National Association of Drug Court Professionals estimates that our actions here today will result in more than 13,000 individuals losing access to drug court services. These 13,000 people will likely continue their lives of crime and drugs and being a threat to public safety instead of getting enrolled in a tough-love program that will help them to turn their lives around and get sober. It is truly a tragedy.

It is my opinion that we found a winning formula when we made the decision to invest in our State and local law enforcement partners and smart on crime initiatives in the nineties, and I believe that we are making a terrible mistake when we reduce funding for them. There is no greater responsibility of the Federal Government than the protection of its citizens. This is true whether the threat comes from international terrorist or from a thug down the street, and I strongly believe that we are taking the wrong approach when we cut funding for our State and local law enforcement partners. Sheriff Ted Sexton, the president of the National Sheriffs Association, got it right when he stated that ''cuts of this magnitude will seriously inhibit our ability to protect our communities and secure the homeland.'' And, the president of the International Association of Chiefs of Police was correct in pointing out that ''demanding that we play a central role in our Nation's homeland security efforts, while at the same time cutting the resources we need to do our job, is both hypocritical and irresponsible.'' I hope that the Republican-led Congress and President Bush will heed the call of these brave men and women and fully fund these critical programs next year.

MANUFACTURING DEDUCTION LEGISLATION

Mr. SANTORUM. I introduced a bill last month, S. 1816, that is vitally important to manufacturing businesses and the workers they employ in Puerto Rico. My bill extends the benefits of the manufacturing deduction, enacted last year with the American Jobs Creation Act of 2004, to apply to manufacturing operations that are conducted in Puerto Rico and are subject to full U.S. tax.

The new manufacturing deduction means that U.S. businesses operating in any of the 50 States will pay tax on their manufacturing income at 32 percent. Without the manufacturing deduction, U.S. businesses operating a branch in Puerto Rico will pay tax on their manufacturing income at 35 percent. This difference in tax treatment creates a disincentive for U.S. companies to conduct manufacturing operations in Puerto Rico, distorting manufacturing location choices and putting Puerto Rico at a disadvantage in terms of attracting and retaining investment.

My bill makes sure that manufacturing in the 50 States and manufacturing in Puerto Rico will be taxed at the same 32 percent rate. This will level the playing field for operations in Puerto Rico and operations in the States. I have a number of constituent corporations that operate in my State and have operations in Puerto Rico, and this provision is important to them.

I realize the proposal cannot be added to the budget reconciliation tax bill at this time but am hopeful it will be considered and enacted this year.

I want to applaud Ways and Means Committee Chairman BILL THOMAS for introducing H.R. 4323, which includes this extension of the manufacturing deduction to Puerto Rico. I look forward to working with Chairman THOMAS to get this important provision enacted.

MASSACRE AT SAN JOSE DE APARTADO

Mr. LEAHY. I want to speak about a matter that I suspect few Senators are aware of, but which should concern each of us.

On February 21, 2005, in the small Colombian community of San Jose de Apartado, eight people, including three children, were brutally murdered. Several of the bodies were mutilated and left to be eaten by wild animals.

This, unfortunately, was not unusual, as some 150 people, overwhelmingly civilians caught in the midst of Colombia's conflict, have been killed by paramilitaries, rebels, and Colombian soldiers in that same community since 1997. None of those crimes has resulted in effective investigations or prosecutions. No one has been punished.

That is an astonishing fact. Think of 150 murders, including massacres of groups of people, in a single rural community, and no one punished.

This latest atrocity occurred in a remote area frequented by rebels and paramilitaries. As a result, the presence of the Colombian army has also grown significantly there. Yet the army, which was sent to that area to protect civilians from attacks by illegal armed groups, is now suspected by some of having committed this massacre.

Residents of San Jose de Apartado have blamed the army, and international observers who went with community members to locate the bodies witnessed disturbing behavior by soldiers who reportedly laughed while body parts were being exhumed, who took pictures of themselves making victory signs, and who mishandled evidence from the massacre sites. There is also the possibility that paramilitaries acted in collusion with the army. And some have speculated that there were two separate groups of perpetrators, perhaps including the FARC, the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia, the country's oldest rebel group.

