



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 2011

No. 16

House of Representatives

The House was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Tuesday, February 8, 2011, at 2 p.m.

Senate

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 2011

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable TOM UDALL, a Senator from the State of New Mexico.

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.
Eternal God, whose Name is love, draw our Senators to You by the cords of Your eternal love. Help them to strive to know You, cultivating a relationship of peaceful trust in Your providential leading. Lord, may the experience of being in Your presence enable them to better comprehend the role You desire for them to play in fulfilling Your purposes on Earth. Sharpen their vision to perceive Your movements in our Nation and world. Where there is anxiety, give them the poise that comes from a confident faith in You.

We pray in Your merciful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable TOM UDALL 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 legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, February 3, 2011.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable TOM UDALL, a Senator from the State of New Mexico, to perform the duties of the Chair.

DANIEL K. INOUE,
President pro tempore.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

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

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I 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.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, there has been a minor change in the schedule. It has been cleared on both sides. I ask unanimous consent that, following any leader remarks, the Senate proceed to

a period of morning business until 10:30 a.m. this morning, with Senators permitted to speak during that period of time for up to 10 minutes each.

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

Mr. REID. Following that morning business, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 223, the Federal Aviation Administration authorization bill. Currently, we have one amendment pending. Other Members are waiting to offer their amendments. It is my understanding Senator WICKER is ready to offer his as soon as the bill is reported. Senators should expect rollcall votes to occur throughout the day in order to make significant progress on this most important legislation.

THE ECONOMY

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we have a long way to go before our economy is back to normal. Ask any American and they will tell you: We have a lot more jobs to create and fill, a lot more homes to save, and a lot more consumer confidence to recover.

I hear every day from families in Nevada who still need us to fight for them. I know every Senator hears the same from citizens in their State.

There are currently bits and pieces of good news. They are not enough, that is for sure. But the Dow Jones opened this morning above 12,000. That is the highest in many years. Manufacturing is rising more than expected. Consumer spending is beating forecasts also. Corporate profits are higher than anyone predicted. We got a decent jobs number

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S499

today, better than most economists predicted—not good enough but decent. So it is not all bad news. But I am not satisfied hearing that things are simply better than expected. Nevada, similar to every other State, is still hurting, and our job is not to beat expectations, it is to beat unemployment and beat back the deficit. We cannot assume we are back to normal every time we hear encouraging news. We don't have that luxury because it is not true. We can't let our guard down and we can't waste any more time on symbolic votes.

The fight to repeal the patients' rights enshrined in the health reform law is behind us now. The arguments have been made, the votes have been counted, and similar to the majority of the American people, the Senate has decided the law of the land is better than the broken system it replaced.

I don't wish to spend a lot of time talking about health care because the vote speaks for itself, but I will say this. Those who want to deny Americans the right to afford a healthy life had their say in 2008, when President Obama was elected on the promise of change. They had their say in 2009, when we first passed this law. They had their say in 2010, when we finalized it. Now they have had their say in 2011, when they tried to repeal it. Each time the votes fell on the side of patients, patients' rights—more rights, not fewer. The Senate voted each time to put people, not insurance companies, in control. The Senate voted each time for health, not sickness. So it is time to move on.

Let's talk about jobs. We are on a jobs bill right now, the Federal Aviation Administration authorization. The Aviation Modernization Act, which is this bill, is to bring to America modern air travel, travel into the 21st century. This legislation will create hundreds of thousands of jobs—not hundreds, not thousands but hundreds of thousands. That is why we are fighting so hard for this legislation. It is a bipartisan piece of legislation. It is not a Democratic bill. It is not Republican. It is a bipartisan bill. The same bill passed the Senate unanimously last year. So I hope we come together in the spirit of compromise we all promised and finish it as quickly as possible. This bill alone will not eradicate unemployment, but it will help. It is going to move us further toward that goal, and the quicker we pass it the quicker 280,000 Americans will breathe easier by knowing a good, consistent paycheck is on the way.

