

and 750 pounds—appeared in the streets of Washington. And it was not just another political statement.

The colorful animals on street corners were oversized piggy banks. Local middle school students and artists painted each one.

“Stash Your Cash” gets to kids early. It teaches them financial vocabulary, how to create a budget, and how and why they should save for the future. It teaches middle-school students that creating a budget helps them understand where their money goes, ensures that they do not spend more than they earn, finds uses for money to achieve goals, and helps them set aside money for the future.

We can all benefit from these lessons. Savings is vital for our children’s and our families’ financial future. And what is vital for our families is vital for our country.

Second, we need to make it easier to save.

The most successful savings programs are payroll-deduction savings through employer-sponsored 401(k) plans. We can make these programs even more successful by encouraging employers to enroll eligible employees automatically. Employees would opt out of saving instead of opting in. Without automatic enrollment, just two-thirds of eligible employees contribute to a 401(k) plan. With automatic enrollment, participation jumps to over 90 percent. The largest increases are among younger and lower-income employees.

Only half of private sector workers have a 401(k) or similar plan available to them. We need to bring payroll-deduction retirement savings to the other half.

Who is that other half? Part-time workers, those who put in less than 1,000 hours a year, do not have to be covered by 401(k) plans. Small employers are less likely to offer 401(k) plans, or similar arrangements, to their workers. And lower-income workers are less likely to have a plan available than moderate- and higher-income workers.

We have a voluntary pension system. We should not change that. But we can make savings opportunities available to more workers without forcing employers to provide more benefits.

Third, we need to make incentives for saving more progressive. Like many tax incentives, our current savings incentives give more bang-for-the-buck to those in the higher tax brackets. Our income taxes go to just the opposite.

In 2001, we took an important step toward fairness by creating the Saver’s Credit. The Saver’s Credit helps low-to-moderate-income taxpayers to save by providing a credit of up to half of the first \$2,000 that they contribute to an IRA or 401(k) plan. More than 5 million taxpayers claimed this credit in 2001. It works. But it will expire after 2006. We must extend it and we must expand it to cover those with no income tax liability.

In ancient times, people viewed the toil of farming as a curse. The ancient text tells how when man left the Garden of Eden, he heard God say:

Cursed be the ground because of you;
By toil shall you eat of it
All the days of your life:
By the sweat of your brow
Shall you get bread to eat,
Until you return to the ground—
For from it you were taken.

But now, increased investment, capital, and productivity have made it so that we may hear the blessing with which Moses blessed the children of Israel on the plains of Moab, across the River Jordan:

The Lord will give you abounding prosperity in . . . the offspring of your cattle, and the produce of your soil in the land that the Lord swore to your fathers to assign to you. The Lord will open for you His bounteous store, the heavens, to provide rain for your land in season and to bless all your undertakings. You will be creditor to many nations, but debtor to none.

From ancient times, the sages recognized that the terms “prosperity” and “debtor” rarely apply to the same country.

Let us return to being a country whose saving provides the seed corn that brings those blessings of “abounding prosperity.”

Let us seek the blessings of being “creditor to many nations, but debtor to none.”

And let us do the work that we need to do to see that “[t]he Lord will [continue]. . . to bless all [the] undertakings” of this great Land.

I yield the floor.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2006—Continued

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, there have been so many legislative fellows and interns requesting to have seats on the floor, I am not sure there will be room for any regular staff soon. So I am going to start refusing to agree to floor privileges unless we are sure that there is going to be space for those staff who are assigned to work with members of the committee on this bill.

It is our hope we will be able to get to a vote on the Harkin amendment soon. I want to make a short statement, and that is, we have had some information from the Department of Defense.

May we go back on the bill now? We are back on the bill automatically?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. STEVENS. I call the attention of my colleagues to the fact that the money for Iraq and Afghanistan is in a reserve account in this bill and, theoretically, it should have started being available this Saturday. It will only be available when this bill is signed into law by the President.

Sometime during the first quarter, operating accounts for day-to-day operation costs—operation and maintenance for the Army, for the Marine

Corps, and for the training efforts of Iraqis—are in the reserve account and will not be available. It is imperative we get this bill to the President so it can be signed to make the money available by the middle of November.

Increased fuel costs are putting pressure on operating accounts. We all know what it costs us when we pull up to a gas station and fill up a tank. It costs just as much or more to fill up the tanks in Iraq and Afghanistan for those people who are in the air and on the ground. That money is not going to be available unless we approve this bill.

One of the things that bothers me is that there is money in this bill to finance continued production of the C-130Js. That production contract is planned for mid-November, but there is no money available now. It will not be available until the 2006 bill is signed. There are a whole series of things in this bill that are designed to take the pressure off of the way the funding is being carried out at the Department of Defense. The ability to finance the improvised explosive device task force initiatives will be constrained unless that \$50 billion portion of this bill is passed.

So I urge the Senate to help us get this bill through as quickly as possible. I know that is sort of difficult now with the recesses that are coming up, but very clearly we are starting to get amendments that are not germane to this bill, and I hope that will not go on.

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.

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

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

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I and the Senator from Hawaii join in asking the clerks in both cloakrooms that they would send out a notice that we intend to move for third reading if there is no amendment presented within an hour.

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.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be dispensed with.

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

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I discussed this with the distinguished floor managers.

First, parliamentary inquiry: Is the Harkin amendment now the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the pending question.

Mr. LEAHY. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order to set aside

that amendment so the distinguished Senator from Missouri and I could offer an amendment, and that upon the completion of action or the setting aside, whichever transpires first, it be in order to return to the Harkin amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1901

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. LEAHY], for himself and Mr. BOND, proposes an amendment numbered 1901.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To appropriate \$1,300,000,000 for Additional War-Related Appropriations for National Guard and Reserve Equipment for homeland security and homeland security response equipment)

On page 228, between lines 4 and 5, insert the following:

NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE EQUIPMENT

For an additional amount for "NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE EQUIPMENT", \$1,300,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the amount available under this heading shall be available for homeland security and homeland security response equipment; *Provided further*, That the amount provided under this heading is designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 402 of the conference report to accompany S. Con. Res. 95 (108th Congress).

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, so Members will know, this amendment adds \$1.3 billion in emergency funding for National Guard equipment to the supplemental portion of the fiscal year 2006 Defense appropriations bill. The funding is set aside for the National Guard to buy much needed items for homeland security and natural disaster response.

Hurricane Katrina exposed glaring deficiencies in the equipment available for the National Guard to respond to such disasters. After Hurricane Katrina, we had barely sufficient levels of trucks, tractors, communication, and miscellaneous equipment that is necessary to respond to the overwhelming scale of this storm. If we have another hurricane or, God forbid, a large-scale terrorist attack, our National Guard is not going to have the basic level of resources to do the job right.

As we know, in every one of our 50 States, we have seen in our career times where the National Guard was called upon to help. The National Guard Chief, LTG Steven Blum, recently noted that the Guard has only about 35 percent of what is officially required to respond to hurricanes, natural disasters, or possible terrorist attacks at home.

Yesterday, in an appearance in the House of Representatives, General Blum noted that Guard members responded to this disaster with insufficient and outdated communications. General Blum noted we are going to need at least—a staggering amount—\$7 billion to procure the communications, trucks, medical supplies, and machinery necessary to respond to future disasters.

We knew, even before that hearing, that without any doubt there is an immediate need for at least \$1.3 billion. We have to procure essential equipment such as a family of medium tractor vehicles, new SINCGARS radios, night-vision goggles, and other equipment.

I ask unanimous consent that a recent report from the National Guard on these critical needs be printed in the RECORD.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

National Guard units that deployed to combat since September 11th have been the best trained and equipped force in American History. \$4.3 billion has been invested to provide those units with the very best, state-of-the-art equipment available in the world today.

This is an unprecedented demonstration of the DoD commitment to ensure that no soldier or airmen, regardless of component (Active, Guard, or Reserve), goes to war ill-equipped or untrained. With the help of the US Congress, this was accomplished over a two-year period. It is a reality for National Guard overseas combat deployments.

Now, the senior leadership of the DoD is extending the same level of commitment to the National Guard, the nation's first military responders in time of domestic need.

The DoD has a comprehensive reset plan that recognizes the National Guard's critical role in Homeland Defense and support to Homeland Security operations. This will take time and resources. I am confident that a real sense of urgency exists to make this a reality for America.

Communications equipment, tactical vehicles and trucks and engineer equipment are the National Guard's highest equipment priorities.

H. STEVEN BLUM, LTG, USA,
Chief, National Guard Bureau.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, we got into this situation for two reasons:

First, unfortunately, with all the other needs of this country, we have traditionally underfunded the National Guard's equipment level. Second, much of the equipment the Guard does have is being used in the ongoing war effort in Iraq, Afghanistan, and in our needs across the Middle East and Central Asia. We all know there is no prospect that we are going to see it again back in the United States any time soon.

The distinguished senior Senator from Missouri, Senator BOND, and I co-chair the Senate National Guard Caucus. On September 13, the two of us wrote the President to urge that the administration deal with this problem immediately. We want to demonstrate by our letter that this is not a partisan issue, it is a national issue.

We asked the President include the \$1.3 billion in the next supplemental spending bill to deal with Hurricane

Katrina. But we can't wait for the President to request the funding. We have to act now. The date this next supplemental spending bill will be submitted is still uncertain. We don't know when it is going to be submitted. But with this Defense appropriations bill, we have billions of dollars in emergency funding. Much of that emergency funding, rightly so, will go toward ensuring that our men and women abroad have the right tools to do their jobs. We should do that. But it is just as reasonable and necessary that we add emergency funding to deal with the equipment needs of our troops at home.

Certainly in the last couple of months, we have seen probably at no other time how much that equipment is needed, and we know there will be other occasions.

I praise Senator STEVENS and Senator INOUE for including so much equipment money for the Guard in supplemental baseline bills. While most of that new equipment will go toward the Guard's overseas warfighting needs, our Guard and Reserve have a greater percentage and a greater activity than at any time in decades, and they need the help. The funding we are now asking for takes a big step forward.

I have worked with them closely. Of course, I want to see the amendment accepted. I will, of course, ask for a vote, if we can't reach such agreement.

I know the distinguished Senator from Alaska and the distinguished Senator from Hawaii have spent even more years in this body than I have, and they worked closely to help our National Guard. Senator BOND and I have done our best to fashion a reasonable and necessary piece of legislation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I rise today to join wholeheartedly my National Guard Caucus cochairman, the distinguished Senator from Vermont, in urging the Senate to adopt these emergency appropriations for our National Guard.

We have had a lot of talk about emergency responders and people wondered, Did this group do their job? Did that group do their job? As Governor of Missouri for 8 years, I saw the National Guard respond, and respond fully, to every natural disaster we had. We had floods, we had tornadoes, we had some other civil disorders, and the Guard responded. They responded with the equipment they needed.

Since that time, I have served in the Senate as cochairman of the National Guard. I have seen the Guard continue to respond to State emergencies time after time after time. When they have been called upon to go abroad as part of the national defense mission, they have done so extremely well.

Unfortunately, the men and women of the National Guard, those vital citizen soldiers who volunteer to serve their country, have not been well resourced. It appears when equipment

is available the Pentagon obviously takes care, first, of the active. In this situation, we have seen a tremendous drain on equipment—not just from emergencies around the country but from the National Guard's participation and contribution of equipment to our overseas mission. As a result, the equipment readiness in critical areas of the National Guard has fallen to about 34 percent. We are asking the men and women of the Guard to go into situations—whether they be overseas military situations or a vital rescue mission such as New Orleans—without the equipment.

Our Guard, along with others, responded and responded promptly to the disaster of the gulf coast. They were in Louisiana. They went proudly. We sent an engineer battalion from Jefferson Barracks in Missouri. They went down there, and they performed admirably. They had one set of trucks, one set of communications equipment, and one set of night vision goggles. The need was great, and they asked for a second of the National Guard engineering units to be deployed. We had to refuse, not because we did not have the personnel ready—we did not have the trucks, we did not have the communication equipment. We absolutely could not respond in that situation because of a lack of equipment.

When we read the stories about the National Guard's participation, one gets a better understanding of how effective and how responsive the National Guard is.

As the Senator from Vermont said, we have requested that an emergency appropriation be added to the supplemental. I join with him today in asking the Senate to approve as an emergency appropriations measure the money we need. This money is critically important. It includes trucks. The big trucks the National Guard has can drive through flood areas. They can rescue people. They can also go in war zones. They need night vision goggles. You may think night vision goggles are necessary primarily in war. Think about going into New Orleans, which has lost all of its power, all of its lighting, and you are trying to find people who are in grave personal danger because of the rising floodwaters. You need the night vision goggles to see them. Most importantly, think about communications. How do they work with other units, other Federal units, other State units, when they are on a civil mission? When they are under control of the local officials who have the responsibility, who have the local command, how do they communicate with them? They cannot in too many instances.

That is why this particular appropriation is so important that we begin resourcing our Guard. We can all be very proud of the Guard in our States. We do not have every Member of the Senate as a member of the National Guard Caucus, but I have not found a Member of this Senate who is not ex-

tremely proud of his or her National Guard. They know when the chips are down, when lives are in danger, the Guard can and will respond. The Guard comes to our defense regularly. The very least we can do is make sure we support the Guard when they go in. Not giving them the equipment they need is not an answer. We are not going to send them into harm's way without the equipment to do their job.

This is an important amendment. This is a large sum. We, obviously, are very much aware of the needs. This is a pressing need, and the emergencies and the wartime situation we are in compel a response to the needs of the Guard.

I thank my colleague from Vermont for offering this, and I urge my colleagues to join in seeing that the National Guard gets the appropriation resources they need. I thank the managers of the bill.

I yield the floor.

Mr. LEAHY. I thank the distinguished Senator from Missouri. I was going to suggest that if the Senator from Alaska and the Senator from Hawaii want to accept the amendment, we could actually get some significant business done right here.

While they are thinking about this, I must say there are few people in this Senate more senior than I, but certainly the Senator from Hawaii is much more senior, the Senator from Alaska is much more senior. They are only two of five people senior to me, and they want a quorum.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BOND. 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. BOND. Mr. President, one of the minor procedural problems we have around here with an emergency clause is this has to go through several layers of clearance. It is not a higher pay grade, it is a different pay grade, it is a different responsibility. The distinguished floor managers are working on that. We have the budget committees and others who have to act on it.

I appreciate very much the work of Chairman STEVENS and Senator INOUE. I hope we will be able to resolve this very shortly. We have two of the best leaders in the Senate handling this bill. Whatever needs to be done I assure my colleagues will be done.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. STEVENS. 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. STEVENS. Mr. President, is the Harkin amendment the pending amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Leahy amendment is pending.

AMENDMENT NO. 1886

Mr. STEVENS. I ask unanimous consent the Leahy amendment be set aside and the Harkin amendment be brought before the Senate.

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

Mr. STEVENS. We have had some conversations about this amendment. It is an amendment that raises the subject of the way the Government is going to approach the great problems associated with Asian flu. Under the circumstances, it has been my recommendation that we take this amendment to conference because then the subject will be in this bill. If the agencies involved can come together with an appropriate plan and request for money, we would then be able to do this in conference.

Although I have had some question about this amendment, we have discussed this now with the author of the amendment. As I indicated to him, if it would pass, I would cosponsor, and I ask that my name be added as a cosponsor.

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

Mr. STEVENS. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Iowa.

The amendment (No. 1886) was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. BOND. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. The pending amendment is the Leahy amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Leahy amendment.

Mr. STEVENS. Is that the Leahy-Bond amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is.

Mr. STEVENS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BOND. 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. BOND. Mr. President, I clarify with the desk that I am shown on the Leahy amendment; it is the Leahy-Bond amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is listed as a cosponsor.

Mr. BOND. I thank the Chair.

NOMINATION OF JOHN ROBERTS

Mr. President, while I have the floor, I will reflect a moment on the vote we took earlier today. This vote has such weight because of its place in our system of government. The Supreme Court is a final voice on the extent of the rights guaranteed by the Constitution, the demarcation of power between

the legislative and executive branch of Government, and the division of power reserved for the Federal Government and the governments of the individual States. As a Member of this legislative body and in a former life as a State Governor, I am acutely aware of the importance of the lines and the consequences when they are broached.

As a Member of the Senate, I do not welcome decisions overturning legislative acts that I support, but I frequently work with my colleagues to reject efforts to meddle in State affairs. As a Governor attempting to guide my State, I had to labor through many burdens placed in our way, the State's way, by an intrusive Federal Government.

The judicial branch of our Government—most notably the Supreme Court—has been designated by the Constitution as the branch to maintain these divisions of power and referee the tensions between our governments. After observing Judge Roberts during the days of hearings before the Committee on the Judiciary, I am convinced the power that comes with the vote of a Supreme Court Justice will be in wise and capable hands.

Throughout the strenuous sessions, Judge Roberts' intelligence, patience, and temperament were on full display. Judge Roberts made a convincing case through words and demeanor that he will approach his responsibility with modesty and humility.

Also, as Judge Roberts repeatedly reminded his inquisitors, he is not a politician. I commend him on his willingness to remind my colleagues that he was not before Congress to compromise or give hints on how he might vote on a hypothetical case in exchange for confirmation votes; rather, he confirmed repeatedly that the Constitution will be his guide to these questions.

I suspect that some of my colleagues have come to rely on the judiciary to advance changes that have no support in the duly elected member of our legislature, State and national; hence, their frustration with Judge Roberts.

Judge Roberts has clearly defined views of the role of the judiciary and the role of the legislature, and they do not appear to be blurred. As Judge Roberts put it so well:

If the people who framed our Constitution were jealous of their freedom and liberty, they would not have sat around and said, "Let's take all the hard issues and give them over to the judges." That would have been the farthest thing from their mind.

As did the Founders, I do not believe State and National legislative bodies are incapable of settling tough and contentious issues. I do not believe it is benevolent or admirable for judges to remove questions from the public realm because they are divisive. Judge Roberts has shown the modesty and respect to refrain from that path.

Judge Roberts also has made it clear he finds no place for reflection on the public attitudes and legal documents of

foreign lands in the consideration of constitutional questions. They do not and should not offer any guidance as to the words and the meaning of our own Constitution.

During his testimony, Judge Roberts displayed a respect for the Constitution and the rule of law as the principles that should guide him when ruling on a case. His view of the role of the judiciary is very consistent with my own.

Finally, I believe President Bush has executed his duties in a responsible manner that will serve our Nation well. He interviewed many distinguished and qualified judges and attorneys in the country. He consulted with Members of the Senate. After careful and thoughtful deliberation, President Bush returned to the Senate the name of John Roberts. I am very pleased today that 78 Members of the Senate agreed and confirmed him to the Supreme Court.

Mr. President, I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. MURRAY. 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 remarks of Mrs. MURRAY are printed in today's RECORD under "Morning Business.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 6 minutes as in morning business.

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

(The remarks of Mr. ALEXANDER are printed in today's RECORD under "Morning Business.")

AMENDMENT NO. 1901

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be added as a cosponsor of the Bond-Leahy amendment regarding additional funding for the Guard and Reserve.

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

Ms. LANDRIEU. This is relative to the extraordinary work that they did in Hurricanes Katrina and Rita and the extraordinary work that our Guard does throughout the Nation. In fact, as I speak, I am sure they are on the ground for this unfolding tragedy in California with the fires. I am not able to speak more fully at this time but I wanted to register my support for the amendment and will speak later tonight. I understand this amendment may be accepted. I thank my colleagues for their great support at this time of obvious need. The people of Louisiana and the gulf coast are grateful.

I yield the floor.

AMENDMENT NO. 1901, AS MODIFIED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, the amendment before the Senate is now the Leahy-Bond amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. STEVENS. I have a modification at the desk. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be so modified.

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

The amendment, as modified, is as follows:

On page 228, between lines 4 and 5, insert the following:

NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE EQUIPMENT

For an additional amount for "NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE EQUIPMENT", \$1,300,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the amount available under this heading shall be available for homeland security and homeland security response equipment; *Provided further*, That the amount provided under this heading is designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 402 of the conference report to accompany S. Con. Res. 95 (109th Congress).

Mr. STEVENS. There was one problem. The number of the Congress has been changed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is so modified.

Mr. STEVENS. I ask for consideration of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the amendment? If not, the question is on agreeing to amendment No. 1901, as modified.

The amendment (No. 1901), as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. INOUE. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. 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. DURBIN. Mr. President, is there a pending amendment before us?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is not.

AMENDMENT NO. 1908

Mr. DURBIN. I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN], for himself, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. CORZINE, Mr. SALAZAR, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. BIDEN, Mr. NELSON of Florida, and Mr. BINGAMAN, proposes an amendment numbered 1908.

Mr. DURBIN. I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows: