARRY REID of Nevada, that we could establish this registry and move even closer to finding the cause of this disease and perhaps lead to a cure. It was certainly a high-minded and sensible approach to a very serious medical condition affecting thousands of families across America.

One of the Senators from Oklahoma on the Republican side put a hold on this bill—in other words, stopped us from calling this bill for a vote. That is extremely unfortunate. There is nothing controversial about this bill. He should reconsider that hold. But it is not the only one.

PEPFAR REAUTHORIZATION

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I rise this evening to speak for a few moments about another hold that has been placed on critically important legislation.

Anyone who follows what we do here on the floor of the Senate or in the House of Representatives knows that many of us on the Democratic side have disagreed with President Bush as to his policies. Over the last 7 years, there have been ample opportunities to vote against the President's policies, whether it is on the invasion, the war in Iraq, or economic policies that brought us to this sorry stage of the American economy, with working families struggling to pay their bills and to survive.

I have opposed President Bush's economic policies and many other things during the course of his administration. But there was one moment I can still recall when the President gave a State of the Union Address and announced that the United States would try to lead the world in dealing with the global AIDS epidemic. On the Democratic side, I joined many of my colleagues, standing and applauding President Bush for that announcement. Though I may disagree with him on many issues, I salute him for his special efforts to deal with the global epidemic of AIDS and tuberculosis and malaria.

The President established a program known as the President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief, commonly known as PEPFAR. This important program is up for reauthorization so that it can continue to save lives across the world.

They have renamed it in honor of two men who served in the House of Representatives—one a Democrat, Tom Lantos; the other a Republican from Illinois, Henry Hyde. It is known as the Tom Lantos and Henry J. Hyde United States Global Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria Reauthorization Act.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee considered this bill and passed it out 18 to 3—an overwhelming bipartisan vote. Our colleagues in the House passed a similar measure with an overwhelming vote at the end of March of this year.

The President has urged Congress to send him the bill before the end of the year. President Bush takes great pride in this bill. He believes it is one of the hallmarks of his tenure in office and administration. I join him. I think it is his most positive achievement as President of the United States.

The purpose of this bill is to prevent 12 million new infections; support