



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 14, 2011

No. 136

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable KIRSTEN E. GILLIBRAND, a Senator from the State of New York.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

As we come into Your presence today, O Lord, we, like Isaiah of old, need to be cleansed from our sinfulness. Forgive us for our failures and cleanse us from all unrighteousness.

Today, use our lawmakers so that their actions will help provide for the security and well-being of all people. Sustain our Senators with the protection of Your providence and give them Your peace. Give them also a spirit of unity and the wisdom to have respect one for the other.

Lord, thank You for the redemption You provide for Your people. Holy and awesome is Your Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable KIRSTEN E. GILLIBRAND led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. INOUE).

The assistant bill clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, September 14, 2011.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable

KIRSTEN E. GILLIBRAND, a Senator from the State of New York, to perform the duties of the Chair.

DANIEL K. INOUE,
President pro tempore.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Madam President, following leader remarks, the Senate will be in morning business for 1 hour. The Republicans will control the first half and the majority will control the final half. Following morning business, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to H.J. Res. 66, which is now a resolution regarding Burma sanctions and the legislative vehicle for additional FEMA funding. We expect to be in consideration of this legislation today. We also hope to consider the FAA and highway extension, which was received from the House yesterday. Senators will be notified when votes are scheduled.

FEMA VICTIMS

Mr. REID. Madam President, the House sent us a package, and I appreciate that very much. It funds the highway bill for 6 months, and it funds the FEMA bill for 4 months. That is terrific. We should move to this as quickly as we can; however, we are told it is going to be held up by the Republicans. If someone wants to have a vote on an amendment as it relates to this, I will be happy to discuss this with the Republican leader and see if we can work something out. In the instance I am talking about, however, the Sen-

ator said he doesn't want to vote; he just wants to hold up the bill. He said if we put in what we got from the House and stuck his provision in that, then he would be happy. Well, I guess anyone would. It is a pretty good way to legislate around here—just be a dictator and say: Either take this or leave it. That isn't the way things work around here. We have to have votes on issues to find out how people feel.

I am convinced his issue would lose overwhelmingly, but he is holding up this legislation, and we are in a position now legislatively that I can't get to this bill. We cannot get to this bill prior to Friday, when the FAA expires. So it is unfortunate that is the position we are in. One Senator is holding this up, and what it will do is—the highway bill does not expire on Friday; FAA does. But they are a package. If this continues, we will have about 80,000 people out of work by Saturday, 4,000 who work for the FAA and about 70,000 or 75,000 who are working on airport construction jobs. In Las Vegas, for example, there is a new tower being built because of McCarran Field being overwhelmed—the old tower can't handle things well—and those people will be laid off. That is the way it is all over the country. That is very unfortunate.

I really appreciate, Madam President, and I have tried to say individually—I have been to each Republican Senator—the Senators who have voted to help us move forward on funding for FEMA, I really appreciate it. As you know, we have a majority, but it is not a huge majority, and to get things done on issues that are specialized, we need seven Republicans, and we have eight Republicans in this instance who helped us pass this legislation. All the Democratic Senators voted for this, and we got those Republicans. This allows us now to fund FEMA.

I have told my friends on the Republican side of the aisle, if it is something that—if they want to change the

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S5587

numbers around, let's have a discussion on that. But right now, people are desperate.

Last night around 6 or 6:30, I spoke to the man who is in charge of FEMA, and he said we are spending money every day on Lee and on Irene. These are not a couple of women; one is a tropical storm, and the other is a hurricane. They are not spending money other places. Why? Because they don't have the money.

As the Presiding Officer knows, there are people in her State who have lost their homes. This is all up and down the coast, from the coast of Florida up to Maine, and even places inward. As we talked about yesterday, some of the very severe damage was not on the coastline but, for example, in the State of Vermont, the worst storm likely they have ever had, and those people are trying to get from one place to the next, but they have scores of bridges that are inoperable. And that money—what money they have left in FEMA—will run out I think he said on the 25th. If things keep going the way they are, on the 25th of this month, they will be out of money—no money.

So we need to get this done. Procedurally, we are on this, and I can't move to the highway bill and the FAA bill. And, I repeat, the FAA bill expires. So I hope we can have something worked out with this Senator so we can get this bill done.

The disasters facing this country are untoward. Forty-eight States have already had emergency declarations. Some States have had multiple emergency declarations. Only two States—West Virginia and Michigan—have not had emergency declarations. We have had in the State of Texas, as an example, 20,000 fires since the first of the year; on Sunday alone, 19 fires. Millions of acres have burned, and 2,000 homes have burned to the ground. That is what FEMA is all about.

FEMA is an organization that is relatively new, but as a country we have been helping people who have experienced disasters since we have been a country.

In the early 1800s, there was a big fire in the State of New Hampshire. I believe the date was 1813. The Federal Government stepped in to help with the rebuilding there. That is the way it should be. That is what our country is all about. I am sorry, Madam President, it was 1803. In 1803, the Federal Government played a role in rebuilding after a calamity in New Hampshire. Congress passed legislation that year to help New Hampshire recover from the devastating fire they had.

FEMA was established in 1979. To this point, it appears this could very likely be the worst disaster year in the history of the country. Irene alone is one of the five worst disasters monetarily we have had in this country.

So I hope my Republican colleagues will work with us and help us move these things along. It is important that we do that. It is important that we do

that as quickly as we can so that people in Joplin, MO, and other places in the country that have been devastated can receive the help they deserve from the Federal Government.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business for 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with the Republicans controlling the first half and the majority controlling the final half.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—S. 1549, H.R. 2832, AND H.R. 2887

Mr. REID. Madam President, there are three bills at the desk due for a second reading.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the bills by title for the second time en bloc.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1549) to provide tax relief for American workers and businesses, to put workers back on the job while rebuilding and modernizing America, and to provide pathways back to work for Americans looking for jobs.

A bill (H.R. 2832) to extend the Generalized System of Preferences, and for other purposes.

A bill (H.R. 2887) to provide an extension of surface and air transportation programs, and for other purposes.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I would object to any further proceedings with respect to these three bills.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard. The bills will be placed on the calendar.

The Senator from Nebraska.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. JOHANNIS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to engage in a colloquy with my Republican colleagues—Senators ROBERTS, PORTMAN, HOEVEN, BLUNT, and ISAKSON—and in the event the minority leader does appear to offer comments, that we interrupt our colloquy for the minority leader to speak.

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

TRADE AGREEMENTS

Mr. JOHANNIS. Madam President, I rise today with my colleagues to talk about trade and the importance of trade and specifically to talk about three pending trade agreements. And

when I say "pending," man alive, am I emphasizing "pending." These agreements have been around a very long time. And I am referring to Korea, Panama, and Colombia.

We all know the benefits of trade in the United States. In Nebraska, my home State, more than 19,000 jobs and more than \$5.5 billion in revenue were directly tied to exports last year.

In trade discussions, we often hear about the need to level the playing field. Well, these agreements do exactly that. They eliminate tariffs and a whole host of other barriers on most agricultural products, including products that are important to my State: beef, corn, soybeans, and pork. No doubt about it, they increase the economic opportunities for Nebraska farmers and ranchers, for businesses and for workers.

Well, for 3 years, we have heard the President say the right thing. In fact, every time he would say something about this, I thought, finally, the trade agreements are going to bust loose and we are going to have an opportunity to vote on them.

He said in last year's State of the Union:

If America sits on the sidelines while other Nations sign trade deals, we will lose the chance to create jobs on our shores.

Then again in May, the President called for a "robust, forward-looking trade agenda that emphasizes exports and domestic job growth."

Just last week, the President noted that now is the time. He said, of "a series of trade agreements that would make it easier for American companies to sell their products in Panama, Colombia and South Korea," now is the time. If now is the time, why is the administration continuing to fail to act? It has been 1,538 days since the Korea agreement was signed. It has been 1,540 days since the Panama agreement was signed. It has been 1,758 days since we completed negotiations with Colombia.

As I said, I have colleagues with me today who are in a much better position than I would be to explain the positive impacts of these trade agreements. I am going to ask that Senator ROBERTS speak first, Senator PORTMAN, Senator HOEVEN, Senator BLUNT, and Senator ISAKSON. It is my hope that if there is time permitting, I will wrap up.

I ask Senator ROBERTS, as former chairman of the House Agriculture subcommittee and ranking member of the Senate Agriculture Committee today, how important are these agreements to agriculture and job creation in the United States?

Mr. ROBERTS. Madam President, I thank my colleague and dear friend from Nebraska for the question.

In the end, the biggest consequence for inaction that is now facing our Nation, our biggest challenge, is jobs. In regards to his question, the three pending trade agreements add up to \$13 billion in additional exports and an estimated 250,000 jobs. From the agricultural perspective, the three pending

trade agreements represent \$2.5 billion, if they are ever implemented.

The estimates are that the three agreements in total are expected to increase direct exports by \$129.5 million just for Kansas farmers and ranchers and an additional 1,150 jobs for our State. For folks on the farm, these export markets are absolutely critical. Approximately one-third of our crop production is exported. For wheat, that number jumps to one-half.

The administration's prolonged delay is causing U.S. businesses and producers to simply lose market share. We are losing out. Other countries are not waiting. They are enacting trade agreements without the United States.

Let me give a very good example. The Colombia-Canada trade agreement went into force on August 15 of this year. Already, Nutresa, the largest food processor in Colombia, has announced it will source all of its wheat from Canada to take advantage of the lower duties the Canadian wheat will receive from the trade agreement. Nutresa's wheat demand alone represents 50 percent of all wheat imports to that country. Our Kansas Farm Bureau estimates that Kansas farmers stand to lose \$21 million from lost wheat sales alone and \$38 million from all agricultural exports just by doing nothing on the trade agreement.

Soon after the United States negotiated the trade agreement with Korea, the European Union followed suit. In July, the Korea-European Union trade agreement went into effect. According to Korean customs, within the first 29 days of July, I say to my friend, the European exports were up 34 percent.

Get this one: Notably, aerospace equipment increased by a whopping 1,693 percent. That is astounding. Kansas is a major player in the aviation sector, exporting \$2.7 billion in transportation equipment last year. As the aviation capital of the world, Wichita's aviation companies and 17,000 workers have much to lose in trying to compete against the European Union.

It is long overdue time for the President to put some action behind his words. Send the three trade agreements to Congress immediately.

I am going to make a statement that I regret to say. Trade assistance notwithstanding, I am very sad to say that I do not believe we are going to see any trade agreement this year or the next. I hope my prediction is not correct. This is ridiculous.

Every third foggy night, the President makes a speech and says: We need these trade agreements. We are losing market share.

Well, I don't see the trade agreements. These are not the trade agreements. Maybe somebody can find them here on the floor or in the House. Maybe they are somewhere. But I think they are in the White House, and until we get the politics out of this and the President sends the trade agreements here, what on Earth is he doing saying we should be passing these trade

agreements? We don't have the bill. Send us the bill, Mr. President.

As the administration delays moving forward on these export agreements with Korea, Panama, and Colombia, what is happening to American exports to these important markets?

Senator PORTMAN is an expert on this issue. There is not anybody in this Senate who is more of an expert on trade. If you apply the administration's own metrics, how many jobs will be created—I am not talking about lost but will be created by these pending agreements?

Mr. PORTMAN. I thank my colleague from Kansas, who has just made the case eloquently as to why we need to move forward.

To answer his question, when you apply the metrics the President of the United States and his administration have used for these three trade agreements alone, they would create 250,000 new jobs. I ask my colleagues, with 9 percent unemployment and continued bad economic news, can't we use those jobs? By the way, jobs that are related to trade tend to be higher paying, tend to have more benefits. This is exactly what we need to do in this Senate and in the House and here in Washington—put the partisanship aside and move forward on what makes sense to create jobs.

I can't think of anything that would have a more immediate impact on those exporters Senator ROBERTS talked about, who right now are seeing their market share eroded because the United States is sitting on its hands. In 2006, the Colombia agreement was finalized. It has been tinkered with since then, but we are talking 5 years ago. It is unbelievable. When we have sat on our hands and not moved forward with giving our farmers and our workers and our service providers the chance to go into that Colombian market, you are exactly right, they have gone ahead and made trade agreements with other folks.

Colombia is a great example. Back when we negotiated this agreement and completed it—and I was the U.S. Trade Representative then, as the Senator indicated, and I negotiated with the then-President of Colombia, President Uribe, who made lots of concessions, including on manufacturing and agricultural services. At that time, we had a 71-percent market share in terms of exports of agricultural products—wheat, corn, and soybeans—into Colombia—a 71-percent market share. Today, that market share is about 26 percent. Why? Because after we completed our agreement with Colombia, they engaged with other countries, including the Mercosur countries of Argentina and Brazil, and now they are buying their products instead from those countries that got their act together and moved forward with trade agreements that this President will not get his act together on and send to us.

As Senator ROBERTS said, just recently, in August, this summer, they

completed an agreement with Canada. Guess what the Canadians love to export—the same kind of wheat we love to export. So the Senator is right, they are going to take the wheat market away from Kansas and North Dakota and other States that really need those jobs and need those exports.

We have to move forward. It is really a crime that we have not been able to provide our farmers, workers, and service providers these opportunities.

Mr. ROBERTS. Will the Senator yield for one quick question?

Mr. PORTMAN. Yes. Absolutely.

Mr. ROBERTS. The Senator has been there and done the negotiating. He knows these trade agreements not only apply to our exports but our national security. What has this continued delay done—what does it do to the credibility of the people who are actually negotiating, our trade representatives?

Mr. PORTMAN. Unfortunately, I think some of these countries—all three of which are great allies of the United States: Panama, Colombia, and South Korea—feel as though the United States has let them down.

We are going to move forward here, I believe. I am more optimistic than the Senator from Kansas. I believe the President will finally send these forward. He has to. The logic is difficult to escape. Why wouldn't you? And that is good. We will be able to move forward, I hope, with not just opening more markets but helping on our relationships with these incredibly important allies. But in the meantime, there has been damage done. The Senator is absolutely right. I think they believe in some respects that the rug has been pulled out from under them. They made huge concessions and commitments to the United States and politically took great risks.

Frankly, in Colombia and Panama, where they moved forward immediately to ratify these agreements in their legislature, it wasn't just the administration, it was the elected representatives of the people, as we are, who took risks to say: Yes, we want to be a partner with the United States of America, the greatest economy on the face of the Earth and this beacon of hope and opportunity, and here we are in America letting them down.

So in both its commercial impacts on the United States—we have lost market share, we have lost jobs because of it, but it also has had an impact, as Senator ROBERTS says, in terms of our standing in the world.

We have to move forward not just with these three, but the important point is that we have to move forward with additional agreements. There are over 100 trade agreements being negotiated right now around the world, and because the United States does not have a trade promotion authority, the ability for the President to negotiate and bring an agreement back here for an up-or-down vote, we are not engaged in these agreements. We are engaged in

one, which is a regional one—the trans-Pacific partnership—but none of these bilateral ones, which is where you are really going to get these trade openings and new exports and, therefore, new jobs.

This is a bigger issue that must be addressed. This Congress, I hope, will address it in the context of the votes we are going to have in connection with the trade agreements. We are going to promote getting the United States back in the game of expanding our trade and helping U.S. jobs.

By the way, it was mentioned earlier that it is not just that we have the opportunity to create over 200,000 jobs. It is also that if we do not move forward on these three agreements, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce has done some analysis showing we would lose 380,000 jobs.

This sort of goes both ways. There is a cost to not moving forward, and that is also hundreds of thousands of jobs we desperately need in States such as Ohio and the States represented by the Senators who are here with us on the floor today. The International Trade Commission now says these three agreements alone would expand exports annually by \$13 billion—again meaning jobs and opportunity.

It is time for us to move forward. Senator ROBERTS has talked about what is happening with the European Union, which actually negotiated its agreements after we completed ours.

In the auto sector, by the way, there is an EU-Korea agreement that says the 8-percent tariff on imported cars has already started being reduced. That has resulted in the companies sending UK cars, including Hondas that are being produced in the United Kingdom—they are being exported to South Korea. We have a Honda plant in Ohio. I visited it recently. There are 4,200 Ohio workers there. We want to export Hondas from Ohio to Korea. We can do that with these export agreements.

It is time for us to move forward. It is not the time for us to play politics. We have to move forward because we need these jobs and because, again, the United States should be at the forefront of these agreements in order to not just protect the market share we have but expand it. Ninety-five percent of the consumers live outside of our borders, and we need to access those consumers.

I now ask, if I could, one of my colleagues to talk a little about his experience in his State.

JOHN HOEVEN was Governor of North Dakota, so he was like the trade representative from North Dakota. He was out there promoting trade as Governor, and North Dakota is a State that has a lot of exports, including wheat, as we talked about earlier, so they are being hit by what Senators ROBERTS and JOHANNIS talked about in terms of what is happening in Colombia today with the Canadian agreement and also the EU agreement with Korea.

I ask Senator HOEVEN if he would talk a little about why these agree-

ments with Colombia and Panama are so important to his State.

Mr. HOEVEN. I thank Senator PORTMAN, and I thank Senator JOHANNIS for organizing this discussion on a very important issue, a timely issue. It is good to be here with Senator ROBERTS, with Senator BLUNT and Senator ISAKSON. I think, coming from our different States, we show how important these trade agreements are not only to our individual States across the country but how important these trade agreements are to our Nation right now.

When we are talking trade, we are talking jobs. We need to create more jobs in this country, and it is the private sector that creates jobs. It is business investment, it is companies that create jobs. Our job, our task, our role is to create an environment where our companies and our entrepreneurs and American ingenuity that built the greatest economic engine in the history of the world—this country, this economy, this U.S. economy—we have to create that environment so they can invest and create those jobs.

One of the important ways we do that is with good trade agreements. Let's make sure our companies can export their great products and services all over the world. We have to compete in a global, high-tech economy, and these trade agreements let us do it. That is why it is so important that we move forward.

Today, we are on the floor of the Senate saying: Why do we have these trade agreements? Thursday night, we heard from the President that we need to move forward with these trade agreements. We want to move forward with these trade agreements. We are ready to go. We have been for some time. In fact, the Senators here on the floor and others have been working very hard to do everything we can to make sure we have cleared the path so these trade agreements can come to the Senate floor.

It was not too long ago that Senator JOHANNIS, myself, and Senator PORTMAN went with Senator MITCH MCCONNELL and Senator MORAN over to South Korea to meet with President Lee. He wants the agreements. He is ready to go. As a matter of fact, he said, please ratify the agreements in your country, get them over to me, because I am ready to take that to my legislators and get this approved.

Second, our President said there are some concerns we need to deal with as part of these trade agreements. He said we need to address TSA, trade assistant adjustment. We said we will work with TSA. We will make sure we have enough Senators so it is squared away. We have it covered. That has been communicated. So the question is: Why at this point don't we have the trade agreements? That is the question I think that has to be asked. Where are they? Why aren't they here on the Senate floor so we can move forward with them? In our State, as others men-

tioned in their States, they are incredibly important.

A few big stats to follow on what Senator PORTMAN mentioned a minute ago. For every 4-percent increase in trade, we create a million jobs in this country. For every 4-percent increase in trade, a million jobs in this country are created. How important is that? The United States-South Korea free trade agreement alone means more than a quarter of a million jobs, more than \$10 billion in increased U.S. exports to that country alone. I cannot think of a time when it is more important to create those jobs than right now when we have more than 14 million people out of work and many more who are either not working because they have not been able to get a job or who are underemployed. Unemployment is more than 9 percent.

This is one of the ways we create that environment that gets our people back to work by empowering the private sector to make that investment and create those jobs.

I was just back in North Dakota, and one of the many events I went to was an expansion of one of the Caterpillar company's locations in West Fargo, ND. They remanufacture a lot of their equipment in West Fargo, ND. This equipment goes all over the world. It is part of the huge machines that Cat makes. They use these machines for excavating, for mining, road building, for all these things all over the world, and they are the technology leader in the world in this huge equipment. They bought Bucyrus, which is huge in mining, so now they are big in the mining business. Getting into places such as Colombia and Panama is incredibly important for Caterpillar. It is not just about creating jobs in North Dakota, but think of the impact throughout the heartland in Indiana or in Illinois or, as Senator ROBERTS talked about, agriculture.

In North Dakota we have more cattle than people. I think we have more than 3 million cattle. Right now to send them to South Korea, we pay more than 40 percent tariff. How do we compete with Argentina or Australia in that situation? This is an opportunity. This is absolutely an opportunity. We need to reach out and grab it with both hands. We have the President right now saying, pass those trade agreements. Absolutely. Please get them down here to us. We have worked so hard to make sure we have cleared all the hurdles, TAA, or whatever else is required. Bring those trade agreements to us. We stand ready to pass them.

Mr. PORTMAN. Would the Senator yield for a second? The Senator talked about being at home and talking to his constituents about this, and I am sure all of us have stories like this, but I will tell you this morning we had one of our weekly coffees and the Ohio pork producers came. There were about 12 pork producers from around the State of Ohio. Do you know what the No. 1 issue was they raised with me? Trade

and getting these trade agreements done. Why? Because it affects their prices directly. They have to have these international sales in order to make ends meet. Particularly with the price of feed going up, they have to have these foreign markets. It was interesting that of all the issues they could have raised with me, the one they are most concerned about is to make sure we get these three agreements done, and then move forward with the additional agreements.

It is our job to provide the environment for success. Part of that environment is to give our exporters the ability to have a level playing field to access these markets. They are the best farmers in the world. We have some of the most productive land in the world. They just need a fair shake.

Mr. HOEVEN. It is absolutely true. In handing off the ball in this discussion, I want to go back to the trade adjustment assistance, which I mentioned earlier. There were a number of things the administration wanted to see before bringing these trade agreements forward to us for ratification. Senator BLUNT and Senator PORTMAN were instrumental—and along with these two, Senator JOHANNIS, myself, Senator ISAKSON, and others. We even signed on to a letter not once but I think twice, to make sure we got it right. Senator BLUNT's leadership in making sure we had taken all the necessary steps so the administration was prepared and willing to bring these agreements to the Senate floor has been covered. I thank the Senator for that leadership. He may want to touch on that, but I know how important the trade agreements are to the State of Missouri. But I also thank the leadership of Senator PORTMAN, as well, in making sure we addressed TAA and all of the issues that needed to be addressed as part of moving forward with these trade agreements.

Mr. BLUNT. I think what Senator PORTMAN and I thought when the President said for these three trade agreements to be voted on, we had to have trade adjustment assistance. We looked at the negotiated package. It was not exactly what any of us who signed the letter would have negotiated. We said, look, these are the jobs that are the low-hanging fruit of job creation if we get these three trade bills. We are willing to look at the Baucus camp-negotiated TAA, and support it in a way the White House can sign it and send these agreements up.

Senator HOEVEN mentioned, as he and I and all of us were sitting in the House Chamber last Thursday night, listening to the President's remarks when he said we need to pass these three trade agreements, I was almost sure the next sentence would be: And so tomorrow, I am sending these trade agreements up. That next sentence did not occur. Just like the week in August where the President was on his bus tour and every single day on the bus tour he said Congress can do some-

thing right now that would create more American jobs if they will pass these three trade agreements. Every time he said that, even though I was hearing it on the TV, I could not help but talk back to the television or the radio and say: Well, we cannot pass them unless you send them up. You are absolutely right, this is one of the easiest things we could do to create jobs, Mr. President, but we have to have the agreements from you before we can vote on them. Don't tell the American people all we have to do is pass the bill when you know that you have to send the bill up before we can pass the bill. We need these three agreements. As Senator PORTMAN has pointed out, we need more agreements, but that is not happening right now. We do need the President to have the authority that I, and I think all of us, would be more than willing to give him, but that is not part of this package, the trade promotion authority we wish to see extended into the future.

Right now we have three agreements that have been negotiated for a long time, and whether it is the Missouri and North Dakota beef industry or the Missouri and Ohio pork industry or the grain industry that we all are impacted by, there is a real opportunity here and these markets are waiting for us.

To look at our State, since 2002, exports have increased more than three times faster than the State domestic product has grown. So for those who say, well, exports cost American jobs or Missouri jobs, they clearly provide those jobs. U.S. farm exports reached an all-time high in 2010, amounting to more than \$115 billion in sales. For every \$1 billion worth of agricultural exports, there are an estimated 8,000 jobs. So these countries are waiting for agreements that will increase trade in soybeans and beef and corn and pork and dairy products and processed food; in fact, in processed goods of all kinds. We cannot get to those markets until we pass these trade agreements.

All of us are eager to work with the President to get that done. All of us are eager for him to send us those trade agreements. Since these agreements were negotiated, others have negotiated agreements and launched them—and it may have been mentioned already this morning, but if it has not, it is important to understand that on July 1, the European Union trade agreement with South Korea went into place and they had a 1-month, 38-percent increase year over year the first month of that trade agreement.

The Canada-Colombia agreement went into place on August 15. Having been to Colombia and worked on this for some time, there is no question there is a preference for our goods, but once they start buying these other products, then you have to convince them you need to come back to the product you would rather have had to start with if that product had had an even shot at the marketplace.

Panama is negotiating all kinds of work agreements and expansion agree-

ments on the canal we are disadvantaged in because we have not passed that agreement.

Let's get these three agreements done. Let's start creating the private sector jobs these agreements clearly will lead to. As we have talked to the White House and the President about that, my good friend from Georgia, JOHNNY ISAKSON, has been in the middle of all of those discussions. We know what can happen. For it to happen, we have to get these agreements sooner rather than later. Let's get them up here. Let's get them passed. Let's get them back in the hands of our new trading partners and see these jobs increase.

I am pleased to recognize and encourage the ongoing efforts for this effort with my good friend, Mr. ISAKSON.

Mr. ISAKSON. I thank Senator BLUNT.

I thank Senator JOHANNIS for organizing this colloquy.

I represent a State that is home to the second largest port on the eastern seaboard in the United States of America. The port is Savannah. We are talking about creating jobs in America. The port of Savannah directly employs 300,000 people in the southeastern United States. Can you think of what an impact this is going to have to increase that employment if we get these free trade agreements?

Let me give you an example that is amazing. South Korea surpassed Japan in 2010 as the second largest Northeast Asian destination for South Atlantic exports behind only China—second largest in all of Asia behind only China—most of that going out of the port of Savannah, most of that being agricultural products from your State and from your State and from mine.

Senator PORTMAN talked about pork. In Georgia it is all about chickens and cattle. We are No. 1 in poultry, and South Korea is a huge importer of our poultry. They would be a lot bigger with a free trade agreement.

Let me give another number that is chilling. South Korea's imports from South Korea into the United States went up by 26 percent last year. Our exports to them went up by 15 percent. That is an 11-percent negative in the trade deficit, which causes us tremendous problems.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. ISAKSON. Madam President, I ask for unanimous consent for 5 additional minutes to close.

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

Mr. ISAKSON. So my point is very simply this: We can help to balance our trade deficit. We can help to increase employment in the southeastern United States. We can help poultry, we can help pork, and we can help beef. It has been 968 days since the President could have sent us these free trade agreements, and he has not. My point in this debate is very simple. There is

one person in the United States of America standing between us and more job creation, and it is the resident of the White House, President Obama.

I wish to turn it over to the organizer of this event, Senator JOHANNIS.

Mr. JOHANNIS. Madam President, I end my comments today by saying to all of my fellow Senators, thank you so very much for coming to the floor today and making the case. There is an old saying in a profession I used to be engaged in: I rest my case. Well, after hearing from these fine gentlemen about the importance of these agreements and why we need to have the President send them here, I rest my case. It is going to improve job creation. It is going to improve our opportunity to export our products. It is going to level the playing field. It is going to give our producers the opportunity to reclaim market share that has been lost while we have been waiting for these agreements to come here.

The final point I wish to make is this. I come from a State where unemployment is right above 4 percent. In this recession in Nebraska, unemployment never went over 5 percent. In fact, as I was doing my townhall meetings across the State, I had members of my business community coming to me and saying: One of the challenges we are facing is finding the workers for the jobs we are creating. Therefore, in my State, trade adjustment assistance would not be the high priority it is in many States. Notwithstanding that fact, when Senator BLUNT came to me and said, look, the President is insisting on trade adjustment assistance as a condition to move these agreements and would I sign on to a letter that will back trade adjustment assistance, I said I would. Why? Because the trade agreements are important to us.

It is my hope that after the many speeches we have all given—the many speeches I have given on the importance of these agreements not only on the Senate floor but across this country—the President is listening and will finally send us these agreements so we can work with the President. We can join forces on these agreements and do everything we can to get the votes in the Senate and in the House to pass them and to put them on his desk and create 250,000 new jobs.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Connecticut.

DISASTER RELIEF

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Madam President, over the past 2 weeks, I have traveled the State of Connecticut, as the Presiding Officer has done in the State of New York, and she has described eloquently the damage she has seen in her State. I have seen much the same in mine. I have seen the destruction of small businesses, of homes; rivers swelling, flooding of historic dimensions causing significant destruction; the wind and rain striking Con-

necticut with a fury, its ferocity virtually unmatched in recent memory.

I met with families and community leaders, farmers and small businesses, about the help they will need to rebuild their homes and their businesses and their lives and their livelihoods. It is a powerful and moving struggle. The citizens of Connecticut, similar to the citizens of New York and others struck by this storm, have acted with determination and resolve, not with desperation or despair. They are determined and dedicated to rebuild and recover from this storm, but they need the help that is provided by FEMA. We are here, hopefully in a bipartisan effort, to make sure these communities and others like them throughout the Northeast and throughout the United States have the help and the real consequential aid they need to make this recovery in rebuilding their lives.

The early estimates suggest that the damage caused by Irene could reach more than \$10 billion, making it one of the 10 costliest disasters in U.S. history. The suffering and real sadness of Connecticut citizens gives us a bond and a cause in common with millions of other Americans who have suffered from hurricanes, tornadoes, floods, and other natural disasters across the country. This year alone, we have seen flooding on the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers and other rivers in the Midwest, devastating tornadoes in the South, wildfires in the South and West, and now Hurricane Irene and Tropical Storm Lee.

In times of natural disaster, Americans come together. In times when they face crises, Americans rally as neighbors, as a community. Regardless of specific States where they live, they come together to rebuild their homes, to make common cause, to recognize our bonds as a nation. The spirit of our Nation is that we put people above politics every time, without exception; that we provide disaster relief for victims, such as Connecticut residents now, and with the resources they need to rebuild.

Currently, FEMA is funding disaster relief for over 550 disasters, including 29 in Oklahoma, 21 in Kentucky, 17 in Texas, 19 in Mississippi, and 18 in Kansas. Yet 2 weeks ago, House majority leader ERIC CANTOR stated that relief funds for Hurricane Irene would need to be offset by savings found elsewhere in the Federal budget. I reject that contention and so should this body and my colleagues from those States I have just named and all the other States in the Union. In fact, all but a handful or less have received and are receiving disaster relief just since January of this year.

We need to do everything we can to put Connecticut and America back to work, to make sure our economy moves forward again, to create jobs, and to reduce the deficit. Yes, we need to reduce the deficit and the debt and cut unnecessary and wasteful spending. However, we cannot permit Wash-

ington politics to create a legislative logjam and gridlock that bogs down these efforts for disaster relief. The need is too urgent for thousands of families and businesses in Connecticut and around the country that have been devastated by these unprecedented floods and other natural disasters, such as hurricanes, wildfires, floods, and tornadoes.

Turning disaster assistance into a political football is unacceptable and unconscionable. It is a recipe for gridlock and it is just plain wrong. It is wrong and a disservice to the men and women whose homes and businesses have been hit by the forces of nature that are unpredictable and unpreventable. Now they are attempting to rebuild their lives, and we owe it to them to match their courage and resilience with efforts from FEMA.

We can't prevent those hurricanes or tornadoes or wildfires, but we can step forward when these disasters occur and lend a hand to our neighbors, as we have done throughout our history, and we can provide these communities with the real resources they need to recover, without distinguishing between what State or what part of the country.

There is one story from Connecticut which I think tells a lot about the choices we face right now. Mel Goldstein and his wife Arlene, whose home was completely destroyed by flooding caused by Hurricane Irene, are being told their homeowners insurance will not cover the damage. Their only hope of recovery is FEMA flood insurance and other FEMA assistance. Right now, they are using their savings to stay in a hotel while they rebuild their lives. Mel is one of the best known weathermen in the State of Connecticut. He is an icon in the broadcasting world and a hero to many of us for his struggle against cancer. His treatment in this unstable environment at this point in his recovery adds an unnecessary toll and stress to their lives. As we have in the past, we must come together to help folks such as Arlene and Mel Goldstein move on after the unthinkable happens in their lives. The unthinkable happened to them and to many of their neighbors in East Haven along the shores of Connecticut.

I have heard their voices and seen their faces throughout our State, in communities big and small, where flooding has put a small business out of business and where homes have been destroyed and people are living in shelters or with their neighbors or were for awhile. These kinds of human stories are part of the fabric of the larger story we need to recognize. I hope my colleagues will come together, as we did on the vote yesterday, to approve this measure. The vote yesterday signaled perhaps a return to the bipartisanship that should prevail when the Nation confronts crisis and disaster. Our No. 1 goal, which should be a bipartisan goal, must be to deliver help to our fellow Americans as quickly as possible.

Thank you. I yield the floor and note the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BLUMENTHAL). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. President, Hurricane Irene and Tropical Storm Lee left a trail of devastation across New York State. I saw firsthand the impact they left on our communities: hundreds of families living in shelters, complete homes destroyed, belongings piled up on people's front yards, small businesses uncertain whether they would even reopen and worrying about whether they could hire back their employees, farms that had no feed for livestock for days, crops and livelihoods vanishing without any trace in a single day, crumbling bridges, washed-out roads, heating oil soaking into buildings and the ground. I was born and raised in upstate New York, and I can say we have never seen this kind of devastation—certainly not in my lifetime.

America has always stood by those who have suffered greatly from disaster and we have always helped them to rebuild. We have an obligation to these families, businesses, and farmers to help them rebuild today.

This picture is of downtown Binghamton. I met with hundreds of families displaced and placed in a Red Cross shelter at the University of Binghamton. They were on day four at the shelter, unclear if they would be able to see what was left of their homes.

I can't fully describe the worry and fear in the eyes of parents who are in a shelter with their children. I talked to one mother who has 10 children, the youngest of whom was 2 years old, trying desperately to keep them fed, keep them safe but literally having no sense of when she could return to her home and what it would look like when she returned.

I talked to one father whose daughter turned 13 years old that day in the shelter and his worry was mostly: I don't know what is in front of us. I don't know when we will be able to go home. I don't know how much has been destroyed, and I don't know how I will rebuild.

One parent I talked to was a young mother. She held a 6-week-old infant in her arms, and she said to me: I have everything I need right here. That exemplified the courage of Americans when they fight through suffering—the strength of New Yorkers that they will pull themselves up by their own bootstraps and make the difference. But we in Washington must help.

In Schoharie County, on the main street of the villages of both Schoharie and Middleburgh, every single home was flooded. The water mark was at

about 7 feet. As you drive down the main street and begin to talk to the business owners and the families, you can see there was not one left untouched. Every piece of these families' belongings is literally on the front lawns of these homes and businesses.

But I watched these business owners begin to rebuild. I could see them literally bringing the mud from the basements, bringing the mud from their ground floors, pulling down all the drywall because obviously the damage was so great it would cause long-lasting damage. People are very worried about how they can make sure their business is safe.

This is just a snapshot right here in this picture of the town of Middleburgh. This is the farming community within Schoharie County. These farmers have lost everything. I can tell you, the water was so strong, the surge was so great, it literally took trees out of the ground, completely uprooted and overturned. The crops that we could see on this farm—they were so covered with silt from the river, we could not even recognize what kind of crops they were. I saw potatoes that had been uprooted from the ground all over the road. That farmer could salvage nothing of their farm.

We had one farmer who came down to meet with me because her cows were stranded. They had 800 cows stuck because the roads had been completely washed out. They had no way to get feed up to those cows. They had no way to deal with manure and dump all the milk that had to be destroyed. They needed a rescue effort. Because of the efforts of our Governor—he reacted quickly—our National Guard got up there, got food and water up to those farmers, they fixed the road, and the feed was delivered. But this is the kind of reaction we need from government. This is why the Federal Government must be there to help and protect these families and businesses.

Our next picture is of Greene County. In Greene County, waters rushed down the main street of Windham—this is a picture of Windham—and destroyed all businesses in its wake. The homes of families were also destroyed. There was absolute destruction throughout Greene County.

I talked to just one business owner, and she had a business for children's clothing, children's needs, children's toys. She had just a couple employees, but she said: I have nothing to rebuild. I have no way that I can rebuild my business. I don't think I could rehire those employees.

So there is the feeling of hopelessness and worry and dread and concern on top of a very tough economy anyway. These are the businesses and families and farmers we need to help because we need them to rebuild. We need them to have the ability to rehire those employees, to produce food for our families, to make sure we have thriving communities once again.