Even before an investigation began, top Colombian officials publicly declared that the FARC was responsible. The Minister of Defense, who has since resigned, insisted that the army could not have done this because on February 21 they were more than 2 days' walking distance from the crime scene. It was soon determined, however, that there were soldiers only half a day's walk away, and army helicopters had recently been seen in the vicinity.

While it has not been proven who is responsible for this horrific crime, the government's rush to judgment was only its first mistake. That was quickly followed by the decision, against the wishes of the community, to send armed police officers into their midst. While I do not doubt the authority of Colombian police to enter that territory, it caused the majority of its inhabitants to flee their homes out of fear that the police would become a target of illegal groups and that the villagers could once again be harmed.

In fact, such an attack took place on June 26, when three policemen were wounded in an attack by the FARC and community members were caught in the crossfire. Later, on July 18, an old man was found beaten to death. There were two more killings by the FARC, one in August and another in September, and verbal threats and acts of intimidation by soldiers and police officers towards members of the community have reportedly steadily increased. Then last month, there were three incidents in which armed paramilitaries and soldiers reportedly threatened members of the community and destroyed property. It appears that the community may be no safer today than it was on February 21.

One of the consequences of the government's tactless approach to this and previous cases is that several witnesses from the community have refused to come forward and give testimony, and this has hindered the investigation. After a massacre of 6 members of this same community 5 years ago when over 100 people gave testimony to judicial authorities, no one was convicted and no report on the investigation was ever issued. Convincing witnesses to come forward this time will require a degree of sensitivity by the government that has, to date, been sorely lacking.

We are told by the Colombian Government that an investigation of the massacre is ongoing. That, unfortunately, is the story of most heinous crimes in Colombia. Investigations often continue without end, and often the perpetrators avoid punishment. I am concerned that this case may be no different.

According to information I have received, neither the soldiers who were in the area at the time of the February 21 killings nor hospital workers who treated a girl who was wounded by soldiers there the previous day have been interviewed by investigators. I find this hard to believe, but if it is correct the government has much to answer for.

For 5 years, the United States has provided significant military aid to Colombia despite ongoing concerns about human rights. Several months ago, the

Secretary of State certified that the Colombian Government had met the human rights conditions in our law, and recommended the release of additional military aid. However, the report accompanying her certification also noted that ''[w]hile the human rights performance of many of the Army's units is improving, an exception is evidenced by continued accusations of human rights violations and collusion with paramilitaries against the Army's 17th Brigade, which operates in northern Colombia. These reportedly include some 200 allegations involving the peace community of San Jose de Apartado in 2000–2001 and, most recently, of involvement in the killings near San Jose de Apartado in February 2005. . . As a result of these allegations, the United States has informed the Government of Colombia that it will not consider providing assistance to the 17th Brigade until all significant human rights allegations involving the unit have been credibly addressed.''

While I might differ with the Secretary's decision to make the certification at the time she did, which coincidently occurred just hours before President Uribe's arrival at President Bush's ranch in Texas, I commend her decision to withhold aid to the 17th Brigade. It is noteworthy, however, that concerns about the 17th Brigade had been conveyed to the State Department well before this incident, including reports that its members were openly colluding with paramilitaries. Yet there is reason to believe that U.S. aid continued despite those reports.

This case presents the Bush administration with an important challenge. It shows that despite billions of dollars from the United States and lofty rhetoric about human rights, the Colombian Government's initial reaction to this despicable crime was not appreciably different from what we saw years ago. They denied responsibility and blamed the victims even before an investigation began, and some of the key witnesses may not even have been interviewed 8 months later.

This is unfortunate because there has been progress on human rights under President Uribe's government. Parts of the country are noticeably safer. The government reports a significant decline in violent crime. But labor leaders and human rights defenders are still threatened and killed, the judicial system remains sluggish, and impunity is more the rule than the exception. Clearly, much more needs to be done to protect human rights.

This case also presents a challenge for the Colombian Government to demonstrate, albeit belatedly, that it can respond with sympathy, with impartiality, and effectively to bring justice to the victims of a crime that epitomizes the worst of Colombia's conflict.

I am also told that the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights conducted its own investigation of the massacre, but that the Colombian Government has not requested a copy of the report of that investigation. If this is correct I urge the government to do so immediately and to release as much of the report to the public as possible without compromising the investigation.

This conflict has brought nothing but suffering to the Colombian people. It has caused the deaths of countless innocent civilians, uprooted millions from their homes, and perpetuated the trade in illegal drugs that has corrupted many sectors of society. The people of San Jose de Apartado, with the conflict raging around them, sought to insolate themselves from this danger by declaring themselves a peace community. That strategy failed, as one after another of their members was brutally murdered.

Before February 21, I was not aware of the many tragedies this community had already suffered. While I do know, as a former prosecutor, that some crimes are harder to solve than others, in Colombia, as in so many countries, political will is often what really matters. It is imperative that this case not be added to the long list of unsolved, unpunished crimes in San Jose de Apartado, or become part of the history of impunity in Colombia. Who ever was responsible must be brought to justice.

Mr. President, I also want to mention the demobilization of paramilitaries that is underway in Colombia. We all want these narco-terrorist organizations to be dismantled, their commanders punished, their illegally acquired assets seized, and their victims compensated. The Colombian Government is asking the United States for millions of dollars to help finance the demobilization, and we want to help.

I am concerned, however, because if the demobilization of the paramilitary unit located in the area of San Jose de Apartado is indicative of the way this process is unfolding, there are serious problems that need to be addressed. According to reports I have received, paramilitaries are engaging in the same threatening and violent behavior, they continue to collude with the army, and some have joined the army. Little has changed for the people in that area who continue to live in fear of losing their property and their lives. I hope the Colombian authorities who have been touting the success of the demobilization process will investigate these reports.

THE GREAT AMERICAN SMOKEOUT

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I would like to take a moment to acknowledge an important event that is taking place today in Philadelphia, PA and across the Nation—the 29th Annual American Cancer Society Great American Smokeout.

We are all aware that cancer is one of the greatest healthcare risks facing Americans today. For years, this disease has taken the lives of our families, our friends, and our neighbors. As a member of the bipartisan Senate Cancer Coalition, I certainly understand that there are few things that would have a greater impact on the quality of life, for millions throughout the world, than the eradication of this terrible disease.

Unfortunately, we are also all aware of the fact that we have not yet found a cure. And while scientists and researchers around the world work feverishly towards this lofty aspiration, the most important action we can take is the promotion of cancer prevention. The Great American Smokeout is a wonderful example of a successful program aimed at assisting those at great risk of developing cancer to change their ways. This annual event has, undoubtedly, saved lives.

Since the inaugural Great American Smokeout took place in 1976, this initiative has provided a powerful platform for the American Cancer Society to encourage Americans to stop smoking. This event, which urges Americans who take the unnecessary health risks associated with the use of tobacco products to band together and make a lifestyle change, is one of the most recognized awareness initiatives in the history of the American Cancer Society—and rightfully so. Rarely does any organization touch so many with its message in a single day as the American Cancer Society during the smokeout. And rarely is the intention of the message as important as reducing the number of Americans who use tobacco products.

I am also pleased that the American Cancer Society has chosen my home State to host this year's smokeout. Pennsylvania has a long history of working with the American Cancer Society, and in 2002, together with the Pennsylvania Department of Health, they established the Pennsylvania Free Quitline. This toll-free service, available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, provides advice and counseling to those attempting to quit smoking. Studies have shown that smokers who take advantage of such services are twice as likely to successfully quit smoking. By choosing Pennsylvania as the host for one of their most important events, the society is reaffirming its commitment to decreasing the prevalence of tobacco use in my state—and, in turn, improving the health of all Pennsylvanians.

Mr. President, these types of efforts have helped the American Cancer Society develop a reputation as one of the most influential and effective participants in the fight to better the health of every American. The Great American Smokeout is a vital event put on by a truly impressive organization, and I thank the American Cancer Society for its leadership.

COLON CANCER SCREEN FOR LIFE ACT

Mr. NELSON of Nebraska. Mr. President, I rise in support of the Colon Cancer Screen for Life Act, S. 1010. Some