

He was imprisoned for his activities as a student dissident against the repressive Communist Yugoslav regime in the 1970s, but this did not diminish his zeal. In 1989, Djindjic, along with a group of dissident writers and intellectuals, founded the Serbian Democratic Party. One year later, he was elected its chairman, and in 1994, its president. In the 1990s, as a member and a leader of Serbia's Parliament, he remained at the forefront of the dissident movement, resisting the oppression of a new generation of post-Communist dictators, this time bent on ethnic cleansing and genocide.

As his courage grew, so did the people's respect for him. In 1996, the people of Belgrade freely elected him the first non-Communist mayor since World War II. It was in that position that he built the popular base and credibility that served him so well in the historical role he was about to play, in the downfall of Slobodan Milosevic. Djindjic was one of the chief strategists behind the September 24, 2002, Yugoslav Presidential elections and the October 5, 2000, uprising that resulted in Milosevic's overthrow. In December 2000, he led the Democratic Opposition of Serbia—a coalition of 18 parties spanning a broad range of the political spectrum—into Serbia's parliamentary elections, and won an impressive 65 percent of the popular vote. The DOS elected Djindjic to be Prime Minister of Serbia on January 25, 2001.

That popularity speaks well of Zoran Djindjic, but it speaks volumes about the people of Serbia. After years—decades—of Communist and fascist dictatorship, the spirit of the Serbian people arose valiant, triumphant because the desire for freedom cannot be crushed. Prime Minister Djindjic was, in a large sense, the embodiment of their determination, their yearning to be free. Each time this man spoke of freedom and liberty, of reform and democracy, the people of Serbia supported him, sustained him, elevated him to lead them, and followed them into the brighter future that he hoped fervently to help them build.

It appears that it was, ultimately, his pledge and his actions to stamp out corruption and widespread organized crime that brought him into the assassin's sights.

In February, a truck swerved from its lane, headed directly for the motorcade carrying the Prime Minister, and narrowly missed. Prime Minister Djindjic very well could have been killed. Djindjic himself suggested that the incident might be the handiwork of members of organized crime rings, which flourished under Miloservic and remain linked to him to this day.

Just as he did not permit prison to diminish his energy, Prime Minister Djindjic did not let this danger impede him or dim his spirit. He pressed on, valiantly, in his campaign against the crime and corruption that corrodes his society.

The news of the Prime Minister's death has been a tremendous shock,

not only to the people of Serbia, but to the entire region. President Stjepan Mesić of Croatia has rightly described the assassination as "an act of madness," and raised concerns that this assassination will "slow down [Serbia's] progress towards democracy."

I certainly understand the Croatian President's concern. It would be a dishonor to the memory of Prime Minister Djindjic were his fears to be realized. After centuries of conflict and decades of oppression and crippling violence, Serbia and the entire Balkan region have made remarkable strides toward peace, democracy, economic development, and a better life for the people of all nations in the region. The United States has played a crucial role in furthering that progress. For the past 10 years, in Bosnia Hercegovina, in Kosovo, the United States has fought—diplomatically and militarily—to stop the forces of oppression and genocide, and to support the forces of liberty and democracy.

There can be no greater way to remember this man than to ensure that his death will not be in vain, that his life's work will continue. And so, I urge all of us who are friends and supporters of democracy, and those who fight for it, to redouble our commitment to and solidarity with those who stand, as Prime Minister Djindjic did, for a better, freer, more democratic future for the people of Serbia.

THE CHILD SUPPORT DISTRIBUTION ACT

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I rise today to state my strong support for the Child Support Distribution Act of 2003, which Senator SNOWE and I introduced yesterday. I want to thank Senator SNOWE for continuing to work with me over the years on this important issue.

This bill takes significant steps toward ensuring that children receive the child support money they are owed and deserve. In fiscal year 2001, the public child support system collected child support payments for only 44 percent of its total caseload, up from 19 percent in 1995. Obviously, we still need to improve, but States are making real progress. It is time for Congress to take the next step and help States overcome a major obstacle to collecting child support for families.

There are many reasons why noncustodial parents may not be paying support for their children. Some are not able to pay because they don't have jobs or have fallen on hard times. Others may not pay because they are unfairly prevented from spending time with their children.

But other fathers don't pay because the public system actually discourages them from paying. Under current law, \$2.2 billion in child support is retained every year by the State and Federal Governments as repayment for welfare benefits—rather than delivered to the children to whom it is owed. Fifty-six

percent of that amount is for families who have left welfare. Since the money doesn't benefit their kids, fathers are discouraged from paying support. And mothers have no incentive to push for payment since the support doesn't go to them.

The current rules withhold a key source of income for low-income families that could help them maintain self-sufficiency. For low-income working families receiving child support, that support is the second-largest source of income for those families, after wages, according to the Urban Institute, a nonpartisan organization that studies social and governance issues. Families who receive child support can often avoid going on welfare. When low-income working families get child support, but not welfare, child support makes up 35 percent of their income.

It is time for Congress to change this system and encourage States to distribute more child support to families. My home State of Wisconsin has already been doing this for several years and is seeing great results. In 1997, I worked with my State to institute an innovative program of passing through child support payments directly to families. An evaluation of the Wisconsin program clearly shows that when child support payments are delivered to families, noncustodial parents are more apt to pay, and to pay more. In addition, Wisconsin has found that, overall, this policy does not increase government costs. That makes sense because "passing through" support payments to families means they have more of their own resources, and are less apt to depend on public help to meet other needs such as food, transportation or child care.

We now have a key opportunity to encourage all States to follow Wisconsin's example. This legislation gives States options and strong incentives to send more child support directly to families who are working their way off—or are already off—public assistance. Not only will this create the right incentives for noncustodial parents to pay, but it will also simplify the job for States, who currently face an administrative nightmare in following the complicated rules of the current system.

We know that creating the right incentives for noncustodial parents to pay support and increasing collections has long-term benefits. People who can count on child support are more likely to stay in jobs and stay off public assistance.

This legislation finally brings the Child Support Enforcement program into the post-welfare reform era, shifting its focus from recovering welfare costs to increasing child support to families so they can sustain work and maintain self-sufficiency. After all, it is only fair that if we are asking parents to move off welfare, stay off welfare, and take financial responsibility for their families, then we in Congress

must make sure that child support payments actually go to the families to whom they are owed and who are working so hard to succeed.

I am pleased that there has been widespread bipartisan support for this legislation. In 2000, a House version of this bill passed by an overwhelming bipartisan vote of 405 to 18. Our legislation was also included in last year's TANF reauthorization bill that passed out of the Senate Finance Committee with bipartisan support.

In addition, I am pleased that the administration and the House of Representatives both included child support provisions in their TANF reauthorization legislation. However, while those provisions are an important first step in the process, I am concerned that both the House bill and the administration's proposal fall short in reforming child support. Their approach would not benefit all States equally, has more limited benefits for families who are currently on TANF, and imposes fees on some low-income families. I hope as the TANF reauthorization process continues, we can all work together to address these concerns and ensure that all children receive the support they are owed and deserve.

We must keep this bipartisan momentum going in this Congress. It is time that we finally make child support meaningful for families, and make sure that children get the support they need and deserve.

PIONEER NATIONAL HISTORIC TRAILS STUDIES ACT

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Pioneer National Historic Trails Studies Act. This bill would require the National Park Service to study the Pony Express, the Oregon, the California, and the Mormon National Historic Trails and make recommendations to Congress on possible additions to these trails that were used by the early pioneers of the West.

For various reasons, early settlers often used routes to arrive in the West which were variations of the main routes now recognized as National Historic Trails. These routes were used by large numbers of westward pioneers. Since the enactment of the National Trails System Act in 1968, support has been building to broaden the law to include alternate routes that branch off the main trails. The Pioneer National Historic Trails Studies Act allows for the feasibility study and designation of side trails and variant routes taken by pioneers otherwise associated with the main trails.

These trails are the highways of our history. They are central to the great story of the West. But unfortunately, because of the confining "point to point" wording now found in the Trails Act, many crucial parts of the story are not being told. Not every pioneer embarked on his journey from Omaha or Independence, and not every great or tragic event took place along the

main routes. To the contrary, tens of thousands of settlers set out from other places, and many of the memorable, if not most important, events occurred along historical side roads and alternate routes that were chosen because of inclement weather, lack of water, and conflicts with Native American tribes, among other reasons.