We are all concerned about the deficit. There is nothing more important than creating jobs, though. We can never have a healthy economy when we have 15 million people out of work. We can never have a balanced budget when we have 15 million people out of work.

The deficit is something that is very important. Jobs, as I indicated, will work toward solving that problem, but it is not the only way to strengthen

our economy. We also need to keep digging out of the fiscal hole we inherited over the last decade. In the short term, we can responsibly cut spending. In the long term, we can cut our deficit. There are some things we have to be careful to avoid, such as jeopardizing the full faith and credit of our great country. That is what will happen if we don't raise our Nation's debt limit. If we don't act, if we allow the country to default on our legal obligations, we will send our economy into default for the first time in its history. That will certainly not save a single job or save a single home from foreclosure or encourage the domestic and foreign investment we need to grow. It will be just the opposite. Each of these steps is an important stride toward recovery. Together, they are a powerful leap forward.

We might be on the right track and heading in the right direction, but we still have a ways to travel. Let's avoid the temptation to get distracted and derailed. Let's keep driving toward that goal. If we work toward putting people back to work, soon Nevada and every other State will not just read good news in a headline here or there, they will see it before their eyes—in their workplaces and in their wallets and throughout our country.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

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

CENTENNIAL OF RONALD REAGAN'S BIRTH

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, this month we celebrate the 100th anniversary of the birth of Ronald Reagan, our Nation's 40th President. He was born in a second-story apartment above a tavern in small-town Tampico, IL, on February 6, 1911.

The values he learned there he would carry with him throughout a long and momentous life—from the radio announcer's booth, the Hollywood sound stage, and the union leader's negotiating table to the Governor's mansion, the White House and the world.

One hundred years after his birth, 30 years after his inauguration as President, and only 7 years after his passing, it is already widely acknowledged by both sides of the aisle that Ronald Reagan was a great man and a great President. His role in ending the Cold War, with America victorious and the forces of Marxism-Leninism, as he so eloquently put it, "on the ash heap of history," has been assured. You could almost say we are all Reaganites now.

But oh, how so much has changed. For when Ronald Reagan was still a force actively shaping history, and not yet a part of it, he had many fewer friends.

One opinion writer in 1986 made his disdain clear when he wrote this:

It seemed to us, the carping critics, that this man was not terribly bright, not terribly thoughtful or well informed, not terribly honest, and in most other ways not up to the most important job in the world.

But it seems a lot of people just did not understand Ronald Reagan's vision at the time—not just his Communist adversaries, not just his political opponents here at home, even those in his own party, and on his own staff sometimes failed to see the strength of the man's commitment to freedom—or his courage in seeking it.

I can think of one prominent example: The words that we now think of as Reagan's most powerful utterance as President were almost never spoken. On June 12, 1987, Reagan traveled to what was then West Berlin to make unmistakably clear his commitment to increasing freedom in Soviet-dominated Eastern Europe. As the draft of his prepared remarks was circulated through the many byzantine layers of bureaucracy that come with the modern presidency, one little phrase kept getting edited out.

Virtually the entire foreign policy apparatus of the U.S. Government was opposed to what Reagan wanted to say. His Secretary of State, his National Security Adviser—they told him he would embarrass his host, West German Chancellor Helmut Kohl. They said he would anger and provoke Soviet Premier Mikhail Gorbachev. They warned he would arouse false hopes among the East Germans unlucky enough to live on the wrong side of the Berlin Wall.

It finally got to the point where Reagan had to have a confrontation with his own deputy chief of staff. "I'm the president, right?" he is reported to have asked. "So I get to decide whether the line about tearing down the wall stays in?" When assured that he was, and he did, Reagan said, "Then it stays in."

Only after pulling rank on his own staff this way did Reagan finally address the crowd of 20,000 gathered at the Brandenburg Gate and issue his famous declaration, "Mr. Gorbachev, tear down this wall."

Two years later, Germans East and West did exactly that, presaging German unification and the fall of the Soviet Union. A piece of the Berlin Wall is preserved today at the Ronald Reagan Presidential Library in Simi Valley, CA, to remind us of the power one man's words can have.

