

In the 28 years that he practiced in Paducah, Carloss treated thousands. When he recently had to cease practice, he found that he had approximately 3,000 current patients on chemotherapy who shifted their cases to other physicians' care.

Even though cut short by result of accident and injury, Carloss can still claim a lengthy practice in a field that often doesn't produce long runs.

"Thirty-two years is a long time to practice as an oncologist," Carloss said. "There is a high burnout rate. Most doctors who do this end up in research or something outside seeing patients every day."

One reason is that there is extra emotional burden in specializing in the care of people who in many instances are fatally ill.

The position of the oncologist has improved through the years as medicine has, yet there is still the excess baggage that comes from serving some of the sickest people.

"Their problems become your problems," Carloss said. "Especially during the early years of my practice, before medicine evolved as much, many cancers were just a death sentence.

"The stuff we had to use for chemotherapy would either kill you or cure you," he said. "It has to attack cancer cells, but it attacked white blood cells, too. We now have antidotes that chemo patients get to keep their white cell levels from dropping.

"There are lots of things we have to battle cancer now that we didn't have then," Carloss said. "And over the years the mortality for cancer has gone down. It's become more of a chronic disease than a death sentence."

That has eased Carloss' burden of fighting what too often seemed a losing battle. More clear wins against cancer certainly helped, but he also has learned to benefit patients—and himself—with relative, mitigated victories.

"I discovered pretty early that I couldn't fix everything," he said. "What I learned is, while I might not be able to save somebody, there are things I could do. I might give them more time, make sure they had less pain and improve the quality of the life they had left."

Carloss said fairly early in his practice he got help in dealing with losses, assistance that came from dying men.

"I explained to one man that he was terminally ill and offered him a chance to take part in some research," Carloss said.

"He really didn't show any emotion and I wasn't sure he understood, so I explained his situation again—and still no emotion.

"Then he told me that he'd landed on Omaha Beach on D-Day and everybody in his group was killed but him," he said. "He figured that everything he'd done since that day was a bonus. And he said if he could do anything that would help somebody else with the time he had left, he'd be glad to."

A young man told Carloss that there was a blessing in his cancer as opposed to a fatal heart attack.

"He said at least he had time to correct his mistakes and say his good-byes to people," Carloss recalled.

Carloss doesn't regret the emotional expenditures from his past practice. He does have some sore spots about some of its frustrations.

"Because of the way treatment is paid for, all services aren't available to everybody," Carloss said.

He said Medicare regulations and the resulting insurance coverage parameters are such that every cancer patient simply cannot get access to some of the drugs that might be beneficial.

"Now drugs have become so expensive that reimbursement drives what can be used for a

patient," Carloss said. "I could, or I used to could write you a prescription for a drug that would cost you \$72,000 for a year's supply. There are drugs available that nobody can afford.

"That's the part of the practice that I don't miss," he said. "Before, in the first 25 years of my practice, if there was a drug out there, I could use it for a patient and it would be paid for. We never turned anybody away if they didn't have the money."

Beyond patient care in small town America, Carloss has been a point man in the campaign to counter cancer.

He has been involved in a wealth of research and clinical trials through the years. He likewise has been a prolific writer of medical scientific papers.

Carloss' honors and awards among medical peers have stacked up through his career. His foremost recognition may be his selection for mastership in the American College of Physicians, which comes only for those cited for exceedingly stellar career achievements.

Carloss, a plain talker might say, had a lot of irons in the fire. His injury-forced retirement was such an abrupt change in schedule, the reversal of pressure was so extreme that it might have produced the bends in a mental sense.

Long days of life and death decisions were suddenly switched over to longer days of no particular commitments.

"I had lots of people that I was taking care of, and it took me two months to stop calling the office every day to check on them," he said. "I solve problems during the night, and it took me two months before I could sleep through the night and not be lying there working things out in my head."

The demands of the career don't seem to have taken a regrettable toll, however.

"If I could do it all over tomorrow, I'd do it again," Carloss said.

TRIBUTE TO THE MOUNT SAINT JOSEPH CONFERENCE AND RETREAT CENTER

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise today to honor an organization that has contributed greatly to the Commonwealth of Kentucky and its citizens. The Mount Saint Joseph Conference and Retreat Center celebrates its 25th year of service this year. The center has been a long time contributor to the State and the community in western Kentucky surrounding Maple Mount.

In 1983, after many years as a boarding school, the Ursuline Sisters of Mount Saint Joseph made a difficult, yet promising decision to close its educational facilities. That led to the opportunity to develop the center into a modern facility. After much thought and prayer, the sisters that so dedicatedly ran the boarding school worked to transform it and its surroundings into a retreat center offering programs and meeting spaces for businesses and organizations.

Since the renovation 25 years ago, the Mount Saint Joseph Conference and Retreat Center has focused on spirituality, the arts, and environmental education. Each year, 500 students visit the center to tour the surrounding farm and learn good stewardship of the Earth. Groups from churches and businesses frequent the center, which contains living quarters and a cafeteria.

Not only does the center add to the mental and spiritual well-being of the people of western Kentucky, it works to preserve the environment as well. Through the dedicated leadership of Sister Amelia Stenger, director of the center, the Ursuline nuns have made it their mission to educate the community about the environment. In so doing, they have built one eco-friendly home out of straw and now plan to rebuild a home using several energy-saving measures.

They plan to build a "near-zero" home that uses no outside sources of energy in western Kentucky. Sister Stenger pioneers these efforts after a visit to Austria, where she toured various conservation efforts there. This house will be called the Casa del Solé Environmental Education Center. The name is Italian for "house of the sun," and for the Ursulines it also refers to Jesus Christ.

The service and selflessness of Sister Stenger, three previous directors, and the center's staff has contributed much to those who visit the center every year and to the Commonwealth of Kentucky. I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the Mount Saint Joseph Conference and Retreat Center for 25 years of service in the community.

HOUSE CONSIDERATION OF FISA LEGISLATION

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I commend the House of Representatives for debating its amendment to the Senate's FISA Amendments Act of 2007. This is a step forward and a good bill.

The Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act is intended to protect both our National security and the privacy and civil liberties of Americans. This law was passed to protect the rights of Americans after the excesses of an earlier time.

The FISA Amendments Act of 2007 that passed the Senate had a number of serious failings and did not adequately protect the privacy and civil liberties of Americans with this sweeping new surveillance. I had hoped that the Senate would incorporate improvements that had been reported by the Senate Judiciary Committee and that I and other Senators offered as amendments on the floor. It did not. Instead, having gotten exactly the bill they wanted from the Intelligence Committee, the administration threatened of Presidential veto if any further improvements were made. The Senate bill was flawed.

The House leadership understood that under our constitutional system of government, Congress gets a say in legislation. For the last month the House has worked with 4 Senators and sought to work with congressional Republicans and the administration to fashion a reasonable compromise between its earlier legislation, the RESTORE Act, which passed last fall, and

the Senate's bill. Unfortunately, congressional Republicans and the administration have refused to engage in meaningful discussions or negotiations about the legislation. It has been their position that the Senate's bill must be the end of all discussions, and the House must simply accept it. I commend the House leadership for upholding our legislative tradition and allowing Congress to act as a separate and equal branch of the Federal Government. The Constitution provides in article I for Congress to write the laws and in article II for the executive to faithfully execute them—not the other way around.

The administration has engaged in all of its usual scare tactics to try to bully the House into accepting the Senate bill. First, they refused to allow an extension of the Protect America Act, thereby allowing it to expire. Then, they tried to convince the American people that the expiration put Americans at risk—and somehow that was the Democrats' fault. It was not true, of course; the expiration of the Protect America Act put nobody at risk because the orders entered under that act remain in force for a year. And it is the White House and congressional Republicans who have repeatedly refused to extend the Protect America Act. And they have ensured delay by refusing to allow the appointment of conferees so work on the bill can move forward. These are just more in a long line of administration attempts to politicize national security in order to shield itself from accountability.

Despite the failure of the administration and the Republican Members of Congress to discuss the bills, the House engaged in intensive, productive bicameral discussions and produced a compromise bill that improves on both the Senate bill and their earlier efforts. It adds to title I of the bill several protections that I urged in the Senate. Very importantly, it includes a requirement that inspectors general, including the Department of Justice inspector general, conduct a thorough review of the so-called terrorist surveillance program and report back to the Congress and, to the greatest degree possible, the American people. This is a key measure to finally require accountability from this administration. We have not yet had anything close to a comprehensive examination of what happened and how it happened. We cannot expect to learn from mistakes if we refuse to allow them to be examined. As an additional accountability mechanism, the House bill would establish a bipartisan national commission to investigate and report on the administration's warrantless surveillance activities.

The House bill also strengthens the exclusivity provision from the Senate bill by mandating that, absent specific statutory authorization, FISA is the exclusive means to conduct electronic surveillance. This provision makes clear that the Government cannot

claim authority to operate outside the law—outside of FISA—from legislative measures that were never intended to provide such exceptional authority. This administration argues that the Authorization for the Use of Military Force, AUMF, passed after September 11, justified conducting warrantless surveillance of Americans for more than 5 years. That is not what was intended. With enactment of this strengthened exclusivity provision, we should not see similar arguments of circumvention in the future.

The House bill would also clarify that the Government may not use this new authority to target Americans indirectly when it cannot do so directly. The administration says it will not do that, but the Senate bill does nothing to prevent it.

Finally, and critically, the House bill would not grant blanket retroactive immunity. This administration violated FISA by conducting warrantless surveillance for more than 5 years. They got caught, and if they had not, they would probably still be doing it. When the public found out about the President's illegal surveillance of Americans, the administration and the telephone companies were sued by citizens who believe their privacy and their rights were violated. Now, the administration is trying to get this Congress to terminate those lawsuits in order to insulate itself from accountability.

The House bill does, however, address the concerns of the carriers who are defendants in those lawsuits that they are prevented from defending themselves because the administration is asserting the State Secrets privilege over the subject matter of the litigation. The bill provides mechanism for the companies to present their defenses in secure proceedings in the district court. I think this is a fair provision.

I have been very disappointed by the failure of the administration and congressional Republicans to participate in important discussions about this bill. I applaud the House for its significant efforts. It has passed a good bill.

Republicans in Congress and the administration now have a choice: If they are concerned with a delay in authority, they should help the House, and in turn the Senate, pass the improvements to FISA that the House amendment contains and replace the expired Protect American Act provisions and do so immediately. Having rejected the extension of the Protect America Act and allowed it to expire before the last congressional recess, I hope that they will join in supporting the House amendment to restore the additional tools this measure would provide without further delay.

40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FAIR HOUSING ACT

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, April 11, 2008 marks the 40th anniversary of the enactment of the Fair Housing Act,

Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968. Signed into law just 1 week after the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., the bill made discrimination in the sale and rental of housing illegal based on a person's race, color, religion, sex, or national origin. This act opened doors of opportunity. It was a big step towards eliminating discrimination in housing and to providing fair housing.

Dr. King's inspiring message of equal opportunity for every person and the commitment to change views and attitudes is embodied in the Fair Housing Act. As we celebrate the 40th anniversary of this historic legislation, we must reaffirm our commitment to ensure that every person has equal access to housing.

I want to commend the Iowa Civil Rights Commission and the 25 local commissions across Iowa for their advocacy of housing opportunities for all of our citizens. These commissions provide comprehensive community education, public outreach, investigation, mediation, and training to foster fair housing by enforcing local, State, and Federal fair housing laws.

I would encourage my fellow Members of Congress to support a commitment to fair housing by strengthening laws against predatory lending practices, racial segregation, and restoring rights for persons with disabilities under the ADA.

On this 40th anniversary, we can celebrate many victories, but, unfortunately, housing discrimination still occurs. We still have many battles to be fought in our march towards a future where there is justice and housing opportunities for all Americans.

FIREARMS INFORMATION USE ACT OF 2007

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I rise today for two purposes. One is to shed light on the serious problem of gun violence that afflicts our Nation, and the other is to introduce legislation which would assist law enforcement in their efforts to address this growing scourge that affects countless Americans every day.

Each and every year, tens of thousands of Americans have their lives senselessly cut short because of gun violence. In 2004, 29,569 Americans were killed by guns. This figure is higher than the number of deaths our military has suffered in any year of any war since World War II—and it translates to over 81 gun deaths per day—over 3 deaths per hour. Tragically, statistics show that by the time I finish this speech, another American will have lost his or her life to gun violence.

Gun violence does not discriminate; it affects rich and poor, young and old, the innocent and guilty alike. It is not a red or blue State issue, but an American crisis that concerns our Nation as a whole. Not a single American is immune to the tragic reach of gun violence.