Since the original passage of the National Trails System Act, the Park Service has conducted endless hours of research, and now has a more accurate picture of the story of our Western pioneers. There has been a great deal of support shown by State and local communities which want to broaden the act to include this new knowledge. However, the Park Service has determined that legislation is required to do this. The Pioneer National Historic Trails Studies Act will enable the Park Service to identify those routes most worthy of being included in our trails system. This legislation will highlight our Western history, and it will do so without any infringement of the rights of private property owners.

Mr. President, I thank the Senate for the opportunity to address this important issue today, and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

TEACHING OF AMERICAN HISTORY AND CIVICS

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of a speech I gave before the Heritage Foundation on March 14 be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR LAMAR ALEXANDER PUTTING THE TEACHING OF AMERICAN HISTORY AND CIVICS BACK INTO OUR CLASSROOMS OUT OF MANY, ONE: E PLURIBUS UNUM

I am glad to have this privilege to come to Heritage today to talk about the two subjects I care about the most: the education of our children and the principles that unite us as Americans. I salute Heritage for providing public forums on issues that are important to our nation.

At a time when we are asking young Americans to give their lives to defend our values, we are doing a poor job of teaching just what those values are.

That is why, last week, in my maiden address—we still call it that in the United States Senate—I proposed ways to put the teaching of American history and civics back in our schools so our children can grow up learning what it means to be an American.

The Senate will hold hearings on April 10 on my proposal. The proposal is to create Presidential Academies for Teachers of American History and Civics and Congressional Academies for students of American history and Civics—residential summer academies at which teachers can learn better how to teach, and outstanding students can learn more about the key events, persons and ideas that shaped the institutions and democratic heritage of the United States of America.

Today I want to discuss, first, why America is exceptional—not always better than other countries, but in important ways different; second, how the teaching and learn-

ing of American history and civics has declined and why; and, finally, why the three Latin words that were the first motto of our nation, E Pluribus Unum, are still in the right order—Out of Many, One—even though some are trying mightily to turn them around to say that we are "Many, out of One." In other words, in the United States of America, I believe unity still trumps diversity.

YOU CAN'T BECOME JAPANESE

Now to do this, I want to ask for your help.

So, will you please imagine that we are in a federal courtroom in Nashville, where I was on October 2001. It is naturalization day. The room is filled with anxious persons, talking among themselves in halting English. They are obviously with their families and closest friends. They are neatly dressed, but for the most part, not so well dressed.

Most faces are radiant. Only a few faces are white. There are 77 persons from 22 countries who have passed their exams, learned English, passed a test about American government, survived a character investigation, paid their taxes and waited in line for five years to be a citizen of the United States.

The bailiff shouts, "God Save this Honorable court," and the judge, Aleta Trauger walks in. She asks each of the applicants to stand.

Now—here is where I need your help.

I will be Judge Trauger.

I want you to be the 77 new citizens.

Will you please stand, actually stand, raise your right hand, and repeat after me. I want you to listen carefully to this oath.

"I, and state your name.

"Hereby declare, on oath, that I absolutely and entirely renounce and abjure all allegiance and fidelity to any foreign prince, potentate, state or sovereignty, of whom or which I have heretofore been a subject or citizen;

"That I will support and defend the Constitution and laws of the United States of America against all enemies, foreign and domestic;

"That I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same;

"That I will bear arms on behalf of the United States when required by the law;

"That I will perform noncombatant service in the Armed Forces of the United States when required by the law;

"That I will perform work of national importance under civilian direction when required by the law; and that I take this obligation freely without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion;

"So help me God."

You may be seated. Thank you for doing that.

Now, that is quite an oath.

Sounds like it might have been written by some rowdy patriots in Philadelphia or Williamsburg, and I wonder if anything like that could be written into law today?

Judge Trauger then addressed the new citizens in Nashville with these words:

"You are now an American citizen. On behalf of your fellow countrymen, I congratulate you. You have studied hard and achieved much. You know more about the matters of citizenship than many of us born into it. Even so, I would like to speak to you for a few minutes about what I think it means to be an American citizen," she said.

Continuing to quote, "Americans, unlike many other people, are not Americans simply because of accidents of geography or centuries of tradition. Instead, we Americans based our citizenship on our foundation of shared ideals and ideas brought from many countries, races, religions and cultures."

The judge said, "We are Americans because we also share certain fundamental beliefs.