Ronald Reagan once said, "We don't have to turn to our history books for heroes; they are all around us." That is true even if you don't know where to look. Thirty years ago some dismissed Reagan as a man of no great importance. With hindsight it is much easier to see him for the giant figure in history that he was.

And while we are thankful that, for most of us, Ronald Reagan's vision and accomplishments are still within living memory, his life, his vision of a freer America and a free world, and his accomplishments to achieve that are most assuredly in the history books.

I yield the floor and I 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 Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. 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.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

FAA AIR TRANSPORTATION MODERNIZATION AND SAFETY IMPROVEMENT ACT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 223, which the clerk will report by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 223) to modernize the air traffic control system, improve the safety, reliability, and availability of transportation by air in the United States, provide for modernization of the air traffic control system, reauthorize the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Whitehouse amendment No. 8, to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide penalties for aiming laser pointers at airplanes.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, we are continuing this morning on this important FAA bill, which is a very important jobs bill for America. I know my colleagues have been down on the Senate floor—the chairman of the full committee, Senator ROCKEFELLER, and the ranking member, Senator HUTCHISON—and they have been doing a good job of explaining why it is so important to move ahead on something that can create hundreds of thousands of jobs both in construction at our airports across America and on the implementation of the NextGen system, which is really about making a digital conversion to air transportation so our flights can be safer, so they can be more fuel efficient, and so there can be coordination on the ground with the flights and all of our transportation systems.

So this morning we want to keep moving through this process to get this legislation done so we can get it implemented and start creating jobs and improving our air transportation safety.

I think there are amendments to be offered under the agreement. I will yield to my colleague from Mississippi.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Mississippi.

AMENDMENT NO. 14

Mr. WICKER. I thank the Senator from Washington, and I thank the Presiding Officer.

I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment so that I may call up my Wicker amendment No. 14, which is at the desk.

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

The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WICKER] proposes an amendment numbered 14.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To exclude employees of the Transportation Security Administration from the collective bargaining rights of Federal employees)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . EXCLUSION OF EMPLOYEES OF THE TRANSPORTATION SECURITY ADMINISTRATION FROM THE COLLECTIVE BARGAINING RIGHTS OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This section may be cited as the “Termination of Collective Bargaining for Transportation Security Administration Employees Act of 2011”.

(b) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 7103(a) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in clause (iv), by striking “; or” and inserting a semicolon;

(B) in clause (v), by striking the semicolon and inserting “; or”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(vi) an officer or employee of the Transportation Security Administration of the Department of Homeland Security;”;

(2) in paragraph (3)—

(A) in subparagraph (G), by striking “; or” and inserting a semicolon;

(B) in subparagraph (H), by striking the period and inserting “; or”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(I) the Transportation Security Administration of the Department of Homeland Security;”.

(c) **AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 49.**—

(1) **TRANSPORTATION SECURITY ADMINISTRATION.**—Section 114(n) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding “This subsection shall be subject to the amendments made by the Termination of Collective Bargaining for Transportation Security Administration Employees Act of 2011.” at the end.

(2) **PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT SYSTEM.**—Section 40122 of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by redesignating subsection (j) as subsection (k); and

(B) by inserting after subsection (i) the following:

“(j) **TRANSPORTATION SECURITY ADMINISTRATION.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section (including subsection (g)(2)(C)), this section shall be subject to the amendments made by the Termination of Collective Bargaining for Transportation Security Administration Employees Act of 2011.”.

(d) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act and apply to any collective bargaining agreement (as defined under section 7103(a)(8) of title 5, United States Code) entered into on or after that date, including the renewal of any collective bargaining agreement in effect on that date.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, this amendment deals with the notion of collective bargaining by TSA employees. The Transportation Security Administration was formed approximately 10 years ago by the Aviation and Transportation Security Act of 2001, Public Law 107-71. Since that time, Transportation Security Administration employees have fared very well. They are a familiar sight in our airports. They are familiar to any of us who fly and who frequent the airports of the United States. It is a good job, and they are well taken care of.