The last picture I wish to show is of Keene, up in the North Country. In

Keene, the river rose 22 feet above the flood stage, washing out roads and bridges, and it left much of the town actually stranded for days. Half the town's firehouse was ripped apart and swept away by the river. Up in the High Peaks, the rain came down so hard it brought huge chunks of the mountainside with it, creating slides that have changed the face of the Adirondacks for generations.

As you can see, this is just four communities. Throughout New York State—the North Country, the Capital Region, the Mohawk Valley, the Hudson Valley, the Southern Tier, and Long Island—no one can question the absolute devastation that these storms have left in our communities. We must stand with them in their greatest time of need.

Federal assistance is essential to help these families, these farmers, these businesses, and communities not only recover but rebuild and be stronger than they were before.

We need immediate funding for FEMA and the USDA disaster assistance to provide relief for these communities all across New York and for all the other States that were affected by these storms.

SYRIA SANCTIONS ACT OF 2011

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. President, I would now like to address a second issue that is causing me very grave concern. I would like to talk for a moment about a piece of legislation I have introduced with Senators KIRK and LIEBERMAN to toughen the sanctions on Syria.

Syrian President Assad has killed over 2,000 of his own people in an alarming torrent of violence from one of the world's most repressive regimes—2,200 people are estimated to have died so far.

Assad's aggression against the Syrian people is matched by his subversive aggression abroad. His regime is a state sponsor of terrorism, one of Iran's closest allies, and a key backer of Hamas and Hezbollah. Assad's regime has for years helped foreign fighters enter Iraq and kill our U.S. soldiers.

In response to this violent crackdown, I introduced the bipartisan Syria Sanctions Act of 2011 to hold Assad's regime accountable. This legislation would block access to the U.S. market for companies that invest in Syria's energy sector, purchase the county's oil, and sell gasoline to Syria. This sanction is critical, since Syria's energy sector accounts for one-third of that state's revenue.

I ask my colleagues to sponsor S. 1472 and send a clear message to Syria that until the Assad regime responds to the democratic urging of its people, halts its nuclear development, and ends support for terrorism, Syria will not and should not have access to the global economy, and any company that does business with Syria will no longer have access to the global economy.

This legislation is very clear and simple: that no company should be allowed to put their profits before our national security.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

APPROVING THE RENEWAL OF IMPORT RESTRICTIONS CONTAINED IN THE BURMESE FREEDOM AND DEMOCRACY ACT OF 2003—MOTION TO PROCEED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to H.J. Res. 66, which the clerk will report by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to the consideration of a joint resolution (H.J. Res. 66) approving the renewal of import restrictions contained in the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, I rise to speak about the need to have a disaster assistance effort to support those in New York, your State, as well as across the country and the tremendous needs we have as a result of what has happened regarding the weather. This year we have seen a terrible string of natural disasters that have shut down businesses, farms, and left families homeless all across our country. As chair of the Agriculture Committee, I am particularly focused, of course, on what has happened to our farmers in America.

I am concerned about the flooding along the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers, the record droughts that have devastated the livelihoods of men and women who grow our food all across America. Earlier this year we had the worst drought in recorded history in Oklahoma, with about \$1.6 billion in crop losses. In Kansas I have had the opportunity, and my staff has, to join with my ranking member, my colleague, Senator ROBERTS, to talk with folks and a chance to see that the drought had wiped out about \$2 billion in crops.

Floods in the Mississippi River Valley washed over 3 million acres—3 million acres—of farmland. Hurricane Irene destroyed more than 450,000 acres of cotton and 300,000 acres of corn in North Carolina. In New York we have

seen similar damage to corn, soybeans, alfalfa, fruits, and vegetables. In Vermont crop losses are estimated at more than \$5 million.

All across our country we have serious challenges that are creating hardships for our businesses, our farmers, and our families. We need to respond. That is our responsibility. Right now the droughts are worse in Texas where the damage is also in the billions of dollars. We have more than 1,000 homes that have been lost.

Already this year there have been natural disasters in 48 of our States—48 out of 50 States have had natural disasters. Michigan, thank goodness, is one of the two States that has not been affected by the weather. But throughout our Nation's history when men and women in one part of the country were hit with a natural disaster, all of America came together to support them and to help rebuild.

That is what this effort is about, coming together as Americans. That is who we are as Americans. We stand with each other in times of trouble. This is not the time to play politics, not when hundreds of thousands of families, farmers, and businesses have been devastated by an unprecedented string of floods, tornadoes, hurricanes, wildfires, and other natural disasters.

Already, FEMA has had to halt rebuilding efforts in 41 States. So it is critical that we get this done. This legislation in front of us needs to pass, and it needs to pass quickly.

But I also want to tell you about another emergency that has taken place in my State and in too many other States. It is called a jobs emergency. We may not have been affected by the natural disasters of the weather, but as we look over the last decade in a global economy, as the economy has changed we have been through the same kind of devastation—over a longer period of time, but our people are affected as much as any other State disaster.

We have 14 million people out of work in this country—14 million people out of work. We have a huge national deficit. We will never get out of debt with more than 14 million people out of work. We have to make smart decisions on cutting what is not important, and we have to grow. We have to create jobs for people and support the efforts of the private sector to create jobs.

For each and every one of those families, their job search is an emergency. It is an emergency every time they think about how to put food on their table. It is an emergency every month when they have to scrape together money for the rent or the mortgage. It is an emergency every minute of every day when those men and women are filling out applications, going to job fairs, trying their best to get back to work.

So I find in the middle of all of this, in the middle of support for all that is going on around the country in terms of natural disasters, it is extremely concerning—and in fact outrageous to

me—that the House Republicans have proposed a job-killing offset to pay for the help that is critically needed for natural disasters; that would pull the rug out from under businesses and families all across our country and put up to 50,000 American jobs at risk. That is what they are proposing.

I absolutely oppose this. They propose paying for this critical disaster bill by taking dollars out of a very successful advanced manufacturing retooling program that we passed in the 2007 Energy bill—and it took a while to get it up and going. The previous administration never administered it. I thank the Obama administration for coming in in 2009 and beginning the process of putting it together and all of the rules it took, and so on. So it took a while to get up and going. It has not moved as fast as I would like at all. But, thank goodness, the Obama administration saw it as a priority and has moved forward to put it in place.

So what has happened already? Well, these retooling loans have meant 41,000 jobs in Tennessee, California, Indiana, Michigan, Delaware, Illinois, Kentucky, Ohio, and Missouri. These retooling loans have helped companies retool older manufacturing plants to build the products of the future in America rather than shipping those jobs overseas. It has been extremely successful.

In Michigan retooling loans made it possible for Ford Motor Company to save 1,900 jobs at the Michigan assembly plant in the city of Wayne so they could build the all new Ford Focus and the battery-electric Focus in America. In the process of that, as we partnered with them on battery funding as well—in the process of that, with the help of these retooling loans they are bringing jobs back from Mexico to support the work they are doing on the new vehicles.

I do not know how many economic development efforts we can stand on the Senate floor today and talk about in the Senate or House that are actually bringing jobs back from overseas. This is the program that the House Republicans want to cut. This loan—and it is a loan, so it has to be repaid—is allowing them to be able to have lower costs to be able to do the retooling on those older plants, to be able to make these new high-tech vehicles.

As I said, in the case of the Ford Motor Company, they have saved 1,900 jobs and are bringing jobs back from Mexico. Another Michigan company, Severstal North America, was able to secure a retooling loan to retool an old steel mill, the Rouge steel mill in Michigan, into a cutting-edge plant building advanced, high-strength steel for automotive production.

Jobs here. That does not count what is happening in States across America. That loan, along with private loans and a billion-dollar investment from the company, will help create over 2,500 constructive jobs and will bring the total number of permanent manufacturing jobs at that plant, again, to

1,900. That is a pretty good investment from a loan that is going to be paid back while creating jobs.

These are the kinds of things that we need to be doing—we need to be doing—to address the jobs emergency that Michigan and States all across the country are feeling and have been feeling. Right now there are 35 to 40,000 jobs at stake in this proposal by the House Republicans.

We have other companies that want to use the retooling loans to make things in America—in Michigan, Illinois, Ohio, Indiana, Louisiana, and Florida. These loans are expected to be approved in the next few months. They are very close, and we would see 35 to 40,000 jobs disappear—the opportunity for those jobs to disappear—if we were to accept the House proposal.

After the next round of manufacturing retooling loans, we could see another 10,000 jobs created across the country. But if these retooling loans do not happen, those jobs will not happen either. To add insult to injury, these companies have been working closely with the Department of Energy, in some cases for several years, in order to qualify for these loans.

They have had to undergo the most rigorous screening to make sure the products and companies are in sound financial shape, as they should. We need to make sure they are going through rigorous screening not only so they can be successful but to make sure that we are making products in America. It is an important project and partnership.

These companies have invested countless hours and, frankly, a lot of money to get these projects off the ground and to get to this point. As I indicated, we have a number of companies in States around the country that are within a month or 2 months or 3 months from being able to complete the deal and create the jobs.

We are so close, and the rug will be pulled out from under not only the companies but the communities and the families who are affected. These businesses are America's job creators. They are doing the right thing. They want to invest in America. While others have been on the sidelines waiting, they have jumped in. They are committed to creating jobs. They want to make things here, and they have moved through a process, spent time, money—a tremendous amount of time. In fact, in my judgment, it hasn't moved as fast as it should. But they are now at a point to actually make it happen.

I am outraged that we would see an effort to end the creation of these jobs. There is no question, as I said, that we have had a series of natural disasters, and families, businesses, and farmers who are affected across this country. Even though those natural disasters, fortunately for us, did not come to Michigan, I support the effort to address them. We are all in this as Americans. But I will not—I will not—support an effort that, in the process,

takes tens of thousands of jobs away, because the crisis for Michigan is a jobs crisis. We were the first ones in it. We have been in it the longest. We are coming out of it now but way too slowly. We are coming out of it because we have been creating partnerships to support the private sector to make things in America again.

I strongly urge everyone involved not to come forward with something that will in fact jeopardize these jobs. It makes absolutely no sense to me, and it is certainly something I will strongly oppose if it does.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. NELSON of Florida. I ask unanimous consent that I speak as if in morning business.

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

IRS TAX SCAM

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Madam President, there is a tax scam that is going on in this country for which you certainly have to give some creativity to these thieves and robbers—and that is exactly what they are.

I first started to get wind of this when people in the Tampa Bay region of my State called in saying an interesting thing happened. They had sent in their income tax return, and they got back a notice from the IRS that their return had already been filed. What they found out was that somebody had stolen their Social Security number, had in their name filled out a tax return, and then, guess what. It showed they had a tax refund due.

When I started hearing from about 25 or 30 people, I knew there was something going on. Sure enough, law enforcement in the Tampa Bay region—the sheriff's office, the city police, combined with the State attorney and the U.S. Attorney—a couple of weeks ago had a bust and arrested 49 people who were in a scam whereby they procure people's Social Security numbers. What is unbelievable is the amount of money they were getting back, estimated at being, just in the Tampa Bay region, something like \$100 million in refunds. That is a rip-off of the American taxpayer because that is their money.

But the story doesn't stop there. Oh, if you were one of the victims whose Social Security number had been stolen and you wanted to file your tax return, the IRS is telling you you can't do it because you have already filed a

tax return. Guess what a nightmare that is for the legitimate taxpayer.

So we have filed legislation. A number of Senators have joined me. No. 1, one of the unbelievable things was that it was difficult to get the IRS to cooperate with the local and State law enforcement agencies, because the IRS is prohibited because of privacy from sharing any of this information. And, of course, we want to protect the privacy of people, but we also want to go after these crooks.

We had done it a few years ago with regard to inmates in the Federal prison system by allowing the IRS, under the law we passed back in 2008, to cooperate with the Federal prison system in order to get the inmates who were filing false tax returns to get tax refunds. That was extended administratively into the State prison system with the IRS. But then this has been taken to a new level, one in which it is a great rip-off of the taxpayers.

What was incredible is when the Tampa police department and the sheriff's department ended up arresting some of these people, it was as if they didn't know they had done anything wrong.

What is going on? They did not know they had done anything wrong, and they are driving around in BMWs, with Rolex watches and gold chains all over them. It is the use of tools in the electronic age just the same as yesterday, when the thief used a crowbar to break in and steal somebody's possessions. This has to stop.

What we do not know is the extent to which this is all over the country. So the first thing we have to do is get the legal ability for the IRS, without divulging people's private financial information, to be able to cooperate with local and State law enforcement and the U.S. attorney to be able to go after these people, to identify them so the U.S. attorney and the State attorney can prosecute.

Additionally, we have to help the victims. In this legislation we filed, we say the IRS will give the victims a special PIN number so they can file a return and that PIN number will identify them as a victim and it will not be kicked out of the system.

Additionally, since so much of this is being done electronically, we have to give the taxpayer the option to file what we called in the old days a paper tax return and in the process see if we can stop this; otherwise, if \$100 million has been stolen from the American taxpayer just in the Tampa Bay region of Florida, you can imagine how extensive this crime probably is across the entire country.

It is important we act and that we get to the bottom of it. If we pass a law, a crook will try to figure out a way to get around it. But when somebody in this electronic age can just sit at a computer, steal a Social Security number and then file a false tax return, enough is enough.

It is my delight to see my colleague from Maryland. It looks as if he has some good stuff to tell us.

I yield the floor.

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I am not sure it is good stuff, but it is what has happened in our State. I thank the Senator from Florida for his leadership on so many of these issues and his comments on the floor of the Senate.

About 2 weeks ago, right before Hurricane Irene struck, I was at the Maryland Emergency Management Center located in Reisterstown, MD. I was with Governor O'Malley, the Governor of our State, and other leaders. I saw our team there to prepare the people of Maryland for the onslaught of Irene and later from Tropical Storm Lee. I saw Maryland preparing the best it possibly could to minimize the risk to the people of our State from a natural storm. I saw the local officials do the right thing and tell people in our coastal areas to evacuate their homes because of the potential risk to life and property from this massive storm.

I also saw another agency that was located right there, side by side with the Maryland agencies, and that was FEMA, the Federal officials. These were people I met for the first time. They were not from Maryland. They had come in from other States to help the people of Maryland and provided the expertise to our State officials so we could properly prepare for this storm that was potentially damaging to the people of Maryland. They were there.

I thank President Obama for declaring, before the storm hit, emergency declarations to Maryland so we could utilize Federal resources and we could take maximum steps to minimize the loss of life and property. It was the right thing to do.

I take this time on the floor—I am going to talk a little bit about the damages that occurred in my State—to point out that we have always come together as a nation to stand by those who have been devastated through these natural disasters. This has been a particularly rough year. We have seen hurricanes and storms and tornadoes and flooding and even an earthquake on the east coast of the United States. This has challenged our ability to respond in a timely way. We have a responsibility to make sure our Federal agencies have the resources to respond—how they were able to be about Maryland before the storm, during the storm and after the storm and they are there now to help the people of Maryland. Our governments—our local governments, our businesses, and our residents are counting on that continued Federal purpose to get us through this very difficult period.

Hurricane Irene caused severe storms, flooding, and strong winds in the State of Maryland. It was followed by Tropical Storm Lee, which aggravated the flooding and other damage throughout the State, including damage to roads, water treatment plants,

and agriculture. Our agricultural community was hit hard. Our water treatment facilities, the plants we depend upon to keep our waters clean and to keep our neighborhoods safe, were damaged severely by this storm. I have talked to our transportation people. Roads were knocked out. Damage was caused.

On the Eastern Shore of Maryland, as I have already indicated, there was a mandatory order for evacuation of Ocean City the weekend before the Labor Day weekend, resulting in heavy economic losses during one of the most profitable periods during the summer for that city. The flooding in Queen Anne's County destroyed railroad tracks. I have a photograph. This is, by the way, railroad tracks. They have been knocked out by the hurricane. As you can see, this required emergency attention.

Multiple roads were closed and numerous homes were flooded in the town of Millington after the Chester River flooded over its banks. In Millington, the wastewater treatment plant was disabled, also affecting the residents in Kent County. The storm in Talbot County caused roads and pipeline damage.

Let me show you this photograph, if I might, because I think it points out the problem. When that amount of water goes through the storm pipes, it can cause significant damage because these pipes were not able to handle the amount of water that was brought down by the hurricane and tropical storm. As a result, the pipes burst, causing the road which the pipe was under to give way, bringing about a road closure. That was terribly inconvenient, of course, to the people of that area, the businesses, et cetera. I am showing an example in Talbot County, MD, on the Eastern Shore. We could show numerous other examples of the failure of stormwater management pipes as well as roads that had to be closed for public safety. In Caroline County, the towns of Federalsburg and Greensboro experienced major flooding of the Choptank River, including the malfunctioning of a wastewater treatment plant. In Cecil and Harford Counties, Irene led to the opening of a significant number of floodgates at the Conowingo Dam, due to rising water levels feeding in from the Susquehanna River. This was the first time the engineers took such measures since Tropical Storm Isabel hit Maryland in 2003. Opening the floodgates led to flooding and property damage in many areas, and mandatory evacuation orders were issued for Port Deposit and Havre de Grace, in Maryland.

People had to leave their homes. The streets were underwater. When the water receded, there was muck and damage to the towns.

In southern Maryland, damage from metal on a roof that was blown into a transformer forced the shutdown of a reactor at Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant. In Calvert County, many of the

substations were damaged and rendered inoperable during Irene, resulting in widespread power outages for many customers and that forced businesses to close for several days. You heard about power outages. We had whole counties where everyone was out of power—everyone. In most of our counties the majority of people lost their power, not for a couple hours, for many days, causing major disruptions to our businesses, to our families, to schools that could not open and, therefore, parents who could not go to work because they had to deal with the unexpected news that the schools would be closed because there was no power in the schools themselves.

In the Washington metro region, Irene and the additional storms caused severe power outages and flooding in Montgomery and Prince George's Counties. In Prince George's County, the loss of power caused thousands of basements to flood. As you know, without power you cannot use your sump pumps. Without that, there is significant damage.

Frankly, because the water came in from the low level rather than from the roof, these property owners are now being challenged as to whether their insurance will cover this damage. That raises the importance, I might say, of the Federal protections that are available when a disaster is declared an emergency by the President because of the altercations over what insurance does not cover. All the more reason why the Federal Government must be there in its traditional role to help communities when a storm or emergency occurs.

Hurricane Irene and subsequent storms required governments to incur additional expenses due to overtime needed for first responders who save lives and property after the storm. I must tell you, I saw those first responders. I saw them out there working 24-hour shifts in some cases. They didn't get home to their families because they were there to help us maintain order and help reduce the loss of life and the loss of property. I thank President Obama for making a timely major disaster declaration for the State of Maryland in advance of the hurricane. Maryland is now eligible for Federal disaster recovery dollars through the Federal Emergency Management Agency. The State budget has already been very much impacted. We all understand our States do not have the flexibility of our country. It is during emergencies that our State and local leaders look to Washington, look to their Federal Government to be there as a partner to deal with this issue that States cannot deal with.

Congress has always acted in a bipartisan manner to help Americans and their communities recover from natural disasters. Congress has never insisted that disaster fund being offset.

Let me explain this issue because it may be confusing to the people who are watching. Yes, the Federal Emergency

Management Agency has a budget. FEMA has a budget. But you cannot predict the number and scope of natural disasters. No one had predicted this storm would be as widespread as it was. Hurricane Irene affected the entire east coast of the United States. FEMA did not have in its budget that type of a scenario, along with the tornadoes we had, along with what has happened in the Midwest. During this period, we have seen 48 of our States declared eligible for FEMA assistance. This affects our entire country. Now the people on the east coast of the United States are looking to the Federal Government to be there. We have always done this, as I said, in a bipartisan manner, without the requirement that if additional moneys are needed, those moneys will be appropriated by Congress. We will not ask other agencies to have to contribute toward that because that was not anticipated when we did the budget. I might point out that we had a very contentious fight over the Budget Control Act. That is the bill we passed that allowed us to increase our debt ceiling and set our budget allocations for fiscal year 2012, the year that will start on October 1.

As you know, there was an agreement in that Budget Control Act that permits the modification of the fiscal year 2012 discretionary cap to be adjusted to accommodate additional disaster relief funding without an offset. That is what we did. We came together as one entity recognizing we cannot predict the next hurricane, storm, earthquake, flood, or tornado. We just cannot predict that. Therefore, Democrats and Republicans said adjust the cap. Meet whatever disaster is out there. Whether it was Katrina in Louisiana, whether it is a bridge falling down in Minnesota that the Presiding Officer had to deal with, whether it is tornadoes as we had in the Midwest, droughts and floods that occurred in our country, we will be there to help the people of America. We helped rebuild countries around the world. We want to make sure we help the communities.

I was with my colleagues from Vermont, and they shared with us the number of bridges that had been wiped out, people who have been isolated as a result of Hurricane Irene and then Tropical Storm Lee. We have a responsibility, and we recognize that in the budget agreement, that we adjust the caps without setoffs so the Federal Government can be there as a true partner in dealing with these issues. We were there for preparation. It is now time to help restore the communities. In some cases it will take months before we are back to normal. We know that, the people know that, but they have a right to expect that the Federal Government will be there to help.

I commend Senator LANDRIEU, the chair of the Homeland Security Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee; Senator INOUE and the mem-

bers of the Senate Appropriations Committee. They recognize that. They have given us a budget that will accommodate the extra needs so FEMA will have the resources it wants.

I thank President Obama. His budget request to us reflects the resources we need so we have the recommendation from our Appropriations Committee. We have the leadership from the White House. Now it is time for us to act. We have the vehicle on the floor of the Senate. It is time for us to give the resources to the Federal agencies so they can be there in all parts of this country—including helping the people of Maryland cope with the disaster of Hurricane Irene and Tropical Storm Lee and the other natural disasters that have happened in other parts of the country by—taking up this issue now, passing it at this moment so the funds are there and the resources are there.

We can live up to the historical mission of the United States to always be there to help any part of our Nation affected by a natural disaster. I hope we will be able to bring up this issue quickly. As the vote in the Senate Appropriations Committee indicated, it should not be delayed because of offset issues. We should get the needed funds and resources to the agency, working with our State and local governments, working for our local communities so we can try to restore and rebuild those areas that have been devastated by these natural disasters. I would urge us to do that as quickly as possible.

Mr. President, I would yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FRANKEN). The clerk will call the roll. The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

TRIBUTE TO TIM O'KEEFE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise today to bid a fond farewell to a man who has been a fixture in the Senate for 33 years. Mr. Tim O'Keefe of the Senate Disbursing Office is retiring today after more than three decades of service to this body and his country. Known to many as a loyal friend and well liked by nearly everyone he has met in these halls—including most of my colleagues and thousands of Senate staffers—he will be greatly missed.

Tim began his career with the disbursing office, and in the Senate, in 1978. Every Senate employee becomes familiar with that office early in their tenure because that is the office in charge of the Senate payroll as well as everything relating to an employee's compensation, payroll deductions, retirement, life and health insurance, and other benefits. The disbursing office used to be located in the Capitol when Tim started. In fact, it was located in S-233, which is now part of the Republican leader's office. During

Tim's early years on the job, staffers and Senators alike would line up in the hallways on payday to receive their paychecks. Maybe that is how Tim became legendary for never forgetting a face or a name for so many members of this very large Senate family, and always having a kind word for every one of them.

The disbursing office moved in 1980 when my predecessor, Howard Baker, expanded the Republican leader's suite of offices. That is how Tim and his coworkers ended up in their now familiar location on the first floor of the Hart Building. Tim has kidded me about that a few times over the years. So on behalf of the Republican leader's office, let me take this opportunity to apologize to him for being booted from his perch.

Tim is a native Washingtonian. He attended St. John's College High School and the University of South Carolina, which has a heck of a good football team this year. Just as Tim is loyal to the Senate, he is a loyal alumnus of both those institutions. He goes to Columbia, SC, every year to see South Carolina play football. Tim is also a great fan of the Washington Redskins who, amazingly enough, are off to a good start this year. He has season tickets, and has been attending their games since his boyhood. He loves to talk football, college or pro, with folks in the office, but be careful if you are a Cowboys fan.

Tim's father George O'Keefe was a distinguished veteran who fought in World War II. His mother Gisela O'Keefe worked for the District of Columbia school system at Alice Deal Middle School. I know they would both be proud to see how well liked and well respected their son has become. Tim also has a brother, Dennis, who lives in South Carolina, and Tim lives in Alexandria with his teenaged son Connor.

When the disbursing office held a retirement party for Tim a few weeks ago, he got quite the sendoff. It was the day of the historic earthquake, felt all along eastern North America from Quebec City to Atlanta and centered about 90 miles away in central Virginia. As Tim was opening his presents, the ground began to shake and the Capitol complex was soon evacuated. It is almost as if Washington, DC, itself was protesting that it did not want Tim to go.

Indeed, it will be hard for many to imagine the Senate with Tim gone. He has the longest tenure of anyone in the disbursing office today, and thousands of Senate staffers know him as the man who led them in the Federal oath of office they take on their first day on the job—the same oath the Vice President of the United States administers to Senators at the beginning of their 6-year terms.

In his retirement, Tim will have time to pursue his many interests, including his love of horse racing. He is particularly a fan of Lexington, Kentucky's Keeneland racetrack. And I would be

remiss if I didn't mention that today, the day of his retirement, is also Tim's birthday.

I know many on Capitol Hill, after hearing about his retirement, have taken a moment to say thank you and goodbye to Mr. Tim O'Keefe. I wanted to make sure I was one of them. He will be missed here in the Senate, and we are very grateful for his 33 years of service.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

POVERTY IN AMERICA

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, yesterday the Census Bureau released information about poverty, income, and health insurance in our country, and the news was, in short, devastating. The number of people in poverty is at an all-time high. Income gains over the last decade have been totally wiped out. Americans are struggling more than ever before.

I am appalled by these facts and I know my colleagues are too. Today I wish to talk about these numbers, but I wish to talk about what we can do about them and about where our country's priorities must be and how we have to focus on rebuilding the middle class in light of the new census numbers.

Yesterday we learned that 46.2 million people in America were poor last year. That is more than 15 percent of Americans. Let me remind my colleagues what this means. The poverty line for a family of four with two adults and two children is \$22,000—just slightly over \$22,000 a year. Can anyone here in this body—and we all know what we make; every Senator, every Congressman, except leadership who get paid a little bit more, makes \$174,000 a year. If we think to ourselves: Could we and our spouses and two children live on \$22,000 a year, \$425 a week? But, beyond that, we also learned that deep poverty; that is, families with incomes less than half the poverty line, is also at the highest rate on record. More than 20 million Americans lived in deep poverty last year. That is just over \$11,000 a year for a family of four. That is almost mind-boggling. How do people live like that?

Our children are suffering incredibly high levels of poverty. The Census Bureau pointed out that 22 percent—1 out of every 5 kids in America—were poor last year. When compared to other industrialized nations—the OECD countries—the United States has one of the highest rates of child poverty in the world. That is inexcusable. It is a national crisis. It is something we should be discussing here on the Senate floor daily.

In addition to our children, other vulnerable populations are suffering as well. People with disabilities continue to face higher poverty than people without disabilities. About 28 percent—almost 1 out of 3 individuals with disabilities in America—are poor, compared with 12.5 percent of those without disabilities. That is twice the amount.

Minorities also face devastating levels of poverty. More than a quarter of Blacks and Hispanics—more than 25 percent or 1 in 4—are in poverty in America. Again, keep in mind, for a family of four, that is just \$22,000 a year. So 25 percent of Blacks and Hispanics are in poverty, 10 percent of Whites, 13 percent of Asians. These disparities are deeply troubling. More than 10 million Black and Hispanic children woke up this morning in a household struggling with poverty.

Again, we have to remember, while I talk about these as numbers, there is a real story, there is a real family, a real individual, a real child behind every one of them.

There are 46 million stories about families sitting around their kitchen table—if they are even lucky enough to have one—struggling to figure out how to make ends meet, stories of people choosing between whether to pay the rent or pay the utility bills, choosing whether to pay for diapers or medication for their kids, choosing whether to put food on the table or gasoline in the car—so they might get to a minimum wage, part-time job someplace. This should not be happening in America.

We have heard a lot of talk and I have heard Senators and Members of the House in speeches recently talking about how we cannot afford this and we cannot afford that because, let's face it, we are broke, we are deeply in debt in this country and we are broke. I beg to differ. The United States of America is today the richest country in the world—the richest country in the history of the world.

If we are so rich, why are we so broke? We are not poor. We are the richest country in the world. So what this census report yesterday points out is this is a wake-up call that we are failing. We are failing our most vulnerable citizens. We are failing to provide a ladder of opportunity for people to become part of the middle class. We are destroying futures, destroying hope among our children.

First and foremost, I think this report yesterday graphically illustrates how dangerous it would be if we as lawmakers give in to the current atmosphere of budget hysteria—budget hysteria—fear, and fatalism that is now going on on Capitol Hill. By giving in to it, we eviscerate the essential economic security programs just because somehow we want to score political points.

Well, people all know that most people in poverty have a higher rate of not voting than wealthier people. We know that. So I guess, if you want to get

votes, you appeal to people who have money. If you want to get elected, you appeal to people who have money because they are the ones who give you money to get elected by, like big corporations. So the poor are kind of forgotten about. So if we give in to this budget hysteria, the first people who are usually hurt are the most vulnerable of our citizens.

The Census Bureau's numbers show, again, without question how effective and important these safety net programs are to keeping millions of people out of poverty. Social Security alone—according to the census numbers, kept 20 million people above the poverty line. Unemployment insurance kept 3.2 million more people out of poverty.

We have always known these are crucial programs, but now we know just how important they are. And other programs, if they were counted by the official poverty measure, which they are not, would have lifted millions more people out of poverty. For example, the SNAP program—food stamps—would have lifted 3.9 million people above poverty. The earned-income tax credit would have lifted 5.4 million people. Without these crucial safety net programs, the poverty situation would be much worse. Yet, mark my words, with this supercommittee that is meeting or whether we go into some kind of a sequestration or whatever that means around here, are we going to cut back on the food stamp program, are we going to cut back on unemployment insurance, maybe cut back on Social Security, as some would want to do, and Social Security benefits? That just means more people will fall below the poverty line.

I think the second lesson we can learn from this report is about the crippling effect falling paychecks and rising inequality are having on our economy. Income went down again last year. Real median household income was \$49,500. That is down 2.3 percent from the year before and down 6.4 percent since the start of the recession. This is not just the effect of the recession; these are long-term economic trends that have caused a dramatic increase in the income inequality in this country, and it has been going on for at least the last three decades, little bit by little bit by little bit, to the point now where we have a huge disparity in income equality in this country.

Again, paychecks for American workers are not falling because they are not working as hard or producing less. According to testimony from former Secretary of Labor Robert Reich to the HELP Committee, the typical American family is working more than 500 hours longer per year now than they were in 1979. Got that. The typical American family is working 500 hours longer per year than they were in 1979. In addition to working longer, their productivity, as measured by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, has continued to rise.

So what has happened? People are working longer. There is more production, more units per person per hour worked, and yet wages have fallen. Why is that? You would think wages and benefits would have gone up with longer hours and more productivity. Well, that is not what happened. It is not that companies cannot afford to pay their workers more. Profit margins of Standard & Poor's 500 companies are at their highest levels since the late 1960s. So what has happened during the last three decades, since 1979, is that the executives have shifted revenues from workers' paychecks to the corporate bottom lines and their own pockets—more to profit, more to capital, less to labor.

We cannot allow these trends to continue. Economists across the political spectrum agree that a major cause of our current economic stagnation is a chronic lack of demand. For nearly three decades, workers' incomes have been stagnant. Working families lack the purchasing power to drive America's consumer economy. Without adequate demand, businesses are reluctant to invest and hire. Simply put, until we raise the numbers on people's paychecks and the number of people working and making a paycheck, the economy will never recover.

The final lesson I think we can learn from yesterday's census report is about health care. There is a small silver lining here. While the recession is obviously continuing to impact health care coverage, there are some signs that the early stages of implementation of the affordable care act, that is, the health care reform bill, are making a difference. While the census data shows that the number of uninsured increased from 16.1 percent to 16.3 percent of the population—the Census Bureau deemed this “not statistically different”—the affordable care act's requirement that health plans provide dependent coverage to young adults to stay on their parents' policy until age 26 is making a difference.

The data from the Census Bureau shows that the 18-to-24 age group was the only group “to experience a significant increase in the percentage with health insurance over the past year,” up to 72.8 percent from 70.7 percent in 2009. So, again, there is a small silver lining there in terms of health care coverage for our younger population. So it is a modest step forward for young Americans.

But the overall picture the census report reveals is a nation—the United States of America—on the brink of a crisis. It should be a call to action. I think the President's jobs bill is a good start. We have to create more jobs, not just any job but good-quality jobs that pay decent wages and benefits, a job to lift a family out of poverty and not to keep a family in it.

Again, I have been paying attention a little bit to some of the debates that have been going on in the other party.

I was looking at the figures from the State of Texas that more jobs have

been created in Texas than any other part of the country. Well, when you look closely, Texas had by far the largest number of minimum wage jobs than any other state, and the number of minimum wage workers more than doubled between 2007 and 2010. That is our future—minimum wage jobs at \$7.25 an hour? That is barely \$15,000 a year, under the poverty line for a family of four. Is that something to brag about, that we are creating more minimum wage jobs that will just keep families in poverty? As I said, we need jobs to lift families out of poverty, not keep them down, under the poverty level.

Lastly, I have said so many times here on the floor that we will not be able to tackle the problem of poverty in this country until we have a strong middle class and a clear path for people to become middle-class citizens. That means we should invest more in education, more in innovation, more in infrastructure-building in this country. It means restoring a level playing field with fair taxation—fair taxation. To repeat something the President said the other night—why should Warren Buffett pay less of a percentage of his income than his secretary? You wonder why people get cynical about government. Of course they are cynical. They have every reason to be cynical when we pass these laws around here and we tax capital at a lower rate than we tax labor. Why should someone who is laboring and working be taxed at a higher rate than a wealthy person who maybe invested a lot of money, and they are putting it all into capital gains, and they are paying a lower rate of taxes than someone who is out there working for a living? Why is that fair?

Well, we also need vibrant unions, vibrant unions that can bargain collectively for their people for wages, hours, conditions of employment. We need a strong ladder of opportunity to give every American access to the middle class.

So, again, yesterday's poverty numbers told a bleak story about 46 million Americans who cannot make ends meet. I hope that next year at this time, when the new census numbers come out, we can begin to tell a different story about how we acted boldly, with imagination and vision, to help these people turn their lives around and build a better future. In a nation as strong and as vibrant and, yes, as rich—as rich—as the United States of America, no one who works hard for a living should have to live in poverty, and we should not rest until that vision becomes a reality.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. UDALL of New Mexico). Without objection, it is so ordered.

SPIRIT OF COOPERATION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, there has been a promising new tone in Congress since our return from the summer recess. It has taken some by surprise. But even more striking than the new tone is that it has brought with it a few modest signs of a new spirit of cooperation.

The House this week sent us the highway extension and an aviation extension that are clean. During August, there were clamors from some corners in the other party to mount a fight over the gas tax or insist on harmful cuts to road and bridge repair, even if these demands risked a shutdown of road construction projects. As recently as last Friday, Republicans were planning to insist on a 5-percent cut to the FAA budget—a move that could well have threatened another shutdown of that agency like we saw in August. But both fears, fortunately, have receded. Barring a setback in the Senate, we should be able to extend both the FAA and highway measures on time and without controversy.

This is a very positive sign. There was a sour taste left in everyone's mouth at the end of the debt ceiling debate, and that is causing a change in behavior. It is actually bringing us together. That process was made unnecessarily difficult because of the extreme tactics of a bloc within the House. The political process broke down and the public noticed.

In the aftermath of that debate, it seems everybody finally realizes there is a premium on reasonableness. The public does not want to see more of the “my way or the highway” approach that has been exhibited by some in the House. That is why there was head scratching earlier this week to hear a new rumor in the Capitol that the House Republican leadership might consider seeking to reopen the debt ceiling fight, ignoring the agreed-upon spending level for the 2012 fiscal year. As you know, the deal included a top-line budget number of \$1.043 trillion for the fiscal year that begins October 1. This was a significant cut, an actual cut from the fiscal 2011 level of \$7 billion. This agreement was ratified by all of those who voted for the final debt ceiling agreement. It was hailed as one of the better aspects of the overall debt ceiling deal because it would mean a lesser likelihood of another budget fight on September 30.

However, since this number was agreed to, some extreme Republicans have started looking to cause trouble. They have tried to see the \$7 billion in cuts represented by the \$1.043 trillion figure as a floor, not a ceiling. This would be a violation not just of the spirit of the debt limit deal but the letter of it.

The public will not stand for another budget fight. Republicans should understand that more brinkmanship on

the budget at the end of September is not in either side's interest. Some, thankfully, in the House leadership seem to realize this. Majority Leader CANTOR, in a memo to the House Republican caucus sent in August, warned against picking another budget fight on the CR. Leader CANTOR wrote:

While all of us would like to have seen a lower discretionary appropriation ceiling for the upcoming fiscal year, the debt limit agreement set a level of spending that is a real cut from the current year. I believe it is in our interest to enact into law full-year appropriation bills at this new lower level.

