Specialist Christopher K. Hill, Ventura;Specialist Eric U. Ramirez, San Diego;Sergeant Patrick S. Tainsh, Oceanside;Master Sergeant Jude C. Mariano, Vallejo;Sergeant Eliu A. Miersandoval, San Clemente;Specialist Jason K. Chappell, Hemet;Sergeant Keicia M. Hines, Citrus Heights;Specialist Michael A. Diraimondo, Simi Valley;Private 1st Class Jesse D. Mizener, Auburn;Specialist Justin W. Pollard, Foothill Ranch;Specialist Michael G. Mihalakis, San Jose;Staff Sergeant Richard A. Burdick, National City;Staff Sergeant Steven H. Bridges, Tracy;Specialist Arron R. Clark, Chico;Sergeant Ryan C. Young, Corona;Staff Sergeant Stephen A. Bertolino, Orange;Chief Warrant Officer (CW2) Christopher G. Nason, Los Angeles;Staff Sergeant Eddie E. Menyweather, Los Angeles;Specialist Rel A. Ravago IV, Glendale;Sergeant 1st Class Kelly Bolor, Whittier;Specialist Genaro Acosta, Fair Oaks;Staff Sergeant Paul A. Velasquez, San Diego;Private 1st Class Karina S. Lau, Livingston;2nd Lieutenant Todd J. Bryant, Riverside;Private 1st Class Steven Acosta, Calexico;Sergeant Michael S. Hancock, Yreka;Specialist Jose L. Mora, Bell Gardens;Corporal Sean R. Grilley, San Bernardino;Private 1st Class Jose Casanova, El Monte;Private Sean A. Silva, Roseville;Private 1st Class Pablo Manzano, Heber;Lieutenant Kylan A. Jones-Huffman, Aptos;Private 1st Class Daniel R. Parker, Lake Elsinore;Staff Sergeant David S. Perry, Bakersfield;Corporal Evan Asa Ashcraft, West Hills;Lance Corporal Cory Ryan Geurin, Santee;Lance Corporal Jason Tetrault, Moreno Valley;Specialist Paul T. Nakamura, Santa Fe Springs;Sergeant Atanasio Haro Marin Jr., Baldwin Park;Lance Corporal Jason William Moore, San Marcos;Captain Andrew David LaMont, Eureka;Corporal Douglas Jose Marencoreyes, Chino;Private 1st Class Jose F. Gonzalez Rodriguez, Norwalk;1st Lieutenant Osbaldo Orozco, Delano;Sergeant Troy David Jenkins, Ridgecrest;Corporal Jesus A. Gonzalez, Indio;Sergeant 1st Class John W. Marshall, Los Angeles;Private Devon D. Jones, San Diego;Corporal Erik H. Silva, Chula Vista;Lance Corporal Patrick T. O'Day, Sonoma;Gunnery Sergeant Joseph Menusa, San Jose;Private 1st Class Francisco A. Martinez-Flores, Los Angeles;Lance Corporal Jesus A. Suarez del Solar, Escondido;Sergeant Michael E. Bitz, Ventura;Corporal Randal Kent Rosacker, San Diego;Corporal Jose A. Garibay, Orange;Corporal Jose A. Gonzalez, Los Angeles;Lieutenant Thomas Mullen Adams, La Mesa.

The Pentagon reports that through today, America has incurred 797 casualties in Operation Iraqi Freedom and 120 deaths in Operation Enduring Freedom. And more than 4,800 men and women have been wounded in these conflicts.

Such grim statistics underscore the fact that the current administration must do more to seek international help, especially in Iraq, during these trying times. Additionally, we must provide the equipment necessary to keep our soldiers safe. At the very least, we owe our soldiers this for their tremendous sacrifice.

In closing, I am honored to take this time to join every American in saluting those individuals who have paid the ultimate sacrifice to uphold the ideals of our democratic Nation.

On Memorial Day, we renew the commitment of this great Nation to the common defense of the country and to the broader causes of peace and freedom from tyranny throughout the world.

LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2003

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, today I speak about the need for hate crimes legislation. On May 1, 2003, Senator KENNEDY and I introduced the Local Law Enforcement Enhancement Act, a bill that would add new categories to current hate crimes law, sending a signal that violence of any kind is unacceptable in our society.

On July 24, 2001, in Greeley, CO, Salvador Rivera, 24, was charged with beating his gay cousin. He was sentenced to 45 days in jail on work release and was also placed on 2 years of unsupervised probation and ordered to pay court costs and restitution.

Government's first duty is to defend its citizens, to defend them against the harms that come out of hate. The Local Law Enforcement Enhancement Act is a symbol that can become substance. I believe that by passing this legislation and changing current law, we can change hearts and minds as well.

OFFSHORE OUTSOURCING OF AMERICAN JOBS

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, today I would like to discuss a major 40-page white paper my office has now released about the outsourcing of American jobs overseas, and the larger challenge it represents to our economic future. The paper attempts to reach beyond the current debate and focus on the next wave of this challenge, which potentially could affect high end research and development jobs, as well as manufacturing and call center jobs. The implications of this trend are profound: it threatens America's competitive advantage in an era when the entire world is competing based on free enterprise economics and open trade—one of our longstanding goals.

Seen in this light, the challenge is more fundamental, and requires that we fundamentally rethink America's competitiveness strategy over the long-term. What we have thought was our nation's ultimate competitive advantage—our high end R&D prowess—may be challenged.

There has been little informed discussion of the fundamental long term challenge of offshoring high end engineering, research and development jobs. Nor have many acknowledged how our nation's irresponsible fiscal policy has undermined U.S. competitiveness. The debate needs to focus on our own needs and solutions, and not simply decry other countries and their industries for rising to challenge us in the global economy.

To meet this challenge, we have to face some hard facts. The American economy may be failing to adapt to fundamental changes and to growing competition in the global economy. We are not just losing jobs—we may be losing critical parts of our innovation infrastructure, and with them, our competitive edge in the global marketplace. The offshore outsourcing of jobs is just the tip of an economic iceberg that America is sailing towards.

Here is one measurement of the size of it. An analysis by the Institute of Business and Economic Research at UC Berkeley estimates that 14 million American jobs are at risk. If that's accurate, our economic vitality and national security are in jeopardy. As the President's Council of Advisors on Science and Technology concluded recently, ''Maintenance of U.S. technical preeminence is not forever assured.'' Carly Fiorina put it more succinctly and memorably: ''There is no job that is America's God given right anymore.''

How do we reassert our world economic leadership and regain our innovation advantage in a more competitive world? And how do we do so without turning a blind eye to the very real

pain that many American workers are feeling as a result of the churning in the global job market? These are the big questions we must answer together—private and public sectors, business and labor, even Democrats, Republicans, and Independents.

But first, we have to better understand what is occurring. Outsourcing is not new. It is really just a variation of the division of labor, a defining feature of capitalism. In a competitive marketplace, with its premium on efficiency, businesses naturally focus their limited resources on their most profitable operations while subcontracting—or outsourcing—functions that can be performed more efficiently and cheaply elsewhere. Jobs shift as a result.

What is new about outsourcing today is its global reach. Technological innovations in transportation and communication have erased geographic borders. Physical proximity to the point of sale is no longer the absolute economic necessity it used to be, particularly for service jobs.

We know that manufacturing jobs have been shifting overseas for some time. But now the services sector is being hit hard by offshore outsourcing—and that hurts. The services sector provides 83 percent of America's jobs, employing 86 million people. It dominates our economy. Customer call centers and data entry facilities are being relocated to places where capable labor can be found at lower wage levels. High-speed digital technologies make a connection between Boston and Bangalore as fast as between Boston and Baltimore.

But offshoring is no longer limited to entry-level services jobs. Higher skilled professional jobs like computer chip design, programming, architecture, engineering, consulting, automotive design, and pharmaceutical research are beginning to go overseas. That is the bulk of the iceberg below the surface of the sea. The outsourcing of R&D is probably the most alarming illustration of this new problem. American companies now invest $17 billion in R&D abroad every year. IT multinationals have now established 223 R&D centers in China alone.

One study by Forrester Research estimates that over the next 15 years, 3.3 million U.S. service jobs and $136 billion in wages will move offshore. Another by McKinsey's Global Institute suggests that the number of U.S. services jobs lost to offshoring will accelerate at an annual rate of 30 to 40 percent during the next five years.

Because the government collects no official data on offshore outsourcing in the services sector, we cannot be at all certain of these figures. But we can be certain that, although the offshore outsourcing problem in the high-end services sector may not be acute at the moment, it will be in the near future if current trends continue. If a software programmer in India earning $7,000 a year can do the same work as a software programmer in the United States making $64,000 a year, it is only a matter of time before more of those jobs relocate overseas.

The Washington response to offshore outsourcing has been predictable: politicians and policy makers jump to predetermined conclusions and finger the usual suspects.

On the one hand, we have the do nothings who profess an abiding and absolute faith in laissez faire capitalism, and see any government intervention as self-defeating. In fact, they argue that jobs flowing overseas are healthy, that they are evidence that the system is working, and that we have nothing to worry about.

The problem with this view, of course, is that we do have something to worry about. Not only does rising unemployment take a real human toll, it also eats away at our ability to create new jobs. Advanced production capabilities and research and development jobs are strategic assets that have defined our nation's competitive advantage. While proximity to the point of sale is less critical, geography still matters in the innovation process. Countries and regions that cluster university and industry research, knowledge-based start-ups, capital for entrepreneurs support from larger firms, and advanced manufacturing—with the talent to support all of this capture new industries.

As we lose jobs to foreign countries, especially high-skilled services jobs, we lose critical parts of our innovation infrastructure—labor, capital, knowledge, facilities, and technology—and with them, the engine of job creation. To cash in on our crops, we are moving the farm—and with it, the promise of future economic harvests.

On the other hand, you have the do anythings who will do anything that might save some jobs today, even if it means losing more tomorrow. Protectionism is their favorite tool—raising higher and higher trade barriers on the unproven argument that it will make it harder and harder for jobs to go overseas.

In their attempts to build a tall wall to stop offshore outsourcing, the do anythings are falling into a trap. Trying to keep jobs in our own borders through protectionist measures will only keep other jobs out. It will also invite retaliation from beyond our borders that will cost us many of the millions of American jobs that are based on exports.

The bottom line is that both the do nothings and the do anythings are wrong. Neither gets to the heart of the outsourcing problem—America's failure to innovate. That's what we all need to do something—the right thing—about.

To stop offshore outsourcing and preserve American jobs, America needs to rise to the international competition and grow again through innovation. There is no other way. Leaving it all to the markets won't work. Hiding behind a wall won't work. Attempting to rig the game won't work. Only education, innovation, investment, trade, training and hard work will give us the growth and jobs we want and need.

In my white paper, I lay out a number of suggestions about how we can achieve this. Let me highlight a few.

First, we must encourage greater innovation and technology development. Basic research and development have been essential to creating the kind of technological breakthroughs that create jobs and reap profits. But the high costs and high risk associated with early stage R&D make the needed investments burdensome for many businesses. Federal funding is crucial here, but federal R&D spending as a percent of GDP has been in steady decline since the mid-1960's—it is less than half of what it was then.

We need to reinvest in R&D. And we need to reorganize our innovation ecosystem to bring on innovations much faster. Tax incentives for R&D investment are one means of doing so. We should make the R&D tax credit permanent, and restructure it to spur collaborative research.

We also need to look at the kind of R&D we do. Although the United States is overwhelmingly a service economy, our federal and corporate R&D is geared to manufacturing. Corporate R&D is now 68 percent of the total national R&D expenditures—and 62 percent of that amount is still focused on manufacturing. But much of the offshore outsourcing challenge will hit our services sector. That is why we must add a new services sector emphasis to our R&D investments. Government and industry should review their R&D portfolios and raise their investments in services research.

Second, we must recognize that no matter how much we innovate, some people are going to lose the jobs they have now. We need to shore up our safety nets to help those hurt by offshore outsourcing. We need, for example, to extend coverage of Trade Adjustment Assistance programs to support and retrain service workers who lose their jobs due to trade. We should also experiment with new concepts like wage loss insurance, offered as part of severance and paid for by a small percentage of the employer's savings from offshoring.

Third, we need to strengthen our trade policies. America will prosper by selling high value goods and services to other nations, not by shutting ourselves off from competition and markets. We need to innovate new goods and services and lower trade barriers abroad to start to reverse our trade deficits, so trade becomes a net jobs insourcer—not a net outsourcer. Overseas markets for American exports are critical to our economic well-being, already directly supporting 12 million American jobs and indirectly many, many more. We can't lose those jobs. We can and must add to them.

But pirates do prey in international economic waters, stealing American

jobs by breaking trade rules or exploiting trade loopholes. We need to crackdown on cheating—and that will take strong government action. Our Federal trade agencies are oriented to negotiating trade agreements; they focus less on the difficult implementation and enforcement of those agreements. We must do both.

Foreign currency manipulation and intellectual property theft are forms of piracy that also must be fought and stopped.

To illustrate the impact of unfair trade practices on American competitiveness, and what we can do about it, let me discuss one sector I have followed over the years—semiconductors, the highest end of U.S. manufacturing. In the 1980's, America was close to losing this sector to Japan. But we battled back, and thanks to innovations that grew from a creative public-private partnership called Sematech, we secured our world semiconductor dominance. It provided a key boost to our growth rate and IT leadership in the 90's.

But now, we are at risk of losing that dominance—this time to China. The Chinese government is using straight industrial subsidies to capture semiconductors: from value-added tax subsidies—which are in violation of WTO agreements—to plant subsidies, to worker subsidies. China's currency manipulation further skews the competition.

After neglecting this issue for too long, the U.S. Trade Representative finally insisted in March on consultations with the Chinese on VAT subsidies for semiconductors. If these talks fail, we should not hesitate to bring a WTO case against China. The loss of most of our semiconductor industry will not only weaken our economy—it will threaten our national security. The U.S. Department of Defense needs to reenter the R&D field with industry and work to spur new semiconductor advances.

Fourth, our talent base is what ultimately sizes our economy, yet the number of U.S. graduates in engineering and physical science is dropping 1 percent a year. In China, 45 percent of all graduating students received their degree in engineering. In the United States, it's only 5 percent. Education reforms are no longer a policy option for us. They are a necessity, from kindergarten through university diploma.

We also need a whole new approach to job training. This century, 60 percent of the new jobs will require skills held by only 20 percent of today's workforce. That is one huge skills gap that we must fill fast if we want to remain competitive. One way to do so is to build stronger partnerships between companies and community colleges to ensure workers get the training they need. Increasing the number of graduates in science, technology, engineering and mathematics through incentive grants and special scholarships is another way to fill the skills gap.

Updating our methods of training to 21st century standards is also important. One way to do so is to train workers by using interactive internet gaming technology to foster better knowledge retention, promote continual skills updating, and even have fun. IT has transformed many sectors—it is time it got to training.

Finally, we need to get our federal fiscal house in order. Our staggering $550 billion current annual deficit, and the course we are on to add $10 trillion to the deficit in the next decade, will eventually raise interest rates. The Medicare Trustees told us last month that our unfunded liabilities are $72 trillion. That's right—$72 trillion. Meanwhile, other nations are buying our debt and are acquiring too much influence over our future. Foreign nationals hold 46 percent of the U.S. national debt. China and Japan together hold $662 billion. We must get our fiscal house in order to stay strong, independent and competitive.

To begin to act on such proposals and meet the challenges of offshore outsourcing, we first need an injection of political will—bipartisan political will—and that's not easy to find in Washington these days.

In the mid-1980's, we faced a similar political deadlock on economic policy. We were in the midst of a recession and our two political parties were driven to the opposite poles of economic policy. Republicans favored deeper and deeper tax cuts to stimulate job growth while sending the deficit through the roof. Democrats pushed for more protectionism and an industrial policy. Neither side thought it could compromise without risking the support of its political base. It sounds familiar, doesn't it?

The creation of a bipartisan commission that focused on the unemployment problem in a cool-headed, depoliticized way helped to break the deadlock. The President's Commission on Industrial Competitiveness, known as the ''Young Commission,'' was proposed by President Reagan, supported by the Democratic Congress, and chaired by Helwett-Packard CEO John Young. It brought all sides to the table and forced each to acknowledge the hard facts that shaped the debate.

That Commission proposed the first generation of reforms that became a bipartisan competitiveness agenda. Public-private collaborations instead of industrial supports, R&D investments in information technology, became a foundation for the economic boom of the 90's.

That is exactly the kind of initiative we need today: a new Young Commission, charged with analyzing the impact of global economic changes on the American economy, including the offshore outsourcing problem, and offering nonpartisan proposals to preserve our innovation infrastructure and create more high-wage American jobs.

We face a dramatically different set of economic competitors now than in the 80's. We have a much more complex set of competitive problems. That's why we need a new generation of competitive solutions if we are going to restore our economic leadership. Some of these solutions will look similar to the kinds I am proposing in my white paper today. Some may not. But regardless, a consensus must be built that would rule out the extremes and rule in the progressive course needed to meet the new foreign competition.

At the beginning of the last century, America faced equally profound economic and social changes. In his inaugural address, President Theodore Roosevelt noted that, ''Modern Life is both complex and intense. And the tremendous changes wrought by the extraordinary industrial development of the last half century are felt in every fiber of our social and political being.''

He went on to say that, ''There is no good reason why we should fear the future. But there is every reason why we should face it seriously—neither hiding from ourselves the gravity of the problems before us, nor fearing to approach these problems with the unbending, unflinching purpose to solve them.''

To meet the challenge of offshore outsourcing, we need to summon up the same honesty, seriousness, and sense of national purpose that TR called for a century ago. If we do, I am confident we will prevail, the American economy will keep on growing, and the next generation of Americans will live better and better lives.

To conclude, I would like to submit for the record for the benefit of my colleagues a summary of the white paper, which is posted on my Senate website with the title ''Offshore Outsourcing and America's Competitive Edge: Losing out in the High Technology R&D and Services Sectors,'' that my staff and I have worked on in the hope it will stimulate a better, broader response to the long-term implications of offshore outsourcing. I want to thank my staffers Elka Koehler, Sara Hagigh, Bill Bonvillian, and Chuck Ludlam for their work on this report.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to print the white paper summary in the RECORD.

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

SUMMARY OF WHITE PAPER

The United States has enjoyed unparalleled technological leadership for decades. Our capacity for innovation has continued to create jobs and raise living standards despite the ongoing migration of manufacturing to foreign nations in the past decade. However, a new, potentially more dangerous migration is upon us. The rising trend of outsourcing high technology manufacturing and high-end services jobs to overseas presents a new and fundamentally different phenomenon. This new trend is far bigger and more complicated than the current debate suggests. Key components of our innovation infrastructure such as knowledge and capital have become highly mobile. If our engineering, design, and research and development (R&D) capabilities continue to follow the manufacturing and services facilities going abroad,

our competitiveness will be weakened, putting our economic prosperity and national security at risk.

The offshoring of facilities, labor, capital, technology, and information not only hurts our workers, but also threatens the backbone of our knowledge-based economy. Emerging nations such as China and India have realized that technological leadership leads to economic prosperity. Their governments are committed to attracting business investments, technology transfer, and knowledge inflow into their countries through industrial policies, subsidies, and business incentives. The offshoring trend will most likely accelerate and spread as more U.S. companies figure out how to efficiently exploit these incentives, not to mention the large pools of educated low cost foreign labor. Enabled by high speed telecommunication connections, the recent migration of labor-intensive services jobs was primarily motivated by the potential of up to a 90% savings in labor costs.

The innovation structure that served us well in the face of less formidable competition is no longer sufficient in the face of this new fierce global competition. Key components of our innovation infrastructure are deteriorating as federal funding of R&D, the number of science and technology graduates, and business investments in the U.S. continue to decline. Our innovation capacity is further undermined by the massive budget deficits which threaten future federal investments in R&D and education, and increase our exposure to currency manipulation by foreign lenders. This subsequently leads to the loss of manufacturing and service jobs. Our competitiveness is further comprised by international trade agreements that are not adequately enforced when our trade partners fail to live up to their commitments.

We can no longer afford to continue in this Administration's path of denial and inaction. There are no assurances that we will remain a global leader in innovation, and maintain our jobs, our standard of living, and our global market share. If our current employment and education trends are an indication of where we are heading, we will eventually fall behind those countries that are aggressively investing in their people, education, R&D, and businesses.

It is time to begin a national debate on restoring U.S. competitiveness so that we can remain at the cutting edge of innovation. This report presents a five part strategy to addresss offshoring, including developing policies that encourage greater investments in federal and industrial R&D, K–16 education and lifelong training, commercialization and businesses, and technological infrastructures such as broadband. Concurrently, it is essential that we assist our displaced workforce by extending compensation benefits and providing rapid retraining programs. We need to confront emerging nations that are aspiring to lead by fighting for greater access to overseas markets for goods and services, enforcing fair trade practices, and vigorously defending our intellectual property rights. Lastly, we must address our nation's irresponsible fiscal policy which makes us dependent on foreign purchases of U.S. securities and facilitates currency manipulation, further exacerbating the loss of our manufacturing and services jobs. By taking these proactive steps, we can create an environment that enables Americans to invent and develop the future waves of innovations that will keep quality jobs in U.S. shores.

Following is a summary of my five-part strategy to address offshoring.

1. Improve Safety Nets to Assist Affected Workers

Extend coverage of Trade Adjustment Assistance programs to support and retrain displaced services workers

Provide 3 months notice to workers when they lose their jobs to offshoring

Encourage corporate-sponsored insurance for wage loss

Encourage proactive instead of reactive training, continuous skills updating (e.g. use of Internet gaming and other technologies)

Provide agile and rapid retraining for displaced workforce

Reform and enforce guest visa regulations

2. Encourage Greater Innovation and Technology Development

Increase federal funding in R&D, particularly early stage R&D

Encourage corporate investment in R&D (e.g. permanent and improved collaborative R&D tax credits)

Greater emphasis on services sector in R&D investments

Innovation in services (e.g. greater integration of IT advances in sectors such as healthcare, construction and education services)

Invest in broadband infrastructure

Create environment that rewards risk taken by firms (e.g. eliminate capital gains for new investments in small companies; ''make it in USA'' tax incentives to domestic firms; accelerate asset depreciation schedules)

3. Invest in Human Capital Through Education and Training

Revitalize workforce training and education by bridging institutional gaps between education and industry

Expand R&D tax credit to encourage industry-university collaboration on science and technology research

Stronger partnerships between companies and community colleges for worker training

Increase graduates in science, technology, engineering, mathematics through incentive grants and special scholarships

Enable retired scientists' participation in education

Improve college readiness through K–16 partnerships

4. Establish and Enforce Effective Trade Policies

Ensure greater access to world markets for U.S. exports

Link additional access to U.S. market to genuine liberalization in overseas markets in both goods and services

Bring WTO dispute settlement cases when trade violations occur

End unfair currency practices in international trade (enact S. 1592, ''Fair Currency Enforcement Act of 2003'')

Vigorously defend U.S. intellectual property rights to prevent foreign piracy and counterfeiting

Incorporate workers' rights and environmental protection in trade agreements

NINTH CIRCUIT JUDGESHIP AND REORGANIZATION ACT

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I rise today in support of a bill introduced last week by my colleague, Senator ENSIGN. I am pleased that he has taken the helm in addressing the many problems posed by an excessively large and cumbersome Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals in his bill S. 2278. I am glad to add my name as a cosponsor of this bill. Montana sits in the Ninth Circuit, whose docket has grown in recent years. In 2003, 12,872 appeals were filed at the court, up almost 1,500 from the previous year. The Ninth Circuit Judgeship and Reorganization Act of 2004 will create two new circuit courts in addition to a restructured Ninth Circuit. The new Ninth Circuit would still contain California, and also Guam, Hawaii, and the Northern Marianas Islands. The new Twelfth Circuit would include Montana, as well as Arizona, Nevada, and Idaho. The new Thirteenth Circuit would comprise the remaining states: Alaska, Oregon, and Washington. I know many in the Senate have revisited this issue every year, and I am pleased to support this current bill.

Many times the judiciary in this country is bound to make unpopular but correct decisions, but lately, the Ninth Circuit has made decisions which I believe are both unpopular and wrong. Many Montanans who hold far more conservative views than the membership of the Ninth Circuit bench sitting in San Francisco were nonetheless bound to a particularly offensive decision made last year. The court found the phrase ''under God'' in the Pledge of Allegiance violated the Establishment Clause of the First Amendment when it is recited in school by our youngsters. The Supreme Court has heard this argument last month, and a decision is expected in July. This case highlights the disconnect between the San Francisco-based Ninth Circuit and my State of Montana which it supposedly represents. When I walk around Washington, DC, I see the presence of our forefathers and our tradition everywhere, which includes many references to God in our hallowed halls and on our currency. Many have given their lives in the name of God and country, and this faith has sustained us as a Nation. By limiting the words our children can utter in the classroom in support of this Nation and our faith, the Ninth Circuit has taken yet another step to remove all that is sacred for Americans. Americans know the words to patriotic songs, like ''God Bless America'' or ''America the Beautiful,'' but this may change if our Nation's young people are not permitted to sing them in a classroom. I find this decision extremely upsetting, because now more than ever, we need to teach our children a little more about faith in America and patriotism. There used to be a time when most young people felt compelled to serve their country, whether it be completed through military or volunteer service, but now it seems as though those numbers lessen every year. In America, we pride ourselves on the willingness of individuals to lend a helping hand, and I am saddened that the court has played an instrumental part in gradually eroding our Nation's values.

One of the other areas the Ninth Circuit has repeatedly addressed is land management, which usually has a negative effect on my State of Montana. One need only look to some of the court's recent decisions, which all share one commonality: they represent