During that 10-year period, TSA employees have not been allowed to collectively bargain. There is a reason for that. First of all, under that act which I referenced, as a compromise back in that day, the Under Secretary of Transportation for Security, who is now the TSA Administrator, was given the ability to fix the compensation and terms thereof, and included in that was the determination about whether collective bargaining rights would be afforded to these TSA employees.

In a 2003 memo, the Under Secretary of Transportation for Security at that time prohibited TSA security screeners from unionizing with collective bargaining rights. The Under Secretary wrote:

I hereby determine that individuals carrying out the security screening function under section 44901 of Title 49, United States Code, in light of their critical national security responsibilities, shall not, as a term or condition of their employment, be entitled to engage in collective bargaining or be represented for the purpose of engaging in such bargaining by any representative or organization.

The determination was made by the predecessor of the TSA Administrator that in light of their critical national security responsibilities, it was not appropriate for collective bargaining rights to be included.

Now we have every reason to believe that under this new administration, that decision is about to be reversed. A decade of experience and practice will be ended unless this Congress acts, and the appropriate vehicle on which to act is this reauthorization bill before us. Wicker amendment No. 14 would simply exclude TSA personnel from forming a union with collective bargaining rights. I point out to my colleagues that the FBI and the CIA and the Secret Service, which all have similar critical national security responsibilities, do not have collective bargaining rights either. So the spirit of amendment No. 14 would be to continue TSA employees in that same vein.

TSA workers have fared well indeed during the past decade. It is a good job. I enjoy seeing them, I enjoy working with them, and we are glad to have them. But for good reason, they have been excluded from collective bargaining rights.

The TSA and TSA leadership need the flexibility to innovate and to move quickly during times of national emergency on issues involving the security

of the traveling public, and for that reason I submit that adding the burdensome responsibility of union demands and dealing with collective bargaining demands could limit the ability of those responsible for the very important function of security at some of the most high-risk targets and make it harder for our security personnel to do their job.

So I will be urging my colleagues during this day—we will be urging the American people to contact their Senators and to let their voices be heard. TSA has worked well in this regard, and we do not need to burden it with extra responsibilities when they need to be concentrating on security.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

PROTESTS IN EGYPT

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, over the last week, I have watched the affairs in Tahrir Square in Cairo, as millions of Americans have, and I was deeply impressed by the peaceful demonstration of Egyptian citizens calling for change in their nation—change that would respond to the economic plight of ordinary citizens, change that would give ordinary citizens the opportunity to be a part of the voice directing the course of their nation.

Until yesterday, those protests were absolutely peaceful. But that did change yesterday when pro-Mubarak forces entered the fray. Last night, I was watching as Molotov cocktails were being thrown by pro-Mubarak forces down from adjacent buildings onto the protesters below. I watched as organized thugs proceeded to stone those protesters. I watched as there was sporadic gunfire in the square. I watched as a group of horsemen galloped through the crowd whipping people with their whips.

This thuggery against citizens who were peacefully protesting is absolutely unacceptable. The United States has had a long and close relationship with Egypt. We channel a tremendous amount of economic development aid to Egypt. But let me be very clear. What happened yesterday cannot happen again. What happened yesterday, with thugs attacking peaceful demonstrators on behalf of the government must not happen again.

In no way can America turn a blind eye to this ruthless assault on ordinary citizens. This morning, there were voices from within the Egyptian Government calling what happened yesterday a fatal error. Prime Minister Shafik called it a fatal error. This morning, there were signs that the army, instead of allowing and organizing thugs and allowing them on the square to assault the demonstrators, was standing in to protect them. This is a right turn of events.

Let it be noted by all who would care to listen that the citizens of the United States of America are not going to stand by and support a government

that is attacking peaceful demonstrators in a square in Cairo. If we see a repeat of this violence, America must send a very strong message that there will be no further aid to the Mubarak government.

We do not know what the ultimate outcome of these protests will be, but peaceful action against government is a hallmark of democracy, a hallmark of freedom. We should ensure that those protests could continue—those peaceful protests—calling for a voice for ordinary citizens, and that Egypt can move toward free and fair elections.

I yield the floor.

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

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 5

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to temporarily set aside the pending amendment so I can call up my amendment, No. 5, which is at the desk.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. BLUNT] proposes an amendment numbered 5.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To require the Under Secretary of Transportation for Security to approve applications from airports to authorize passenger and property screening to be carried out by a qualified private screening company)

On page 311, between lines 11 and 12, insert the following:

SEC. 733. APPROVAL OF APPLICATIONS FOR THE SECURITY SCREENING OPT-OUT PROGRAM.

Section 44920(b) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking “The Under Secretary may approve any application submitted under subsection (a).” and inserting “Not later than 30 days after receiving an application submitted under subsection (a), the Under Secretary shall approve the application.”

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, this is an amendment that deals with an issue going back to the beginning of the TSA screening program, almost 10 years ago now, at the end of 2001. We had significant discussion between the House and the Senate about how that program would run. In fact, the House, which I was a Member of at the time and the occupant of the chair was a Member of at the time, passed a bill which said

the screening would continue to be competitive and private and determined by local airports. The Senate's view at the time was this was a new responsibility that would be taken over everywhere by the Federal Government and the TSA.

The final determination was that, while the Federal Government would take this responsibility, there would be allowed to be pilot airports that would be determined and be monitored to determine whether a pilot project would verify that another alternative would be a competitive, private screening as one of the options available to airports. In fact, in 2004, the screening partnership program was created.

The pilots had worked. The verification was that the private screeners were performing at a level that was equal to that of the government-paid screeners, that the cost was comparable, and that airports in the future would be able to apply to go from the government-run program to a competitive program, and about 16 airports have done that. I think the biggest one is probably the San Francisco airport. The Kansas City airport, which I use and that I represent, may be the second biggest of those. Rochester, NY, is also in this program, as are a number of smaller airports.

In fact, as recently as a few months ago, the TSA was still telling airports and recommended to four airports in Montana—a State where seven of their airports are currently in this program—the TSA recommended to four more airports in Montana that they look at this program as a potential better alternative for them. Only in recent weeks did TSA determine in responses to the Springfield, MO airport, the four Montana airports, and perhaps as many as a handful of other airports that, no, we think that program is big enough. This is an option that is no longer available to local airport boards.

This amendment would reach the conclusion that the local airport board is still an important determiner of which system works best in an airport. Essentially, this amendment would tell the TSA that if local airports apply, the TSA would allow them to become part of the screening partnership program and treat them as they are treating the 16 airports that have been in that program—some for as long as a decade now, since the beginning of screening as we see it in airports today.

I hope we get to where we actually give authority back, or maintain authority at the local airport level to determine which system works better for them. A competitive system allows flexibility, and flexibility allows more adaptability, more innovation and, frankly, I think, encourages the government-run systems to be more competitive and responsive.

That is why I am offering this amendment. I hope it becomes part of this bill, and I look forward to working with the committee on this amendment and over the next few days as we

continue to debate FAA. This has a real impact on a number of the authorities that are under the Federal Aviation Administration. I think this is an important time to solve this problem. It is one that was created, in my view, totally by TSA deciding on their own something that the law never envisioned. I was part of that debate a decade ago. I know what the intention was, and it was not the intention of the pilot program, or of the determination we made at the end of 2001, that TSA would determine for local airport authorities what was best for their airport.

This amendment would require the TSA to work with local airports and implement their desire to change from the system they have at the time—totally run by TSA—to a system under the screening partnership program. That is the essence of this amendment, and I urge its adoption and inclusion in this bill.

I yield the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWN of Ohio). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 8

Mr. KIRK. Mr. President, today I am pleased to join Senator WHITEHOUSE, Senator BOXER and a growing list of my colleagues in support of the Whitehouse-Kirk-Boxer amendment that will improve airline safety throughout the Nation.