Leader CANTOR affirmed these remarks earlier this week:

I say to my Republican colleagues, a deal is a deal. It's hard to imagine you would go back on the debt limit agreement, but if you are even considering it, please stop.

We already will likely need to take time next week resolving what level of FEMA funding we should appropriate for fiscal year 2012. Earlier indications are that some House Republicans may want to shortchange the level of funding FEMA says it needs for next year. I can't imagine why anyone would want to play games with disaster relief. But if they want to debate that, they should not also be tying it to another budget fight that we have already resolved and that nearly caused a default for the first time in American history. We should not go back over those pages. We have had enough debates on the docket without reopening the ones we have already done.

The public is tired of these fights, and the public understands who keeps instigating them. To the House Republicans I say: Don't go back on your word on the CR. Leader CANTOR was right when he said in August you should abide by the level agreed to over the summer. Stick with that decision and let's move on to other issues.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

INTERNATIONAL SPACE STATION

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, I am very happy to announce to the Senate that today NASA announced its new, big rocket design, with the President stepping forth to indicate that he will request funding for the design and building of this rocket.

I want to take the opportunity to share with the Senate what this rocket is going to be. To set the stage, you will recall that we have the International Space Station up in orbit now. There is a combination of six astronauts on board. It is an international crew. The space station itself—people don't realize how big it is. If you think about sitting in a football stadium on the 50-yard line, and looking from one end zone to the other, that is how big the space station is—120 yards long.

The space shuttle has been the vehicle that we have used now for 30 years, the last 10 of which have been used to build the International Space Station. The Russians have been taking up some components, but the major com-

ponents, the heavy components are being taken up in the cargo bay of the space shuttle and assembled over the last decade into the station. We have six astronauts doing research in the zero gravity of orbit.

The future rockets going to and from the space station—a space taxi, if you will—are a competition among commercial rocket companies, and we think that competition will bring down significantly the cost of those rockets to take cargo and crew, and at the end of this year one version of those rockets will in fact launch, rendezvous, and dock with the space station and deliver cargo.

To make those human rated, with all of the redundancies and escape systems to save human life, it is going to take another few years. Of course, it is a disappointment for so many of us that the new rocket, ready to go to and from the space station, as the space shuttle used to, is not ready for humans, even though we are launching cargo. Thus, in the interim, we have to rely on the Russians with their spacecraft, which we have done before, because when the Space Shuttle *Columbia* was destroyed on reentry back in 2003, for well over 2 years we were down and not flying the space shuttle, until we could make sure that it was fixed. We relied on the Russian Soyuz to get to and from the space station.

All right, that is going to low-Earth orbit. But NASA, with its human space program, has another mission. Now, with the nonmanned space program, we just launched to Jupiter, we just launched a mission to the Moon, next month we are going to launch a mission on Earth observations, and before Thanksgiving we are launching a Volkswagen-size Recovery to Mars, with six wheels powered by a plutonium source so it doesn't have to go to sleep in the Martian night. This will rove all over.

It has a pole that will stick up, with a laser, and it can zap rocks so we can analyze their chemical content. It has a big scoop that can also get us additional samples. It has two eyes that will pop up as it roams around so we can see in real time the surface of Mars.

So we have a vigorous space program. But we still have to do what NASA is supposed to do; that is, leave the orbit of the Earth and venture out into the heavens with humans. That is what was announced today—announced by Senator HUTCHISON and myself, with NASA Administrator General Charlie Bolden making the formal announcement. The President has signed off on the specifics.

I am going to explain this rocket. But before I do, let me say there have been a lot of critics saying: Oh, it will cost too much. Remember, last year we passed the NASA bill unanimously in the Senate and passed it in the House with an overwhelming three-quarters vote. That set the parameters on the funding for this new rocket, and all of

NASA's figures have come in underneath those levels that we set in the NASA authorization bill. Those are the numbers the Office of Management and Budget and the White House have scrubbed to make sure they are realistic, and that is what has been announced today.

Here it is. This is the rocket. Just to give an idea of the scale of this monster, the space shuttle in the stack, with the external tank and the two solids on either side, the tallest point of that stack is the top of the external tank. From here that would come up to right there. That gives an idea of how much larger this rocket is. This rocket will launch more payload than any rocket in America's space program and probably the Russian/Soviet space program, certainly, now. Back in the old Soviet days I don't think the Soviets had one that was anywhere near this one.

What this rocket has is a core, and this is a core with liquid oxygen, liquid hydrogen fuel tank. It is taking the space shuttle engines—so we can keep the cost down, and a lot of this has already been developed—and putting five in the tail of this first stage. So first stage, liquid hydrogen, liquid oxygen. But it is boosted on either side by those solid rocket boosters—in this case a new one. Under the space shuttle it was four segments, but this one has five segments. So it is elongated and gives more thrust. These, on future versions, will be competed as to whether it is going to be solid rockets—and, by the way, the consistency of this pencil eraser is what the solid rocket material looks like—or whether those in the competition will be liquid boosters.

All right, that is the core. That comes up all the way to here. Then there is the second stage. We have second-stage engines we have been using in the past called the J-2. They are now updated with a new, more powerful version called the J-2X. So we have a lot of history on these engines. That is what is going to be the second stage, which then takes the housing for a lot of the electronics, and then the capsule.

The tower at the top is an escape tower. We could actually have an explosion right here on the pad, and the crew could survive because they would eject in the full capsule, being thrust away from the explosion, and then the parachutes would deploy and the crew saved; likewise, we could save the crew on this rocket all the way to orbit. So if there was a problem, we could still save the human life of the four to seven astronauts who are going to be in this crew capsule. We could save their lives, and that was one of the mandates after we lost *Columbia* in the reentry over Texas. The investigation board said: Build a safer rocket, and certainly one that is more economical.

This is now on a schedule for its first test—this version. This is the smaller version. This thing can evolve. This is

about 70 to 77 tons. This thing can evolve to 150 tons, and then we are talking about a monster. On this version they will test it on a schedule for 2017. They will have several other tests, and they are on a schedule to put a crew into this rocket in 2021. They are then scheduled to rendezvous, or land, on an asteroid—this will be the first time that has ever been done—as a way of preparing us to then go to Mars.

So that is what NASA has announced today. I want to give great credit—great, great credit—to Senator HUTCHISON. She has been the ranking member and, alternately, chairman of the Subcommittee on Science and Space and is now the ranking member of the full Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation. She has been a princess in helping guide, first of all, the NASA authorization bill and the funding. Tomorrow, she and Senator MIKULSKI—the chair of the Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations—will be taking up NASA's budget as they get ready to come to the floor.

This rocket will now allow us to get out of low-Earth orbit, assemble components—heavy components—that ultimately will take us out into the heavens exploring in ways we never have even started to design. Remember, 40 years ago we went to the Moon. That was quite an accomplishment. But the Moon is about 250,000 miles from Earth. With rockets like these, we are going to go far out into the heavens to explore the origins of the universe, to explore that which we have never even dreamed of, as we fulfill our destiny as a people who are explorers and adventurers by nature.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina is recognized.

Mrs. HAGAN. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mrs. HAGAN. Mr. President, I rise to join my colleagues in imploring Congress to provide needed assistance to our families, our communities, and our businesses suffering from the rash of natural disasters that have hit our country hard this year.

While many of us who represent States on the east coast planned to spend our final week of our August work period traveling our State, touring factories, stopping by schools, and visiting military bases, Mother Nature had other plans.

We still traveled to our States, but we saw a very different scene: whole streets and towns flooded, homes and businesses washed away from their foundations, destroyed crop fields, and

constituents worried about the loss of their homes and mourning their loved ones.

Over 2 weeks ago, Hurricane Irene barreled down our eastern seaboard, and early estimates suggest it could be one of the top 10 costliest disasters in U.S. history. I am here to tell the story of North Carolina.

In the early morning of August 27, Irene first touched down over eastern North Carolina's Outer Banks. Even before it made landfall, the storm brought on several tornadoes along the coast that swept away entire homes.

This is a photo of what is left of three homes hit by tornadoes in Tyrrell County. I was there, and it was truly devastating. One elderly man who had one of these homes was there the next day with a rake, forlorn look in his eyes, and said: The only thing I own now are the clothes on my back.

By the time Irene finally moved beyond the State of North Carolina, six North Carolinians had been killed, storm surges 6 to 9 feet high had flooded many towns, more than 500,000 were without power, and countless homes, businesses, and schools had been destroyed or severely damaged.

Fortunately, our State had prepared diligently for days leading up to the storm, boarding up houses and businesses and declaring mandatory evacuations for tourists and residents in our most at-risk towns.

A lot of pundits woke after Irene hit and started saying: Hey, it wasn't that bad. I wish to invite those individuals to come to eastern North Carolina and see what I saw in the wake of Hurricane Irene.

I saw small business owners in downtown Manteo emptying stores they have run for decades, tossing their waterlogged inventory, moving their furniture to the curb, moving out carpet totally destroyed, and these business owners wondering if it was even worth reopening their stores.

There was a bookstore, and a resident in the community came up to me and he said: Senator HAGAN, I have raised my children by sitting on this man's knees having books read to him day in and day out. We need this bookstore back in Manteo.

I wish to be sure it gets there.

I also saw crops that had been beaten by wind and rain for 15 hours, and it looked like they had gone through the spin cycle of a washing machine. I saw flooding in the fields so severe that Agricultural Secretary and former Iowa Gov. Tom Vilsack said it was the worst agricultural flooding he recalled seeing.

I saw families clearing and burning debris, pumping floodwater, tossing aside their soaked possessions that were beyond saving.

I also stood along Highway 12, eerily quiet, a highway that is usually busy with traffic, totally still at the point where Irene had left a gaping hole, blocking any vehicle travel to and from Hatteras Island and the towns of

Rodanthe, Waves, Salvo, Avon, Buxton, Frisco, and Hatteras. We can clearly see the breach of the highway here. It actually breached in three separate points along Highway 12. The only way to get to the island now is by ferry; and, according to local reports, the line for that ferry was 15 miles long this weekend.

That is the picture in North Carolina. It is not the only picture. While there were scenes of destruction and loss, I also saw tremendous acts of determination and kindness. If winds and rains may have swept away our possessions, they also stirred up the best parts of North Carolina spirit. Our intrinsic devotion to community and to assisting those in need produced countless heroes across our State the past 2 weeks.

Everywhere I went, I saw emergency workers, volunteer organizations, and members of the community reaching out to their neighbors in need. In Craven and Tyrrell Counties, the American Red Cross and the North Carolina Baptist Men and Women provided hot meals. The North Carolina Baptist Men and Women were there, distributing 5,000 meals one afternoon when I was with them and also helping shelter and debris removal for those affected by the hurricane.

The North Carolina National Guard activated 400 members—including a member of my own staff who serves in the Guard—to provide emergency water, food, and supplies to some of the hardest hit areas. Emergency workers throughout the State continue to help families, businesses, and entire communities recover and rebuild.

While the people of the great State of North Carolina are committed to getting themselves and their neighbors back on their own feet, we have to do the same in Congress. For the North Carolina families, farmers, fishermen, educators, seniors, and small businesses struggling to recover, government assistance cannot come fast enough. It must not leave too soon.

Here is my bottom line: Congress must fully fund Irene recovery efforts now. But we must also fund the emergency funding needs in tornado-devastated Joplin, MO, and Alabama, and the flooded communities of the Midwest, also, and in the wildfire disaster currently in Texas.

Without a doubt, this year, our country has been ravaged by an unprecedented series of natural disasters. Since January 1, the President has issued disaster declarations in 48 States, and the hurricane season is far from over.

We are aware of this trend all too well in North Carolina. Just about 4 months before Irene hit, 28 tornadoes touched down across central and southern North Carolina, the most severe weather to hit our State since 1984. More than 20 North Carolinians were killed, 6,200 homes damaged, and about 440 homes were completely destroyed;

21 businesses, including the largest employer in the town of Sanford, were demolished, with another 92 significantly damaged, leaving at least 2,000 North Carolinians in that one area out of work. Shaw University, located in downtown Raleigh, was forced to close for the remainder of the semester due to the immense damage to its campus.

We will never be able to predict the whims of Mother Nature, but we are able to prepare and prepare we must. Right now, FEMA's Disaster Relief Fund is running dangerously low. Even before Hurricane Irene arrived we were using \$400 million a month on disaster relief efforts. Today the fund is down to \$377 million, not enough for a week of spending before Hurricane Irene hit, and we still have 3 weeks to go in this fiscal year.

If we do not act now to fix this shortfall, millions of Americans will be left behind. Already, FEMA is shifting funds away from vitally needed reconstruction projects in previously hard-hit areas to what they call "immediate needs" assistance. I do not believe any one of us wants to be in the position of telling one of our constituents—one of our small business owners, one of our school principals—that we can't help because they are not considered an "immediate need." American victims of natural disasters should not be left at the mercy of a rob-Peter-to-pay-Paul system. That is not who we are as Americans.

We have a choice right now. In my mind and in the minds of all North Carolinians affected by the storms of Irene and the tornadoes that took place in April, the choice is clear: Congress must make these FEMA supplemental funds available.

The Budget Control Act that we passed in early August established strict spending caps to get our fiscal house in order while also allowing for a limited amount of funds to be made available in case disaster struck. Disaster struck, and now is the time to make those funds available. Meeting these needs is not just a necessity for the people of my State and many others, but it is also wholly consistent with the fiscal discipline that we agreed on and voted on in August.

But FEMA funding is not enough. Our farmers in North Carolina and across the eastern coast were devastated by Irene, and they are in desperate need of assistance. North Carolina is an agricultural State. Agriculture generates about \$78 billion a year in economic activity, and it employs close to one-fifth of the workers in North Carolina. Our agricultural industry, particularly our cotton and tobacco farmers, are in trouble.

At the end of the day, when all of the damage assessments are completed, our farmers could be out more than \$400 million from Hurricane Irene, and these crops were just getting ready to be harvested. Our farmers in our State absolutely cannot afford a blow like this one. We in Congress need to work

together so assistance from the U.S. Department of Agriculture can be expedited and delivered in a timelier manner. We need to act soon.

I want to end with a story from my State that I believe is particularly relevant at this time when communities across the country are in the process of recovery. Back in April, one of the most recognizable scenes from the post-tornado coverage was of a Lowe's store in Sanford, NC. Unlike with Irene, there were few warnings of the tornado's arrival. But when Michael Hollowell, the store manager, saw the storm approaching his store—and it was very fast—he calmly moved every customer to the back corner where he knew—because he had been trained—they would be the safest. I saw that Lowe's the very next day.

This is what that store looked like. It was completely demolished. But every single person in the store when the storm hit was alive. Mike Hollowell is a hero, not just to those people in the Lowe's store but to people all over North Carolina. Last week, not even 5 months after this devastation, that same Lowe's reopened, and it reopened with 2,000 more square feet than it had before. It just shows that North Carolinians and people across the country are committed to a recovery that will leave our communities better than ever.

The people of this great country are stronger than any storm. They will rebuild and recover. But that process may take many months, it may take many years. As their representatives, we have a responsibility to provide a reliable, comprehensive program of relief for that duration. To do any less is a dereliction of duty.

I call on all my colleagues to pass this FEMA supplemental bill as soon as possible.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

STIMULUS BILL

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, in recent days the President has repeatedly told Congress to pass the stimulus package immediately. This began during his joint address to Congress last week when he said at one point:

I am sending this Congress a plan that you should pass right away. You should pass this jobs plan right away. Pass this jobs bill—pass this jobs bill.

Immediately following the President's joint address to the Congress, Press Secretary Jay Carney declared:

The President will submit a bill early next week, the American Jobs Act, which will specify how he proposes paying for the American Jobs Act.

As ranking Republican on the Budget Committee and wrestling with these

difficult issues—I know Senator CARDIN is a member of the committee—we tried to figure out what this means and how much money the spending will be. But the bill that was transmitted to Congress Monday afternoon does not contain any fiscal tables, costs for any of his provisions, actually how those provisions will be paid for and when the pay-for will occur, or even an overall pricetag for the bill.

How can the President call on Congress to "pass this bill immediately" when no one even knows how much it will cost or where the money is coming from?

I sent a letter yesterday to the President's Director of the Office of Management and Budget, Jack Lew, asking that this information be provided to the Congress at once. But so far we have had no response. Part of the reason we need this information is that the total cost of the President's bill may be much higher than advertised. That has been the pattern around here. No one should be surprised. When the President said his plan would be "paid for," he did not specify if he meant the total cost—to include increased interest resulting from the borrowed money to be spent immediately—or just the cost of the jobs provisions alone, actually how much goes out the door. Depending on whether the money is spent out and when it is paid back—assuming it is ever paid back—interest costs resulting from just this bill's borrowing could top \$100 billion. In other words, the interest on the money over the 10-year window, the 10-year budget we are talking about—if we spend \$450 billion now, we pay interest on that money. It is borrowed money. People loan us the money and we pay interest. Interest rates alone now—CBO projects them to go up, our Congressional Budget Office. Certainly they will. They are extraordinarily low today. But, at any rate, we could easily see the interest on this money over 10 years reaching \$100 billion.

The problem with looking at it as a 10-year scenario is that the debt is probably not going to be paid off in 10 years. Most of the debts we run up will be part of our deficit. If we want to raise taxes to fund a new program, maybe we ought to raise taxes to pay off the debt we have instead of spending it on a new program. The debt we have distributes American wealth to people who hold our debt all over the world.

In my letter to OMB, I request tables showing the year-by-year data for this bill's budgetary impact, including projected changes to the deficit for each of the next 10 years. In other words, how will it play out? If we spend \$450 billion in 1, 2, or 3 years, how much does that run up the debt? When does the repayment begin? How will it be paid, and at what rate? If the President wants to advocate for a sharp, near-term increase in the deficit in exchange for the possibility of some undefined economic future, with the possibility of a

stimulus, he ought to make that argument clearly to the American people.

I believe the President also needs to be honest in admitting that the bill's short-term costs would wipe out—obliterate—the \$7 billion in savings next year resulting from the debt limit deal. In other words, we went through this long, painful exercise that resulted in an agreement in the eleventh hour and the 59th minute to save \$900 billion, and then, hopefully, form a committee that would save another \$1.1 trillion to \$1.5 trillion, only a fraction of this \$2.1 billion in savings, of the \$13 trillion the Congressional Budget Office tells us will be added to the debt in the next 10 years. So it would save a little over \$2 trillion over 10 years but, at the same time, we are running up over \$10 trillion in debt. So it is not a big enough step. It is a step. There is progress. I certainly respect that, but it wasn't much.

To show us how small it is, next year we are projected, under the agreement Congress ratified, to reduce spending by \$7 billion. That is all. That is all it would be reduced from this year to next year in actual spending levels. So I ask my colleagues: Don't we need to be careful? After all the effort we took to achieve that much savings, shouldn't we think very carefully about a new stimulus plan that would spend \$450 billion, obliterating that savings? I think we should. But, at any rate, we do need to know precisely how much it is going to cost and precisely how the money would be spent.

Let's flash back to February. The Office of Management and Budget Director, Jack Lew, said this. This was when the President submitted his budget for the next 10 years. It was brought up here on the floor of the Senate. In fact, I brought it up. It was voted down 97 to nothing. But this is what Mr. Lew said about that budget:

Our budget will get us, over the next several years, to the point where we can look the American people in the eye and say we're not adding to the debt anymore; we're spending money that we have each year, and then we can work on bringing down the national debt.

We all know there is a certain amount of political license people get to utilize in the political world, and exaggeration sometimes is forgiven. But let me tell my colleagues, this is the Office of Management and Budget talking about the President's budget that he had just submitted to Congress. He said:

Our budget will get us, over the next several years, to the point where we can look the American people in the eye and say we're not adding to the debt anymore; we're spending money that we have each year, and then we can work on bringing down our national debt.

What is the truth? The Congressional Budget Office scored this budgetary plan and this is what they concluded: that over a 10-year period there would be huge deficits every single year. In about year 6 or 7, the lowest deficit would occur—\$750 billion would be the

lowest annual deficit that would occur—and by the 10th year we would be back up to \$1 trillion. President Bush's largest deficit he ever had was \$450 billion and he was criticized for that. So we are going to have the lowest—and he says this is going to pay down the debt and wouldn't be adding more to the debt if we passed his budget, when his budget spent more, taxed more, and ran up more debt. I believe this is the most irresponsible budget ever submitted to the Congress of the United States, at a time of national crisis, when all experts are telling us the greatest threat to our national security is our debt.

Forgive me if I want to see the fine print on this legislation, when an administration tells us that—and the President said very similar things; the President himself said very similar things—we would not be adding more to the debt.

We in Congress raised the legal debt limit—I did not vote for that particular bill—but we have breached, I am afraid, our economic debt limit. America's \$14.5 trillion gross debt is now 100 percent of our GDP, our economy. Experts tell us we have already crossed a dangerous threshold. Our debt is pulling down growth and putting a damper on job creation right now.

We have to ask ourselves: Can we continue to borrow, running up even more debt in the hope that we can spend it today in a sugar-high type stimulus to create jobs in the short run? The Congressional Budget Office scored the first stimulus package 2 years ago that has come nowhere near achieving what was promised for it. They said, OK, if you spend \$825 billion now, you will get some short-term economic benefit, but scored over a decade, we would have an economic decline. The net growth of the United States would be less over 10 years than if we didn't pass a stimulus package at all. When we get up to 100 percent of GDP, I submit it is even more dangerous to keep running up debt.

This is a dilemma. We are in a fix. The economy is not growing the way we wish it to grow. CBO was projecting in January of this year that economic growth for the first 6 months would be about 2.9 percent. We were hoping that would be true. But what happened? The first quarter of this fiscal year it was .4 percent—not 2 percent, not 2.9 percent—and the second quarter was extremely low also. We have averaged about 1 percent growth the first half of this year.

We want to do something to help this economy grow. I submit we should do everything we can that would help our economy grow now that does not run up the debt. What are some of those things? Producing more energy at home, creating jobs here; pumping more energy supply which could bring down the cost of energy. We can bring down the cost of energy, create jobs, create tax revenue, and create growth that way. We should eliminate every

regulation that is not beneficial to this economy, and there are a lot of them. Some regulations are good. Many of them add costs to the entire economy for little or no benefit. We need to have the kind of tax reform of a permanent nature that creates confidence in our economy—the kind of tax reform that advances economic growth rather than increasing taxes to give Washington more money.

Those are my suggestions about how to deal with this. First and foremost, we are going to look at this proposal. We certainly are worried about the status of the economy today. We are deeply disappointed in the job numbers that continue to fall and, hopefully, we will find the key to changing that. But fundamentally the economy will come back and jobs will come back when growth occurs and growth will occur not in the public sector but in the private sector. We need to ask ourselves what it is we can do to create a better climate for growth and job creation. We need to be rigorous in analyzing the President's proposal, and to look at the details of it and how much it is going to cost and how we plan to pay it back. I think at a very minimum, we are entitled to that.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant majority leader.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I thank my friend and colleague from Alabama who has come to the floor. We see the world differently, but we both acknowledge we are at a moment where action is the only alternative. Doing nothing is unacceptable. When President Obama came to speak to us in a joint session of Congress last week, that is what he told us. He basically said, Let's roll up our sleeves, work together, both parties in Congress, for a change, and do something about this economy.

There are 14 million Americans out of work. The report now from the Joint Economic Committee and others cites the highest level of poverty in our country in decades; the problems working families are having week to week, month to month, and year to year, falling behind, despite all of their hard work. Their wages aren't rising to keep up with the cost of living. Many are surviving paycheck to paycheck.

A survey was taken recently across America asking working families the following question: Could you come up with \$2,000 in 30 days if you had to, either from savings or borrowing it? Fifty-three percent of working families said yes and 47 percent said no. That is how close to the edge almost half of working families are living. A \$2,000 medical bill at an emergency room is almost nothing these days—it is for a minor injury—and these families could not come up with it. That is what they are facing. That is why the President said let us focus on doing things that will help these families and equally, if not more importantly, help small businesses create jobs.

There is no argument here about creating an army of government jobs. That is not even on the table. The President is not proposing that. Here is what he said: Let's give a tax cut, a payroll tax cut to working individuals so they have more take-home pay. I took a look at what it would mean in the State of Illinois. It would mean that for the average income, which is \$53,000 a year, that family would get \$1,400 in tax cuts or \$120 a month. I think it is worth something to working families to have that much more in their pockets to meet the needs of their families and perhaps make some critical purchases for their children, for their future, whatever it might be. That is a tax cut the President has proposed.

He also proposed a tax cut for small businesses if they will hire unemployed people, a tax credit of up to \$4,000 to hire these folks, take them off the unemployed rolls, and put them to work.

I went to several job centers during the August recess. One was in McHenry, IL, and one was in Elgin, IL. I spent the better part of the day sitting with unemployed people and talking to them. You ought to go there. If you think unemployed Americans—the 14 million on whom we hear the statistics—are living the life of luxury on their unemployment checks, they are not. Most of them are struggling to survive, and many of them come each day to a job center to brush up their résumé, to find out the latest people asking for new workers and put in new applications day after day. Many of them are discouraged after submitting hundreds of applications with no response. Some go back to school. I met a few who really made the right life choice by going back to take courses at community college, where they could afford it, or at job-training centers where there would be no charge to them, so they could pick up a new skill in an area in which they could get a job. That is the reality. The President is trying to create tax incentives for small businesses to hire those people.

Usually the Republicans who come to the floor applaud tax cuts. My experience is that they are for tax cuts when times are good and bad, but this time they are against these tax cuts. What is the difference between these tax cuts and the ones the Republicans historically support? There are two differences: The President's tax cuts are focused on middle-income families, not the wealthiest, and they are the President's tax cuts. Those are the two differences.

I hope some on the Republican side will reflect on the fact, as the President said, that the American people are not going to reward us for our campaign rhetoric if this economy does not turn around. They want us to work together to solve the problems facing our economy. They want tax cuts for working families. They want small businesses to have an incentive to hire people. They want us to focus on creating

good-paying jobs here at home. What kinds of jobs? Building America.

As the President said, if we are going to succeed in this world, we need to outeducate our competitors, outinnovate our competitors, and outbuild them.

I went to China over Easter. What is happening in that country is incredible. They are building in every direction—building cranes and construction activity everywhere. They are building the infrastructure in China to become the No. 1 economic power of the world in the 21st century. What are we doing? We are hearing speech after speech saying that because of the deficit, we cannot invest in America. Some say we cannot invest in education. They argue that we cannot invest in research, we cannot invest in building America. I think they are wrong.

The deficit is a serious challenge. Even the Bowles-Simpson Commission, which I served on and voted for, said: When you get serious about cutting spending, do it when this recession is behind you. They know, we know you can't balance the budget with 14 million Americans out of work.

Let me say a word about the safety net in America. I made a visit in Champagne, IL, to a food-distributing operation. They distribute food to pantries and soup kitchens all around central Illinois. Unfortunately, their business has never been better. More and more families are showing up in these places for a helping hand. I went in there to hear how they are doing. They are getting a lot of help from the private sector that donates food that is near expiration, for example, and a lot of contributions from churches and charitable individuals. It is very heartwarming to see it.

As I went to tour this place, there was a young woman there. She was an attractive, well-dressed woman. I assumed she worked for this food depository. She said to me that she had a job in a local school district as a teacher's aide. I was a little bit puzzled as to whether she was on the board of directors or what her connection was. She came there to tell me that as a single mom with two little kids, even with a job in the school district, which she was happy to have, she still needed food stamps to put food on the table every day for her kids.

I don't think Americans—those of us lucky enough to never have to worry about the next meal—know what families are going through, working families struggling with low income, trying to keep their kids well-fed and to do what every parent wants to do. More and more of these families are going to soup kitchens very quietly because that is a meal they don't have to pay for. They are going to the pantries to pick up the groceries. I have seen them in one of the nicest and most prosperous counties in my State, DuPage County. I went to the pantries there, and I saw the people coming through the door. You would not be able to pick

them out, but they are working families who need a helping hand. That is the reality. That is why the safety net is so important.

I am troubled that so many people today are on food stamps. I am not troubled that they are on food stamps; I am troubled because they have to be on food stamps. I hear critics come to the floor who say: There are too darned many people on food stamps. There is something wrong here.

What is wrong is not the food stamps; what is wrong is hunger and low-income and working families struggling to get by paycheck to paycheck. That is what is wrong. The number of Americans now qualifying for this food stamp assistance is even going up among those who are employed, such as the lady I met in Champagne, IL. That is a reality.

Something else is happening too. As more and more people lose their jobs, they lose their health insurance. When I sit down with the unemployed, that is one of the first items that comes up. Once you have lost that health insurance premium your employer helps you pay, most folks can't afford it. It is just way beyond them. So they are out there without insurance, and they are vulnerable. Some of them have sick kids, chronically ill children, and they worry about it. They go to the free clinics. We are seeing more and more working families showing up at free clinics across America. That is a reality of this economy too.

When we talk about cutting spending on Medicaid, keep in mind who receives Medicaid payments in America. In my State of Illinois, 36 percent of Illinois children are covered by Medicaid insurance. When it comes to births in the State of Illinois, 52 percent of all births in Illinois are paid for by Medicaid. But the biggest single expense in Medicaid is neither one of those. Mr. President, 20 percent of the Medicaid recipients in my State account for 60 percent of the cost of the program: the elderly—parents, grandparents, great-grandparents in nursing homes and convalescent centers, on Medicare and broke and stay there because Medicaid steps in and helps them keep things together, so they have at least some care and some attention in the late years of their lives. When we talk about cutting spending in Medicaid, we are talking about hurting the most vulnerable people in America: children, such as the kids of that single mom I met; those who need prenatal care so their babies will be healthy; and, of course, the elderly who are stuck in that situation.

The same thing is true with Medicare. I understand Medicare costs are going up dramatically. I also understand the number of people under Social Security and Medicare is going to rise as baby boomers reach that age. But we have to take care that at the end of the day we protect the basic premiums and benefits that are presently available under Medicare. For a lot of

seniors, it is their only health insurance. It is what keeps them independent and strong. We can't compromise that basic protection by privatizing Medicare or raising the cost of Medicare beyond the reach of senior citizens.

Finally, when it comes to Social Security, let me just say that this is a program which means a lot. For 70 percent of Social Security recipients, it is a majority of their retirement. For 25 percent of the Social Security recipients, it is all they get. That is it. So guarding Social Security and protecting its future is important for our parents and grandparents. It is important for our country and for its future as well.

The President came forward, and he said: This is my jobs bill. This is what I think will help move America forward, put more spending power in the hands of working families, create incentives for small businesses to hire people, focus on putting firefighters, cops, and teachers back to work. That is a priority in our country for sure, and investing in building in America.

One of the few lines the President had that got a bipartisan standing ovation—and there were not many last Thursday—was when he said it is an embarrassment that 10 percent of our returning veterans are unemployed. Let's put our veterans back to work. That is part of our President's plan.

When I listened to the Senator from Alabama—he doesn't like the way the President is paying for the plan, but he does pay for it. How does he pay for it? One thing he does is he reduces the Federal subsidy to oil and gas companies. Filled your tank lately? Take a look at what they are charging at the pump. In Illinois and most places, it is over \$4. That is translating into the highest reported profits in the history of American business. Oil companies have never ever had it so good. President Obama has said—and I agree with him—that if there were ever a moment in time when the Federal subsidies to these oil companies should come to an end, this is it. The money saved should go to small businesses and families across America in this difficult economy.

The President also believes—and I agree with him—that the wealthiest among us, those who are most comfortable, should be asked to share in the sacrifice. There are some on the other side who would not accept one penny more in taxes on the wealthiest people in America. I don't get it. As I travel around Illinois, a lot of families are sacrificing in this tough economy. They know they have to. It is the only way they are going to make it. They know that some of the government programs which have been around in the past are not going to be there in the future or may be not as generous.

If working families and middle-class families across America accept that reality, why can't the wealthiest families in America accept it too? Honestly, I

think they can. By and large, the people I know who are blessed with a lot of wealth and a pretty comfortable life have said to me: Senator, I don't need all of this. I don't need all of that Social Security payment. I can get by without it. I don't mind paying a little more in taxes.

Those are the people I run into. But you hear from the other side that is totally unacceptable. Some of them have said the President's plan is going to fall flat on its face because it taxes the wealthy in America. I think the wealthy should pay their fair share, and I think the President's plan is an honest, good plan that moves us forward. So for those who are critical of it, give me your alternative.

I wrote down here what the Senator from Alabama suggested. He wants more energy produced here at home. I am for that. I think we ought to go to places where it is environmentally responsible and produce more energy here in the United States. But I will say two things to keep in mind:

No. 1, all of the known oil and gas reserves in the United States of America that we could reach onshore and offshore equal 3 percent of the known oil and gas reserves in the world. Each year, the United States of America consumes 25 percent of the oil and gas consumed in the world.

We cannot drill our way into energy independence. We can expand the base and do it in an environmentally responsible way, perhaps find better sources, newer sources for things such as natural gas, but this is not the answer to our prayers.

Secondly, moving toward energy efficiency is not only good for the environment, it is good for the bottom line for a family and for a business, promoting efficiency.

My wife and I take a little pride in the fact that we own a car, a Ford Fusion Hybrid, and we were kind of patting ourselves on the back a little bit. As we came back from vacation in Michigan, we were getting 36 miles a gallon. We felt pretty good about it. I was bragging to my friends about it, and now I am bragging on the Senate floor. It can be done. We can create more fuel-efficient vehicles. We didn't compromise anything, and we bought American.

I think that is what we need to encourage in this country: cars and other energy-saving equipment made in this country, creating jobs, reducing the need for energy to be imported from overseas and reducing the pollution that, unfortunately, hinders our environment and our health. I think that is a good thing.

So on the Senator's first point, sure, more energy at home, but put it in perspective. That is not the answer to America's economic needs.

The second point he says is to eliminate certain regulations. That could be true. I am sure the President agrees there are regulations now that don't make any sense. Get rid of them. I am

not sure this is a big ball and chain being dragged around by our economy, but there is no sense in wasting time or money on regulations that really don't serve a good public purpose.

The final point he said—and I couldn't agree more—tax reform. We lose \$1.2 trillion a year to the Tax Code. Credits and deductions and exclusions and special favors written in the Tax Code for businesses and individuals have to come to an end. I actually think that is a good way to raise revenue and maybe even reduce marginal tax rates for corporations and individuals in the process.

That is what Bowles-Simpson said. So even my friend from Alabama who spoke earlier—even he and I can find some common ground. I hope he will agree with me and the President: doing nothing is unacceptable. The President has said: No more games, no more delay, no more politics. Do something. That is the message I got in August, as I returned to Illinois. It is a message I hope my colleagues share as well.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant editor of the Daily Digest proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The Senator from Wyoming is recognized.

A SECOND OPINION

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I come to the floor, as I do almost on a weekly basis, to talk about the health care law and, I do that as a physician, someone who has practiced medicine in Wyoming for a quarter of a century, taking care of Wyoming families. I come to the floor because I have great concerns about this health care law.

We know—history proves—that landmark pieces of legislation written in Congress often contain drafting errors at one stage or another during the bill's development. This is one of the main reasons most landmark bills are written and negotiated in an open and transparent manner. Writing and negotiating bills in this way helps Members of Congress minimize mistakes. It helps uncover any unintentional consequences. It helps fix problems. This is done through rigorous committee and floor debate, as well as House-Senate conference committees, as the bills go through the process.

Most importantly, doing something in an open and transparent manner gives the American people, the folks at home, an opportunity to read a bill, to study it, to think about it, to discuss it during townhall meetings with their Members, and ask questions and weigh in.

Well, unfortunately, we all know the largest health care law ever enacted did not undergo an open, transparent, or bipartisan process. President Obama

promised the American people they could watch the discussions and the writing process—he said—on C-SPAN. Well, instead, the President and Democrat leaders in both the House and the Senate sealed themselves behind closed doors. Their strategy? Pass sweeping health care legislation based on stealth and speed. Use sound bites to sell America about expanding coverage, about cutting costs, about improving quality, and then offer very few details explaining exactly how the bill would impact individual Americans, nor what it would cost the country.

Well, while this entire strategy was being played out, the President and Washington Democrats were writing the legislation behind closed doors. Why? Well, to limit the time the bills could be read and reviewed by the American public. Some in Washington thought rushing a health care bill into law before America could read it was the perfect way to avoid public debate and public questioning.

Many of us recall when former Speaker of the House NANCY PELOSI infamously said: First, you have to pass the bill to find out what is in it. Well, the President passed his health care law, and the American people continue, on a daily basis, to find out what is in it. They do not like it, and it is easy to understand why.

As the American people had a chance to read the details, they started asking more questions. The numbers simply were not adding up. Health care costs, they were seeing, were going up, even though the President promised that health care costs would go down. There were costly mandates on small employers, and that was going to discourage hiring. NANCY PELOSI said they would hire 400,000 people immediately. They have not been hired. She said 4 million new workers would be hired ultimately. We have not seen it yet.

