Mrs. BOXER. For Senator CARPER? Is there any way we can assuage the Senator? Does he want to take the floor before Senator CARPER?

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, I believe I still have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has the floor.

CONDEMNING THE USE OF VIOLENCE

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, yesterday, along with Senators BOXER, KLOBUCHAR, and 43 other Senators, I submitted S. Res. 187, a resolution condemning the use of violence against providers of reproductive health care services to women and expressing sympathy for the family, friends, and patients of Dr. George Tiller.

Unfortunately, the murder of Dr. Tiller was not an isolated incident. Our country has a history of violence against reproductive health care providers. Since 1993, eight clinic workers have been murdered, and there have been hundreds of additional attempted murders, bombings, death threats, and kidnappings. Since 1977, there have been more than 5,800 reported acts of violence against providers and clinics.

My own State has been touched by such acts of violence. In December 1994, a man from New Hampshire killed two workers at clinics in Massachusetts, including a nurse from Salem, NH. Almost 9 years ago, the Feminist Health Center in Concord, NH was burned in an arson attack. These acts of violence are not acceptable. Not only do they violate our laws and lead to human tragedy, but they dissuade medical professionals from entering a field of medicine that is critically important to women across the country.

I realize that the issue of reproductive choice is divisive. I know there are many heartfelt feelings on both sides of this issue and on both sides of the aisle, even within my own caucus. However, I was hopeful that regardless of our differences of opinion on this sensitive issue, the Senate could come together and quickly pass a resolution that rejects the use of violence against reproductive health care providers. Sadly, this is not the case.

My cosponsors and I have tried to pass this resolution by unanimous consent. Unfortunately, some on the other side of the aisle have objected. How disappointing it is that in this country and in this body, we can't come together to unanimously condemn the use of violence. My cosponsors and I were urged to eliminate references to women's reproductive health care to get this resolution passed through the Senate. We are not going to back down. This country should be able to come together to condemn violence against reproductive health care providers. It is a very sad day when the elected leaders of the greatest democracy on Earth cannot agree to protect those exercising their constitutional rights.

I am pleased to be joined by 45 of my colleagues on this important resolution. We are saddened that we are not able to pass it without objection.

I wish to now read this simple resolution, a resolution condemning the use of violence against providers of health care services to women.

Whereas Dr. George Tiller of Wichita, Kansas was shot to death at church on Sunday, May 31;

Whereas there is a history of violence against providers of reproductive health care, as health care employees have suffered threats, hostility, and attacks in order to provide crucial services to patients;

Whereas the threat or use of force or physical obstruction has been used to injure, intimidate, or interfere with individuals seeking to obtain or provide health care services; and

Whereas acts of violence are never an acceptable means of expression and always shall be condemned. Now, therefore, be it Resolved, That the Senate expresses great sympathy for the family, friends, and patients of Dr. George Tiller; recognizes that acts of violence should never be used to prevent women from receiving reproductive health care; and condemns the use of violence as a means of resolving differences of opinion.

I find it hard to believe that this language condemning the murder of a health care provider and expressing sympathy to a family in mourning could be objectionable.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Thank you very much.

Madam President, I want to say to my friend, Senator SHAHEEN, that her words were eloquent here today and that her voice adds so much texture to the Senate. In a very plainspoken way, as is her way, Senator SHAHEEN has told us that regardless of where we stand on this issue, this contentious issue of a woman's right to choose, we should be able to come together when there is violence of any sort from any quarter, right, left, or center. There is no place for violence in any of our debates. That is what makes this such a great country. We debate here. We have had difficult debates here on the issue of a woman's right to choose. Yes, we have. But we decide those issues in this Chamber, in the House, at the White House, and across the street at the Supreme Court. And the Supreme Court has ruled very clearly, in 1973, in Roe v. Wade, that it is legal—legal—for a woman in the early stages of her pregnancy to make this tough choice and get the health care she needs. And, yes, later in the pregnancy, if her health is threatened, if her life is threatened, yes, a doctor can help her in that type of a circumstance.

Here we have many cases where violence is being used, where Web sites are being put up with pictures of doctors and nurses, trying to incite trouble, trying to incite violence, and that is not what the law allows.

With the case of Dr. Tiller, he was a doctor. After this tragedy where he was shot and killed in church—and before that, he had his arm shot, but he continued his work—many, many women came forward to attest to how kind he was to them in their great need.

Dr. Tiller operated within the law. There were those who tried to run him out of town with lawsuits, and he won all of those.

So when a procedure is legal and a doctor is following the rules, to have a murder of a doctor in that circumstance is a tragedy to his family, to his friends, to his patients, and, yes, frankly, to America because it diminishes us as a society.

I want to tell it like it is around here. Every Democrat cleared this resolution and said, yes, we ought to have a chance to bring it to the floor and be voted upon. That is all my colleague wants. She wrote a simple resolution. She read it to you. She wants a vote. Every Democrat said, yes, let's bring it to the floor. If you do not like it, you do not have to vote for it. If you want to change it, make an amendment to change it.

But the Republicans will not clear this resolution. Now, I have to say to the people who may be listening to this debate, hear what I am saying. The Republicans will not allow a vote, will not clear a resolution that simply says, in the resolve clause—and I quote from it—we express ''great sympathy for the family, friends and patients of Dr. George Tiller.'' We recognize ''that acts of violence should never be used to prevent women from receiving reproductive health care,'' and we condemn ''the use of violence as a means of resolving differences of opinion.''

I think my colleague, in her eloquence here, has said it all. I urge those people who are anonymously holding up this resolution, come to the floor, have the courage and the guts to look out at this Chamber and explain why you do not believe we should condemn acts of violence to prevent women from receiving their health care, and come to the floor and explain why you are not ready to condemn the use of violence as a means of resolving differences.

This is the greatest democracy in the world. We will not be the greatest democracy in the world if we decide we are going to take the law into our own hands and kill people with whom we disagree.

So I beg my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to rethink their position because, I can tell you, anyone who does not know Senator SHAHEEN—she was the Governor of a State, she is a great Senator already—she is not going to give up on this. We are going to be here day after day. We are going to ask that this be brought before the body. And we are going to make those who are stopping us from voting on this come to the floor and explain why they cannot join with us.

We know abortion is a contentious issue. We appreciate that. We respect our colleagues' views. Frankly, I totally respect their views on the issue. But I do not respect someone who is anonymously holding up a resolution that condemns violence.

So I am going to work with my colleague. I am very proud of her work on

this. I am proud of Senator KLOBUCHAR's work on this. And I want to thank every Democrat in this Senate who said, yes, this resolution is worthy of debate and worthy of a vote.

Madam President, I thank you very much and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. Madam President, thank you very much.

75TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. CARPER. Madam President, I take the floor for a few minutes to draw the attention of my colleagues to the fact that there is a birthday this year, a 75th birthday—not the birthday of a Member of the Senate, not a birthday of a Member of the House, but actually it is the 75th birthday of the National Archives and Records Administration. It is 75 years old this year.

My colleague who is presiding today may recall the reception that was held at the National Archives during our orientation for new Senators and their spouses back in November. As it turns out, it was a small group of people who were able to witness and to visually see and read some of the most famous short documents in our Nation's history.

But as it turns out, millions of Americans come every year and visitors from all over the world come each year to visit the National Archives. The National Archives serves as the custodian of some of our county's most precious and historic records and documents, and they have been doing this for something like three-quarters of a century.

I wish to take a moment on behalf of all of my colleagues, Democratic and Republican, and an Independent or two, to thank the men and women who work at the National Archives now—and who have done that for the last three-quarters of a century—who work diligently to preserve our Nation's history, not just for us but for future generations of Americans and others who will come to our shores to visit here.

Established by Congress to be our Nation's record keeper, the National Archives has the critical mission of storing and protecting our most valuable and our most important documents. In fact, the main Archives facility, which is located not far from where we are gathered here today, is the permanent home of—get this—the Declaration of Independence, our Constitution, and the Bill of Rights.

Thomas Jefferson once said that an educated citizenry will ensure a free society. He was right then. That is right now. Unhindered access to information about our government and leaders is truly critical to the continued health and vibrancy of our democracy.

That is why I am pleased to hear that more than 1 million visitors travel to the National Archives each year to see thousands of documents—the ones I mentioned and others as well—records, and special exhibits. It is no stretch to say the National Archives is one of the most popular agencies in the U.S. Government. That probably comes as a surprise to a lot of us.

But the Archives is not just a tourist attraction. Over the years, the Archives has become an international leader in developing an electrical records archiving system that will preserve digital information in any format—not just for a few years but forever.

Information technology has forever altered our ability to create, access, and search information from any location in the world. Every year, billions—not millions, billions—of documents that shape and inform government decisions are never written down with pen and paper. Instead, these records are ''born digital.'' That means they are created electronically and stored not in a filing cabinet but on computers and on the Internet.

Each year, the Archives preserves more and more information that is essential to understanding our democracy, our history, and our culture. To put it into some kind of perspective, it took eight C–5 military cargo planes to transport all of the paper materials created by the Clinton administration. Imagine that: eight C–5 military cargo aircraft. Following the most recent Presidential transition, it took 20 tractor trailers, 2 Boeing 747s, and a DC–8 aircraft to transport all of President George W. Bush's records. At the same time, the National Archives continues to maintain records from 1775, including the military record of every single veteran in the 20th and 21st centuries. That is no small task.

So I stand here today to give my thanks—really, to give our thanks—to the hard-working folks who work and volunteer their time at our National Archives.

Winston Churchill once said:

> A nation that forgets its past is doomed to repeat it.

I think that quote truly sums up the important role of the Archives, not just for our history but for our future.

Madam President, tomorrow I will submit, with a number of my colleagues, a resolution to commend the National Archives and its employees for excellent service over the past 75 years and to wish them many years of additional service.

HEALTH CARE

Mr. CARPER. Madam President, I know my colleague from Wisconsin is standing to speak, so I will be very brief. I just want to take a moment.

While Senator SHAHEEN and Senator BOXER were speaking, I went over and chatted a little bit with one of our colleagues from Texas who was on the floor. We talked a little bit about the debate on health care. As we approach, in a week or two, marking up a health care reform bill in the Finance Committee, he mentioned to me something I very much agree with, the 80–20 rule.

MIKE ENZI, the Senator from Wyoming, likes to talk about the 80–20 rule and why he has been so productive over the years with Senator TED KENNEDY. Senator KENNEDY, obviously, is a liberal Member of the Senate. Senator ENZI is a very conservative Member of the Senate. They get a lot done in the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee. It is because they follow what Senator ENZI calls the 80–20 rule. They focus on the 80 percent of the stuff they agree on. They set aside the 20 percent they do not agree on, and they really focus on where the most agreement is.

We need to do a similar kind of approach as we prepare to mark up in the Finance Committee the health reform bill, to go along with the areas of work going on in the HELP Committee.

I strongly agree with Senator BAUCUS and Senator GRASSLEY. We need a bipartisan bill. I know many Democrats and Republicans feel we need a bipartisan bill. My fear is, if we do not have a bipartisan bill, we will not be successful ultimately.

While most of the media coverage of the health care debate focuses on the conflict—should we have a public plan or not; tax exclusions; what portion of our benefits should be excluded from taxation; should there be an employer mandate or individual mandate or should there not be—setting all of those things aside, not that they are unimportant, there is huge agreement on a bunch of things that are important that are going to save money, save lives, reduce costs, and provide better health care for people. Part of it is in information technology; make it possible for businesses—large and small but especially small businesses—to get into a purchasing pool to be able to take advantage of much lower rates and have better choices of benefits for their folks; moving toward chronic care to make sure for people who have diabetes that we do not just wait until they get really sick and they have to have arms and legs and feet amputated, but make sure we take care of them early on as we go along.

As to these purchasing pools we are going to create under health care reform, if people have a preexisting condition, they do not get excluded. They can participate as well. We are going to be covering more people for pharmaceuticals. We are going to do a much better job of making sure people who will benefit from a particular pharmaceutical—whether it is a large molecule or a small molecule—will have access to something that is going to help them. We will be smart enough to figure out the pharmaceuticals out there that will not help somebody, so then they will not be taking those.

We are going to be focusing more on primary care, less on fee for service, which drives up the cost of health care.