Most individuals are familiar with laser pointers that are often used in presentations. What you may not know is the growing danger these devices pose to pilots.

Last month, the FAA released nationwide data on lasers pointed at aircraft. From 2009 to 2010, incidents nearly doubled from 1,527, to 2,836. To show how quickly this has become a problem, when the FAA first began to track this problem in 2005, incidents were under 300.

Transportation Secretary LaHood has acknowledged this is a serious safety issue. Lasers can temporarily blind pilots, which is incredibly dangerous, but even more so during the critical time of takeoff and landing. Advancements in laser technology also are making the problem worse. Certain color variations, such as green lasers, are 35 times brighter than comparable red lasers.

This is a particular worry for me and for my State's busiest airport—O'Hare. According to the FAA, last year O'Hare had the second-highest number of laser events in the Nation at 98.

The Whitehouse-Kirk-Boxer amendment creates new penalties for knowingly pointing a laser pointer at an air-

craft, or at the flight path of an airplane. Commonsense exemptions are provided to allow further research and testing activities.

Current law has not kept up to date with this new threat. It is time we give law enforcement and prosecutors additional tools to reduce the likelihood of a tragedy.

The amendment is supported by the Air Line Pilots Association and the National Association of Police Organizations which includes the Federal Flight Deck Officers Association.

I thank Senator WHITEHOUSE and his staff for their leadership on this issue, and I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan proposal to help make our Nation's pilots, and especially their passengers, safer.

I yield the floor and 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. ROCKEFELLER. 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. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, we are sitting here, and what is good is we are not doing health care amendments. What is bad is we are not doing any amendments.

The Republicans have proffered a number of amendments. We need to do them by pairs so we can work them out. Some of them will be able to be accepted by voice vote. I expect that Senator WHITEHOUSE's on laser use into pilots' eyes will probably be accepted by voice vote. But he may want a vote. If I were he, I would want a vote because it is so important to emphasize the issue.

But we need to have Democrats—I know we have some amendments that Democrats want to offer. But they are not coming to the floor to offer those amendments. So this is my plea, through the distinguished Presiding Officer, for Democrats please to come to the floor and do their amendments.

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. INHOFE. 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. INHOFE. First of all, let me say that the manager has been very kind to me in offering to allow me to come up at some point. I do not care so much when it is, but I do have two amendments I have already discussed on the floor. I would like to get them in the queue so at some time we will be able to do that. So I would wait until such time as the majority feels it would be appropriate, and then I would be asking them if I can do that.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I understand the Senator from Okla-

homa has a particularly difficult scheduling problem right now and for most of the afternoon. So putting his amendments in and talking about them, whatever he wishes to do, is important to him and also is hard to do in terms of the schedule. So that renews my offer, my request, my prayer, that Democrats who have amendments will come down and offer them.

It is called the Federal aviation bill. It reauthorizes it. It is monumental, and we are kind of sitting here. So the Republicans are sort of doing their part, but the Democrats are not doing our part. So please come down, if you have amendments, because I wish to accommodate not just Senator INHOFE but all others who have amendments, many of which we can probably work out.

Some will be accepted by voice, others may have to be voted on. But we have to have amendments before we can get to any of that. So that is my request.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, reclaiming my time. First of all, I thank you very much. The one set of amendments I have, I would hope to get into the managers' amendment or somehow have them come up and even be voice voted. But they are issues I have talked about in the past quite often. I think we all understand—or most of us do—that when our good friend Senator Glenn retired, that left me as the last active commercial pilot, on a regular basis, in the Senate. So I have these two amendments I am very interested in. I will yield the floor. When such time comes—what the Senator from West Virginia said is true. Right now, because of the Prayer Breakfast that is taking place, I happen to be hosting the African dinner tonight, so I have groups coming by every 30 minutes throughout the day.