Mandates we have seen come out of the health care law do nothing to spur economic growth and help the 9.1 percent of individuals nationwide—14 million Americans—who are currently unemployed and are looking for work. Then there are even more government orders forcing individuals to buy one-size-fits-all, government-approved insurance or face a fine.

The American people have had 17 months to find out what is in the President's health care law. One news report after another has been uncovering a laundry list of so-called glitches in the health care law. Well, former Speaker PELOSI wanted the American people to find out what was in the law, and 17 months later the American people are finding out that the President and Washington Democrats did not even write it correctly.

On Wednesday, September 7, of this year, Investor's Business Daily printed an article titled, "Oops! No ObamaCare Tax Credit Via Federal Exchanges?" The article explains that the way ObamaCare was written, individuals who qualify for a taxpayer-funded sub-

sidy to buy government-approved health insurance in the new State exchanges may not get it. Section 1311 of the health care law requires the States to set up a State-run "exchange." This State-based exchange is a place where individuals can use their government subsidy to buy health insurance. Now, if a State declines to set up their own exchange, then section 1321 mandates that the Federal Government set it up and run it for them.

Here is the catch: The health care law, as written, as signed by the President, explicitly says the taxpayer-funded subsidies can only go to people who are enrolled in exchanges set up by the State. Nowhere does the health care law mention that the subsidy can be given to people enrolled in the Federal exchange.

So the American people are now finding out that their family might actually qualify for government help to buy health insurance, but they are not going to receive the help. Instead, individuals enrolled in federally run exchanges could be forced to buy health insurance that, absolutely, they cannot afford.

Not only might this law cause individuals to spend money they do not have, the law may also offer taxpayer-funded subsidies to people who do not actually need it. Let me repeat that. The law may actually offer taxpayer-funded subsidies to people who do not actually need it.

At a time when our country can hardly afford to spend money we do not have, Medicare's Chief Actuary, Richard Foster, exposed yet another glitch in the President's health care law. The law allows approximately 3 million middle-class early retirees to qualify for Medicaid. Well, Medicaid is a safety net program designed to help low-income Americans.

Here is how this one works: The health care law defines how the Federal Government will set an individual's Medicaid eligibility. The calculations are all based on income. Here is the glitch: The health care law excludes a large part of an individual's Social Security income from that calculation. Well, today, Federal low-income assistance programs are required to count Social Security benefits as part of an individual's income. Thanks to the health care law, early retirees earning up to \$58,840 a year could now be eligible for Medicaid.

Here is what Mr. Foster said in an Associated Press article. He said:

I don't generally comment on the pros or cons of policy, but that just doesn't make sense.

This is the Chief Actuary of Medicare. "I don't generally comment," he says, "on the pros or cons of policy, but that just doesn't make sense."

Well, I agree. That is why I cosponsored legislation introduced by Senator MIKE ENZI closing this loophole. Senator ENZI's bill, S. 1376, changes the health care law subsidy eligibility calculation to include all nontaxable Social Security income.

The Congressional Budget Office and the Joint Committee on Taxation estimate if we enacted Senator ENZI's bill, we will save the Federal Government and the American people about \$13 billion. The Senate should immediately take up S. 1376 and pass it. This is \$13 billion we can save right now, today. Let's show the American people that when we see our country spending money that it shouldn't, we will take a stand, collectively as a Senate, and stop it.

These examples—these two examples—inevitably beg the question: What next? Clearly, the self-described "most transparent Administration in history" has a lot of explaining to do. I do not believe my friends on the other side of the aisle, who wrote this very flawed health care law—and they did it behind closed doors—I do not think they knew what they were doing when they wrote these provisions. How do I know that? Well, if they understood how devastating their policies would be, I think they might have had second thoughts.

How many more disruptive, ticking time bombs are there lurking in this law and in the regulations that still have not been written about this health care law that was signed a year and a half ago? We do not know. We do not know because many of the provisions do not even go into effect until the year 2014 or later.

As a physician who has practiced medicine a long time, cared for patients all around the State of Wyoming, been active in the Wyoming health fairs, bringing low-cost health screenings to people all around the Cowboy State, I intend to fight each and every day in this Senate to make sure the American people will not have to find out what kind of additional ticking time bombs there are in the health care law. That is because I am more committed than ever to repeal the health care law and replace it with patient-centered care, replace it with health care reforms that help American families get the care they need, from the doctor they want, at a price they can afford.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant editor of the Daily Digest proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The Senator from Louisiana is recognized.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I know we have had several speeches over the last couple of hours on very important topics—the jobs bill, our efforts to stimulate the recovery, a response from one of our Democratic leaders to Senator SESSIONS, and the good Senator who was just speaking talking about health care—but I have

come to focus our attention, if I could, again this afternoon on a particular issue. We spent most of yesterday talking about a matter that is absolutely right at hand; that is, disaster relief funding and calling on this Senate and the House of Representatives to focus some immediate and comprehensive thought and attention on this subject, which is affecting so many of our constituents—Republicans, Democrats, and Independents—in big cities, small towns, and rural areas all over this country.

In fact, this is the first year in our memory and in, I think, the recorded recent history, we have had a Presidentially declared disaster in 48 of our 50 States. Just a few days ago, we along the eastern seaboard and the gulf coast, where I am from representing Louisiana, suffered from the original hit and then remnants of Tropical Storm Lee and then Hurricane Irene.

There are some Senators who joined me in a press conference earlier today. I think it was the Senator from North Carolina who said it has actually been three disasters: an economic disaster, in terms of an economy that is weak and fragile and we are doing our best to lift it and to strengthen it, and then Tropical Storm Lee and then Hurricane Irene.

It has been millions and millions of dollars of damage. Unfortunately, we on the gulf coast tragically are getting to be experts in this field because we, as Senators and House Members from the gulf coast, have battled multiple disasters over this last decade. Katrina and Rita, which broke all records, surpassed any planning this government has ever done.

We had a FEMA that showed up not ready, not comprehensive enough in its view. Our people have suffered. But we have made a lot of changes since then, and here we are today with actually a better FEMA, from all accounts. I wish to give a lot of credit to this administration, particularly, and not just Homeland Security. But the Cabinet of this President has been extraordinary in their reasonableness when it comes to this subject.

I have seen the opposite. So I think I am in a position to see the difference. It is a big difference in this Obama administration in terms of the Cabinet. They want to say yes to disaster victims. They did not want to say no. That is very important. They cannot always say yes to everything, to rebuild every building, repave every street, elevate every home. But they are trying to say yes. Most importantly, the lawyers have been instructed to find a way forward, as opposed to instruction that came from the last administration which was to find a way to say no.

So let me give credit where credit is due, to the Obama administration and their willingness to be flexible, to be forward leaning, to have attorneys who are trying to be on the side of the taxpayer, on the side of the victims, and

not shortchanging people in times of desperate need.

Having said that, the administration cannot do it all on its own. They need Congress, as the Constitution says, to provide the funding so the executive branch can do its job. The executive branch, by all accounts, even Republicans have come to the floor from States that have been hard hit and said: It is a more muscular FEMA, it is a more dynamic FEMA, it is a more flexible FEMA.

I wish to thank Senators LIEBERMAN and COLLINS. They are the authorizers. Yes, I have had a part of it—others have, but they have worked tirelessly after Katrina and the disaster that happened on the gulf coast, where we were all shamed when we saw what did not happen that should have.

We fixed a lot of it, and that is something to be happy and proud about. When government does set its mind to improve things, it can. But we cannot do anything without the funding. Right now, FEMA is empty. The pot of money is empty. Projects, millions, hundreds of millions of dollars today, not just in my State but in California, in Tennessee, in Iowa, in Texas, and in North Dakota—and I could go on and on—but for the Record let me say a couple.

In Tennessee, mitigation of private residences from the 2010 floods has been halted. For those who might not be familiar with the word “mitigation,” which most people are, it means one could be elevating their house, one could be putting shutters or storm windows on their windows. Let’s see what else. A person could be potentially strengthening the frame of their house if they are trying to mitigate against high winds from a tornado. There are rules that allow people to try to improve their home so the next time it happens not only are they not homeless, but taxpayers are not paying again for the same sort of incident.

The Federal Government, under good policy, requires a certain portion of all disaster funding to be specific, to go to mitigation because taxpayers think, when we are trying to rebuild from a flood or a storm or a tornado or a bridge collapse, do not just build the same old thing, try to mitigate so it does not happen again. That is smart because then we are not double, triple spending taxpayer money.

But in Tennessee this family, let’s say, is in the middle of elevating their home. Let’s say they have gotten it off the ground by 2 feet, and the contractor showed up on Monday. They were sent home because this project has been stopped. So somewhere there are homes in Tennessee—I am not sure in what particular community—where private sector contractors, many small business owners and their employees, showed up to work and were told: Go home. FEMA is out of money.

We have to fix this this week before we leave and, if not, at the latest by next week.

In Iowa, repairs for an electric utility—I am not sure who provides utilities in Iowa. Potentially, it may be, as in my State in rural areas, the local rural co-op. Everybody knows what a rural co-op is. Their project has been shut down. Potentially, people are still receiving electricity. I do not think people are sitting in the dark. I am hoping not. But whatever they were planning to repair and fix in Iowa has been halted because we have run out of money.

In Texas, repairs to the University of Texas medical facility have been stopped. In Louisiana, roadway construction has been stopped. In fact, there was an article in our paper, the Times-Picayune, just this week that said \$100 million for Jefferson Parish—\$100 million—that is just 1 of my parishes, 1 of 64, the suburban parish that sits right beside Orleans that was very hard hit by these storms, not as hard as Orleans Parish but received billions of dollars of damage—those projects have been put on hold while we move that money to help the victims in the Northeast. That should not be the case.

We need to act quickly to refill the FEMA funds. In addition, I understand in North Dakota and in other places there are problems. It is not just the DRF. The Corps of Engineers in its budget last year did not have enough money for emergencies. I slipped out of the Chamber a few minutes ago to go actually meet with the mayor of Grand Isle, who was here, as he is quite often, advocating on behalf of the only barrier island that is inhabited in the State of Louisiana, and he brought up pictures. Again, they are too small to see, but I am going to have them blown up for tomorrow. But I have in my hand pictures of the levees that were just ripped up and destroyed again from Tropical Storm Lee. These were levees on the gulf that we just completed.

But because the Corps of Engineers, when they rebuild levees, in their authorizing legislation are prohibited—which makes no sense whatsoever, it is a complete waste of taxpayer money—they are prohibited from betterment. They can build back what was there, but they cannot build it better or higher, unless they are directed to do so.

I am about ready to direct them because I am tired, on behalf of my people and the people of this country and the taxpayers, from rebuilding levees 10 times in a matter of 5 years. It is a waste of money—it is aggravating to the people whose homes are behind these levees—because we do not even have a policy, when we are building levees, to be ordered to build them stronger, higher, except, of course, in the case of some levee systems in Katrina. That was specifically directed, and it is being done.

We are building around the city of New Orleans a much stronger, much better system. One would think that would be being done all over the country. It is not. Why? Because we are

short on funding, short on political will, and short on imagination and creativity when it comes to building infrastructure in this country. I, for one, am tired of it. So are the people I represent.

I am asking the other side of the aisle to step up and to provide funding, funding that is not offset in the middle of a disaster. We will figure out how to pay for these later—these disaster funds later. But as I think Senator LEAHY said so eloquently in our press conference today: Do the Republicans, some people in the Republican Party, actually believe we want fire departments all over the United States, when someone's house is on fire and they show up with the engines, to debate in the middle of the street how they are going to pay for the extra overtime to put out the fire? I do not think so.

Even if the fire department is broke, even if the funding has run out, we do not want to have a debate over how they are going to pay for overtime when the fire is burning. Put the fire out. Bring the people to safety. Put the families in shelter. Then go back to the city council meeting next week and they can debate for as long as they want how they are going to ultimately pay for it.

We paid for World War II, obviously. It was a long time ago. It is completely paid for. We paid for World War I. We are paying for Afghanistan. We are paying for Iraq, which, by the way, not one, single, solitary Republican—and not many Democrats, for that matter, but not one Republican whom I can recall stood and asked or debated for 5 seconds how we were going to pay for the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan.

But when the people of Vermont stand in front of their bridges collapsed, their homes collapsed, their schools collapsed, and say: We need help, we have to have now a month-long debate on how we are going to pay for it. We have not done this since the 1800s.

We will eventually pay for it. America has to pay for everything. We will pay for it. We do not have to have that debate now. What we do have to have a debate about is how do we repair levees and what is the best way to mitigate it. What are the new technologies that can be used to make our communities stronger and smarter? How can we streamline the process? How can we eliminate the redtape? How can we get help to people faster? That is what we should be debating.

Instead, I have CANTOR and BOEHNER making us argue about what offsets there are. So I have to go to the State of Maryland and say: Senator, what can you give up this year in your State? I have to go to Michigan: What can you give up in Michigan? I have to go to California: What can you give up in California, so we can pay for people who are underwater in Vermont and North Carolina?

What kind of government is this? I do not want to be a part of that and I am

not going to be. So we have to fund these disasters now. The saddest thing about all this—it is sad and it is also puzzling and it is perplexing and it is aggravating is that we already sort of made this deal 1 month ago, when we negotiated that big agreement we all came to, about how the levels of funding would be for 2012.

Everybody remembers that, before we left for August, and we had this big knock-down, drag-out—in that agreement, our leadership, Republicans and Democrats, already agreed to do something that I think is very smart. I want to show what they agreed to. They agreed—because it is a puzzlement—how do we fund in advance disasters, how do we know how much to set aside. It is a problem because every year is different.

I wish to show what our problem is, so people listening can give me their own suggestions about how to solve it. In 2003, we set aside, in the whole budget of the United States—we can see this a little bit—\$800 million for disasters. But we had \$1.7 billion. So we were short \$984 million. We funded it. That went on our books.

The next year we said: Well, this year we had \$1.7 billion in disasters. So the next year we put \$1.8 in our bill, thinking we would cover it because last year was \$1.7. But, lo and behold, we had an additional \$3 billion worth of disaster funding. We did not know these disasters were going to happen.

So the next year we increased the amount of money in our base budget. Then, lo and behold, in that year, we put in \$2 billion dollars. Katrina hit.

The levees broke. Do you know what the bill came in for? It was \$43 billion. We had budgeted \$2 billion because in the history of the past that is all we needed to cover disasters. It went from \$2 billion to \$43 billion. Who would have had a crystal ball to know that? Did we sit and debate? Some people tried to, until I said there was no way I was going to have to find a \$43 billion offset before we can let the people of the gulf coast know that help was on the way. We spent what was required to help the gulf coast.

You can see the next year here. These numbers are very erratic, unpredictable. So what our leadership did, looking back on these 10 years and listening to the debate and argument, was come up with a pretty good plan. They said, OK, we will throw out the high number, we will throw out the low number—in 2009 we didn't have any emergencies. Can you imagine 1 year that you have no declared emergencies, and the next year you have one in almost every State? That is how erratic this is. It is not as though we are not trying to plan. It is just impossible by the nature of what an emergency or disaster is. You can plan for them, but you cannot always predict how many you are going to have and where they will be. Of course, everybody understands that.

What our leaders did is they threw out the top one and the bottom one and

came up with an average. That average is about \$11 billion—a very reasonable approach. So they put in our agreement that we made 30 days ago—we said, OK, next year, this is what the Federal Government can spend and, in addition to that, you can go up to the average. You can spend an additional \$11 billion, which is a very small amount of money compared to the whole Federal budget.

You would think we would not be having this debate. Why? The need is very evident, the history would dictate that we don't have debate over disasters, and the Republican and Democratic leadership has already provided a way, over and above our 2012 numbers, to pay for these disasters.

I ask this: Why are we having to fight for this? That is a very good question. I think it is because some people on the other side of the aisle think this is a good thing to fight about. They think they have to find a pay-for for everything we do even, as I have described, when you cannot predict. Even if you do plan responsibly, you never know, as in the cases of Katrina, Rita, and Wilma. But our leadership negotiated a way forward.

Yet we have people all over the country looking to the Republican leadership and listening to Representative CANTOR and to Speaker BOEHNER saying: I want to help you, ladies and gentlemen, but we have to find an offset.

I think people might say: Why didn't we hear that when they sent troops into Afghanistan or Iraq? Why didn't we hear that when they are rebuilding Iraq and Afghanistan? The same people are not yelling and screaming—or didn't do it when we went in there. I think we have a good point.

I am saying I am proud of the Senate for last night, with Democrats mostly—and, yes, about 8 Republicans—who voted to move this debate forward. I thank particularly Senator BLUNT from Missouri, who is an outspoken leader on the Appropriations Committee, for the need to act now, act quickly, to fund the DRF, the Corps of Engineers. Of course, Missouri has had terrible tornadoes and flooding. Not only did they have Joplin, but they had the great flood of the Mississippi River, which was the highest in 50 years. It was so high along our capital city when I visited our mayor a couple months ago—that is Baton Rouge, which is our largest city, since 100,000 people left New Orleans to literally live on higher ground, although it has broken their hearts and divided their families. They have moved to Baton Rouge, as we are rebuilding levees and our flood control is stronger in the southeastern part of our State. People spend time walking on levees and riding bikes on the levees. Of course, mechanical vehicles are not allowed. You cannot have cars, trucks, and four-wheelers because that would be destructive to our levees. Our levees are quite huge. They are almost like linear parks. For the first time in the history of anybody who can remember, the mayor had to declare that

everyone stay off the levees because the water was so high and seeping through. We literally thought maybe some of these great levee systems would breach. Happily, they did not. It was a frightening situation for millions and millions.

In some parts of Missouri, and other parts north of us, the levees did breach. Sometimes the levees will blow to protect other areas. It is frightening if your business is behind one of those levees, as North Dakota residents know all too well.

Nonetheless, we should not be debating this. I hope our bill will pass this week and get over to the House for a quick vote. If the House decides to send us a continuing resolution, please, I want the leadership to hear clearly what I am saying—and I will send them a message by letter in the next few minutes—please do not think you can nickel and dime recovery efforts, that you can fund it 6 weeks at a time, or 4 weeks at a time. Disaster recovery doesn't operate that way. Our mayors, Governors, the Republican Governor of New Jersey, the Republican Governor of Virginia, the mayor of Patterson, who was with us today, and mayors up along the east coast who are with their people every day—the mayor of Joplin, MO, who has to be able to know that he can plan a year out or 2 years out—having to rebuild an entire town is overwhelming even if you have the money and the plan. Can you imagine if you sort of have a plan, but you don't know if the Federal Government will provide you money? Do you know the frustrating council meetings and school board meetings that will be had, and they will say, well, the Republican party in Washington cannot figure out if we should get funding, but it is 6 weeks at a time?

I will not allow that to happen. I am going to draw the line in the sand right now. You may get around me on it, but it will take a huge effort to get around this desk on that subject—a huge effort. If I have to shut the Senate down—and I have done it before—I will do it again, because I can tell you, as much as my name is MARY LANDRIEU, you cannot rebuild communities with 6-week plans. It took us 2 years to put together the Road Home Program—2 years after we got the funding. The reason we could not put it together before was—even though Mississippi had their money because President Bush gave it to them right away but made the people of Louisiana wait—because Congress would not decide how much money to give us. No mayor, no Governor, no matter how great they are, no matter how smart they are, no matter how many engineers they have, no matter how many Rotary Clubs are helping, no matter what the chamber of commerce is doing, I am telling you that it cannot be done without a reliable source of funding, so the planners can say something like this: We lost eight schools in this flood. They bring the community together—and these

are how these discussions go—and say we might not have money to build all eight, but we have money to build six. Which six do you want to build, and where, what materials do you want to use, and which kids should go to which schools?

I have been in these meetings. I am not going to allow the mayors and Governors to call their people together and say we lost six schools and we don't know when the money is coming to build them, and we cannot make any plans because the Republican leadership has decided that every 6 weeks they are going to let us know how much money we are going to get.

That is not going to happen.

I want Speaker BOEHNER to think about this, and I want MITCH MCCONNELL to think about this, and I want the Republican leadership to think about it. I will negotiate on the top number. I will talk about maybe FEMA doesn't need quite this much. I will talk about maybe the Corps of Engineers doesn't need that much. But I will not, under any circumstances, agree to a 6-week or 4-week continuing resolution. You may run the Government of the United States that way. We have, unfortunately, gotten used to it. That is a sad commentary. I might say, that we run the greatest government ever created in the eyes and vision and hearts of mankind, but we operate it on a 6-week basis. That might be the game we play with the government, but I am not going to allow that game to be played with people who have lost their homes, lost their businesses, and who look up from a storm and say, my gosh, what happened to me? Then they don't know what is going to happen because we cannot make a decision that lasts more than 6 months or a year. So the minimum will be 6 months. I hope we can find the will to do a whole year, because without that you are going to shut down recovery operations at a time when it is heartbreaking to think of small business owners who have lost their print shop or their dress store or their shoe store, and they see everybody talking about creating jobs. They used to have three of them last week—selling printing material or selling shoes or whatever—and they are trying to get their business back, and we cannot decide—even though we have the money, even though we already budgeted the money, and although we already made an agreement about how we would do this—we are going to still argue.

I will tell you, if this is on the tea party's agenda, I suggest they take it off. If it is somebody else's agenda, please speak up. I have not had one single Republican Senator come down and defend this position, because it is indefensible. I hope when the leadership is negotiating—and they are doing so now—they will hear me in summary very quickly: The FEMA pot is empty. The Corps of Engineers is always running on fumes. Levees are breaking and flooding, and it is occurring in places

that haven't flooded in a hundred years. When we wake up and realize that we have to put more money in emergency funding and be there when our people are hurting, as they are now—and we will eventually pay for this; we don't have to figure that out in the next 30 days. We have to give them a green light and the billions of dollars they need to operate for a year. Everything else is negotiable. But this is not going to be negotiated. We are not going to rebuild pieces of 48 States 4 weeks at a time. That will not happen. Whatever amount of money we give, let it be for as long as we can make it, let it be as robust as it can possibly be, and let's give a green light to our Republican Governors, Republican mayors, Independents, and Democrats out there, who are shellshocked about the work before them.

The people in neighborhoods are still crying and in shock about what they have to do in making decisions. Should we come back? Should we not come back? What should our neighborhood or community do? Maybe we should all move to higher ground. These decisions are being made right now. The last thing they should worry about is Congress debating whether there is money there to turn that hose on.

Let's do our job the way we have done it for 150 years.

Let's continue to do it and let our people know we are there for them, as we try to be there for other people in the world who are caught in situations such as this. We most certainly need to be here for our people in America.

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

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

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WARNER. 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. WARNER. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to talk about a site of particular historic significance to the Commonwealth of Virginia and an action we in Virginia are requesting the President make. But before I get to that subject, I want to take a moment to echo what I know the Presiding Officer said, and my colleague, the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, and so many other of my colleagues who have come to the floor over the last few days to express concern and talk about the series of natural disasters and calamities our various States have experienced over the last few weeks and months.

We have had, in effect, the trifecta in the Commonwealth of Virginia in the last month, where, about a month ago, we had an earthquake hit—something that was a bit unprecedented in Virginia—which shut down schools in Louisa County. That earthquake also caused damage at the Washington Monument and at the National Cathedral, but in central Virginia—in Louisa

County, in Mineral, and Culpeper, and other places around Virginia—it caused enormous damage.

We had Hurricane Irene, which—again, through central Virginia and down into Hampton Roads—caused enormous damage. Then, most recently, we had Tropical Storm Lee, where I had the opportunity to visit a community not far from where I know some of the distinguished folks who work in the Clerk and Parliamentarian's Offices live—in Alexandria. Not too far away from there is a neighborhood named Huntington, VA. This community I walked through has been flooded out three times in the last decade. So we have a 100-year floodplain. Yet three times in the last decade they have been flooded out.

So all these folks—whether in Hampton Roads in Richmond or the folks in Louisa County and central Virginia with the earthquake or the folks in Huntington—are saying: We just need that assistance that other communities have when they have been met by natural disasters. What purpose do we have for government other than to make sure there is an emergency response, and then after that response that there is an ability to get people back on their feet?

So I thank my colleagues again, particularly the Senator from Louisiana, who has been tireless on this issue of making sure FEMA has the resources it needs to address these disasters, and that we do so in a meaningful way. We recognize, of course, we can't just put these on a credit card forever; that we have to have a rational way to pay it back and figuring out a 10-year rolling cycle to budget for emergencies ought to be part of our discussions going forward. But trying to say that must be done at this moment, with the economic downturn and the recession, while communities are in need—whether they are in Oregon or in Virginia or one of the other 48 States that have had a disaster declaration issued over the last year—is not the way we ought to be doing business.

FORT MONROE

Mr. President, in addition, I rise today to encourage President Obama to use his authority under an act that probably most in this Chamber are not that familiar with—called the 1906 Antiquities Act—to designate Hampton, VA, Fort Monroe, as a national monument, which would make it an official part of the National Park Service. Our hope is that the President will consider designating this in the coming days as this historic fort is turned back over to the State of Virginia, having gone through the BRAC process, with the Federal Government disposing of it.

Let me take a moment on the Senate floor this afternoon to tell you a bit about this special place. This fort was built in the early 1800s, but, actually, the fortifications go back much earlier than that. It is an area called Point Comfort. As early as 1608 Captain John Smith recognized the importance of

building a fort at Point Comfort, as the English colonists called this land.

From its very beginnings, Fort Monroe has been associated with many key figures in American history. Robert E. Lee supervised work on the fortress as a young U.S. Army lieutenant. Edgar Allan Poe, the famous poet—and I am sure our pages, at one point, hopefully, had to memorize “The Raven” in high school—was a soldier at Fort Monroe. Abraham Lincoln, during the midst of the Civil War, paid a critical visit to Fort Monroe. And Harriet Tubman, an incredibly important American—who was only recently, in the last 50 or so years appropriately recognized—nursed wounded soldiers there in 1865.

Another historic American figure had maybe mixed feelings about his visits to Fort Monroe. Jefferson Davis was at Fort Monroe on two very different occasions: First, as the U.S. Secretary of War, and later, as the former President of the Confederacy, he was imprisoned at Fort Monroe for 2 years.

By World War II, Fort Monroe was the headquarters of our military's successful efforts to protect the mid-Atlantic coast. After World War II and to the current day it has been home of the Army Command responsible for training our warfighters.

For all of these various events alone, I would argue, as a Virginian, that would warrant the designation of Fort Monroe as part of the National Park Service. But its true historic significance goes back, actually, to a night in May of 1861.

During the Civil War, Fort Monroe had an important strategic role as one of the very few Union military installations located in the South that was never occupied by Confederate forces. For the folks who have traveled down to Norfolk and Virginia Beach, they know that Fort Monroe is the point that sticks out right before they go through the bridge-tunnel that takes them over to Norfolk and Virginia Beach. It has a commanding view of the whole gateway into what we call Hampton Roads.

On May 23, 1861, three slaves—Frank Baker, Shepard Mallory, and James Townsend—got into a small boat in Hampton, crossed the James River, and presented themselves at the front gate of Fort Monroe seeking safety and sanctuary. For the previous many weeks, Baker, Mallory, and Townsend had been forced by their owners to help construct a Confederate artillery post aimed directly at Fort Monroe. Obviously, that was not something these individuals wanted to be part of.

I want you to think a moment about the choices that were being made by these three men—these three slaves—Frank Baker, Shepard Mallory, and James Townsend. They left behind the community where they had spent most, if not all, of their lives. At least two of the three left behind wives and children. It was entirely possible that once these three men reached Fort Monroe, the Union soldiers would simply turn

them around and send them back to their owners.

One of the things I think even students of American history sometimes forget is that it was the official U.S. Government policy, even in the so-called Confederate States, after the Civil War had begun in April of 1861, to still turn slaves back over to their owners.

Baker, Mallory, and Townsend had to know if they were returned as runaways, they could expect the most Draconian of punishments. But they figured the choice should be theirs to make, so they made it. They soon found themselves standing before the new commander of Fort Monroe, MG Benjamin Franklin Butler.

Deciding it might be easier to apologize later rather than seek permission beforehand, General Butler made a huge and historically courageous decision. He classified the three slaves as “contraband of war,” a policy that was later adopted across the Union to protect any slaves who managed to reach Union lines. As a result, Virginia's Fort Monroe ultimately became a beacon of hope for thousands of enslaved people seeking freedom. In fact, Fort Monroe became known as the Freedom Fort.

The day after General Butler's edict, eight more slaves showed up at Fort Monroe. The day after that, 47 more appeared. By the war's end, thousands—literally thousands—had appealed for contraband status at Fort Monroe. General Butler's declaration of this decision of “contraband of war” helped change the course of the Civil War and our Nation's history.

This Thursday, September 15, the U.S. Army will officially hand over Fort Monroe to the city of Hampton and the Commonwealth of Virginia as part of the 2005 BRAC process. I proudly join with my colleague Senator WEBB, the bipartisan Virginia House delegation, Virginia's Governor Bob McDonnell, local residents, and the National Trust for Historic Preservation in urging the President to take this opportunity to declare Fort Monroe a national historic treasure. By using the Antiquities Act to grant this designation, it also will allow us to begin the work to create a national park at Fort Monroe.

For more than 100 years, Presidents have used the Antiquities Act to protect some of America's most important and beloved historic places. As a matter of fact, it was use of the Antiquities Act that first designated the Grand Canyon as well as the Statue of Liberty. So there is obviously enormous historical precedent. And there is no dispute over the historical significance of Fort Monroe.

Over the last few years, I have spent a considerable amount of time, both as Governor and then subsequently during the BRAC process and now as a Senator, working with State and local residents and officials to explore the

opportunities to partner with the National Park Service to preserve this incredible piece of American history. I spoke as recently as last Friday with the White House about Fort Monroe. I am hopeful we will have promising news in short order.

It would certainly be timely if the President's decision could be announced this week, as the Army prepares to exit Fort Monroe, as our Nation marks the 150th anniversary of the Civil War, and as many Virginians focus anew on the future of this very special place.

I feel this is an especially appropriate time for the President to recognize the crucial role Fort Monroe has played in our Nation's history, and I again urge him to use his long-established power under the Antiquities Act to keep this process on track.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. the clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HAGAN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 10 minutes as in morning business.

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

TRADE

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Last week, new trade figures were released. I know the Presiding Officer from North Carolina is very concerned about what has happened with these trade figures and what it means for jobs in her State and in my State.

The trade deficit with China widened from \$26.7 billion in June to \$27 billion in July. That is one country in one month. Granted, it is the country we have the biggest trade deficit with, but it is 1 month. President Bush, Sr., some years ago, said that a \$1 billion trade surplus or trade deficit translated into some 13,000 jobs. Whether that number is precise or quantifiable or measurable is not the point. The point is that when we have persistently large trade deficits month after month, year after year, now decade after decade, we know what it means to the industrial base in our country.

I spent much of August in places such as Belmont County, St. Clairsville, Cleveland, Dayton, Mansfield, and Springfield, OH, where, in my State alone, these cities and communities had proud industrial heritages. They are places where people had real opportunity to join the middle class. After they graduated from high school, they could go and be trained and work in manufacturing and usually buy a home, a car, and send their child to college. My wife is the daughter of a utility worker, since deceased, in

northeast Ohio, and she and her two younger sisters and brother were able to go to, in her case, Kent State, and other universities, in part paid for by her father's work in manufacturing—if you will, his union card—and assistance from government Pell grants and all they were able to do so the kids didn't graduate with huge debt the way they too often do now.

The trade deficit with China through July 2011 totaled \$160 billion, up from \$145 billion over the same period in 2010. We debate the budget deficit, as we should. But too many politicians in this city, too many editorial writers, too many pundits and economists ignore the trade deficit. They are too focused on things such as pay-fors. They ignore how the trade deficit has a dangerous effect on American jobs.

The best way to get our fiscal house in order is to get America working again, and one way to do that is by cracking down on unfair trade practices of some of our so-called trading partners. When the President steps up and enforces trade rules—and while I do not agree with the President sending the Korea, Panama, and Colombia trade agreements to the Congress for votes because I don't think they serve America's interests, I do believe this President, more than his predecessors, has been, relatively—I say “relatively” but blessedly so, and in some cases aggressive at enforcing trade rules. I have seen that in Youngstown in creating jobs. I have seen it in Loraine, where it has created jobs, and in Fenway, where it has created jobs, and it has helped our industry in Butler County in steel, in paper, and in tires.

It is clear that part of this problem is currency manipulation from the Chinese, which undermines American manufacturing and our very own job-creating efforts. In June, the Economic Policy Institute released a new report showing that addressing Chinese currency manipulation could support the creation of 2.25 million jobs. Put that in contrast to what they say—the “free traders at any cost” sort of free market, free-trade fundamentalists who preach: Pass NAFTA. It will mean hundreds of thousands of jobs. Pass CAFTA. Pass PNTR with China. It will mean millions of jobs.

It never does. It means job growth, but the job growth usually takes place—with NAFTA, it was in Mexico; CAFTA, in Central America; and PNTR, in China, which is East Asia. There is job growth, but there is nothing close to net job growth in our country. Even that, the President is saying, with this new agreement with South Korea, that it will sustain or keep or contribute to sustaining or keeping 100,000 jobs or so. So even the promises aren't that great on this new trade agreement, and we know they never live up to their promises. But we do also know if we stood up to currency manipulation, it could create 2.25 million American jobs. My friends on the other side of the aisle don't ever want

to do any kind of direct spending on infrastructure in terms of job creation; that costs tax money. I think it is a good investment; they don't. But standing up on currency we know doesn't cost American taxpayers and it will, in fact, mean American jobs.

A paper mill in Butler County, down near Dayton and Cincinnati, someone who worked at that paper mill told me they are now competing with China for coated paper, which is a higher tech manufacturing of paper—the kind of magazine paper we all touch and use—that the pulp comes from Brazil, it is shipped to China, it is milled in China and shipped back to the United States and they undercut American prices. Yet only 10 percent of the cost of paper production is labor. What does that mean? It means they are gaming the currency system. They are subsidizing water and capital and land and they are paying low wages. How do we compete when they are not playing fair? Forget the low wages even for a minute. How do we compete when they are playing these currency games? By continuing the currency manipulation, we lose far too many jobs. By combating it, we help level the playing field for our manufacturers, we help our workers, we help spur our economic recovery.

That is why I introduced the Currency Reform for Fair Trade Act. It would strengthen countervailing duty laws to consider undervalued currency as an unfair subsidy in determining duty rates.

So when we contest on a trade agreement, all we are saying when we contest is that undervalued currency is considered an unfair subsidy, because it is. It is not hard to convince people of that. It is not hard to illustrate or prove that. So when an industry such as the coated paper company in Hamilton or the oil country tubular steel used in drilling in Lorain or in Youngstown, where there is a new steel mill because of a trade decision the President made—thank you—or aluminum in Sidney—when an industry petitions the International Trade Commission for relief against unfair subsidies, currency manipulation under this new bill and amendment we are going to offer on the floor will be part of that investigation.

This is a designation that would ensure the government has the tools to respond on behalf of American manufacturers and workers by imposing countervailing duties on subsidized exports from China.

We have broad support here. Senator SCHUMER from New York, a Democrat, has been very involved. Senator SNOWE from Maine, a Republican, has been very involved. Senator STABENOW, a Democrat from Michigan, and Senator GRAHAM from South Carolina, a Republican, have been very involved in understanding that these kinds of currency manipulations cost us American jobs and undermine our economy. This designation would ensure the government has the tools to respond on behalf

of American manufacturers and workers by imposing these countervailing duties on subsidized exports from China. It is simple, straightforward, and achievable.

Addressing currency manipulation would decrease our budget deficit up to \$70 billion a year and somewhere between \$500 billion and \$800 billion over 10 years if sustained. Addressing our trade deficit should be part of the debate in reducing our budget deficit. If we are going to create jobs, we have to ensure that our trading partners don't stack the deck. We want trade, and we want more of it, but we want fair trade, not this kind of phony free trade.

Almost every country in the world practices trade according to their national interests. The United States in this body and the President of the United States—typically, Presidents in both parties—have practiced trade according to some economics textbook that is 20 years out of date. If we are serious about standing for American workers and companies that continue to play by the rules, we need to pass this legislation.

With each passing week, more companies and workers are faced with the harsh realities of unfair competition and unwanted cutbacks due to Chinese currency manipulation. In towns and cities across our country—go anywhere in this country, including Texas, where Senator HUTCHISON is from and who is awaiting a chance to speak on the floor, or North Carolina, the Presiding Officer's State, or my State, and we see that companies and workers are faced with the harsh realities of that unfair competition.

Workers have the proud tradition of making products that matter to America. From the tanks made in Lima, OH, supporting our troops abroad, to steel tubes created in Lorain, equipping our energy markets, Ohio manufacturers are vital to our Nation's security and economy. Our national security, our economic security, our family security, all those are dependent on making things in the United States of America.

My State is the third largest manufacturing State in the country. We are seventh in population, but we are third in manufacturing. We have lost far too many jobs in Zanesville and Jackson and Columbus and Akron because of this undermining of currency, because of this gaming of the system by China, its gaming of the system on currency.

It is time to take bold action. It is time to stand up to China. It is time to practice trade according to our communities and our national interests. It is time to do that. It is time to pass this legislation.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

NASA'S VISION

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Madam President, I wish to mark today, September 14 of 2011, as the day that NASA announced our vision for the future. Since the shuttle was retired earlier this year

and we saw the last people go into space on an American flight, many of us have worried that there wasn't going to be another heavy launch vehicle that would take our astronauts to beyond low earth orbit. Today, after much study and a lot of going back and forth with NASA, I was encouraged to see the design approved by both NASA and the OMB, and I think it is going—well, it will be the heaviest, biggest, strongest, most robust vehicle we have seen since we put men on the Moon.

I was very concerned because of the long timeframe. Congress asked that this design be delivered by January of this year. We kept getting delays and delays and delays. Finally, Senator BILL NELSON and I just got frustrated about that timeline, so we had meetings.

As recently as yesterday, I met with the director of OMB, Mr. Jack Lew, who did come to my office to meet with Senator NELSON and myself and General Bolden, who is the NASA Administrator, to get his commitment that we would be on a robust timeline and that it would be as much a priority of NASA to go beyond low earth orbit as the ferry to the space station would be for NASA. We got those assurances from Mr. Lew and the NASA Administrator. Senator NELSON and myself, Senator ROCKEFELLER was represented, Senator BOOZMAN—we had all the relevant people in the loop on this issue because we want to make sure Congress and the administration are on the same goal with a timeline to achieve that goal.

What worried us about the delays were the loss of cost efficiencies and the loss of experienced personnel to design that new heavy launch vehicle.

We want to have the most experienced engineers who will use the proven technology that has been time tested and add to that proven technology the added boosters, the added capabilities that we know we must have to go to Mars, to an asteroid, and to make sure we do it in a safe manner.

I am very encouraged by the commitments that were made and the timetables we are seeing. I am told by the NASA personnel that we are now going to look, in 1 week or 2, to have the contract modifications in place that will tell the workers that they are going to have those jobs, that we are going to have that expedience, that they have a project to work on. I think it is essential we have that kind of experienced personnel to do this.

I am very pleased we now have this way forward. It is the most powerful vehicle we will have seen in many years. I think the announcement today is going to set us on a path. If we can see those contract modifications going out from NASA in the next week—or a little more, but no more than 2 weeks from now—then we will know there is progress and that we are going toward the time when we will have the building of that rocket, that we will have the design, followed by the building, and then, of course, testing, and then the launch.

I think when we saw that last flight come down this summer, so many people had very mixed feelings because space exploration has been a part of America's drive and spirit for all these years we have watched more and more things be accomplished. From President Kennedy's first challenge that we would put men on the Moon, Americans have been excited about that opportunity. They have not just been excited, though, about the exploration and the pushing of the envelope, they have also been excited with the quality of life that has been produced by what came from the research: the advancements we have had in medical treatment, MRIs, the advancements in products we have been able to discover.

I fully expect that with the space station we are going to be able to do the research on cancers that will grow in the microgravity conditions in space that will not grow the same way on Earth, and that maybe we will be able to test antidotes and medicines for those. That is why I was pleased the President did announce we would extend the space station until 2020. We have international partners as well. So we want to make sure we are a good partner, that we are a reliable partner, and that we do some things for mankind that might make a difference in our lives.

National security. We have gained so much in satellite-guided missiles for our national security. And being able to put a missile into a window from 1 mile out is because we have been able to discover in space the use of satellites. Earlier this summer the space shuttle carried the magnetic spectrometer that Dr. Ting, the Nobel laureate from MIT, built and insisted on putting on the space station, it will help us understand the nature of dark energy and its relationship to the origins and function of the universe.

We are looking at how matter was formed. We are looking at the cosmic rays. I went to the Johnson Space Center in Houston and saw from the space station the magnetic spectrometer that was getting the hits from cosmic rays. There were 60 scientists in the room who were tracking these hits, trying to determine what was happening when those cosmic rays hit the magnetic spectrometer because they want to see if we can understand the nature of dark energy. There are things we have not even thought of that we hope to find by using the space station, and then going to an asteroid or going to the Moon.

We have taken a first step today. I think many people in America were waiting for the blueprint for the future. Now I think we have one. As long as we stay on a regular timetable and with the funding levels that have been approved already in the authorization bill passed by Congress and signed by the President—if we can stick with those, this has the potential to bring us energy, health, possibly curing breast

cancer, things that will make a difference in the lives not only of Americans but of our fellow citizens all over the world. That is what the investment can be in NASA if we go forward as we have made this blueprint to do.

We are in a time where we must be more efficient. We must fund the priorities and not fund the lesser priorities.

In today's markup of our committee, our Appropriations subcommittee that does fund NASA, we have found the priorities. We also cut programs. Senator MIKULSKI said in her whole time in the Senate she has never been an appropriator who actually cut programs. But we did today. We cut programs that were lesser priorities in different areas of our jurisdiction. But we funded NASA so we would have this heavy launch vehicle. We would fund the commercial vehicle that is going to take our astronauts to the space station. That is going to be done in the private sector. That was the balance we did in our authorization bill last year. Then we fund the Webb Space Telescope because that is part of the scientific advances we must make if we are going to know what is out there in space that we might be able to utilize or utilize the knowledge for better life on Earth.

I am very pleased we have the Appropriations Committee that will, hopefully, approve the bill tomorrow and that we have made those tough decisions. We came in under the 2011 continuing resolution on our overall bill. We came in under the President's request. But we have fully funded the priorities which have the possibility to reap the benefits from exploration and assure that America remains the No. 1 country in the world in space exploration. Our economy has benefitted, our national security has benefitted, and now we are going to be looking at health care possibilities, energy possibilities, and living in space, and seeing how we can do that in a better way.

I think we have a plan that will excite the American people again about what we can do in space if we put our minds to it, if we prioritize, if we are efficient with the taxpayer dollars, and we do not lose sight of the vision that is the spirit of America.

Madam President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant editor of the Daily Digest proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. I would ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. COBURN. Madam President, I would like to spend a few minutes discussing some things in general.

In making a couple points today, I was referred to by one of our colleagues as a dictator. I am not offended at that; I understand the frustration of

what is going on. But I think there are some significant points that the American people ought to hear about where we are and what we are doing.

Quite frankly, if we look at our financial situation and we look at the history of the world, no country has ever recovered from the situation in which we find ourselves in terms of our debt-to-GDP ratio and our debt-to-export ratio.

In August, before we left, we passed a piece of legislation that goes—a small amount—toward fixing the very real problems that are in front of our country in terms of spending money we don't have on things we don't absolutely need. But we have before us, and coming before us, two different pieces of legislation: One is a shell piece of legislation, and the assumption is the majority leader will utilize it to fund supplementation for disaster relief for the many areas in our country that need that funding. There is not a dispute that we should be doing that. There is a dispute about how much that should be. But the greatest dispute is, when we are running \$1.3 trillion and \$1.4 trillion deficits, and we know we have significant waste, duplication, and fraud in the Federal Government, whether we ought to spend another \$6 billion or \$7 billion by borrowing or we ought to actually reduce spending somewhere else to pay for a much more important and proper need in which the Federal Government has a role. That is the real debate.

I think we have worked a way to have appropriate amendments to try to pay for that, and we should probably go forward. There are, however, two other programs that are precarious in their funding: One is FAA—and we have coming to us the 22nd temporary reauthorization—and the Transportation bill, which is, I believe, its sixth temporary reauthorization.

Now, there are some real questions the American people ought to be asking about why 22 times we have temporarily reauthorized the FAA for a short period of time, and why now we are on our sixth temporary—or fifth; I may be wrong on one of those numbers but close—temporary reauthorization. That is because we are not prioritizing what is important for the country in terms of our legislative agenda. We don't control that, but there are some things that the American people are interested in that we do control.

The highway trust fund has received a supplementation over the last 4 years of \$35 billion from the American taxpayer outside of the taxes they collect for that trust fund. Out of that amount of money billions of dollars have been spent on things other than highways and bridges.

We now have 146,000 deficient bridges in our country, some in every State in the country. We have more now after the floods in the Northeast. We have significant problems and we have a limited amount of money, and what is in front of us is another short-term ex-

tension of 6 months for the transportation funding which continues to spend money on items that are a low priority.

I am not saying we couldn't spend the money on it. But when we are short of money, and we are borrowing money to put money into the trust fund, and our No. 1 priority ought to be safety and quality roads and bridges, to spend significant funds on things that are not a priority now—not when we are head over heels in debt, not when the trust fund is precarious—then we ought to not force States to spend money they don't want to spend. Yet in this bill 10 percent of the surface transportation moneys have to be spent on enhancement.

So that tells Oklahoma, or any other State: If you have an excess number of bridges, it doesn't matter that that is a safety problem for your citizens; we are still going to make you spend this 10 percent money over here that doesn't have anything to do with safety or true transportation, but we are going to require it because we can—except, the problem is, the people in your State pay the taxes in the first place for their highways and their bridges, not for the museums, not for all the hundreds of other things that are spent that are low priority.

So I thought I might give us a little flavor of what some of those things are. If we were at a different time where we had an excess of funds, I am not saying they are necessarily bad. But when we have bridges falling down in this country, and concrete—like the summer before last in Oklahoma—falling out of an interstate highway bridge injuring somebody, falling onto their car as they drove under it, I would think that we would want to repair these 146,000 bridges rather than spend money redecorating a sign.

So I will not go through all of them—I will put all of them into the RECORD—but let me go through a few of them just to see. If the American people actually believe we should not fix bridges or roads and we ought to spend money, I am fine. If the Senate believes we ought to not fix bridges, we ought not concentrate on safety, we ought not concentrate on the quality of our roads and bridges and they vote it down, I am fine too. But the fact is, we ought not to be spending money when we have the hundreds of thousands of bridges that are dangerous to people in this country.

All we are saying is, if a State wants to continue to spend money on something other than safety and bridges and roads, fine, it can, but don't make those of us who already have a big problem with safety have to spend money on something that doesn't protect our citizens, doesn't enhance their highways by spending money on something that is called an enhancement but doesn't enhance their safety or their ability to commute.

So what are some of them? Lincoln Highway 200-Mile Roadside Museum in

Pennsylvania—it received \$300,000 in enhancement funding to commemorate the historic highway along the 200-mile route. Interpretive signage, colorful, repainted vintage gas pumps, engaging murals, refurbishing a large coffee pot.

Notably, Pennsylvania ranks No. 1 in the country in terms of bridge deficiency levels. Forty-six percent of the bridges in Pennsylvania are either structurally deficient or functionally obsolete. Mr. President, \$300,000 would have fixed two of them. So we chose to not fix two but spend the money elsewhere. At a different time, sure, or if Pennsylvania wants to spend it, let them. But don't force them to spend money on something that does not protect the quality of transportation for their citizens.

How about Chinatown Gateway, a \$250,000 enhancement to supplement the construction of the Twin Dragons Gateway to the Chinatown area? California has over 7,000 bridges that are structurally deficient or functionally obsolete. One out of every three bridges in California is in trouble, and we are doing aesthetics instead of fixing bridges.

How about the White Squirrel Sanctuary in Tennessee? Kenton, TN, located in Gibson County, calls itself "the Home of the White Squirrel." They received \$110,000 in transportation enhancement funding to construct a white squirrel sanctuary with walking trails, brick crosswalks, a footbridge, and a parking lot. There are 3,856 bridges that are structurally deficient in the State of Tennessee. They didn't necessarily want to do this. They did not have any choice. They had to spend 10 percent of their surface transportation money on things such as this.

Tuscumbia Landing in Sheffield, AL—\$104,000 to investigate Tuscumbia Landing's archaeological features. The only problem is, 23 percent of Alabama's bridges are structurally deficient. That could have fixed two of them.

How about the National Corvette Museum Simulator Theater in Warren County, KY—\$200,000 to build a grand simulator theater. Mr. President, 31 percent of the bridges they cross in Kentucky are structurally deficient or functionally obsolete.

The Pennsylvania Trolley Museum—\$400,000 to construct the Pennsylvania Trolley Museum. It is a great idea if we are in the black and have a good cashflow. But when Pennsylvania leads the Nation in deficient bridges and dangerous bridges, why would we spend that money? Why would we force them to spend that money?

I can go on. I will add to the record many other examples, all the way up to 40 separate examples of where we are spending money but we are not fixing bridges.

I ask unanimous consent that those examples be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. COBURN. We are not pouring asphalt, we are not laying concrete, we are not decreasing congestion, and we are not increasing safety. What we are doing is we are following the rules of Washington when we have greater needs. We are in trouble as a nation because Congress does not set priorities, and when they do set priorities, there is no connection to the reality of our financial situation.

We have some options on how to go forward. One of the options would be to take the FAA bill, split it out, approve it, send it back to the House, and FAA is taken care of. The second option would be to pass the highway extension for 6 months with the elimination of enhancements and send it back to the House. But I will not give a unanimous consent, as is my right as a Senator of the United States, for us to continue to spend billions of dollars on things that are not a priority when the country is struggling to survive. Its very survival depends on us changing the way we do business. If that means the highway transportation bill does not get approved, so be it. But there has to be a point in time in this country when we change direction and we start meeting the obligations that are put before us.

The No. 1 obligation is to start spending money where it does the most good and quit spending money we do not have on things we do not absolutely need. With a 35-percent deficit—and we are going to run another \$1.3 trillion deficit next year, which will cost a significant amount of funds for our kids and our grandkids just to repay what we are going to waste next year—there ought to be a time at which we say enough is enough.

I know there will be several, including my own senior Senator, who will be unhappy with my position, but I believe it is time to draw a line in the sand for the American people, for our future. It is not popular. It is certainly not expedient. But it is absolutely the right thing to do.

If the Senate wants to solve the problem of these two bills, we can split them or we can keep them together, but we need to end the enhancements right now until we get the highway trust fund healthy again, No. 1, and, No. 2, until we get our country healthy again. When we do, I will be happy to defer.

Remember, we are not saying you cannot do it. We are just saying you ought to have the option to not do it.

EXHIBIT 1

Kalanianaʻole Highway, Kaʻiwi Scenic Shoreline Trail—Federal Transportation enhancement funds were used to intervene in a local land use dispute in Hawaii. A decades long dispute over the preservation of Hawaiian shoreline versus local developmental interests was assisted by the Department of Transportation, which used \$11 million in enhancement funds to acquire land for conservation purposes, effectively meddling in the local land use. In the mean time, 45 percent of Hawaii's bridges are either structurally deficient or functionally obsolete.

Antique bike collections—The University of California Davis received a transportation enhancement grant of \$440,000 to purchase 60 unique antique bikes for its Bicycle Museum Collection.

Shrine to Tennessee state history costs federal government \$23 million—Nashville, Tennessee received \$23 million in federal enhancement funding to construct its bicentennial ode to Tennessee state history. The project included the building of "a 1,400-foot Wall of History etched with historic events from the state's first two centuries, 31 fountains that each represent one of the state's rivers, and a 200-foot granite state map." The only thing more egregious than federal funds used for a clearly state interest, is that 20 percent of Tennessee Bridges are either structurally deficient or functionally obsolete.

ARTwalk—ARTwalk is tagged as a unique outdoor experience that constructs pathways between shopping areas, galleries, and museums in Rochester, Vermont. The project used \$234,000 in federal enhancement dollars to build the artsy outdoor museum, while 861 of Vermont's bridges remain either structurally deficient or functionally obsolete.

Old Roman Bath House Renovation—\$160,000 worth of enhancement funding was used in Berkeley, West Virginia for the renovation of the oldest building in town, an Old Roman Bath House. While local residents may be interested in visiting a bath house where George Washington used to frequent, federal taxpayers may find the connection to critical infrastructure more puzzling. Moreover, 36 percent of West Virginia's bridges remain structurally deficient or functionally obsolete.

Saddletree Factory Renovation—The Ben Schroeder Saddle Tree Factory, a historical factory in Madison, Indiana, received transportation enhancement funding for historical preservation purposes because the factory used to make Saddletrees, the foundation of a saddle. 21.5 percent of Indiana's bridges are either structurally deficient or functionally obsolete.

Toledo Harbor Lighthouse—The Toledo Harbor Lighthouse in Toledo, Ohio, protected by the "phantom" officer Frank, will receive a \$500,000 enhancement grant to restore windows, doors, bricks, and shutters. This grant will not only help to restore the facade of the historical lighthouse, but also carry on the legendary ghosts of the haunted lighthouse. Unfortunately, "phantom" officer Frank will not be able to protect Ohio drivers from the 6,598 bridges that are either structurally deficient or functionally obsolete.

Critter Crossing—The Monkton, Vermont Conservation Commission received \$150,000 in federal grant money to build a—critter crossing, to save the lives of thousands of migrating salamanders and other amphibians that would otherwise be slaughtered by vehicle traffic on a major roadway. Thousands of blue- and yellow-spotted salamanders, frogs, and other amphibians spend the winter months in the rocky uplands near Monkton, but must return to low-lying wetlands in order to reproduce. To travel between these two areas, the salamanders must cross the heavily-traveled Monkton-Vergennes Road. While some conservationists have celebrated the project, others remain skeptical. "I certainly respect all species. However, I don't see the need to pay \$150,000 for a salamander crossing", read one email reportedly sent to the Burlington [Vermont] Free Press newspaper. "I realize there are a lot of other stupid things my tax dollars go toward, but this one is near the top of the list." Maybe the local communities will prevent the critters from crossing one of the 861 bridges that are either structurally deficient or functionally obsolete.

North Carolina Transportation Museum Spencer, North Carolina—The North Carolina Transportation Museum has received over 11 million to renovate and showcase steam locomotive artifacts. As of 2010, North Carolina has nearly 5000 bridges that are either structurally deficient or functionally obsolete.

Massachusetts bike and pedestrian allotted millions, but remain unspent—Massachusetts has received \$135 million in federal funds for bike and pedestrian projects since 1991, of which it has spent little more than \$51 million, according to *The Boston Globe*. That means nearly two-thirds of the funds provided in the last two decades by Congress to the state for such projects remain unspent. Perhaps Massachusetts would like to use their unspent funds to work on their 2,548 bridges that are either structurally deficient or functionally obsolete.

Nevada spending millions of federal transportation dollars to make Vegas highways beautiful—In 2008, Nevada received its transportation enhancement allotment of \$6,287,466. They decided to spend it in a variety of ways, a few million went to biking facilities and trails, a few million went to welcome centers and interpretive centers. \$498,750 even went for “decorative rocks, native plants, some pavement graphics, a few walls, and some great big granite boulders” to beautify an interchange to Las Vegas’ 215 Beltway.

A couple miles down the highway, N-DOT beautified another interchange with “striping in the rocks and some native plants.” That project has cost \$319,163 so far this year.

The people of Nevada might have been able to think of some better things to spend that money on. One local who uses the interchange frequently was not impressed by the expensive beautification project. “I’m busy watching where I’m going. I’m not looking at landscape improvements and stamped concrete.”

Unfortunately, there is little that local officials can do to re-direct the money to better uses. “We applied for the federal enhancement dollars and those federal enhancement dollars can only be used for landscaping and pedestrian type improvements,” explains the top civil engineer at the Clark County Public Works Traffic Management Division.

The N-DOT deputy director for southern Nevada is just as frustrated as many citizens that federal restrictions prohibit states from directing money where it is really needed. “It’s really getting out of hand to where these pots of money have these constraints associated with them and you can’t spend money where you want to.” These restrictions sometimes leave states no choice but to spend money on frivolous projects or lose it entirely. The deputy director notes, “if N-DOT doesn’t spend that money and employ workers in Nevada, another state is gonna have that money up for grabs.”

Washington, DC receives Transportation Enhancement grants for murals and valet bikes—Washington, DC received nearly \$2 million in transportation enhancement grants in Fiscal Year 2010, ranging from \$50,000 to \$579,000. These grants include items such as the stabilization of historic murals and a grant for bicycle parking and valet services, along with the creation of a “Room to Breathe” poster. The \$2 million allotment would be much better used for bridge repair, as 158 of the 244 bridges in the District are either structurally deficient or functionally obsolete.

Railroad Caboose Relocation and Renovation—The Princeton Railroad Museum received a \$78,280 transportation enhancement grant to help pay for the relocation of a his-

toric train caboose to be displayed and restored.

Texas Highway Rest Stops—The Texas Department of Transportation uses a substantial amount of their required transportation enhancement spending to build highway rest areas. Texas plans to spend \$262 million to build or overhaul roadside stops along its highways, with a majority of the funds coming from enhancement grants. However, some residents question the construction of rest stops in such close proximity to other commercial areas, leading one local resident to surmise about the \$10 million Salado rest area, “I think \$10 million would have made a nice third lane in a lot of spots . . . It’s pretty spectacular for a rest area, for, I guess, \$2 million worth . . . \$10 million? That’s a lot of money.” Additionally, the Texas Department of Transportation spent \$16.2 million in enhancement funding on a Battleship Texas restoration project.

California Sculpture Competition—Federal transportation enhancement dollars were used as prize money for an art competition to find a sculpture fitting to place in a parking lot for a Laguna Beach, California Friday Film Series event.

Merchant and Drovers Tavern Museum—The Merchants and Drovers Tavern Museum in Union County, New Jersey received a \$210,790 transportation enhancement grant to create a museum on the second floor of the recently renovated building. The Merchants and Drovers Tavern Museum touts its amenities by letting visitors “experience the hospitality of the 1820s” and “quench his thirst in the taproom, sit for a while in the parlor or, perhaps, try a bed for size at this ‘hands-on’ museum.” Meanwhile, visitors should also be wary of driving over any New Jersey bridges on the way to the museum, as 35 percent of them are either structurally deficient or functionally obsolete.

Museum uses transportation funds for its Heating and Air Conditioning system—The Sayre Historical Society Museum in Bradford County, Pennsylvania received a transportation enhancement grant of \$74,704 for the “Sayre Historical Society RR Museum Heating and AC project.” You read that correctly, American gas taxes are being directed towards heating and air installation.

War of 1812, Bladensburg, Maryland excavation—Enhancement funding was used to excavate several historical buildings in Bladensburg, Maryland to study the “transportation history” of the area. Bladensburg was used for troop movements during the War of 1812, as well as being a transportation hub during early America.

Funding for a Transportation Exhibit—\$300,000 in federal money will pay for a new exhibit on the history of transportation at a local museum in Missouri. The fresh display at the St. Charles County Heritage museum will explain the influence of rivers, railroads, roads, and trails in the region over the years. The grant application highlights how “The County and its residents have had to rely on multiple forms of transportation and as technology changed, the area had to adapt to the changing transportation methods/patterns.”

Not everyone in the community agrees the federal government should fund this type of project. A county executive said, “It’s the kind of thing the federal government can’t afford to do.” Other officials however have a different perspective on the federal funding. The county parks director explained how “the \$300,000 grant is ‘a pretty insignificant amount of money compared to that total pool’ of federal transportation spending.” Maybe a more significant number should be 7,021, the number of Missouri bridges that are either structurally deficient or functionally obsolete.

Iowa town receives new entrance sign—Fairfield, Iowa used \$40,800 in transportation enhancement funds to upgrade its “Welcome to Fairfield” sign. It is likely that Iowans would welcome their transportation funds upgrading their bridges, as Iowa ranks 3rd in bridge deficiency rates in America.

Michigan Receives Transportation funds to plant flowers and rehabilitate an engine house—In 2010, the Michigan awarded \$5 million in federal transportation enhancement grants to various projects including reconstructing cobblestone roads, purchasing and installing bicycle racks, and “streetscaping” a downtown street in Bridgetown, Michigan with “decorative sidewalk treatments, street trees, perennial flowers and other decorative plantings, planters, and ornamental street lighting.” One grant awarded \$336,490 to rehabilitate the historic Quincy and Torch Lake Railroad Engine House while another grant awarded \$1,490,280 to the Detroit Science Center to construct an exhibit depicting “how roads, tunnels and bridges are constructed.”

Transportation Funding used to replace unaesthetic fencing around Oklahoma Capitol Oil Derricks—The Oklahoma Department of Central Services, the controller of Capitol Grounds, received \$216,000 in transportation enhancement funding to replace fencing around active oil wells on Lincoln Boulevard with a more aesthetically pleasing form of fencing. Unfortunately while Capitol Complex may look better, Oklahoma bridge deficiency rates remain 2nd in the United States.

Over \$150,000 in Gasoline Taxes directed towards making brochures—Over the last 10 years, federal transportation enhancement grants have been used to produce brochures for various purposes including monuments paths, scenic trails, and bicycle safety. The State of Kansas even received a federal grant to install and replace their brochure display cases at SRA.

Enhancement funds used to help construct replica of historical schooner—In 2001, Burlington, Vermont received a \$20,000 grant to subsidize the building a full scale replica of the 1862-class sailing canal boat, the Louis McClure.

Crandall Farm Restoration project—Washington County, Rhode Island received a \$120,000 transportation enhancement grant for renovation of Crandall Farm. The project consisted of renovating the 1870 house on the farm into a welcome center and educational tool for the traveling public.

South Carolina uses gas taxes to purchase \$15,000 “Welcome Signs”—Orangeburg County, South Carolina received a \$34,965 transportation enhancement grant to help purchase three signs at a cost of \$44,500, or \$14,833 per sign. Unfortunately, South Carolina bridges are not as welcoming, as 22 percent of them are structurally deficient or functionally obsolete.

The State of Michigan receives nearly \$100,000 to celebrate mysterious centennial—In 2004, Michigan received a \$99,540 transportation enhancement grant for publications, historical commemorative items, and displays for a “centennial celebration.” The only thing more puzzling than how these activities are related to transportation is that the centennial for Michigan Statehood occurred in 1937.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, today I rise to offer my support for the President’s request for immediate supplemental assistance for the Federal Emergency Management Agency. This funding will enable FEMA to continue to provide critical aid to victims left in the wake of Irene’s deadly

path, and victims of other natural disasters that have struck throughout the country.

My home State of Rhode Island has experienced two major disasters in the last couple of years, so I know firsthand how hard homeowners, businesses, and municipalities have struggled to recover, even with Federal assistance programs.

This is not the time to play politics. If Congress fails to provide this emergency funding between now and September 30, we run the risk of completely running out of disaster funds. Our fellow Americans need this funding to recover from catastrophic disasters. Mother Nature does not distinguish between blue and red States, and both Democratic and Republican Governors—and in Rhode Island's case an Independent Governor—have asked for immediate disaster aid.

This supplemental funding will help replenish FEMA's Disaster Relief Fund, which pays for Federal disaster response and recovery activities. The fund has been running dangerously low as a result of the devastating tornado in Missouri, tornados in Alabama, major flooding in the Midwest and South, wildfires in Texas, and the historic flooding caused by Hurricane Irene and Tropical Storm Lee.

This year's disasters have been particularly destructive and I urge my colleagues to remain committed to all the victims as they struggle to become whole again. We should approve this disaster aid to ensure that communities aren't left in ruins.

The shortfall in funding has already forced the administration to put certain disaster recovery activities on hold. My State, like many others, sustained a federally declared disaster last month as a result of Hurricane and Tropical Storm Irene. In order for FEMA to ensure it had the resources to provide immediate relief for new disasters such as Hurricane Irene, the agency had to freeze long-term recovery and mitigation projects.

This funding conundrum really hits home because in Rhode Island communities are still reeling from the historic flooding that occurred in the spring of 2010. Rhode Island saw more rain during that disaster than any month on record, and the devastation wrought by those storms exceeded anything in living memory.

I was on the ground during the flooding last year and have been intimately involved in the recovery process. I know how important FEMA's long-term recovery and mitigation programs are for revitalizing damaged communities, especially in States like mine that were already hurting from the difficult economic environment.

I urge my colleagues across the aisle to let us pass this critical legislation to provide supplemental funding for FEMA. Not only will it go a long way toward providing peace of mind should another disaster strike, it will also ensure that communities across the coun-

try that are still recovering from past disasters can continue to move forward in their recovery. This will make us a stronger and more resilient nation.

Mr. BAUCUS. Madam President, Nelson Mandela once said, "There is no easy walk to freedom anywhere."

The walk to freedom for the Burmese people has certainly not been easy, and it is far from complete.

The military-controlled government that rules Burma continues to maintain its tight grip over the Burmese people through fear, intimidation, and violence.

According to the State Department, over the last year the Burmese regime has "severely restricted and frequently violated freedoms of assembly, expression, association, movement, and religion."

And in furthering its hold over Burmese society, the regime has committed crimes of murder, abduction, rape, torture, recruitment of child soldiers, and forced labor—all with impunity.

In recent months however, we have seen some encouraging steps.

Last November, the Burmese regime released Aung San Suu Kyi, the Burmese democracy leader and winner of the Nobel Peace Prize, after a long and unjustified incarceration. And the regime has made some modest movement towards dialogue with the opposition.

But it is far too soon to think that the walk to freedom has succeeded. Just 2 months after releasing Aung San Suu Kyi, the regime dissolved the National League for Democracy, which has sought to bring democracy to Burma for more than 20 years.

And the regime keeps more than 2,000 political prisoners in detention.

As Aung San Suu Kyi herself has said, "If my people are not free, how can you say I'm free? We are none of us free."

In order to help the Burmese people on their march to freedom, I urge my colleagues to extend our sanctions against Burmese imports for another year.

Several of our trading partners—including the European Union, Canada, and Australia—have joined us in imposing trade and investment sanctions against Burma. And these sanctions have put significant pressure on the Burmese leadership.

So let us extend the import sanctions on Burma for another year. Let us do our part to help the Burmese people complete their long walk to freedom.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WHITEHOUSE). The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. I would ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

REMEMBERING MALCOLM WALLOP

Mr. ENZI. It is with a great deal of sadness I have to tell you that Senator Malcolm Wallop, the 18th Senator for the State of Wyoming, passed away this afternoon. He had been ill for some time but had had a very active life and made a great deal of difference to this body. We were very fortunate to have Malcolm Wallop represent us in the Senate for 18 years. For all of his three terms he was a powerful and effective presence in the Congress, assuring the people of Wyoming they were heard and that their concerns were being addressed. Although there are many accomplishments I could mention—and tomorrow I will probably mention quite a few more—I want to mention two of them today, as they were very significant efforts.

The first was the establishment of the Republican Steering Committee. He and two other Senators considered themselves to be the conservatives of the Senate and formed a special caucus that today has grown to include almost all the Republicans. It was for a smaller government and constitutional principles and spending constraints, and he stuck to those principles throughout his entire Senate career.

His other accomplishment—and I can think of none that would make him more proud than the mention that he started the Congressional Awards Program. This is a program for young Americans where they can do service for their community and receive an award from Congress. Congress puts no dollars into this, which would be part of the philosophy of Malcolm Wallop. He helped to provide for a number of people through the years to be able to come to Washington and receive the Gold Award. It is set up so when you do 100 hours of community service, you can get a bronze medal. When you do another 100 hours of service, you can get a silver medal. When you do 200 or more hours of service, you get a gold medal.

He helped to promote the community spirit and his community service has made a huge difference to Wyoming and has spread across the Nation. Of course, we are always very proud in Wyoming that more kids from Wyoming have gotten the gold medal than from any other State. It partly has to do with his founding of it and the time and effort he put into it, and that succeeding Senators have. Over the years it has served to inspire countless young Americans to believe in themselves and their ability to change the world beginning in their own backyard and to start some good habits. Thanks to his initiative, the young people of our Nation will continue to dare to do great service in their neighborhoods and communities, and I cannot think of a better way to have Senator Malcolm Wallop be remembered.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BENNET). The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I join my colleague from Wyoming because

today Wyoming and America lost an extraordinary man. Senator Malcolm Wallop was a dedicated public servant and great legislator. He leaves a proud legacy of a Wyoming Senator who solved problems and initiated great solutions. He set a high bar for public service, and all of Wyoming is grateful.

Whether he was serving in the Army, the Wyoming legislature, or in the U.S. Senate, Malcolm Wallop always stood for freedom. For decades he worked to strengthen America's national security and to protect States rights. His common sense and his commitment helped break down Washington's barriers to American energy development. Our Nation continues to benefit from his leadership.

There will be much more to say about Malcolm in these coming days and in the weeks ahead as we seek to honor his legacy.

I will miss Malcolm's friendship and his support. My wife Bobbi and I send our very heartfelt condolences to his family and to his friends throughout this great country. We will continue to keep the entire Wallop family in our thoughts and in our prayers.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

APPROVING THE RENEWAL OF IMPORT RESTRICTIONS CONTAINED IN THE BURMESE FREEDOM AND DEMOCRACY ACT OF 2003

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remaining time postcloture be yielded back and the Senate proceed to consideration of H.J. Res. 66.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 66) approving the renewal of import restrictions contained in the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003.

AMENDMENT NO. 602

Mr. REID. I have a substitute amendment which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows: (The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Text of Amendments.")

Mr. REID. On that amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 603 TO AMENDMENT NO. 602

Mr. REID. I have a perfecting amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] proposes an amendment numbered 603 to amendment No. 602.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end, add the following new section:

SECTION . . . EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by this division shall become effective 2 days after enactment.

Mr. REID. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 604 TO AMENDMENT NO. 603

Mr. REID. I have a second-degree amendment which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] proposes an amendment numbered 604 to amendment No. 603.

The amendment is as follows:

In the amendment, strike "2 days", and insert "1 day".

AMENDMENT NO. 605

Mr. REID. I have an amendment at the desk to the language that is proposed to be stricken.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] proposes an amendment numbered 605 to the language proposed to be stricken by amendment No. 602.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 2, line 17, strike "on" and insert "3 days after".

Mr. REID. I ask for the yeas and nays on that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 606 TO AMENDMENT NO. 605

Mr. REID. I have a second-degree amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] proposes an amendment numbered 606 to amendment No. 605.

The amendment is as follows:

In the amendment, strike "3 days" and insert "2 days".

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the Reid substitute amendment No. 602 to H.J. Res. 66, a joint resolution approving the renewal of import restrictions contained in the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003.

Harry Reid, Patrick J. Leahy, John F. Kerry, Barbara Boxer, Patty Murray, Debbie Stabenow, Carl Levin, Kent Conrad, Dianne Feinstein, Tom Harkin, Jeff Bingaman, Tim Johnson, Daniel K. Inouye, Richard J. Durbin, Joseph I. Lieberman, Mary L. Landrieu, Benjamin L. Cardin.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. I have a cloture motion on the underlying joint resolution which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on H.J. Res. 66, a joint resolution approving the renewal of import restrictions contained in the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003.

Harry Reid, Patrick J. Leahy, John F. Kerry, Barbara Boxer, Patty Murray, Debbie Stabenow, Carl Levin, Kent Conrad, Dianne Feinstein, Tom Harkin, Jeff Bingaman, Tim Johnson, Daniel K. Inouye, Richard J. Durbin, Joseph I. Lieberman, Mary L. Landrieu, Benjamin L. Cardin.

MOTION TO COMMIT

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have a motion to commit the joint resolution with instructions, which is also at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] moves to commit the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 66) to the Finance Committee with instructions to report back with an amendment numbered 607.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 2, strike line 17 through 19 and insert the following:

This joint resolution shall take effect on July 26, 2011.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on that motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 608

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have an amendment to the instructions at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] proposes an amendment numbered 608 to the instructions on the motion to commit H.J. Res. 66.

The amendment is as follows:

In the amendment, strike "July 26" and insert "July 25".

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 609 TO AMENDMENT NO. 608

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have a second-degree amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] proposes an amendment numbered 609 to amendment No. 608.

The amendment is as follows:

In the amendment, strike "July 25" and insert "July 24".

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived for the two cloture motions just filed.

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

Mr. REID. Mr. President, sadly, in just 2 days, about 80,000 people will be out of work because of the obstructionism of one man. This Senator, the junior Senator from Oklahoma, is putting his own petty priorities ahead of the thousands of safety inspectors, construction workers, and contractors who are about to lose their health care and their livelihoods for the second time in the last few months. These workers will be furloughed or laid off on Friday if we don't reauthorize the Federal Aviation Administration.

The same Senator is holding up emergency funding for thousands of Americans—hundreds of thousands, actually—whose homes have been destroyed by tornadoes, floods, and wildfires. Keep in mind what I just said. We have a bill that came from the House of Representatives that funded for 4 months the Federal Aviation Administration. We have a bill that came from the House—they put them together—to fund the highway bill for 6 months. With those two bills together, almost 2 million jobs will be eliminated if we don't pass the highway bill by the end of the month but FEMA by Friday.

The Senator from Oklahoma, to whom I referred, doesn't like a provision in the highway bill. Stopping that is one thing. But now he is stopping us from doing something about people who are in desperate need of help, who have been hit hard by fires—in Texas alone, we have had 2,000 homes burned to the ground. So he is holding up emergency aid for Americans whose homes have been destroyed by tornadoes, floods, wildfires, and millions of acres of farmland are underwater, and he is jeopardizing almost 2 million jobs by blocking the highway bill. How he gets these together is something I cannot logically understand. He is stopping us from doing something on the FAA bill but also FEMA.

On Friday, as I said, it is going to cause 80,000 workers, thousands of whom are responsible for the millions of air travelers' safety every day. We have just been through this. A short time ago, we had the same issue, where the safety inspectors were paying for their own lunches when they would go out inspecting airplanes, and buying their own plane tickets, paying for their own hotel and motel rooms, and not being reimbursed.

It is interesting to note this same Senator voted for the highway bill in 2005—we do a major highway bill about

every 5 years. He voted for that when his party held the White House, although the bill included the same issue he has objected to today. I have been told his big concern is over bike trails, bike paths. But the interesting part is that he can have a vote on this. He wants a vote to get rid of bike paths. He is willing to do that. In fact, we have given him the same vote on an amendment before. In 2009, the Senate voted down the very same amendment. He has had this vote before, and it has failed before. He is not willing to even take a vote anymore. This is how far afield this is. He doesn't want a vote. He wants to put whatever he thinks is the right thing for the world and the country as it relates to highways in this bill and say: Just do it; I am a dictator, and I am going to put it in the bill, and you are not going to do anything around here.

We are willing to vote on this again, but we cannot get to a vote because he is blocking us from doing so. So one Senator out of 100 is holding up the important work of this body, demanding that we make this amendment law or else put 80,000 people out of work. This kind of obstruction should end. This is not logical, not rational. I have strong feelings about this part of the highway bill. But this is a bill that has billions of dollars in it. About 1.7 or 1.8 million jobs will be eliminated if we don't get this bill passed. So I urge my Republican colleague to reconsider how this gridlock harms real people in this country. It is hard for me to explain.

In Las Vegas we have a new tower that is being built for the air traffic controllers. It is needed very much. Air traffic into Las Vegas is heavy—about 60 million people a year arrive, and so we need a new tower. We started construction on it a few months ago. It was held up once because of this problem we have with this bill. Now it is to be held up again.

But this isn't just a Nevada issue, it is all over the country. About 75,000 construction workers are working on essential parts of our airports, and these jobs are badly needed. It is just the wrong thing for my friend to do. I hope he will allow us to move forward on FEMA and allow us to move forward on the Federal Aviation Administration legislation. Of course, on the highway bill, we will give him his vote. If he wants another vote, we will give him another vote if there is another part of the bill he doesn't like. But it is something we need to get done as quickly as possible—like in the next 24 hours.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

RECOGNIZING THE HAZARD HERALD

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize one of Kentucky's oldest and most respected local newspapers, the Hazard Herald of Hazard, KY. In July of this year, The Hazard Herald celebrated over a century's worth of news coverage by publishing a 100th-anniversary edition of its morning paper. The Herald is, and has been, the most trusted source of local and national news to the people of Hazard and Perry County for decades.

Founder and prominent lawyer and statesman Bailey P. Wootton, who eventually served one term as Kentucky attorney general in the 1930s, envisioned that the Herald would serve as the primary medium for progress and information for the local community when he began publishing the paper in 1911. Over the years, the Herald became the heart of the community, sharing in both the triumphs and sorrows of citizens of the county as it grew alongside them.

From the arrival of the first train to Hazard Depot in 1912, which a year later would pave the way for boosting the region's coal industry, to the decade-defining flood of 1927 that devastated the county, the Herald was front and center. In the 1930s the Herald followed Bailey during his campaign to be elected Kentucky attorney general, as well as the Hazard High School boys' basketball team as they were eventually crowned state champions.

World War II in the 1940s forced the Herald to begin printing daily to keep people informed with the war efforts in Europe, and it remained so until the mid-1950s when it then alternated to a biweekly publication. The paper mourned President Kennedy's death with the nation in the 1960s, and provided an in-depth account of President Bill Clinton's visit to Hazard in 1999—which was printed in color after the paper adopted color printing technology in the middle of the decade. Most recently, the Herald has adopted online publications and social media to keep pace with the technological advancements that define news and media today.

Perry County is fortunate to have such an established and trusted news source to inform the great people of Kentucky. In the 100th anniversary edition of the Herald, printed July 27, 2011, there is an article that highlights the paper's founding and first decade of printing. To help celebrate this landmark occasion, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full article be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Hazard Herald, Centennial Edition, July 27, 2011]

The first decade 1911–1919: The Hazard Herald publishes first issue, begins a tradition still alive a century later.

The first edition of The Hazard Herald was hand set and came off the gasoline powered

printing press on June 22, 1911. Though we can't find a copy of that first edition, the effect the Herald had on the local community during its first decade is certainly on record.

The Herald was operated by its founder and president at the time, Bailey P. Wootton, along with officers George W. Humphries, James B. Hoge, and W.C. Trosper.

During that first year, a one-year subscription to the Herald could be purchased for one dollar as the paper's staff covered the growth of Hazard, which at the time was still looking forward to the coming of the railroad a year later, a move that would open up a town that in the years prior was a remote hamlet nearly cut off by the rough and tumble foothills of the Appalachian Mountains.

The first two years of the Herald's publication were certainly not easy ones, as noted in Perry County Kentucky: A History, published by the Hazard Chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution during the 1950s. A publisher in Hazard at that time certainly lacked some of the modern conveniences that newspaper staff today may take for granted: "With power still not available in 1911, a two H.P. gasoline engine was installed to run the press. After 1912, electricity was available and the changeover was made."

In those first years the Herald also served as a chronicler of Hazard's history (as it still does today). One of the most important events in that history was the arrival of the railroad. In the July 20, 1911 edition, the paper's fifth that first year, a story details work being completed by the Jones-Davis Company regarding construction of a section of the L&E Railroad which extended "from below Yerkes to the head of the river of the mouth of Buckeye Creek, about 18 miles."

The first train arrived at the Hazard Depot in 1912, and it not only opened avenues of travel in and out of the county, but it also paved the way for a more robust coal industry, as noted in the Herald's October 7, 1912 edition: "It will not be long before the coal from this city will be counted by the trainloads instead of the carload."

Other notable events during the decade include a fire in December 1913 that ravaged the business section of town, destroying \$50,000 worth of property, according to a headline of the day. Consumed in the fire was the D.Y. Combs Hotel as well as the offices of Dr. Gross and Dr. Hurst.

On August 17, 1914, the Herald reported on the first automobile to arrive in Perry County: "Last Thursday, Hazard and Perry County (sic) were honored by the first automobile ever inside the county limits. We have had the railroad trains upward of two years, and that has ceased to be a wonder; we have had one autocycle, which remained for a few days and departed from whence it came. But the crowning glory of all was the advent of the Ford touring car which passed through our city last Thursday. Now we are on the qui vive for the first aeroplane."

By 1916, Wootton was still listed as the president, with James B. Hoge and W.C. Trosper as secretary and manager respectively, and a weekly editorial appeared in the newspaper as well. In the January 27, 1916 edition, the Herald took to task the City of Hazard for allowing the city's sidewalks to fall in disrepair, writing: "In any case, there has been no excuse on the part of either Big Bottom residents or the City government for leaving the walks up that way in the shape it has been for such a long time."

While the Herald maintained a local flavor during its first decade, in this age before the Internet and instant news delivery, the paper also made note of issues of national importance. By 1918, World War I ended with the abdication of Kaiser Wilhelm II on November 9. The Herald carried the story with the headline: "War Is Ended; Kaiser Abdicates."

By the end of the decade, the paper's yearly subscription rate had increased to \$1.50 while Bailey Wootton remained the president of the Herald Publishing Company, and John B. Horton had been serving as the editor.

FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to commend my friend and colleague, Senator MARCO RUBIO of Florida, on the outstanding speech he delivered yesterday at the Jesse Helms Center in Wingate, NC. I share Senator RUBIO's conviction that America is at our best in the world when we put our values at the center of our foreign policy, beginning with a commitment to the cause of freedom. Senator RUBIO's thoughtful warning against the danger of withdrawing behind our borders is especially timely and important. He is absolutely right that, when we do not confront monsters like al-Qaida abroad, they will sooner or later come to threaten us here at home.

I thank Senator RUBIO for delivering such a lucid and visionary speech. His remarks reaffirm for me the critical leadership role that I am convinced he will play in this chamber, and in our country, in the years to come. His voice is an important one. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD Senator RUBIO's remarks as prepared for delivery.

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

SENATOR MARCO RUBIO'S REMARKS AS DELIVERED TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 13, 2011

Thank you. Thank you. Thank you very much. Thank you. First of all, thank you all for coming. I am honored and privileged to be here. I'm impressed by the good work, by the way, that the Helms Center is doing in teaching young people the foreign policy principles that Senator Helms stood for. And I'm honored by this opportunity to speak to you for a few moments eight and a half months into my Senate career on what I think is a historic and important moment in American history. And I hope by the end of our time here together tonight we'll all share that belief irrespective of where we fall on the individual issues.

I have come to deeply appreciate Jesse Helms' willingness to fight for his views—particularly in foreign policy—and his unwillingness to compromise on matters of basic principle. That made him rare in Washington, and it also made him influential. I want to read what a distinguished journalist once wrote that it was "his relentless, unswerving application of conservative principles to practically every issue" is what "made him a major player in Washington and [in] national politics."

Jesse Helms was, in particular, an unswerving champion of freedom fighters. When he was still a junior Senator, he and a former governor of California—a fellow named Ronald Reagan—they worked together to introduce a "morality in foreign policy" plank to the 1976 Republican platform.

Here is what it said, it said: "The goal of Republican foreign policy is the achievement of liberty under law and a just and lasting peace in the world. The principles by which we act to achieve peace and to protect the interests of the United States must merit the restored confidence of our people."

It also said that "we must face the world with no illusions about the nature of tyranny." And it pledged that: "Ours will be a foreign policy that keeps this ever in mind."

Now, remarkably, this was controversial in the 1970s—the era of détente, of defeat and of retreat. The idea of placing morality at the center of our dealings with other nations was derided by supposed sophisticates as unrealistic and uninformed.

But then Ronald Reagan took these words to heart and he made them the center of his foreign policy—a foreign policy that even his critics now admit was remarkably successful.

President Reagan challenged the "evil empire."

"Tear down this wall," he demanded—and it came down. He won the Cold War not by coddling dictators but by confronting them—and by standing up for the principles that have defined us since the formation of our great Republic.

As I think about the challenges of the 21st century—challenges that range from upheavals in the Middle East to the fiscal crisis back home—I am mindful of Ronald Reagan's example and of Jesse Helms'.

I am guided by their understanding that America's strength lies in its ideals, and that if we are to make this century another American century, we must be prepared to fight for those ideals.

Now, fundamentally, I believe that the world is a better place when the United States of America is strong and prosperous. Now, I don't believe that America has the power or means to solve every issue in the world. But I do believe there are some critically important issues where America does have a meaningful role to play in resolving crises that are tied to our national interests.

If we refuse to play our rightful role and shrink from the world, America and the entire world will pay a terrible price. And it is our responsibility to clearly outline to the American people what our proper role in the world is and what American interests are at stake when we engage abroad.

At the core of our strength are the "self-evident" truths of the Declaration of Independence: "that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness," that government exists to "secure these rights" and that it derives its "just powers from the consent of the governed."

These are not just our rights as Americans. These are the rights of all human beings. Nurtured in thirteen embattled colonies along the Eastern seaboard more than two centuries ago, the blessings of liberties have since spread to more than 100 countries around the world.

Freedom's domain now stretches from Mexico to Mongolia. Some of the world's democracies are ancient nations. Others are more recent in origin. Some are poor. Others are rich. Some are Christian. Others Muslim, Jewish, Buddhist, Confucian, Hindu. All are united by their respect for certain fundamental human rights—even if they do not always achieve in practice the ideals they seek to honor. America should take pride in knowing that so many of the freedom movements we have seen around the world since 1776 draw their inspiration from the courage and the words of our own Founding Fathers.

The honor roll of free countries does not yet include the land of my parents or grandparents—Cuba—but that I believe is only a matter of time. Because sooner or later, the tides of freedom will wash against the shores of this island nation that has been trapped for too long in a prison constructed by Fidel and Raul Castro.

Why am I so confident about the future? Because in our time, we have seen how dictatorships have fallen and democracies risen—even in the most unpromising surroundings.

Just in the past year, in the Middle East—the region whose governments have been most resistant to freedom—we have seen the first stirrings of democratic upheavals. We do not know how the Arab Spring will ultimately turn out, but it has already proven one thing: that no faith, no ethnicity, no region, and no people are immune to the fundamental desire to control their own destiny.

As dissidents and freedom fighters battle dictators around the world, they look for support to the greatest democracy in the world. And America must answer their call.

We do not seek to impose our vision of government. We do not insist that every nation must have a presidency, a supreme court or a bicameral legislature. Nor do we have any intention of using force to depose every despotic regime on the planet.

But we must do what we can to champion the cause of freedom—not only with the power of our example but also with our money and our resources, our ingenuity and our diplomacy, and on rare occasion, when there is no good alternative and when our national interest is clearly at stake, our armed might.

Without our commitment to the rights of man enunciated by our forefathers, what are we? Just another big, rich country. But when we champion our ideals, we gain moral authority—and we gain physical security.

You see, we may not always agree with our fellow democracies, but seldom, if ever, do we fight them. The more functioning democracies there are—“functioning” being the important quality—the easier we can breathe.

States that do not respect the rights of their citizens seldom respect the rights of their neighbors. They become breeding grounds for all sorts of ills—from the trafficking of humans and drugs to contagious diseases and famine, from nuclear proliferation to terrorism—that threaten our own security.

Now some suggest that America should heed the famous words of John Quincy Adams and go “not abroad, in search of monsters to destroy.” The problem is if America turns inward and ignores the monsters abroad, they are likely to come here.

It happened in 1917 when German U-boats torpedoed American merchant ships.

It happened in 1941 when Japanese aircraft bombed Pearl Harbor.

And it happened ten years ago when Al Qaeda carried off the deadliest terrorist attack in history from a base in the Hindu Kush. If we do not have the luxury of ignoring developments in lands as remote as Afghanistan, then there is no corner of the world from which we can safely turn our backs.

The fanatics who orchestrated the attacks of 9/11 were nurtured in lands that knew no freedom, in countries where, for too long, the people's pursuit of happiness had been subordinated to the rulers' pursuit of power. A lack of economic, social and political opportunity helped to create the conditions that enabled a radical few—deluded by demented doctrines of hate—to commit mass murder simply to make a statement.

The form of the threat was relatively novel: We were attacked not by another nation-state but by a band of terrorists who took shelter in a failed state. But this threat—like the threats of Nazism, fascism, and communism—comes from a sick and failed ideology.

With Osama bin Laden's recent demise, the founder of Al Qaeda joined a long list of tyrants—Adolf Hitler to Saddam Hussein—who

have experienced for themselves the righteous wrath of a democracy bestirred from its peaceful pursuits.

I applaud President Obama for ordering the raid that finally brought Osama bin Laden to his just fate. I applaud the President, too, for his stirring words in support of reformers in the Middle East. I only wish that he had shown more commitment to the cause of freedom. He has been slow and hesitant, and we have missed some significant opportunities to alter the strategic landscape in America's favor. And the President's failure to lead has served to magnify the damage done to U.S. interests.

For example, in the summer of 2009, the young people of Iran took to the streets to protest against mullahs that had consigned them to poverty, while squandering oil riches to build nuclear weapons and support foreign terrorist groups. The President was so intent on negotiating with Iran's tyrants that he did little to help its people. As the Green Revolution fizzled, protesters demanded to know, “Obama, are you with us or against us?”

This year, the Administration did come to the aid of the people of Libya, but only after weeks of hesitation that allowed Moammar Qaddafi—an anti-American criminal—to get back on his feet and resume slaughtering his own people.

Then it took another four months before the President was willing to recognize the Transitional National Council as the rightful government of Libya. And even then, the Administration refused to commit the resources and make the tactical decisions that could have shortened this conflict.

The regime was so lacking in popular support that it finally fell, but the fact that the war dragged on so long has, at a minimum, raised the costs of reconstruction and lengthened the toll of the dead and wounded.

An anonymous presidential adviser justified this by claiming that it was part of a deliberate strategy to “lead from behind.”

We could see the same doctrine in effect in Syria where the President waited a full six months after the start of a popular uprising—six months that Bashar Assad and his goons spent indiscriminately slaughtering their own people—before calling for Assad's removal. And even then, the Administration refused to recall our ambassador or impose the entire list of sanctions that some of us in Congress had been pressing for.

Now the President's defenders suggest that it was right not to get more involved because they worry about the consequences of turmoil in the Middle East. I've often hear it said that: “Better the devil you know.” We should be concerned about what will come next in places like Egypt that have been American allies.

I can understand why President Obama hesitated before finally withdrawing our support from Hosni Mubarak, which I believe, under the circumstances, was the right thing to do. But it is hard to see why we would hesitate in the case of Iran, Syria or Libya—all avowed enemies of America. It is hard to imagine a ruler worse than Ahmadinejad, Assad or Qaddafi, and easy to imagine that their successors might be much more amenable to our interests.

Even in countries such as Egypt, Bahrain and Saudi Arabia, we simply do not have the luxury of endorsing the status quo.

Instead of tying our fate to discredited dictators, we would be better advised to build constructive alternatives. That's what Ronald Reagan did when he pushed Ferdinand Marcos out of power in the Philippines in 1986. The following year he did the same thing when he helped push a military ruler out of power in South Korea and supported the transition to civilian rule. Today, South

Korea is one of the world's freest countries—and one of the richest. Yet only forty years ago, it was poorer than North Korea and nearly as poor as Syria. Its transformation shows what is possible when free people are allowed to harness their full potential.

This is the change that we must encourage in the Middle East. Now unfortunately the views of some of the protestors distasteful. I certainly condemn the anti-Israel sentiments uttered by protest leaders, and I can understand why many Israelis are alarmed by the recent turn of events.

Israel is one of America's closest allies in the world, and our closest and most reliable friend in the Middle East. It is a shining bastion of democracy, liberty, and opportunity in one of the most blighted parts of the world. But the naïve strategy of trying to appease Islamist extremists like Iran, and turning our back on Israel, will only embolden our common enemies and weaken the prospects for peace—and for democracy itself.

For the sake of peace, and out of principle, the United States must strongly affirm its commitment to Israel, not just in words but in deeds.

At the same time, the people of Tunisia, Egypt, Libya, Syria, Yemen, and other Middle Eastern lands are in the streets because they want a better life for themselves and their children. They aren't asking for the imposition of a Taliban-style rule. They are asking for the ballot box and for economic opportunity. And if their desires are fulfilled, they will move closer to Thomas Jefferson's vision of the world than Osama bin Laden's.

That is why I am so concerned that the Administration may let this historic opportunity pass. I am glad that the President is trying to bring along our allies. But our allies would be the first to tell you that nothing important or difficult happens without American leadership. Unfortunately, that leadership has been missing at a critical juncture during the last few years.

Most recently, for example, it has been suggested that the advice of military commanders in Iraq be completely ignored in favor of a dramatic troop drawdown that even Iraqis say is too drastic.

It's a reminder that, in our republic, elections have consequences not just at home, but all over the world. Because while previous generations of leaders—and even some I serve with today—have stood up for unpopular but necessary measures, even at the risk of losing elections, others are simply too willing to do what is politically self-serving. America, and the entire world for that matter, needs resolute leadership in this era of historic but volatile transformation, particularly in the Middle East—and particularly in Iraq.

Beyond the Middle East, in our own hemisphere, a combination of narco-trafficking networks, anti-American strongmen, and the increasing penetration of Iranian influence is raising dangers of a special kind. Individuals like Hugo Chavez, who have no business running anything in the first place much less a country, have worked strenuously to build a bloc of countries to work against U.S. interests—and at great risk to great friends like Colombia.

Again, the Administration has missed easy opportunities to stand with our allies, for instance, through free trade agreements. We cannot continue to ignore or be complacent about Latin America, nor can we relegate our friends in the region to anything less than high priority partnerships for us to continue nurturing.

After all, the security of our democratic society depends on the success of liberty in our own hemisphere. The fight against drug

and human trafficking, and the infiltration of Islamist terrorists requires the success of economic and political freedoms—and of the rule of law—in Latin America. We must be more vigilant—and more decisive—in defending our interests in our own hemisphere.

And by the way, the notion that we should “lead from behind” would have been incomprehensible even to the Democrat who preceded President Obama. In his second inaugural address, President Bill Clinton said that “America stands alone as the world’s indispensable nation.” That is as true today as it was in 1997.

If America refuses to lead, who will combat international outlaws? Who will stop terrorists and weapons proliferators? Who will deal with the Iranian and North Korean nuclear programs? The rising disorder in Pakistan, Yemen and Somalia? The growing challenge from China which seeks to dominate East Asia, but won’t even let its own people use Google?

The world counts on America. And whether we like it or not, there is virtually no aspect of our daily lives that is not directly impacted by what happens in the world around us. We can choose to ignore global problems, but global problems will not ignore us.

Yet our ability to lead is threatened. It’s threatened not by any external foe, but rather by our own fiscal woes.

This year, the national debt surpassed the size of our economy and it will continue to grow unless we get it under control.

Now, I am a strong advocate of cutting unnecessary and wasteful spending, but the defense budget is not the biggest driver of our debt—it accounts for roughly twenty percent of our annual federal spending. By contrast, entitlement programs swallow more than half the budget and they are the main drivers of our debt.

The Pentagon already faced sharp cuts. During his last two years in office, Secretary of Defense Gates cut or curtailed procurement programs that, if taken to completion, would have cost \$300 billion. This summer, the President and congressional leaders agreed to cut another \$350 billion from the defense budget over the next ten years.

Those cuts by themselves alone are worrisome enough but what is more worrisome is what’s looming: In the worst case scenario, if the so-called Debt Super Committee doesn’t reach any deal at all, the Pentagon could stand to be slashed by more than \$1 trillion over ten years.

Our new secretary of defense—himself is a well-known budget hawk—has warned that cutbacks of this scale would have a “devastating effect on our national defense.” I can but echo Leon Panetta’s words.

The American armed forces have been one of the greatest forces of good in the world during the past century. They stopped Nazism and Communism and other evils such as Serbian ethnic-cleansing. They have helped birthed democracies from Germany to Iraq. They have delivered relief supplies, and performed countless tasks in service to our nation.

All they have ever asked for in return is that we provide them the tools to get the job done—and that we look after them and their families. They have never failed us in our time of need.

We must not fail them now. We must maintain a strong national defense.

Foreign aid is also an important part of America’s foreign policy leadership. While we certainly must be careful about spending money on foreign aid, the reality is that it is not the reason we have a growing debt problem.

If it is done right, and when done in partnership with the private sector and faith-based community, foreign aid spreads Amer-

ica’s influence around the world in a positive way. Let me give you an example: the Bush Administration’s program to provide HIV medicine to Africa has not only saved lives, it has increased America’s influence across the continent. These are allies in the future that can be our partners, not just in our political struggles on the world stage, but in economic trade. And a world where people are prosperous and free to grow their economies and pursue their own dreams is a better world for all of us.

I began by quoting the words of Jesse Helms and Ronald Reagan. In closing, let me recall the great words of one of the most important Democrat leaders of the 20th Century—Harry S. Truman. In 1951, speaking to the New York Avenue Presbyterian Church in Washington, D.C., this is what he said:

“I have the feeling that God has created us and brought us to our present position of power and strength for some great purpose. It is not given to us to know fully what that purpose is. But I think we may be sure of one thing. And that is that our country is intended to do all it can in cooperating with other nations to help create peace and preserve peace in the world. It is given to us to defend the spiritual values—the moral code—against the vast forces of evil that seek to destroy them.”

There are still vast forces of evil seeking to destroy us. The form of the threat has changed since Truman’s time. But evil remains potent—and America remains the strongest line of defense, often the only line of defense.

I pray that we will continue to find the wisdom and courage—and resources—to act effectively in the defense of our moral code—the same code that we share with all civilized people. The world needed a strong America in Truman’s time. And if this is to be another American Century, the world needs a strong America now.

Because freedom cannot survive without us.

Thank you so much for having me. May God bless all of you and may God bless our country. Thank you.

REMEMBERING COMPTROLLER GENERAL ELMER B. STAATS

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, today I pay tribute to the memory of Elmer B. Staats, one of the great civil servants of the post-World War II era. A former Comptroller General of the United States and head of the General Accounting Office, as GAO was then called, Mr. Staats died July 23 in Washington at the age of 97.

Elmer Staats had the distinction of serving under every U.S. President from Franklin Roosevelt to Ronald Reagan. But more important than the longevity of his career was his record of professional achievement. A leading figure in the world of public administration and government accountability, Elmer Staats was renowned for his dedication to constructive change and good government principles.

Appointed Comptroller General in 1966, Elmer Staats helped lay the foundation for the modern-day GAO. He transformed it from an agency primarily known for financial audit work to one that evaluates the effectiveness of virtually every Federal activity at home and abroad, from antipoverty programs to military spending to investments in infrastructure.

At the start of Staats’ tenure at GAO, accountants comprised more than 95 percent of the agency’s professional staff. By the time he retired in 1981, the agency’s workforce included such diverse professionals as economists, social scientists, attorneys, and computer experts—all career employees hired on the basis of their knowledge, skills, and ability.

Under Elmer Staats, GAO took a lead role in issuing auditing guidance. In 1972, the Comptroller General issued the first edition of what has come to be known as the “Yellow Book”—the final word on government auditing standards. He also directed GAO to issue guidance to help state and local auditors and was instrumental in establishing intergovernmental audit forums in the 1970s.

In addition, Elmer Staats sought to strengthen ties with the international auditing community through his active involvement and leadership in the International Organization of Supreme Audit Institutions. He founded GAO’s International Auditor Fellowship Program in 1979, which enables auditors from other countries to meet with GAO staff and acquire new knowledge and perspectives.

His is a living legacy that is still delivering results, both for Congress and the American people. Just name a Federal program or policy, GAO has probably reviewed it and made suggestions for improvement. Last year, measurable financial benefits from GAO work totaled nearly \$50 billion, an \$87 return on every dollar invested in GAO.

Elmer Boyd Staats was born in Richfield, KS, in 1914. His family were wheat farmers. The only one of his eight siblings to attend college, Elmer Staats graduated Phi Beta Kappa from McPherson College in 1935, and later earned a master’s degree in political science and economics from the University of Kansas and a doctorate in political economy at the University of Minnesota, where he wrote his dissertation on the new Social Security Administration.

Elmer Staats’ career in the Federal Government began in 1939, when he joined the Bureau of the Budget, now the Office of Management and Budget. His talents were recognized early on, and he served in high-level posts at the Bureau under Presidents Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson. Eventually, he became the Bureau’s Deputy Director before President Johnson appointed him to a 15-year term as the fifth Comptroller General of the United States. He held that post through the administrations of Presidents Johnson, Nixon, Ford, and Carter, and into the early months of the Reagan administration.

After leaving GAO, Elmer Staats became the president and later chairman of the board of trustees of the Harry S. Truman Scholarship Foundation. He was a member of the Governmental Accounting Standards Board from 1984 to 1990. During the 1990s, he served as the

first chairman of the Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board.

Elmer Staats helped found the American Society for Public Administration in 1939 and later served as its national president and vice president. He was also a founding member in 1967 of the National Academy of Public Administration and remained a trusted advisor on many Academy projects over the years. He received numerous awards for distinguished public service, along with honorary degrees from eight universities. He was elected to the Accounting Hall of Fame in 1981.

When asked whether he was a Republican or a Democrat, Elmer always politely but firmly declined to answer. In fact, he was famous for having a needlepoint pillow in his office that featured an elephant on one side and a donkey on the other. The message about his and GAO's nonpartisan role in government was clear.

As Bob Schieffer observed in a recent commentary on "Face the Nation," Elmer Staats' reputation in Washington was such that you "knew you could take what his agency reported to the bank—its facts were seldom disputed, its neutrality never challenged, his political affiliation never known."

I want to express my gratitude for Elmer Staats' many years of exemplary service to our Nation. His intelligence, dedication, and integrity will be missed. At the same time, Elmer Staats set an example for the type of men and women who will be needed to help lead our government in the future—individuals of outstanding ability, sound character, and a genuine commitment to the greater good.

My thoughts and prayers go to his three children—David Staats, Deborah Sanders, and Catharine Taubman—and to his three grandchildren and great-granddaughter.

CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, this Saturday, the Nation marks the 224th anniversary of the day when the Founders signed the fundamental charter for our democracy—the Constitution of the United States. During the Constitutional Convention, the delegates debated hundreds of issues and proposals before crafting the final charter. Thankfully, the Founders had the foresight to know that their debate would not be the final word on the subject. The work of defining our Nation—ensuring protection of rights for all Americans—would continue, as we strive to create "a more perfect union."

It was through the leadership of the late Senator Robert C. Byrd that the Congress began to officially celebrate the signing of the Constitution, calling the September 17 anniversary Constitution Day. Senator Byrd understood the importance of ensuring that future generations value our Nation's founding charter. This week, in schools across the country, students will learn

about the Constitutional Convention and the meaning of Constitution Day.

For well over two centuries, the Constitution has allowed America to flourish and, importantly, adapt to new challenges. Since the inclusion of the Bill of Rights in 1791, the Constitution has been amended just 17 times. There has been much discussion of late about amending our Nation's fundamental charter. As chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, that is not something that I take lightly. Proposing amendments to the Constitution should not be a reflexive response to political threats. Each Member of Congress swears to support and defend the Constitution; it should be treated with the reverence it deserves, not as leverage in heated political debate. While I certainly believe that the Constitution has been improved over time in our effort to create a more perfect union, those amendments were thoroughly considered and debated over time. Before we alter our national charter, we must openly consider whether such amendment would hamstring future generations.

Pressure groups may demand that elected representatives sign pledges about what they will and will not do if elected to office. The pledge I follow—the one I was honored to make again at the beginning of this Congress—is to uphold the Constitution. I take that pledge seriously. "We the People" owe a great debt to the Framers of our Constitution. And as we commemorate the signing of the Constitution of the United States of America 224 years ago, I hope all Americans will take this opportunity to read the words of our founding charter and learn about how it protects us all.

TRIBUTE TO KEEGAN BRADLEY

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, with the Senate now back in session, as a Vermonter I would like to call the Senate's attention to Mr. Keegan Bradley's first-place finish in the 93rd Professional Golf Association's Championship Tournament on Sunday, August 14. Mr. Bradley is the first male golfer born in Vermont to win a major PGA Championship.

Keegan Bradley has earned a permanent place for himself, and Vermont, in the record books. As a rookie golfer, his participation in the 2011 PGA Championship is his first major tournament, making him one of only three rookie golfers ever to place first in a major tournament debut. This win also marks the end of a six-major tournament dry spell for American golfers. In order to win this year's PGA Championship, Bradley needed to demonstrate tenacity and determination. Keegan successfully came back from a four-shot deficit in the last three holes of the tournament, proving his ability to focus and overcome obstacles.

His PGA Championship win extends Mr. Bradley's successful start to his professional golf career. Most notably,

he placed first in another PGA tournament earlier this year, the HP Byron Nelson Championship in Texas. In 2011 he has also finished in the top 10 in 4 PGA tournaments, as well as having finished within the top 25 in 10 others.

Even more impressively, Keegan Bradley has spent many of his younger years living in the New England area, with seasonal weather that did not always afford him the luxury of training year-round. This resulted in much time-sensitive dedication and focus, as winter weather inhibits year-round outside practice in our part of the country.

Keegan Bradley was born in Woodstock, VT, in 1986 and attended Woodstock High School. He is the son of Mr. Mark Bradley, golf professional at Crown Point Golf Club, and Mrs. Kay Bradley. Keegan is also the nephew of Ms. Pat Bradley, a Ladies Professional Golf Association Hall-of-Famer. I am proud to recognize Keegan Bradley for his accomplishment, both as a Vermonter and a professional golfer. I join all Vermonters in wishing him many more years of success.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 1:23 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2218. An act to amend the charter school program under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 2218. An act to amend the charter school program under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bills were read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

S. 1549. A bill to provide tax relief for American workers and businesses, to put workers back on the job while rebuilding and modernizing America, and to provide pathways back to work for Americans looking for jobs.

H.R. 2832. An act to extend the Generalized System of Preferences, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2887. An act to provide an extension of surface and air transportation programs, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-3219. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Mackerel, Squid, and Butterfish Fisheries; Closure of the 2011 Tri-mester 2 Directed Loligo Squid Fishery" (RIN0648-XA617) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 6, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3220. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Spiny Dogfish Fishery; Commercial Period 1 Quota Harvested" (RIN0648-XA632) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 7, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3221. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Gulf of Mexico Reef Fish Fishery; 2011 Commercial Quota and 2011 Commercial Fishing Season for Greater Amberjack" (RIN0648-XA592) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 7, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3222. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Scup Fishery; Adjustment to the 2011 Winter II Quota" (RIN0648-XA555) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 7, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3223. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Modification of the Retention of Incidentally-Caught Highly Migratory Species in Atlantic Trawl Fisheries" (RIN0648-BA45) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 6, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3224. A communication from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Mackerel, Squid, and Butterfish Fishery; Emergency Rule Extension, Revision of 2011 Butterfish Specifications" (RIN0648-BA86)

received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 7, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3225. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Ocean Perch in the West Yakutat District of the Gulf of Alaska" (RIN0648-XA610) received during recess of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3226. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; 'Other Rockfish' in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska" (RIN0648-XA613) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 6, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3227. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Ocean Perch, Northern Rockfish, and Pelagic Shelf Rockfish in the Western Regulatory Area and the West Yakutat District of the Gulf of Alaska" (RIN0648-XA544) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 6, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3228. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Operations, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act Provisions; Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Sea Scallop Fishery; Amendment 15 to the Atlantic Sea Scallop Fishery Management Plan" (RIN0648-BA71) received during recess in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3229. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Operations, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Multispecies Fishery; Amendment 16, Framework Adjustment 44, and Framework Adjustment 45" (RIN0648-AY95) received during recess of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 25, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3230. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Addition of Persons Acting Contrary to the National Security or Foreign Policy Interests of the United States; and Implementation of Additional Changes from the Annual Review of the Entity List" (RIN0694-AF22) received during recess of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3231. A communication from the Program Analyst, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Event Data Recorders" (RIN2127-AK71) received during recess of the Senate in the Office of

the President of the Senate on August 11, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3232. A communication from the Program Analyst, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Make In-operative Exemptions; Vehicle Modifications to Accommodate People with Disabilities, Head Restraints" (RIN2127-AK22) received during recess of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3233. A communication from the Program Analyst, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "New Car Assessment Program; Safety Labeling" (RIN2127-AK51) received during recess of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3234. A communication from the Program Analyst, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards; Electric-Powered Vehicles; Electrolyte Spillage and Electrical Shock Protection" (RIN2127-AK80) received during recess of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3235. A communication from the Program Analyst, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards; Air Brake Systems" (RIN2127-AK84) received during recess of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3236. A communication from the Trial Attorney, Federal Railroad Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Hours of Service: Passenger Train Employees" (RIN2130-AC15) received during recess of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3237. A communication from the Chairman of the Office of Proceedings, Surface Transportation Board, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Regulations Governing Fees for Services Performed in Connection with Licensing and Related Services—2011 Update" (RIN2140-AB08) received during recess of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 25, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3238. A communication from the Deputy Chief Counsel for Regulations and Security Standards, Transportation Security Administration, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Cargo Screening" (RIN1652-AA64) received during recess of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 22, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3239. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Substantial Product Safety List: Hand-Supported Hair Dryers" (16 CFR Part 1120) received during recess of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 23, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3240. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Substantial Product Safety List: Children's Upper Outerwear in Sizes 2T to 12 with Neck or Hood Drawstrings and Children's Upper Outerwear in Sizes 2T to 16 with Certain Waist or Bottom Drawstrings" (16 CFR Part 1120) received during recess of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 23, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3241. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Poison Prevention Packaging Requirements; Exemption of Powder Formulations of Colesevelam Hydrochloride and Sevelamer Carbonate" (16 CFR Part 1700) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 6, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3242. A communication from the Deputy General Counsel, Office of the General Counsel, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Claims for Patent and Copyright Infringement" (RIN2700-AD63) received during recess of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 4, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3243. A communication from the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report providing a statement of actions with respect to the Government Accountability Office report entitled "Reimbursable Space Act Agreements: NASA Generally Adhering to Fair Reimbursement Controls, but Guidance on Waived Cost Justifications Needs Refinement"; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3244. A communication from the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report providing a statement of actions with respect to the Government Accountability Office report entitled "Training Necessary to Address Data Reliability Issues in NASA Agreement Database and to Minimize Potential Competition with Commercial Sector"; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3245. A communication from the Acting Chief of the Division of Habitat and Resource Conservation, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Marine Mammal; Incidental Take During Specified Activities (Beaufort Sea)" (RIN1018-AX32) received during recess of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 4, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. CRAPO (for himself and Mr. RISH):

S. 1552. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to provide an exception to that Act for actions carried out against grizzly bears in self-defense, defense of others, or a reasonable belief of imminent danger; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. ENZI):

S. 1553. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to facilitate emergency medical services personnel training and certification curriculums for military veterans; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. HELLER:

S. 1554. A bill to prohibit the further extension or establishment of national monuments in the State of Nevada except by express authorization of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 1555. A bill to authorize the use of certain offshore oil and gas platforms in the Gulf of Mexico for artificial reefs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. VITTER (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin):

S. 1556. A bill to require an accounting for financial support made to promote the production or use of renewable energy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. BINGAMAN (for himself and Mr. KERRY):

S. 1557. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand personal savings and retirement savings coverage by allowing employees not covered by qualified retirement plans to save for retirement through automatic IRAs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. LEAHY, Mrs. McCASKILL, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Ms. MIKULSKI):

S. 1558. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to apply payroll taxes to remuneration and earnings from self-employment up to the contribution and benefit base and to remuneration in excess of \$250,000; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. CANTWELL (for herself and Mr. MURRAY):

S. 1559. A bill to establish the San Juan Islands National Conservation Area in the San Juan Islands, Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. KOHL:

S. 1560. A bill to enhance access to controlled substances for residents of institutional long-term care facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. CONRAD (for himself, Mr. ENZI, and Mr. CARDIN):

S. Res. 266. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of "National Save for Retirement Week", including raising public awareness of the various tax-preferred retirement vehicles and increasing personal financial literacy; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. REID, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. INOUE, Mr. REED, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. AKAKA, Mrs. HAGAN, Mr. CASEY, and Mr. CRAPO):

S. Res. 267. A resolution recognizing the Hispanic Heritage Month and celebrating the heritage and culture of Latinos in the United States and the immense contributions of Latinos to the United States; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 170

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 170, a bill to provide for the affordable refinancing of mortgages held by Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac.

S. 309

At the request of Mr. LUGAR, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 309, a bill to authorize the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment (normal trade relations treatment) to the products of Moldova.

S. 676

At the request of Mr. AKAKA, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 676, a bill to amend the Act of June 18, 1934, to reaffirm the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to take land into trust for Indian tribes.

S. 805

At the request of Mr. BAUCUS, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 805, a bill to amend the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act to improve the business and industry direct and guaranteed loan program of the Department of Agriculture.

S. 829

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 829, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to repeal the Medicare outpatient rehabilitation therapy caps.

S. 920

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 920, a bill to create clean energy jobs and set efficiency standards for small-duct high-velocity air conditioning and heat pump systems, and for other purposes.

S. 967

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WEBB) was added as a cosponsor of S. 967, a bill to establish clear regulatory standards for mortgage servicers, and for other purposes.

S. 1030

At the request of Ms. SNOWE, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1030, a bill to reform the regulatory process to ensure that small businesses are free to compete and to create jobs, and for other purposes.

S. 1224

At the request of Mr. BINGAMAN, the name of the Senator from Colorado

(Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1224, a bill to amend Public Law 106-392 to maintain annual base funding for the Upper Colorado and San Juan fish recovery program through fiscal year 2023.

S. 1265

At the request of Mr. BINGAMAN, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1265, a bill to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 to provide consistent and reliable authority for, and for the funding of, the land and water conservation fund to maximize the effectiveness of the fund for future generations, and for other purposes.

S. 1392

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1392, a bill to provide additional time for the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to issue achievable standards for industrial, commercial, and institutional boilers, process heaters, and incinerators, and for other purposes.

S. 1467

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1467, a bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to protect rights of conscience with regard to requirements for coverage of specific items and services.

S. 1472

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1472, a bill to impose sanctions on persons making certain investments that directly and significantly contribute to the enhancement of the ability of Syria to develop its petroleum resources, and for other purposes.

S. 1523

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1523, a bill to prohibit the National Labor Relations Board from ordering any employers to close, relocate, or transfer employment under any circumstance.

S. 1527

At the request of Mrs. HAGAN, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WEBB) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1527, a bill to authorize the award of a Congressional gold medal to the Montford Point Marines of World War II.

S. 1538

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1538, a bill to provide for a time-out on certain regulations, and for other purposes.

S. 1539

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1539, a bill to provide Taiwan with critically

needed United States-built multirole fighter aircraft to strengthen its self-defense capability against the increasing military threat from China.

S.J. RES. 17

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 17, a joint resolution approving the renewal of import restrictions contained in the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003.

S.J. RES. 27

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 27, a joint resolution disapproving a rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to the mitigation by States of cross-border air pollution under the Clean Air Act.

S. RES. 132

At the request of Mr. NELSON of Nebraska, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 132, a resolution recognizing and honoring the zoos and aquariums of the United States.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. BINGAMAN (for himself and Mr. KERRY):

S. 1557. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand personal savings and retirement savings coverage by allowing employees not covered by qualified retirement plans to save for retirement through automatic IRAs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Automatic IRA Act of 2011. When fully phased in, this bill will give nearly 42 million Americans nationwide an easy, effective way to take responsibility for their financial futures and plan for a secure retirement. The Act incorporates the President's call, in his Proposed fiscal year 2010, 2011, and 2012 Budgets, for Congress to enact Automatic IRA legislation.

Currently, about half of American workers have no opportunity to save for retirement at work. In my home State of New Mexico, that share is nearly 60 percent. Among those lacking coverage at work, only one in ten contributes annually to an individual retirement account, IRA; the rest generally make no dedicated savings for retirement. The result? An alarming number of American workers are woefully unprepared for a financially secure retirement. According to Boston College's Center for Retirement Research, "in 2009 half of today's households will not have enough retirement income to maintain their pre-retirement standard of living, even if they work to age 65, which is above the current average retirement age." Especially in this period of economic uncertainty, it is imperative that Congress focus on this retirement savings crisis.

My bill takes a common-sense approach to doing so.

Under this bill, most private-sector employees working in establishments of 10 or more employees who are not currently covered by a workplace retirement plan would be given the opportunity to save through regular payroll deposits that continue automatically, unless they elect out. The savings will be deposited into the worker's own IRA, which will be subject to the laws already in place governing IRA accounts. Employers' administrative functions will be minimal. And the arrangement is market-oriented; other than the smallest of accounts, automatic IRAs will be provided by the same banks, mutual funds, insurance carriers, and other institutions that currently provide them.

The automatic IRA approach is intended to help these households overcome the barrier of inertia. It builds on the successful use—encouraged by reforms I strongly supported the Pension Protection Act of 2006—of automatic features in 401(k) plans that encourage employees toward sensible decisions, while allowing them to make alternative choices. We have already seen evidence that automatic 401(k) enrollment can dramatically boost employee participation rates, from seven in ten eligible workers to 9 in 10. In the 401(k) context, the gains are even more striking for population groups least likely to save, including women, Latino, and low-income workers.

Of the 75 million American workers who now are not covered by employment-based retirement plans, an estimated 42 million would be eligible to save and enroll under Automatic IRA legislation. This includes more than 250,000 in my home state of New Mexico. Many of these individuals are familiar with IRAs. But when asked why they haven't used the existing program, about half point to issues relating to setup and decision-making as the key barriers. The automatic IRA would eliminate these barriers, and the Retirement Security Project estimates that automatic IRA legislation could increase net national saving by nearly \$15 billion annually.

This is the fourth consecutive Congress in which I have introduced Automatic IRA legislation. The concept was initially developed by scholars at the Brookings Institution and Heritage Foundation. Indeed, the Automatic IRA concept has long enjoyed broad support across the political spectrum. For instance, Martin Feldstein, chief economic advisor to President Reagan, has described himself as "a great enthusiast of automatic enrollment IRAs" who thinks "as a policy, it's a no-brainer" and "can't imagine why there would be any significant opposition from political players on either side of the aisle."

Finally, this bill seeks to send a strong signal of preference for employers to offer qualified retirement plans,

like 401(k)s. Among other features, it doubles the credit for employers that newly establish qualified plans and it directs the Secretaries of the Treasury and Labor to implement final regulations and establish a model plan for Multiple Employer Plans.

I am grateful that my colleague on the Senate Finance Committee, Senator KERRY, is joining me in introducing this bill. I am also pleased to note the broad range of stakeholders supporting the Automatic IRA concept, including AARP; the American Society of Pension Professionals & Actuaries; Aspen Institute's Initiative on Financial Security; the Business and Professional Women's Foundation; CFED; Consumers Union; FINRA; the Minority Business Roundtable; New Economics for Women; the United States Black Chamber; the United States Women's Chamber of Commerce; Women Impacting Public Policy; and the Women's Institute for a Secure Retirement.

Ensuring easy access to a retirement account and the ability to have part of their wages go directly from their paycheck into this account are proven strategies to encourage retirement savings. I call on the Senate to take up this bill and give it full consideration.

By Ms. CANTWELL (for herself and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. 1559. A bill to establish the San Juan Islands National Conservation Area in the San Juan Islands, Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the San Juan Islands National Conservation Area Act.

The San Juan Islands in northwest Washington host some of the most beautiful, serene spots in the world. The San Juans are made up of 172 islands with over 300 miles of shoreline, some little more than rocks, others home to towns, farms, and forests. The coastlines are a mix of sandy and rocky beaches, shallow and deep harbors, and placid and reef-studded bays. And between the many islands run channels of water that support many of Washington's most important marine species, including abundant salmon runs and our majestic regional icon, the orca whale.

Included in the San Juan Islands are nearly 1,000 acres of land owned by the Federal Government, spread out over 60 separate locations and managed by the U.S. Bureau of Land Management, BLM. These parcels, which range from pine forests to lighthouses, provide recreational, ecological, historical, cultural, and scientific benefits to island residents and around 70,000 tourists that visit each year.

Despite their value, no long-term comprehensive management plan exists for these Federal parcels, threatening continued preservation and public access to these sites. Many of these areas are fragile, increasing the chal-

lenge of accommodating increasing numbers of visitors.

In addition, San Juan Island residents have seen the possibility of public lands they treasure being transferred to private ownership. In 2005, the Washington State Department of Natural Resources made a unilateral decision to divest itself of all its properties in San Juan County, including Mitchell Hill, a popular and scenic hiking trail on San Juan Island. While these lands were actively pursued by a private, out-of-state, real-estate developer, I was proud to work with the San Juan Island community to help secure Federal funding to keep these lands in the public domain.

Unfortunately, the Bureau of Land Management lands in the San Juan Islands are not permanently protected or preserved in public ownership. Last July, Congressman LARSEN, the Bureau of Land Management, and I visited with residents and businesses that have been working for years to permanently protect these special places.

The legislation I introduce today is a direct result of our efforts and represents a consensus between the San Juan Island community, Congressman LARSEN, and the Department of the Interior. If enacted, the San Juan Islands National Conservation Area Act will designate all 1,000 acres of BLM lands in the San Juans as a National Conservation Area, ensuring that these natural treasures remain protected, accessible to the public, and better managed to accommodate visitor use.

National Conservation Area designated lands are considered some of the most important Bureau of Land Management properties and are therefore a higher priority for management funding than non-designated lands they manage. Specifically, National Conservation Area status would ensure the San Juan Island properties are appropriately managed to protect their unique qualities and not grouped in with other BLM lands where activities such as mining, oil and gas exploration, off road vehicle use, and grazing are allowed. Importantly, my legislation requires that the management plan drafting process allows for local input into how these properties are to be managed for the long-term.

A National Conservation Area designation will also foster a stronger working relationship with other agency partners such as the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and provide increased opportunities for sharing resources.

I am looking forward to working to advance this legislation through the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee, and through the full Senate. Through our efforts we will work to ensure that future generations will be able to enjoy these special parts of the San Juan Islands.

I would also like to thank my colleague Senator MURRAY for agreeing to cosponsor this legislation, and Congressman LARSEN for his leadership and introducing companion legislation today in the House of Representatives.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1559

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "San Juan Islands National Conservation Area Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS; PURPOSES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) land managed by the Bureau of Land Management in the San Juan Archipelago in the State of Washington comprising nearly 1,000 acres of small islands, rocks and reef, headlands, historic lighthouses, and ecologically important areas are of great value to people in the State of Washington and the United States;

(2) the area described in paragraph (1)—

(A) provides recreational opportunities for hiking, wildlife viewing, boating, picnicking, photography, sea kayaking, and camping; and

(B) is enjoyed by residents of the area and visitors;

(3) in 2010, the area described in paragraph (1) received more than 65,000 visitors in a county with a population of 15,769 residents;

(4) the area described in paragraph (1) preserves important local, national, and tribal cultural and historic sites, such as—

(A) lighthouses on Potos Islands, Turn Point, and Cattle Point, which are registered as State Historic Structures;

(B) numerous archaeological sites, including shell middens, plank-house sites, and burial markers; and

(C) areas of cultural importance, including ancient Coast Salish camas cultivation sites, homesteads, reef-net sites, and settler cabins;

(5) the area described in paragraph (1) includes vanishing coastal flower meadows, spruce bogs, groves of Garry oaks and endemic coastal junipers, and other rare and fragile ecosystems that support numerous plant species and provide nesting habitat for seabirds, songbirds, bats, and other small native mammals;

(6) the area described in paragraph (1) is used by several nonprofit, government, and educational organizations for scientific research and education, including the San Juan Islands Experimental Education Outdoor Classroom; and

(7) establishing the San Juan Islands National Conservation Area is the best way to preserve, protect, enhance, and restore a landscape that is of local and national importance.

(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this Act are—

(1) to conserve, protect, and enhance for the benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations the ecological, scenic, wildlife, recreational, cultural, historical, natural, educational, and scientific resources of the National Conservation Area; and

(2) to protect each species that is—

(A) located in the National Conservation Area; and

(B) listed as a threatened or endangered species on the list of threatened species or the list of endangered species published under section 4(c)(1) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1533(c)(1)).

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) ADVISORY COUNCIL.—The term "Advisory Council" means the San Juan Islands National Conservation Area Advisory Council established under section 4(e).

(2) **MANAGEMENT PLAN.**—The term “management plan” means the management plan for the National Conservation Area developed under section 4(b).

(3) **NATIONAL CONSERVATION AREA.**—The term “National Conservation Area” means the San Juan Islands National Conservation Area established by section 4(a).

(4) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 4. SAN JUAN ISLANDS NATIONAL CONSERVATION AREA.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—Subject to valid existing rights, there is established in the State of Washington the San Juan Islands National Conservation Area, consisting of approximately 1,000 acres of public land in the State of Washington, as generally depicted on the map entitled “Proposed San Juan Islands National Conservation Area” and dated June 30, 2011.

(b) **MANAGEMENT PLAN.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act and in accordance with paragraph (2), the Secretary shall develop a comprehensive plan for the long-term management of the National Conservation Area.

(2) **CONSULTATION.**—In developing the management plan required under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall consult with—

(A) appropriate State, tribal, and local governmental entities; and

(B) members of the public.

(c) **MANAGEMENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall manage the National Conservation Area—

(A) in a manner that conserves, protects, and enhances the resources of the National Conservation Area; and

(B) in accordance with—

(i) the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.);

(ii) this Act; and

(iii) any other applicable law (including regulations).

(2) **USES.**—The Secretary shall only allow uses of the National Conservation Area that the Secretary determines would further a purpose described in section 2(b).

(3) **MOTORIZED VEHICLES.**—Except as needed for administrative purposes or to respond to an emergency, the use of motorized vehicles in the National Conservation Area shall be permitted only on roads designated by the management plan for the use of motorized vehicles.

(4) **WILDLAND FIRE OPERATIONS.**—Nothing in this Act prohibits the Secretary, in cooperation with other Federal, State, and local agencies, as appropriate, from conducting wildland fire operations in the National Conservation Area, consistent with the purposes of this Act.

(5) **INVASIVE SPECIES AND NOXIOUS WEEDS.**—In accordance with any applicable laws and subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines to be appropriate, the Secretary may prescribe measures to control nonnative invasive plants and noxious weeds within the National Conservation Area.

(6) **TRIBAL CULTURAL USES.**—The Secretary shall, in consultation with Indian tribes—

(A) ensure the protection of religious and cultural sites in the National Conservation Area; and

(B) provide access to the sites by members of Indian tribes for traditional cultural and customary uses, consistent with Public Law 95-341 (commonly known as the “American Indian Religious Freedom Act”) (42 U.S.C. 1996).

(d) **NO BUFFER ZONES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Nothing in this Act creates a protective perimeter or buffer zone around the National Conservation Area.

(2) **ACTIVITIES OUTSIDE CONSERVATION AREA.**—The fact that an activity or use on

land outside the National Conservation Area can be seen or heard within the National Conservation Area shall not preclude the activity or use outside the boundary of the National Conservation Area.

(3) **ACQUISITION OF LAND.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary may acquire non-Federal land within the boundaries of the National Conservation Area only through exchange, donation, or purchase from a willing seller.

(B) **MANAGEMENT.**—Land acquired under subparagraph (A) shall become part of the National Conservation Area.

(e) **ADVISORY COUNCIL.**—

(1) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall establish an advisory council, to be known as the “San Juan Islands National Conservation Area Advisory Council”.

(2) **MEMBERS.**—

(A) **COMPOSITION.**—The Advisory Council shall be composed of 7 members, to be appointed by the Secretary.

(B) **QUALIFICATIONS.**—To the maximum extent practicable, the members appointed under subparagraph (A) shall—

(i) reside in or within reasonable proximity to San Juan County, Washington;

(ii) have backgrounds that reflect—

(I) the purposes for which the National Conservation Area was established; and

(II) the interests of the stakeholders that are affected by the planning and management of the National Conservation Area; and

(iii) be fairly balanced in terms of the points of view represented and the functions to be performed by the Advisory Council.

(3) **DUTIES.**—The Advisory Council shall advise the Secretary with respect to the preparation and implementation of the management plan.

(4) **APPLICABLE LAW.**—The Advisory Council shall be subject to—

(A) the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.); and

(B) the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.).

(5) **TERMINATION.**—The Advisory Council shall terminate on the date that is 1 year after the date on which the management plan is adopted by the Secretary.

(f) **INCORPORATION OF ACQUIRED LAND AND INTERESTS.**—Any land acquired by the United States after the date of enactment of this Act that is located in the National Conservation Area shall—

(1) become part of the National Conservation Area; and

(2) be managed in accordance with—

(A) the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.);

(B) this Act; and

(C) any other applicable law (including regulations).

(g) **WITHDRAWAL.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to valid existing rights, all Federal land (including interests in the Federal land) located in the National Conservation Area is withdrawn from—

(A) all forms of entry, appropriation, and disposal under the public land laws;

(B) location, entry, and patenting under the mining laws; and

(C) operation of the mineral leasing, mineral materials, and geothermal leasing laws.

(2) **ADDITIONAL LAND.**—Any land acquired by the United States after the date of enactment of this Act that is located in the National Conservation Area shall be withdrawn from operation of the laws referred to in paragraph (1) on the date of acquisition of the land.

(h) **EFFECT.**—Nothing in this Act alters, modifies, enlarges, diminishes, or abrogates the treaty rights of any Indian tribe.

By Mr. KOHL:

S. 1560. A bill to enhance access to controlled substances for residents of institutional long-term care facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Nursing Home Resident Pain Relief Act of 2011. This legislation will help ensure that nursing home residents have timely access to pain medication as needed in emergency situations. By streamlining processes that can now cause delays in administering these vital drugs, the bill will also allow designated health care professionals to administer controlled substances to residents whose medical conditions warrant quick pain relief.

To accomplish these ends, the legislation amends the Controlled Substances Act, CSA, in several ways. First, it allows nurses and other appropriately licensed health professionals, designated by the nursing home and with approval from the physician, to order and administer pain medication to residents upon a physician's oral prescription. The bill also establishes a clear chain of accountability for these licensed health professionals, physicians, as well as for nursing homes and long-term care pharmacies.

Last year, the Special Committee on Aging, which I Chair, held a listening session where we heard about a recent Drug Enforcement Agency, DEA, enforcement initiative that has kept nursing home residents from receiving much-needed medication to manage their pain. For many years, nurses had been able to call urgently-needed prescriptions into pharmacies upon a physician's order over the phone. Pharmacies would fill the order, residents would get their pain medication, and physicians would follow up with written confirmation of the prescription. Now, DEA requires physicians to directly issue prescriptions in writing for Schedule II pain medications before they can be dispensed, including in emergency circumstances. This poses a problem for nursing home residents because facilities often do not have physicians on site to fill out the necessary paper work in time to provide critically needed pain medicine. The DEA's enforcement initiative has created an unintended consequence where nursing home residents often have to suffer for several hours or even days before they receive pain medication.

These delays have serious consequences. Here is an all-too-common scenario: an elderly resident that returns to a nursing home after surgery may be in more pain than his physician anticipated and need more medication than the physician prescribed to manage the pain. In order to access the medication he needs, the nursing home employees must first have his physician send a written prescription to a pharmacy. If the physician is difficult to locate or slow to respond, this can take hours or even days. The resident's

pain may become so unmanageable while he waits that he must be transported by ambulance to a hospital emergency room. The ambulance ride and emergency room admission are not only expensive; they can set back the fragile resident's recovery from surgery. Our legislation would make these situations entirely avoidable.

DEA's enforcement initiative effectively put nursing home providers in a difficult position: If they follow the letter of the law, they are in danger of violating Health and Human Services regulations requiring them to administer medications in a timely manner. Failure to do so can result in monetary penalties. In addition, pharmacies could face fines under the CSA if they respond to the nursing home's order—which is almost always transmitted by a nurse—if they fill the order. As a result, a number of pharmacies, including several in the Midwest, are facing tens of millions of dollars in fines imposed by DEA.

Last year DEA issued a policy statement to provide a way for nursing home residents to access some kinds of medication more quickly. Under this new policy, a nursing home's licensed health care professionals may, on a physician's behalf, transcribe the physician's oral prescription for Schedule III, IV or V medications to a pharmacy to be filled. While we appreciated DEA's efforts, without amending the CSA the agency does not have the statutory authority to allow licensed health care professionals to transmit prescriptions for Schedule II controlled substances, the category under which nearly all pain medications fall. Legislation is required in order to provide nursing home residents prompt, reliable pain relief when they are suffering from severe injury or illness.

Our bill would provide a remedy by modifying the CSA to permit pain medication to be dispensed in emergency situations by nursing home professionals without a direct written order by a physician prior to its dispensing. Let me explain how this would work. A physician, if he or she chooses, would be able to authorize the administrator of a long-term care facility to designate one or more licensed health care professionals employed by the facility to act as a "facility designee." In emergency situations only, and upon receiving an oral prescription from the physician, a facility designee would be permitted to contact a pharmacy to have the prescription filled and then dispense Schedule II medications to long-term care facility residents.

This would allow a physician to provide the prescription information to the facility designee via phone when a resident urgently needs pain medication and the physician is unavailable to transmit a written prescription to a pharmacy for a Schedule II controlled substance. The facility designee must document the physician's prescription in writing and transmit the written document to a pharmacy so that the

prescription can be filled. After the pharmacy fills the prescription, it must send a copy of the written document memorializing the prescription to the physician for his or her endorsement. The physician must then send the endorsed document, confirming the oral prescription, to the pharmacy within five business days.

Diversion of controlled substances for illicit purposes is of great concern to me. That is why we have included numerous provisions to protect against diversion in nursing homes. For example, the bill requires careful record-keeping by facilities and pharmacies, which can then be reviewed by DEA as necessary. It requires each actor—the physician, facility designee, and pharmacist—to make a record of his or her role in the process. Long-term care facilities are asked to maintain a written or electronic logbook that memorializes prescriptions and their administration.

Additionally, the legislation enhances criminal and civil penalties for long-term care facility administrators and facility designees who divert drugs, or who violate recordkeeping requirements. These steps will help to ensure that pain medications get to those nursing home residents who need them.

I appreciate the great interest of the stakeholders, including long-term care facility, physician and pharmacy organizations, in solving this problem and I look forward to working with them to finally end the needless delay in pain relief. I would like to thank Attorney General Holder, DEA Administrator Michelle Leonhardt, and their staff for working with me on this legislation, and I look forward to continuing our work together to assure rapid approval by Congress.

Nursing home residents cannot wait for pain medication when they are in debilitating pain and our straightforward bill can help provide some needed relief. I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 266—SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF "NATIONAL SAVE FOR RETIREMENT WEEK", INCLUDING RAISING PUBLIC AWARENESS OF THE VARIOUS TAX-PREFERRED RETIREMENT VEHICLES AND INCREASING PERSONAL FINANCIAL LITERACY

Mr. CONRAD (for himself, Mr. ENZI, and Mr. CARDIN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

S. RES. 266

Whereas people in the United States are living longer, and the cost of retirement is increasing significantly;

Whereas Social Security remains the bedrock of retirement income for the great majority of the people of the United States but was never intended by Congress to be the

sole source of retirement income for families;

Whereas recent data from the Employee Benefit Research Institute indicates that, in the United States, less than ⅓ of workers or their spouses are currently saving for retirement, and the actual amount of retirement savings of workers is much less than the amount needed to adequately fund their retirement years;

Whereas the financial literacy of workers in the United States is an important factor to workers understanding the true need to save for retirement;

Whereas saving for retirement is a key component to overall financial health and security during retirement years, and the importance of financial literacy in planning for retirement must be advocated;

Whereas many workers may not be aware of their options in saving for retirement or may not have focused on the importance of, and need for, saving for retirement;

Whereas many employees have available to them, through their employers, access to defined benefit and defined contribution plans to assist them in preparing for retirement, yet many of those employees may not be taking advantage of those plans at all or to the full extent allowed by Federal law;

Whereas the need to save for retirement is important even during economic downturns or market declines, which make continued contributions all the more important;

Whereas all workers, including public and private sector employees, employees of tax-exempt organizations, and self-employed individuals, can benefit from increased awareness of the need to develop personal budgets and financial plans that include retirement savings strategies and to take advantage of the availability of tax-preferred savings vehicles to assist workers in saving for retirement; and

Whereas October 16 through October 22, 2011, has been designated as "National Save for Retirement Week": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of "National Save for Retirement Week", including raising public awareness of the various tax-preferred retirement vehicles as important tools for personal savings and retirement financial security;

(2) supports the need to raise public awareness of the availability of a variety of ways to save for retirement which are favored under the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and are utilized by many people in the United States, but which should be utilized by more;

(3) supports the need to raise public awareness of the importance of saving adequately for retirement and the continued existence of tax-preferred employer-sponsored retirement savings vehicles; and

(4) calls on the States, localities, schools, universities, nonprofit organizations, businesses, other entities, and the people of the United States to observe National Save for Retirement Week with appropriate programs and activities, with the goal of increasing retirement savings for all people in the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 267—RECOGNIZING THE HISPANIC HERITAGE MONTH AND CELEBRATING THE HERITAGE AND CULTURE OF LATINOS IN THE UNITED STATES AND THE IMMENSE CONTRIBUTIONS OF LATINOS TO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. REID of Nevada, Mr.

WHITEHOUSE, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. INOUE, Mr. REED of Rhode Island, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. AKAKA, Mrs. HAGAN, Mr. CASEY, and Mr. CRAPO submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 267

Whereas beginning on September 15, 2011, through October 15, 2011, the United States celebrates Hispanic Heritage Month;

Whereas the Census Bureau estimates the Hispanic population in the United States at almost 50,500,000 people, making Hispanic Americans the largest ethnic minority within the United States;

Whereas 1 in 5 United States public school students is Hispanic, and the total number of Hispanic students enrolled in public schools in the United States is expected to reach 28,000,000 by 2050;

Whereas the purchasing power of Hispanic Americans is nearly \$1,000,000,000,000, and there are more than 2,300,000 Hispanic-owned firms in the United States, supporting millions of employees nationwide and greatly contributing to the economic sector, especially retail trade, wholesale trade, food services, and construction;

Whereas Hispanic Americans serve in all branches of the Armed Forces and have bravely fought in every war in the history of the United States;

Whereas, as of May 31, 2011, there are 29,204 Hispanics serving with distinction in Afghanistan and Iraq;

Whereas 140,000 Hispanic soldiers served in the Korean War;

Whereas more than 80,000 Hispanics served in the Vietnam War, representing 5.5 percent of individuals who made the ultimate sacrifice for their country in that conflict even though Hispanics comprised only 4.5 percent of the United States population at the time;

Whereas, as of May 31, 2011, 605 United States military fatalities in Iraq and Afghanistan have been Hispanic;

Whereas, as of September 30, 2009, there were approximately 1,332,033 Hispanic veterans of the United States Armed Forces;

Whereas 41 Hispanic Americans have received the Congressional Medal of Honor, the highest award for valor in action against an enemy force that can be bestowed upon an individual serving in the United States Armed Forces;

Whereas Hispanic Americans are dedicated public servants, holding posts at the highest levels of government, including 1 seat on the Supreme Court, 2 seats in the Senate, 24 seats in the House of Representatives, and 2 seats in the Cabinet; and

Whereas Hispanic Americans harbor a deep commitment to family and community, an enduring work ethic, and a perseverance to succeed and contribute to society: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the celebration of Hispanic Heritage Month from September 15, 2011, through October 15, 2011;

(2) esteems the integral role of Latinos and the manifold heritage of Latinos in the economy, culture, and identity of the United States; and

(3) urges the people of the United States to observe Hispanic Heritage Month with appropriate programs and activities that appreciate the cultural contributions of Latinos to American life.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 601. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 602. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 66, approving the renewal of import restrictions contained in the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003.

SA 603. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 602 proposed by Mr. REID to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 66, *supra*.

SA 604. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 603 proposed by Mr. REID to the amendment SA 602 proposed by Mr. REID to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 66, *supra*.

SA 605. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 66, *supra*.

SA 606. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 605 proposed by Mr. REID to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 66, *supra*.

SA 607. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 66, *supra*.

SA 608. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 607 proposed by Mr. REID to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 66, *supra*.

SA 609. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 608 proposed by Mr. REID to the amendment SA 607 proposed by Mr. REID to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 66, *supra*.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 601. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ OFFSET.

There is rescinded on a pro rata base from the unobligated balances made available to the President, the Department of State, or the United States Agency for International Development for foreign assistance programs for fiscal 2011 an amount equal to the amount appropriated under this Act to the Federal Emergency Management Agency for disaster relief for fiscal years 2011 and 2012.

SA 602. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 66, approving the renewal of import restrictions contained in the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003; as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

DIVISION A—RENEWAL OF IMPORT RESTRICTIONS UNDER BURMESE FREEDOM AND DEMOCRACY ACT OF 2003

SECTION 1. RENEWAL OF IMPORT RESTRICTIONS UNDER BURMESE FREEDOM AND DEMOCRACY ACT OF 2003.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Congress approves the renewal of the import restrictions contained in section 3(a)(1) and section 3A (b)(1) and (c)(1) of the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—This division shall be deemed to be a “renewal resolution” for purposes of section 9 of the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003.

SEC. 2. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This division shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this joint resolution or July 26, 2011, whichever occurs earlier.

DIVISION B—SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

The following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to provide emergency supple-

mental appropriations for disaster relief for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

FARM SERVICE AGENCY

EMERGENCY CONSERVATION PROGRAM

For “Emergency Conservation Program” for expenses resulting from a major disaster designation pursuant to the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5122(2)), \$78,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the amount in this paragraph shall not become available for obligation until October 1, 2011: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by Congress as being for disaster relief pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (Public Law 99-177), as amended.

EMERGENCY FOREST RESTORATION PROGRAM

For “Emergency Forest Restoration Program”, for expenses resulting from a major disaster designation pursuant to the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5122(2)), \$49,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the amount in this paragraph shall not become available for obligation until October 1, 2011: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by Congress as being for disaster relief pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1958 (Public Law 99-177), as amended.

NATURAL RESOURCES CONSERVATION SERVICE

EMERGENCY WATERSHED PROTECTION PROGRAM

For “Emergency Watershed Protection Program” for expenses resulting from a major disaster designation pursuant to the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5122(2)), \$139,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the amount in this paragraph shall not become available for obligation until October 1, 2011: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by Congress as being for disaster relief pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (Public Law 99-177), as amended.

TITLE II

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE

PROGRAMS

For an additional amount for “Economic Development Assistance Programs” for expenses related to disaster relief, long-term recovery, and restoration of infrastructure in areas that received a major disaster designation in 2011 pursuant to the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5122(2)), \$135,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the amount in this paragraph shall not become available for obligation until October 1, 2011: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by Congress as being for disaster relief pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (Public Law 99-177), as amended.

TITLE III

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

For an additional amount for “Mississippi River and Tributaries” for expenses resulting from a major disaster designation pursuant to the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief

and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5122(2)), \$890,177,300, to remain available until expended for repair of damages to Federal projects: *Provided*, That the amount in this paragraph shall not become available for obligation until October 1, 2011: *Provided further*, That the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works shall provide a monthly report to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate detailing the allocation and obligation of these funds, beginning not later than 60 days after enactment of this Act: *Provided further*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated by Congress as being for disaster relief pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (Public Law 99-177), as amended.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance", \$60,000,000, to remain available until expended to dredge navigation channels and repair damage to Corps projects nationwide related to natural disasters: *Provided*, That the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works shall provide a monthly report to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate detailing the allocation and obligation of these funds, beginning not later than 60 days after enactment of this Act: *Provided further*, That the amount in this paragraph is designated by Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 3(c)(1) of H. Res. 5 (112th Congress) and to section 403(a) of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010.

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance" for expenses resulting from a major disaster designation pursuant to the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5122(2)) to dredge navigation channels and repair damage to Corps projects nationwide related to natural disasters, \$88,003,700, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the amount in this paragraph shall not become available for obligation until October 1, 2011: *Provided further*, That the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works shall provide a monthly report to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate detailing the allocation and obligation of these funds, beginning not later than 60 days after enactment of this Act: *Provided further*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated by Congress as being for disaster relief pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (Public Law 99-177), as amended.

FLOOD CONTROL AND COASTAL EMERGENCIES

For an additional amount for "Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies", as authorized by section 5 of the Act of August 18, 1941 (33 U.S.C. 701n), for necessary expenses to prepare for flood, hurricane and other natural disasters and support emergency operations, repair and other activities in response to recent natural disasters as authorized by law, \$244,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works shall provide a monthly report to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate detailing the allocation and obligation of these funds, beginning not later than 60 days after enactment of this Act: *Provided further*, That the amount in this paragraph is designated by Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 3(c)(1) of H. Res. 5 (112th Congress) and to section 403(a) of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010.

For an additional amount for "Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies", for expenses resulting from a major disaster designation pursuant to the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5122(2)) and as authorized by section 5 of the Act of August 18, 1941 (33 U.S.C. 701n), for necessary expenses to prepare for flood, hurricane and other natural disasters and support emergency operations, repair and other activities in response to recent natural disasters as authorized by law, \$66,387,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the amount in this paragraph shall not become available for obligation until October 1, 2011: *Provided further*, That the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works shall provide a monthly report to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate detailing the allocation and obligation of these funds, beginning not later than 60 days after enactment of this Act: *Provided further*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated by Congress as being for disaster relief pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (Public Law 99-177), as amended.

TITLE IV

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY DISASTER RELIEF

For an additional amount for "Disaster Relief", \$500,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the amount in this paragraph is designated by Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 3(c)(1) of H. Res. 5 (112th Congress) and to section 403(a) of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010.

For an additional amount for the "Disaster Relief" for expenses resulting from a major disaster designation pursuant to the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5122(2)), \$4,600,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the amount in this paragraph shall not become available for obligation until October 1, 2011: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by Congress as being for disaster relief pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (Public Law 99-177), as amended. This Act may be cited as the "Emergency Supplemental Disaster Relief Appropriations Resolution, 2011".

TITLE V

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FUND

For an additional amount for the "Community Development Fund", for necessary expenses related to disaster relief, long-term recovery, and restoration of infrastructure, housing, and economic revitalization resulting from a major disaster designation pursuant to the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5122(2)) in 2011, \$100,000,000, to remain available until expended, for activities authorized under title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-383): *Provided*, That the amount in this paragraph shall not become available for obligation until October 1, 2011: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by Congress as being for disaster relief pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (Public Law 99-177), as amended: *Provided further*, That funds shall be awarded directly to the State or unit of general local government at

the discretion of the Secretary: *Provided further*, That prior to the obligation of funds a grantee shall submit a plan to the Secretary detailing the proposed use of all funds, including criteria for eligibility and how the use of these funds will address long-term recovery and restoration of infrastructure: *Provided further*, That funds provided under this heading may be used by a State or locality as a matching requirement, share, or contribution for any other Federal program: *Provided further*, That such funds may not be used for activities reimbursable by, or for which funds are made available by, the Federal Emergency Management Agency or the Army Corps of Engineers: *Provided further*, That funds allocated under this heading shall not adversely affect the amount of any formula assistance received by a State or subdivision thereof under the Community Development Fund: *Provided further*, That a State or subdivision thereof may use up to 5 percent of its allocation for administrative costs: *Provided further*, That in administering the funds under this heading, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may waive, or specify alternative requirements for, any provision of any statute or regulation that the Secretary administers in connection with the obligation by the Secretary or the use by the recipient of these funds or guarantees (except for requirements related to fair housing, nondiscrimination, labor standards, and the environment), upon a request by a State or subdivision thereof explaining why such waiver is required to facilitate the use of such funds or guarantees, if the Secretary finds that such waiver would not be inconsistent with the overall purpose of title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register any waiver of any statute or regulation that the Secretary administers pursuant to title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 no later than 5 days before the effective date of such waiver.

This division may be cited as the "Emergency Supplemental Disaster Relief Appropriations Resolution, 2011".

SA 603. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 602 proposed by Mr. REID to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 66, approving the renewal of import restrictions contained in the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003; as follows:

At the end, add the following new section:
SECTION ____ EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by this division shall become effective 2 days after enactment.

SA 604. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 603 proposed by Mr. REID to the amendment SA 602 proposed by Mr. REID to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 66, approving the renewal of import restrictions contained in the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003; as follows:

In the amendment, strike "2 days", insert "1 day".

SA 605. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 66, approving the renewal of import restrictions contained in the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003; as follows:

On page 2, line 17, strike "on" and insert "3 days after".

SA 606. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 605 proposed by Mr. REID to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 66, approving the renewal of import restrictions contained in the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003; as follows:

In the amendment, strike “3 days” and insert “2 days”.

SA 607. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 66, approving the renewal of import restrictions contained in the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003; as follows:

On page 2, strike line 17 through 19 and insert the following:

This joint resolution shall take effect on July 26, 2011.

SA 608. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 607 proposed by Mr. REID to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 66, approving the renewal of import restrictions contained in the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003; as follows:

In the amendment, strike “July 26” and insert “July 25”.

SA 609. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 608 proposed by Mr. REID to the amendment SA 607 proposed by Mr. REID to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 66, approving the renewal of import restrictions contained in the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003; as follows:

In the amendment, strike “July 25” and insert “July 24”.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 14, 2011, at 10 a.m., in room 253 of the Russell Senate Office Building. The Committee will hold a hearing entitled, “Moving Intercity Passenger Rail into the Future.”

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

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 14, 2011, at 10 a.m., in room 215 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled “Tax Reform Options: Marginal Rates on High-Income Taxpayers, Capital Gains and Dividends.”

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

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be authorized to meet,

during the session of the Senate, to conduct a hearing entitled “Securing the Pharmaceutical Supply Chain,” on September 14, 2011, at 10 a.m., in room 430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

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

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 14, 2011, at 10 a.m.

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

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on September 14, 2011, at 10 a.m., in room SD-226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled “The Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act: Renewing the Commitment to Victims of Human Trafficking.”

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING, TRANSPORTATION, AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs’ Subcommittee on Housing, Transportation, and Community Development be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 14, 2011, at 2 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “New Ideas for Refinancing and Restructuring Mortgage Loans.”

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PERSONNEL

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Personnel of the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, September 14, 2011, at 2 p.m.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SECURITIES, INSURANCE, AND INVESTMENT

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs’ Subcommittee on Securities, Insurance, and Investment, be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 14, 2011, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “Emerging Issues in Insurance Regulation.”

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

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Christina Wright of my staff be granted floor

privileges for the duration of today’s proceedings.

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Sarah Babcock and Danielle Fidler from Senator BAUCUS’s staff be allowed floor privileges during the consideration of the pending Burma and disaster relief bill.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATIONS DISCHARGED

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session and the Foreign Relations Committee be discharged from further consideration of PN 828, Mary B. DeRosa, to be Alternate Representative to the United Nations; PN 829, Frank E. Loy, to be Alternate Representative to the United Nations; and PN 830, Kendrick B. Meek, to be Representative to the United Nations; that the nominations be confirmed en bloc; the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to the nominations; that any related statements be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate’s action, and the Senate then resume legislative session.

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

The nominations considered and confirmed en bloc are as follows:

GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Mary B. DeRosa, of the District of Columbia, to be an Alternate Representative of the United States of America to the Sixty-sixth Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Frank E. Loy, of the District of Columbia, to be an Alternate Representative of the United States of America to the Sixty-sixth Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Kendrick B. Meek, of Florida, to be a Representative of the United States of America to the Sixty-sixth Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume legislative session.

HISPANIC HERITAGE MONTH

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to consideration of S. Res. 267.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 267) recognizing Hispanic Heritage Month and celebrating the heritage and culture of Latinos in the United States and the immense contributions of Latinos to the United States.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid on the table, with no intervening action or debate, and that any statements be printed in the RECORD.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 267) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 267

Whereas beginning on September 15, 2011, through October 15, 2011, the United States celebrates Hispanic Heritage Month;

Whereas the Census Bureau estimates the Hispanic population in the United States at almost 50,500,000 people, making Hispanic Americans the largest ethnic minority within the United States;

Whereas 1 in 5 United States public school students is Hispanic, and the total number of Hispanic students enrolled in public schools in the United States is expected to reach 28,000,000 by 2050;

Whereas the purchasing power of Hispanic Americans is nearly \$1,000,000,000,000, and there are more than 2,300,000 Hispanic-owned firms in the United States, supporting millions of employees nationwide and greatly contributing to the economic sector, especially retail trade, wholesale trade, food services, and construction;

Whereas Hispanic Americans serve in all branches of the Armed Forces and have bravely fought in every war in the history of the United States;

Whereas, as of May 31, 2011, there are 29,204 Hispanics serving with distinction in Afghanistan and Iraq;

Whereas 140,000 Hispanic soldiers served in the Korean War;

Whereas more than 80,000 Hispanics served in the Vietnam War, representing 5.5 percent of individuals who made the ultimate sacrifice for their country in that conflict even though Hispanics comprised only 4.5 percent of the United States population at the time;

Whereas, as of May 31, 2011, 605 United States military fatalities in Iraq and Afghanistan have been Hispanic;

Whereas, as of September 30, 2009, there were approximately 1,332,033 Hispanic veterans of the United States Armed Forces;

Whereas 41 Hispanic Americans have received the Congressional Medal of Honor, the highest award for valor in action against an enemy force that can be bestowed upon an individual serving in the United States Armed Forces;

Whereas Hispanic Americans are dedicated public servants, holding posts at the highest levels of government, including 1 seat on the Supreme Court, 2 seats in the Senate, 24 seats in the House of Representatives, and 2 seats in the Cabinet; and

Whereas Hispanic Americans harbor a deep commitment to family and community, an enduring work ethic, and a perseverance to succeed and contribute to society: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the celebration of Hispanic Heritage Month from September 15, 2011, through October 15, 2011;

(2) esteems the integral role of Latinos and the manifold heritage of Latinos in the economy, culture, and identity of the United States; and

(3) urges the people of the United States to observe Hispanic Heritage Month with appropriate programs and activities that appreciate the cultural contributions of Latinos to American life.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 15, 2011

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business tonight, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m., tomorrow morning, Thursday, September 15; that following the prayer and pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks, the Senate be in a period of morning business for 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each during that time, with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with the majority controlling the first half and the Republicans controlling the final half; that following morning business, the Senate resume consideration of H.J. Res. 66, a joint resolution regarding Burma Sanctions and the legislative vehicle for additional FEMA funds; and I also ask that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late Senator Malcolm Wallop of Wyoming.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. REID. We are now considering the Burma Sanctions and FEMA regulations. As a reminder, I filed cloture on the substitute amendment and the joint resolution today. If no agreement is reached, a cloture vote on the substitute amendment will occur Friday morning. The filing deadline for all first-degree amendments to H.J. Res. 66 and the substitute amendment is 1 p.m. tomorrow. However, we hope to reach an agreement to complete consideration of H.J. Res. 66 and the FAA and highway extensions during tomorrow's session. Senators will be notified when votes are scheduled.

As things now stand, we will have a series of votes on Friday.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. REID. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order, as a further mark of respect to the memory of Senator Malcolm Wallop of Wyoming.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:12 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, September 15, 2011, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

THE JUDICIARY

DAVID CAMPOS GUADERRAMA, OF TEXAS, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS, VICE DAVID BRIONES, RETIRED.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

MICHAEL ANTHONY MCAUL, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

IN THE COAST GUARD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. KURT B. HINRICH

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO SERVE AS THE DIRECTOR OF THE COAST GUARD RESERVE PURSUANT TO TITLE 14, U.S.C., SECTION 53 IN THE GRADE INDICATED:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

RDML DAVID R. CALLAHAN

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. RAYMOND V. MASON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

HYUN S. SIM

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY NURSE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be major

OLGA BETANCOURT

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be major

MICHAEL C. FREIDL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUAL FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY NURSE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be major

NATACHA L. MILLER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUAL FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY DENTAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be major

BENJAMIN D. OWEN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUALS FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be lieutenant colonel

HEIDI J. COX

To be major

JORDY C. COX
CHRISTOPHER A. KOVELL
RAFAEL NUNEZ
MARK A. RICH

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be major

COLIN A. BITTERFIELD
KENNETH H. SCHLORF II
STEPHEN J. SHANK
ANDREAS W. WOOTEN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

RICHARD J. ALLINGER
DALE J. BECK
JAMES D. BELLAMY
KENNETH W. BRACE
DANIEL W. CLARK
WILLIAM J. CLERKIN
CLAUDE N. CRESSY
ROBERT C. CROSVELL
TIMOTHY D. EVANS
WILLIAM G. FRANKENBERG
ELIZABETH F. HARRISON
ADRIANNE M. HOLT
ANA I. KUEHNE

JONATHAN R. LANE
KEITH L. LAWSON
WILLIAM R. MCSKIMMING III
JAMES H. MURPHY
ALAN NAPIER
FREDERICK S. REGEL
RICHARD B. SMESTAD
GREGORY J. SWATKOWSKI
PARIS D. UM
MICHAEL T. VAVREK
SHAWN A. WAGNER
ANGELA D. WOODS
MARGARET A. YOUNGBLOOD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE
ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

BRIAN R. BENJAMIN
THOMAS A. JOHNSON
GERALD L. LEMASTERS
CAROL M. PASCO
BRADLEY T. RICHARDSON
DELAINE L. SAWYERS
RICHARD C. SWOOPE, JR.
MARK D. YOUNG

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE
ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

TERESE B. ACOCCELLA
DANIEL F. BOHMER
WALTER H. CONNERY
JUAN J. FLORES
MARIA E. OTERO
BRYCE J. TAGGART
KIMBAL R. TAYLOR
RONALD S. WALLS
JEFFREY J. WEBB
LAURA A. WHEELER
GARY L. WILLIAMSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE
ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

MICHAEL D. ALPERIN
JAMES C. ANDERSON
PEDRO J. ARROYO
DAVID A. BALT
ROBERT C. BASS
JAMES L. BUDNY
DARRELL L. CASS
KEVIN B. COSTELLO
TIMOTHY C. COUNIHAN
MANUEL A. ECHANDI
EDGAR A. FIKE IV
VICENTE E. FONT, JR.
JOE B. FOX
LAURENCE W. GEBLER
BERNARD T. GEISER
DENNIS A. GORT
JONATHAN R. GREIFER
PIETRO GUADALUPI
SIMON HAMID
CARL T. HASSELMAN
JOHN W. HUNNICUTT
CYRUS S. KUMP
EDWARD A. LELONEK
CHARLES D. MAGRUDER
LAWRENCE MARTINEK
TAMARIN L. MCCARTIN
BRIAN P. MCGLINCH
JEFFREY J. MCINTURFF
ALEXANDRE F. MIGALA
CARL M. MINAMI
EDWARD A. PEREZCONDE
ANDREW C. PETERSON
SCOTT D. PICKER
STEPHEN E. POST
FABRIZIO REMOTTI
RICHARD A. REUTLINGER
HERBERT W. RIDYARD, JR.
STEVEN L. ROMITI
NELSON G. ROSEN
BROOK D. SCOTT
ROBERT L. SHERIDAN
LANCE S. SMITH
WILLIAM J. STANTON
JERRY J. SVOBODA
JACQUELINE S. THOMPSON
JOHN E. TIS
GINO T. TREVISANI
KURT VONFRICKEN
BARRY K. WADE
STEVE W. WAXMAN
DAVID S. WILLIAMS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE
ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

CLAYTON T. ABE
DANIEL W. ALLEY
ROY G. BASSETT
NATHANIEL F. BROWN
WAYNE A. CAROLEO
PAUL N. CERVONE
PHILIP A. DINGMANN
ALBERT F. DINICOLA
SANTOSH DODDAMANE
STEVEN C. ESHENAU
CLARENCE L. KEMP

RONY R. LEE, JR.
MICHAEL D. MONETA
JONATHON L. PARK
LEE A. PIETRANGELO
CARL T. REESE
HECTOR L. ROSADO
STEPHEN B. SHOOP
TERRENCE A. SMITH

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE
ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

GEORGE V. HANKEWYCZ
SU T. KANG
RALPH W. OGILVIE
DEAN J. ROBINSON
BARRY STEINBERG
HENRY K. THOMAS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE
ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

JOHN F. BOWLEY
ROBERT C. BYRD
LILLIAN M. CONNER
CHRISTOPHER M. COSHATT
GLENN E. GARLAND
RICHARD J. GREEN
ROBERT D. HARRINGTON
ROBERT B. KOHL
MARY D. LEE
CAM W. LITTLE
DAVID C. MATHIS
TERRY A. MCCOOE
KRISTIN L. RAJALA
JAMES H. TIMMONS
MAUREN E. WEBER

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

DAMON M. ARMSTRONG
CODY B. AULL
CHARLES D. BAKER
SARAH B. BALLARD
JASON S. BALLIN
DEBRA D. BANKS
SEAN M. BARANIAK
PATRICK D. BARKER
THOMAS K. BARLOW
PETER J. BAUMEISTER
CARRIE A. BEATY
JASON R. BERNHARD
DANA L. BOE
STEVEN P. BOE
DENISE BOGGSWILKERSON
FRANK J. BOGNI
JACK R. BRANDAU
KENT C. BRANDEBERRY
ANDREW M. BRANHAM
NICHOLAS J. BREMER
BRIDGET S. BROWN
KEVIN A. BROWN
ANDREW S. CAMARATA
JACOB L. CAMP
HELEN L. CANN
AMY A. CANUSO
SAMUEL N. CAOILE
GREGORY G. CAIPRA
PETER N. CARBONE
BROOKE A. CAUFIELD
KAI Y. CHENG
REGINA R. CHINSIOWKONG
CHRISTINA M. CHIRICO
ANNA Y. CHOE
JAMES K. CLARK
JUSTIN S. CLARK
THERESA R. CLARK
JOHN T. CLEAVES
JAMES C. CLIFFORD
CAROLYN F. COGHILL
JOSHUA S. COLMAN
KRISTINA A. CONLEY
JONATHON COOKE
JAMES S. CORTES
WILLIAM J. COTTER III
STACY L. COULTHARD
BRADY B. COX
PATRICK D. CRONYN
BRYAN A. CURRIE
GREGORY A. DADEKIAN
BRANDON L. DAVALL
LAWRENCE C. DECKER
KRISTINA L. DEPAOLO
JENNIFER R. DERBY
JOSHUA P. DETTMER
JAY R. DIAZPARLET
ANGELA M. DICARLOMEACHAM
BRIAN M. DIMMER
MARK S. DOUGLAS
ROBERT W. ENGELN
JEREMY S. ENNIS
SARAH M. ESCOTT
LINETTE J. EWING
JERRY J. FASOLDT
DARYL B. FICK, JR.
SETH Y. FLAGG
DANIEL A. FOSTER
ELIZABETH M. FOWLER
JAMES R. FREDERICK

JON R. FREDERICK
KYLE D. GADBOIS
MICAH J. GASPARY
SARAH B. GENDERNALIK
ANTONINO GERMANA
ANTHONY A. GIBERMAN
LISA K. GIBSON
ERIC E. GLASS
JOSEPH P. GORMLEY
RYAN K. GOULD
SUZANNE R. GUDEMAN
PHILIP A. HAGAN
JESSICA M. HAMEED
NATHAN C. HAMMEL
JUSTIN A. HARDER
TRAVIS E. HARRELL
NIEKA K. HARRIS
JARED L. HARWOOD
ERIC W. HEWITT
YOREL C. HICKERSON
AMANDA I. HIGGINSON
JENNIFER L. HIPFLORES
GEORGE J. HNATH
ERROL C. HULL
MARK E. HUMPHREY
MEGHAN E. HUNTER
MATTHEW S. IRWIN
ASHLEY Y. JACKSON
SHANE D. JENSEN
PAUL D. JOHENK
CHARLES E. JOHNSON
JAMIE S. JOHNSON
JULIE L. KAESBERG
JEAN D. KEMP
JONATHAN S. KERR
CECILIA M. KIPNIS
LEAH K. KOHLER
KELLY G. KOREN
KATHERINE J. KOSS
JENNIFER A. KRUSE
TREVOR L. KUTTLE
MARCY G. LAKE
IAN A. LANG
MATTHEW A. LANGFORD
MICHAEL F. LAROCHELLE
KELLY S. LARSON
SUZAN M. LEWIS
SCOTT LIU
DEREK N. LODICO
DAWN M. LONG
ADRIENNE M. LOPATA
KATHLEEN M. LOVE
MARTIN W. LUNCEFORD
DIANA M. MACLAN
JOHN S. MADDOX
PATRICK W. MAGAJNA
RYAN A. MAKAR
KATHERINE L. H. MALOZZI
VENKAT R. MANGUNTA
DALICE A. MARRIOTT
MALCOLM C. MASTELLER
DOUGLAS C. MCADAMS
ELEXIS C. MCBEE
AMANDA C. MCCAULLEY
JONATHAN D. MCDIVITT
CHRISTINE E. MCDONALD
PATRICK T. MCVEY
ELLIE C. K. MENTLER
CAROLINE T. MESSMER
MATTHEW F. MESSOLINE
JORDAN J. MICHELENA
DEREK M. MILETICH
JONATHAN P. MILLER
CHRISTINE M. MINEROWICZ
TINIKKA A. MONTGOMERY
HEIDI K. MORGAN
LUCAS A. MUELLER
LYNTIA H. MULINS
KRISTINE B. MUNOZ
NOREEN E. MURPHY
ERIK J. NAGEL
JOSHUA D. NASSIRI
BENJAMIN E. NELSON
NICHOLAS T. NELSON
LUKE C. NICHOLAS
ANDRES A. NIETO
JUSTIN J. NORR
THAYTS S. NOVAKOFF
MICHAEL J. OKASINSKI
NIELS H. OLSON
CHRISTIAN W. ORAM
YAN T. ORTIZPOMALES
BENJAMIN J. OSBORNE
AMANDA E. OWENS
ALFRED E. OWINGS II
MICHAEL B. PAUL
JAMI J. PETERSON
HOANGANH PHAN
AARON J. PHARISS
CHRISTOPHER R. PHILLIPS
HUY Q. PHUN
KEVIN A. PINKOS
ALEXANDRA L. PINON
MARINELLE PLATON
AJA E. POLARD
MICHAEL W. PRUITT
TAMEKA J. PYLES
SARA J. QUAN
JOSHUA D. QUICK
JODIE D. RAPPE
ROBERT M. REED
SHANNON F. REEVE
KEITH E. REID
AARON J. REILLY
JASON P. RICE
JAMES R. RIPPPE
JOHN S. ROBERTSON

MATTHEW W. ROSE
JONATHAN M. ROTH
LEAH S. SAG
ADAM M. SANBORN
MICHELLE J. SANGIORGI
BRENDA J. SCHMIDT
BRIAN L. SCHMIDT
BREMEN K. SCHULTZ
PETER G. SEGUIN
JEREMY K. SELLEY
KELLI K. SHANNON
ANDREW E. SHEEP
ANGELA Y. SHEN
ALEXANDRA L. SINGER
MANISH SINGLA
KRIS SIRIRATSIVAWONG
MONIQUE E. SMITH
ROBERT B. SMITH
JENNIFER L. SOGGE
JEFFREY S. SORENSEN
CLAIR K. J. ST
SHANNON M. STACY
JAMES E. STANTON
EDWARD T. STICKLE, JR.
CORRIE E. STOFCHO
CHAD A. STORCH
JIMMY SUVATNE
NICHOLAS N. SWEET
AARON W. SWENSON
NADINE S. TASSIN
VIRGINIA P. TETI
ANGELA L. TOMASCHKO
ARTURO G. TORRES
KATHERYNN H. TRAN
DOUGLAS M. TURNER
ROBERT N. UNISZKIEWICZ
TYLER A. VACHON
FRANK E. VILLAUME IV
SHELTON A. VIOLA
CATHERINE M. VISINTAINER
HERRMANN P. F. VON
ROBERT B. WALTON
KARA B. WANCHICK
WILLIAM H. WARD
REX S. WATSON
AMY M. WELLS
NICHOLAS J. WELLS
DARYL W. WILLIAMS
RAQUEL T. WILLIAMS
DERIC M. WILSON
MATTHEW R. WILSON
BENJAMIN D. WIND
KRISTI M. WOOD
JEFFREY C. WORTHLEY
BRUCE A. YEE
MARISOL C. ZIEMBA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

JAMES P. ALDERETE II
JENNIFER D. ANDERSON
RANDY L. BALL
ERIC F. BAUMAN
SAMUEL S. BECK
ROBIN C. BENNETT
KITTIMA BOONSIRISERMSOOK
MARK A. BUCKNER
JORDAN N. BUZZELL
LAURA N. CARLE
JOSHUA E. COHEN
ANTHONY L. DAVIS
JEFFREY A. DRAUDE
MICHAEL G. FOUST
EDWARD J. GIVENS, JR.
JAYSON H. HUBER
DIANA H. KIM
PAUL E. KOCIAN
JASON W. MATHYS
DAVID C. MYHRE
CALEB J. NOORDMANS
CHRISTOPHER S. OSWALD
KENNETH J. OTTERSTEDT
MELANIE A. PERRY
BARRY E. PETERSON
JOHN J. PETRINI, JR.
AARON E. QUITMEYER
VERNE F. REED II
ANGELA C. SESSA
ANDREW D. SILVESTRI
SHAWN D. TEUTSCH
PHILLIP S. TIMMONS
VINH T. TON
JOSHUA C. TREESH
DUANE A. VANNIEUWENHUYZEN
WALTER B. VOLINSKI, JR.
JOHN P. WALSH
EVAN R. WHITBECK
SETH T. WILLIAMS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

SAAD M. ALAZIZ
DAVID H. ALLGOOD
EFLAND H. AMERSON
CLEMIA N. ANDERSON
JOHNFRITZ E. ANTOINE
RAOUL ARCHAMBAULT
JANETTE B. ARENCIBIA
LAURA J. BARKER
CHRISTOPHER E. BARNES
ALLISON L. BENNETT

WILLIAM O. BENNETT
WILLIAM R. BERG
HYRUM T. BROSSARD
FELECIA E. BROWN
JERRY BROWN III
ROXANNE G. BURRUS
LINDA P. BYRNE
TILFORD L. CLARK
JANIESE A. CLECKLEY
HEATH M. CLIFFORD
KAARIN E. COE
KATHLEEN A. COLTER
JOHN O. COOKE
BARRY A. COOPER
WILLIAM T. CRIDER
TIMOTHY V. CRUICKSHANK
MICHAEL A. CZIGLER
GRAHAM T. DANYLEYKO
DAVID P. DAY
CHRISTOPHER S. DEANGELIS
NANCY C. DELAHOYA
PRASAD B. DIWADKAR
KYLE D. DOHM
EMILY M. DOVER
MARIA D. EDUSADA
TESHARA E. FELDER
JOHN J. FRASER
REINA GOMEZ
PAUL C. GRAF
DANIEL O. GRAJEDA
TOBIJAH T. GRIFFIN
FERNANDO S. GUEVARRA, JR.
SAACHA L. HAKE
MELISSA J. HARNLY
JOHN R. HAWLEY
WILLIAM P. HAYWOOD
SCOTT A. HAZELRIGG
AMY E. HENDRIX
NATALIA C. HENRIQUEZ
MONICA E. HERNANDEZ
MATTHEW J. HORNER
WILLIAM J. HOWES
DANIEL L. IMMEKER
SAMUEL H. JARVIS
ELMER L. JIMENEZ
BRADLEY E. JOHNSON
JASON M. JONES
PAMELA M. KLEPACTULENSRU
AUSTIN W. LATOUR
SAMUEL Y. LEVIN
CHRISTOPHER P. LINGARD
CARL E. LONG, JR.
DAVID J. LOOMIS II
KEVIN J. LYLE
SHAWNNA M. LYNCHCHEE
MICHAEL B. A. MABRY
RESSURRECCION J. MACASPAC
NICHOLAS J. MARTIN
KIMBERLY L. MARYMAN
ELENA M. MATHIS
VENANCIO MAYSONET
JOHN W. MCAFEE
KEVIN P. MCMULLEN
TERRY D. MILES
JOSHUA A. MILLER
WILFREDO MORALES
GINA L. MOROSKY
MARLO M. NARRO
JULIA A. NECZYK
JAMES F. NOEL
JAMES M. NOGLE
KIMBERLY A. DELSCHLAGER
AYDELE O. OLABISI
TERRI K. OSNER
ANTHONY D. OWENS
EMILY A. OWENS
TOBY W. PALMER
MARGARET M. PARKS
MICHAEL S. PAYNE
TREVOR S. PETROU
DARREN J. PIERCE
ROBERT A. PILLITIERE
BRYAN L. PYLE
ADAM C. RAE
CALVIN W. RALLS, JR.
JEROME E. RANDLE
MATHEW A. RANDOLPH
ROY J. RANGLIN
ALBERT RICCARDI III
MEGAN J. RIEMAN
DAVID R. ROBSON
CARMEN F. ROWE
MICHELLE L. SCHOLL
NATHAN L. SEAMAN
ANTON SHUPUTINSKY
NATHANIEL M. SMITH
JOSEPH A. SORCIC
DARCY L. SOWARDS
LOREN E. STANDLEY, JR.
KEVIN L. STARKEY
JOSEPH G. STASTNY
SAM STEPHENS
GEORGE H. STERNS
MELISSA J. STRAHAN
LEEDJIA A. SVEC
FRANCIS TAM
ELMER F. TAYLOR, JR.
JESUS S. THOMPSON
SHANNON K. THOR
TYLER J. TOWERS
JAMES E. TUBERSON
MONIKA J. TUBERSON
KATHERINE L. VOGEL
DEAN J. WAGNER, JR.
SCOTT F. WEIDNER
JEREMY D. WILKINSON
BRANDON J. WILLIAMS

THOMAS M. WILLIAMS
SEAN O. WILSON
CHRISTINE M. ZOHLER
MICHAEL A. ZUNDEL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

MICHAEL W. BLOOMROSE
DYLAN T. BURCH
HEATHER L. CASSIDY
JASON W. CONNORS
BRETT D. COOK
MARIO M. CORREA, JR.
MATTHEW P. CUTCHEN
CHRISTOPHER J. DEERWESTER
JONATHAN T. FLYNN
NATHANIEL R. GROSS
JUSTIN C. HENDERSON
JAMES M. KENNEDY, JR.
RUSSELL A. LANNUTTI
GREGORY W. MANZ
DAVID A. MELSON
BENJAMIN C. ROBERTSON
JACOB W. ROMELHARDT
LISA M. SENAY
DAVID M. SHULL
CHRISTOPHER C. SWAIN
JAMES M. TOOHEY
CHRISTOPHER P. TOSCANO

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

HECTOR ACEVEDO
ERICA L. ARNOLD
DAVID M. AUERBACH
RAFAL B. BANEK
DORA M. BERRIOS
SHAWN R. BOWDOIN
ARON W. BOWLIN
KELLY J. BOWMAN
JENNIFER M. BROOKS
BRANDI M. BROWN
CORNELIUS B. BROWN
JEAN E. BRUTON
CRYSTAL A. BRYANT
MELISSA K. BURKE
MARGARET A. S. BUSH
REGINALDO F. CAGAMPAN
LORI A. CAMPBELL
RICHARD B. CANONG
WARREN L. CANTRELL
TREVOR W. COLEMAN
CECILLA R. COLEMAN
TAMERA A. CORSON
CURT P. CUNNINGHAM
JOANNE E. DANA
CHRISTINE D. DAVIES
DIANE L. DAVIS
WALTER J. DAVIS
CHEVAUX D. WIKINS
LISA L. DOBISON
DANA DONES
LANOE K. DOWNING
JAMES J. DRISCOLL
NICOLE J. DUFFY
STEPHANIE L. DUFFY
CHRISTA D. DUNCANARFAA
VANESSA R. DUNN
BRIAN E. ELLIS
CAROL M. ELSWORTH
BROOKES A. ENGLEBERT
JAMES L. ESTOESTA
ARNOLD FAJAYAN
CHERIE D. FERRIS
KIMBERLEE P. FLANNERY
THOMAS N. FULLER
GERALD T. GAMBALA
LACY L. GEE
ERINN V. GELAKOSKA
ELIZABETH K. GLOOR
KOREY A. GOULETTE
NOELLE M. GRIFFITH
STACEY M. HAMLETT
JASON A. HARRISON
BRADLEY S. HAZEN
JOHN F. HENLEY
LAWRENCE B. HENRY
RACHEL S. HERNANDEZ
DANETTE R. HINELY
JAMES T. HINKLE
TINA M. HITCHNER
TODD A. HLAYAC
PATRICIA A. HORN
PENNY J. JIMENEZ
ROBERT D. JOHNS
GREGORY A. JONES
ELIZABETH A. JORDAN
JAMES A. KETZLER
CASEY V. KIRBERGER
SHERRI L. LAMMERDING
SHANE E. LAWSON
SARAH A. LEDFORD
BRANDON J. LIMTIACO
MARY F. LISEC
JOHN LITCHEFIELD
LEAH M. LIZADA
RODRIGO F. LOPEZ
RUBEN A. LOPEZ
CAROLE N. LOUIS
SCOTT M. MACDONALD
JOSEPH D. MCBEAIRN

CHRISTOPHER J. MCCOMB
TONIA M. MCGHEE
ALEAH J. MCHENRY
HILARY A. MEYER
ERIC J. MILLER
JESSICA M. MILLER
MARK J. MILLER
ERIN C. MOHAN
SHAYNE O. MORRIS
AARON C. MYERS
DENISE D. NEUMANN
SO Y. NEWTON
ERIN R. OCKER
KAREN L. ORTOLANI
NANCY M. PEREZ
GLORIA C. PIERCE
JOSE L. PINON
TINA PLAGGEMEYER
TREVA POERSCHMANN
SHANNA C. POWELLSEARCEY
SHARON QUALLIO
JAMES D. REICHERT
MICHAEL J. RIEGLER
JESSICA J. ROBINSON
WILLIAM J. ROLFES
GAYLORD M. ROMEROSA
MICHELLE E. SANABIA
STEVEN K. SARRO
PETER W. SCHENKE
EILEEN SCOTT
ANGELA M. SMITH
FIDEL S. SORIANO
CHAD M. SPRINGER
KIMBERLY STUART
STACEY M. STUMP
KENDER W. SURIN
JAMES A. TAMPLIN
STEPHEN V. THATE
FRANK D. TRATCHEL
BETTY A. ULMER
SHERWIN VALDEZ
LIGIA B. VILLAJUANA
MICHELLE L. WESTCOTT
CAROL E. WHEELER
ABIGAIL T. WHITE
MARIA WILLIAMS
RILEY L. WILLIAMS, JR.
ALFONZA WILLIS
BRANDON K. WOLF
DARCY T. WRIGHT
ANTHONY D. YARBROUGH
JAY ZULUETA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

JAVIER ARAUJO
FLORENCE D. BEATO
KRISTINA J. BICKING
BRYAN A. BOGGS
CLINTON S. BRYANT
TIMOTHY J. CALVO
KURT A. CELIS
PETER CHANG
KELLY M. CHUFO
BRIAN D. COLBURN
ERIC J. COOMES
TANYA K. CORMIER
AUTUMN L. DANIEL
EUGENE DAWSON, JR.
ANTHONY R. DICOLA
KIRK A. ENGLER
LEE H. EUBANKS
JOEL B. FREY
MONICA M. FREY
SCOTT W. FUTRELLE
PHILLIP J. GAGEN
JESUS M. GARZON
JUAN C. GONZALEZ
TERRY C. GRIGSBY
IVAN R. GUMBS
ANTHONY D. HARPER
JARRED S. HENLEY
JACKIE B. HURSE
SCOTT T. HUTTLESTON
WILLIAM M. JAKUBOWICZ
KEVIN J. KENT

MORDOCAI KIFLU
CRAIG A. KNOX
WALTER L. LAPTEW, JR.
SCOTT A. LONG
TAQUINA T. LUSTER
MICHAEL J. MACOMBER
MICHAEL H. MALONE
THELMA L. MANNING
ERIC A. MELO
JOHN R. MEYER
JAMIE L. MITCHELL
JASON A. MORGAN
SEAN A. NEER
THUAN M. NGUYEN
TONY N. NGUYEN
DAVID J. OZECK
ANNE R. PAINE
DERRICK L. PASLEY
MICHAEL J. PEREIRA
DOUGLAS M. QUINN
CHRISTOPHER C. RADKE
RICO A. REYES
RICARDO R. RODRIGUEZ
DAVID M. ROSS
JASON W. ROSS
ERIKA M. SCHOENTHAL
FRANK W. SHERMAN
MATTHEW J. SHIELS
MICHELLE A. SIMMONS
ALBERT T. SONON IV
JOSEPH K. SPEDE
ROBIN L. TAYLOR
NICHOLAS A. ULMER
ERNESTO M. URETA
THOMAS G. WALKER
LAWRENCE S. WATKINS, JR.
MATTHEW D. WILCOX
KRISTOPHER F. WILLIAMS
CHRISTOPHER T. WILSON
RYAN J. WODELE
RAYMOND C. YAU

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

THOMAS T. COOK
JERRY D. DURHAM
PAUL B. GREER
SONG S. HWANG
JEFFERY B. JENKINS
JOHN F. KEITH
RONALD J. KENNEDY
NEAL R. KREISLER
TAVIS J. LONG
HARVEY C. MACKLIN
MYRON D. MCCONVILLE
ROBERT S. NELSON
MICHAEL Q. OBANNON
GLENN W. ORRIS
JEFFREY B. PARKS
CARL P. RHODAS
RAY F. RIVERS
LESZEK M. SIKORSKI
TIMOTHY A. SPRINGER
MICHAEL A. TAYLOR
GUY A. THOMPSON
COREY T. THORNTON
WAYNE N. TOMASEK
ULYSSES L. UBALDE
LEROY C. YOUNG

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

ADNAN S. AHSAN
CHRISTOPHER L. ALMOND
PETER R. BENSON
BLAKE E. BURKET
PETER R. CALI
JUAN CHAVIRA
BRIAN J. CRYSTAL
ARCE D. DOBLE, JR.
JAMES M. DOHM
GRADY D. DONATHAN IV
ELIZABETH A. DURIKA

ALAN W. EICHELMAN
TIMOTHY W. GLEASON
CRYSTINE M. GOOD
MICHAEL A. GUZZI
JACKSON R. HABECK
PHILLIP R. HAMROCK
BENJAMIN P. HOFMAN
DANIEL E. LUTZ
CHAD M. MARSHALL
ANDREW W. OLSEN
ERNESTO S. PADILLA
BRYAN M. PARNELL
WILLIAM R. PITCAIRN IV
AARON J. RIPPPE
CHARLES E. ROY
CLINTON R. ROY
DANIEL J. SCHMITT
BRIAN B. SCHONEFELD
JACOB W. SEGALLA
JAMES W. SHEFCHIK
SPENCER L. SHIH
THOMAS J. SOLETHIER
JUSTIN D. SPINKS
BENJAMIN H. TURNER
REBECCA L. WALDRAM

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

FABIO O. AUSTRIA, JR.
MARVIN G. BOONE
NOEL A. FONTANILLA
ERIC W. HASS
RHYSS B. HIZON
DANIEL C. LEWIS
ROLANDO R. PAGADUAN
LEON QUARLES
DONNA L. SMOAK

DISCHARGED NOMINATIONS

The Senate Committee on Foreign Relations was discharged from further consideration of the following nominations by unanimous consent and the nominations were confirmed:

MARY B. DEROSA, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ALTERNATE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE SIXTY-SIXTH SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS.

FRANK E. LOY, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ALTERNATE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE SIXTY-SIXTH SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS.

KENDRICK B. MEEK, OF FLORIDA, TO BE A REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE SIXTY-SIXTH SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate September 14, 2011:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

MARY B. DEROSA, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ALTERNATE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE SIXTY-SIXTH SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS.

FRANK E. LOY, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ALTERNATE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE SIXTY-SIXTH SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS.

KENDRICK B. MEEK, OF FLORIDA, TO BE A REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE SIXTY-SIXTH SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS.