

has swirled around a provision also in NCLB that allows a student or parent to request that contact information not be released to recruiters. School districts are required to inform parents and students that they have the option to make this request.

In some areas the debate on this provision has gone much further. The city of San Francisco recently voted in favor of Measure I, a symbolic measure that opposes, but does not forbid, military recruiting on public high school or college campuses. The city cannot forbid military recruiting at public high schools as doing so would put the schools at risk of losing all federal funding. I cannot fathom why the city passed this Measure. Students in San Francisco should have access to the same information that all other students have, and should be allowed to hear what the military has to offer them.

I understand the concerns surrounding privacy of personal information in today's society. However, I find it appalling that people have taken this provision and used it to rally against our troops, against our military system, and against our President.

We are here today because we are secured by the presence of our military that protects our freedoms. My question is why are we so frightened by the very instrument that helps keep us free?

Service in our armed forces is 100 percent voluntary and has been since the end of the Vietnam War. In order to maintain a voluntary force, the services must offer incentives to allow them to compete with the private sector for young, bright students about to graduate from high school. Recruiters search for the best and the brightest in our Nation's high schools to keep our forces strong and able to fight the forces that are against our way of life.

In the last 30 years, millions of young Americans have been given technical skills, received money for college tuition and preferred loans for first-time home purchases by choosing to serve in our military. Not only are these young soldiers given skills that can lead them to future employment, they are also given unique leadership training. Our military trains leaders not just for war, but for success in life.

Yet, it is perplexing to me that many parents today seem to look at military service as being akin to joining a radical cult or a violent gang. Military recruiters are going to our Nation's high schools to inform high school students of the opportunities that are available in our Armed Forces. Military recruiters are on campuses to provide information to students that is often not available in the mainstream media or in many high school counseling offices. Military recruiters are on high school campuses to dispel the many myths that surround service opportunities in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marines and Coast Guard.

Some parents are concerned about reports of recruiter abuse. In fact, following televised reports of recruiter abuse, the U.S. Army stopped recruiting activities for one day to review procedures that its 7,500 recruiters use.

In one case the network reported a recruiter suggesting how a volunteer might cheat to pass a drug test, and in another, a sergeant threatened a prospect with arrest if he didn't report to a recruiting station. Two cases out of 7,500 Army recruiters operating out of some 1,700 recruiting stations nationwide prompted the Army to stand down, to refocus recruiters on their mission, reinforcing the Army's core values, and ensure its procedures were carried out consistently at all recruiting stations. It sounds like a pretty responsible reaction to me. It sounds like an institution concerned about doing things the right way.

We must not forget the brave young men and women who do sign up for a tour of duty with the military. They swear to uphold and to protect the Constitution. We must not forget they take that duty seriously. They protect each and every one of us from outside threats, not just threats of violence but also threats to our constitutionally protected freedoms of speech and religion.

In his book "The Greatest Generation," Tom Brokaw recounts a generation of Americans who sacrificed all they had to preserve our freedoms. Young men even went so far as to lie about their age so they could enjoy the honor of fighting for our country in World War II. Their country needed them, and they responded with uncommon valor and courage. The crucible of war formed who we are as a country today. Today, our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines stand on the shoulders of those warriors. We celebrate their accomplishments in movies and books. We regale them with the honors they earned and deserve. I wonder what sort of message we are sending to today's youth if we honor the soldiers of yesterday but shun the soldiers of today.

My fear is that freedom is becoming almost too free, too entitled to more and more Americans. As long as we are free to switch cell phone service or download music from any Web site, we believe our freedoms are intact. But freedom is about so much more than that. Freedom is having the ability to speak our mind and stand for what we believe. Freedom means having the right to publicly disagree with the decisions of elected leaders. Freedom is a right, but it comes with a responsibility.

As a parent, I have the direct responsibility to teach my children about the honor in serving our fellow man, our community, and in serving our country. As parents, from the time our children are born, we worry about their health, the friends they keep, the decisions they make, and the grades they bring home from school. We worry

about drugs, letting them drive, and about preparing them for a life after mom and dad. But when we shield young adults from the things that scare us as parents, we belittle our children. It is our responsibility to share the world with our children, in many cases, the good with the bad. It is our responsibility to instill in them a sense of pride in our country and in the freedom we enjoy.

We cannot shield our children from information about military service because in doing so, we underestimate our children's capacity to judge for themselves what their future should be. It is vital that our young adults in high school have access not only to future employment and educational opportunities but also to the opportunities provided in the U.S. military. And most importantly, it is absolutely necessary that our Nation's military have the opportunity to recruit the best and the brightest our Nation has to offer. If we continue to discriminate against our military recruiters, we risk undermining the well-being of our military. We risk fracturing the base on which our Army, our Navy, our Air Force and our Marines is built. It is vital that recruiters have access to our Nation's young adults to continue the traditions of our Armed Forces.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. I inform the Senator from Florida that there is approximately 8 minutes remaining of the time reserved for the majority leader; there is 30 minutes reserved for the Democratic leader. The Senator may request to speak out of turn and have his time allocated toward the Democratic leader's time.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. I ask unanimous consent to do so.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Florida is recognized.

CONFISCATION OF SENIORS' PRESCRIPTION DRUGS

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, I share with the Senate that there have been a couple of occurrences in Florida over the course of this recess that might be worth noting.

The first is, seniors were assured by the Food and Drug Administration 2 years ago that our senior citizens would not be harassed by the confiscation of their prescription drugs when they order those prescriptions by the Internet or by mail from Canada for a limited supply. The Food and Drug Administration assured me that the overall intent of the law was to stop the massive purchases of drugs out of State in which they would go on the black market, but that for senior citizens

seeking a 90-day supply, since the prescriptions are so much cheaper ordering them through Canada, there was not going to be the harassment of the confiscations.

That has dramatically changed. Over the course of the last week and a half, I have received over 100 complaints of senior citizens from all over Florida having their prescriptions, when ordered by mail or Internet from Canada, confiscated. This is serious business. This could be a matter of life and death for senior citizens who cannot afford to pay the retail price and are depending on that medicine in order to help them with whatever their ailments are—in some cases, life-threatening situations. Fortunately, we have not had any one of those reported to me, but the harassment has started.

I certainly hope there is no connection between this spike in the number of instances with Customs taking senior citizens' prescriptions. I hope there is no connection between that and trying to force senior citizens into the Medicare prescription drug benefit, the Medicare Part D. Naturally, seniors are quite resistant to the new plan.

We have talked in the Senate over and over, and I have offered amendments, all of which have had a majority vote, but under the parliamentary procedure of having to waive the Budget Act, I had to get 60 votes. I have gotten over 50 but not the 60 votes needed in order to delay the implementation of the prescription drug benefit, the deadline for signing up, which is May 15.

Naturally, seniors are resistant because they do not understand it. They are confused and in some cases bewildered. They have 40 to 50 plans to pick from. They are confused and they are frightened because if they do not pick a plan by the May deadline, they will be penalized 1 percent a month or 12 percent a year, or if they pick the wrong plan, they are stuck with that plan for a year and they have the fear that suddenly the need to change their prescription by their doctor may occur and the formulary they pick may not cover the new prescription.

This resistance is a fact. I hope we do not see any of this harassment connected with trying to force seniors into the prescription drug bill.

I call on the Department of Homeland Security, Customs, to stop harassing our senior citizens by confiscating their prescriptions for purchase of a short supply, which is bought at so much of a reduced cost.

That is not the total answer, just getting the drugs from Canada. That is bandaiding the problem. The problem is having a Medicare prescription drug benefit offered to senior citizens where Medicare can use its huge buying power of bulk purchases in order to bring down the price of the drugs, as the Veterans' Administration has been doing for the last two decades. But until we can get to that point, until we can change the law, until we can get

the votes to change the law, in the meantime, some of our senior citizens who have trouble making financial ends meet have to buy their drugs through Canada at a much reduced price.

I bring this to the attention of the Senate. I bring it to the attention of Customs, as I have through correspondence. It is time to stop harassing our senior citizens.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COLEMAN). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. MENENDEZ. I ask unanimous consent to have 12 minutes in morning business.

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

Mr. MENENDEZ. I thank the Chair. (The remarks of Mr. MENENDEZ pertaining to the introduction of S. 2334 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized.

ORDER FOR FILING DEADLINE

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the filing deadline for all amendments to S. 2271 occur at 12 noon today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I yield back the remaining Republican time for morning business.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is now closed.

USA PATRIOT ACT ADDITIONAL REAUTHORIZING AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2006

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 2271, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2271) to clarify that individuals who receive FISA orders can challenge non-disclosure requirements, that individuals who receive national security letters are not required to disclose the name of their attorney, that libraries are not wire or electronic communication service providers unless they provide specific services, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Frist Amendment No. 2895, to establish the enactment date of the Act.

Frist Amendment No. 2896 (to Amendment No. 2895), of a perfecting nature.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 12:30 p.m. will be equally divided.

The Senator from Texas is recognized.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I wish to speak about the USA PATRIOT Act. As you know, the Senate has recently agreed to another temporary extension of this act. We have twice since December been in a position of having to offer, instead of permanent reauthorization, a temporary fix. Yet at a time when so many in this body are continuing to talk about security, this one piece of legislation, in my humble opinion, has been more important in terms of protecting the security of the United States than anything else we have done since September 11.

This critical law, which, of course, provides law enforcement agencies with the vital tools necessary to fight and win the war on terror, should not be allowed to expire. I, frankly, am at a loss to explain why we are spending so much time trying to get to final closure on this legislation when the merits of the legislation seem to be so obvious—primarily by providing tools to law enforcement and intelligence agencies of this country, tools that are already in broad use in other aspects of law enforcement investigations.

Unfortunately, it seems to me that there has been a certain amount of hysteria whipped up over this to cause people to have unreasonable fear and concern about civil liberties, when, in fact, the balance between security and civil liberties has been struck in an entirely appropriate way in this legislation.

We must make it a top priority of the Senate to reauthorize this legislation as soon as possible, as it would be unconscionable to compromise the safety of the American people and undermine the progress we have made since 9/11 and delay critical investigations.

An agreement reached in December between the House and Senate conferees preserved the provisions of this act which have made America safer since 9/11 while increasing congressional and judicial oversight, which should alleviate the concerns of those who believe the law enforcement tools somehow endanger civil liberties. And even recently, the White House and leaders of the House and Senate have made additional concessions in an attempt to reach a final agreement to reauthorize the PATRIOT Act.

Unfortunately, it seems that there are a few who are continuing in their effort to stop reauthorization of the PATRIOT Act, insisting on imposing their will on a bipartisan majority of the Senate, the House, and the President of the United States. The handful of diehards who continue to oppose this legislation are simply unwilling to accept the compromise that has been agreed to by both Houses of Congress, despite efforts from all quarters to try to accommodate reasonable concerns. Most reasonable people would agree