At some time today, I wish to be able to get two amendments, Nos. 6 and 7, in the queue.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

REMEMBERING DON TYSON

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I come to the floor to honor a great man, a great Arkansan and a great American, Donald John Tyson.

Don Tyson was one of the three iconic Arkansans who helped move our State forward. Don Tyson, Sam Walton, and J.B. Hunt transformed the northwest part of our State and made Arkansas a mecca for business.

When I think of Don, one of his favorite phrases comes to mind. He would say: "I don't have time to have a bad time." Don lived life to the fullest and enjoyed every minute of it. Don came to Arkansas in very humble circumstances. He was born in Kansas but moved to Springdale as an infant when, as Don liked to tell it, his father's truck ran out of gas.

There in Springdale, Don took over the family business when his father passed away. Don's hard work helped

turn his father's small poultry business into the most successful meat processor in the world. As chairman of the board and CEO of Tyson Foods, Don revolutionized the poultry industry and made protein more accessible to Americans, helping create Chicken McNuggets, chicken tenders, chicken sandwiches, and much more.

He was responsible for developing the Rock Cornish game hen, smaller birds that weigh only a few pounds that were more profitable but also immensely popular. Under Don's leadership, the company's revenue increased from \$51 million to more than \$10 billion.

As the Washington Post said: "For many Americans, Tyson products became the answer to a daily question: What's for dinner?"

Even as he rose to great heights, Don remained true to his roots—his trademark khaki Tyson uniform with "Don" embroidered on the front pocket. He referred to all staff members as coworkers, never employees. Don understood that the truck drivers and plant workers were as essential to Tyson's success as the executives in the corner offices.

Don was also committed to giving back to his community. A noted philanthropist, Don created the Tyson Family Foundation, which provides scholarships for students from communities where Tyson Foods operates, including many communities in Arkansas.

Don was a huge supporter of the University of Arkansas, helping fund many of the school's educational and athletic programs. He also was a great friend to veterans. One of his most recent projects was helping preserve the Fayetteville National Cemetery. An avid fisherman and devoted conservationist, Don created the Billfish Foundation, which promotes catch-and-release practices for billfish to conserve their populations. Don's charitable work had a real impact on Arkansas and communities across the country.

Finally, Don understood the importance of family. Tyson Foods has always been and remains a family-run business, starting with Don's father John Tyson and continuing with his son John. Don's emphasis on family, from his father-son collaborations to the way he treated all his coworkers as extended family, is what made Tyson Foods great.

In looking back on Don Tyson's life, I see a man who loved his business, who loved his community, who loved his family, and who lived life. Today, I join all Arkansans in celebrating a life well lived.

Don, you will be missed.

Mr. INHOFE. Will the Senator yield?

One of the things that is interesting about northwest Arkansas is that you were just talking about Don Tyson. You could just as well have been talking about Sam Walton, Hunt, and many others.

I do not know what it is about northwest Arkansas, that these great entrepreneurs who changed the world seem

to all come from that area, as the Senator from Arkansas knows. I am very familiar with that area, since my daughter Molly is a professor at the University of Arkansas.

I have been over there many times. I was just listening to you describe the life of Don Tyson and how consistent that is with many of the other entrepreneurs. I salute all those guys up there and you for bringing that to the floor.

Mr. PRYOR. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

REMEMBERING PRESIDENT RONALD REAGAN

Mr. DURBIN. Sunday is the 100th anniversary of the birth of President Ronald Reagan.

When Ronald Reagan was born, his father Jack looked at his new son and exclaimed, "He looks like a fat little Dutchman but who knows, he might grow up to be President some day."

In fact, Ronald Reagan grew up to become not just a President but one of America's most memorable Presidents.

As we mark the 100th anniversary of his birth, much is being said and written about Ronald Reagan's White House years, and understandably so. But in my State of Illinois, people are also remembering an earlier time in the life of this iconic American.

Ronald Wilson Reagan is the only American President born in Illinois.

He entered this world on Feb. 6, 1911, in the little town of Tampico, IL, in an apartment above a bakery on Main Street.

His father Jack sold shoes to support his wife and two sons.

Over the first 9 years of his life, the Reagan family moved four times, from Tampico to Galesburg, to Monmouth, and the south side of Chicago before finally settling in Dixon, IL, population 10,000.

Today, the white frame house at 810 South Hennepin Street in Dixon, the Ronald Reagan Boyhood Home, draws visitors from around the world.

It was in Dixon that the shy boy would begin to discover self-confidence and the talents that would serve him so well in life. He acted in his first play in Dixon, and he was elected student body president during his senior year at Dixon High School.

From Dixon, Ronald Reagan went to Eureka College, a small college near Peoria. The tuition was \$180 a year, twice that much with room and board, more than the Reagan family could afford. But Ronald Reagan did not let that discourage him. He received a "needy student scholarship" and waited tables and washed dishes at his fraternity house to help pay his way.

Once again, he was elected president of his senior class.

1935, Ronald Reagan was working as a radio sports announcer. He followed

the Chicago Cubs to spring training in California and slipped away one day to visit Hollywood and explore whether there might be a future for him in movies.

Two years later, Ronald Reagan packed his possessions into a Nash convertible and moved to California, where he would become a successful actor and later Governor. But he never forgot his Illinois roots.

In his first inaugural parade in 1981, Ronald Reagan included the Dixon High School band.

On a visit to Eureka College in 1992, President Reagan told students, "Everything good that happened to me, everything, started here on this campus."

In 1990, 2 years after he left the White House, President Reagan travelled to Abilene, KS, for a ceremony marking the 100th anniversary of President Eisenhower's birth.

He said that day:

I learned long ago that in order to find the heart of America you need only visit the heartland of America.

It was a lesson he had learned years earlier in those small towns in Illinois.

Both the State of Illinois and the town of Dixon have created Ronald Reagan Centennial Commissions to celebrate the 100th anniversary of his birth. If you want to see the places that helped shape America's 40th President, come to Illinois this year, where it all began.

Ronald Reagan was President when I was first elected to the House of Representatives in 1982. While our views of government differed remarkably, I admired his optimism and his unshakable faith that America's best days were ahead of us. He restored a sense of confidence in many Americans at a time when we really needed it.

He told us:

America is too great to dream small dreams.

And he was right.

In 1992, 2 years before he announced he had Alzheimer's disease, Ronald Reagan addressed his party's nominating convention for the last time.

He said then:

Whatever else history may say about me when I'm gone, I hope it will recall that I appealed to your best hopes, not your worst fears, to your confidence rather than your doubts.

In 1983, in one of the most important accomplishments of his Presidency, Ronald Reagan brought together Democrats and Republicans to head off a funding crisis in Social Security. That bipartisan agreement helped add years of solvency to one of the most successful programs this government has ever created. It brought 50 years of solvency to Social Security and is one of the crowning jewels of his leadership.

In 1986, he signed America's last major tax reform act to simplify the Income Tax Code, broaden the tax base and eliminate loopholes that allowed some to avoid their obligations while unfairly increasing the tax burden on others.

Today we face a far greater challenge. Not only do we have to protect Social Security for the long run, we also have to simplify our Tax Code again, and put in place a responsible plan to reduce our deficits even as we invest in a stronger economic future.

In this centennial year of his birth, it would be a fitting tribute to President Reagan if Democrats and Republicans could work together to solve our challenges in the same spirit of patriotic pragmatism that President Reagan and others brought to protecting Social Security a generation ago. I hope we can work together to help get Americans back to work today and to lay the foundation for a strong economic future so that our children can continue to say, as President Reagan said so often, that America's best days are still ahead.

After Ronald Reagan clinched the delegates needed to win his party's 1980 Presidential nomination, a newspaper reporter asked him what he thought he needed to do next. He replied that he wanted to dispel the notion that he was a hard-nosed radical who would oppose compromise on principle.

These are his words. He said:

You know, there are some people so imbued with their ideology that if they can't get everything they want, they'll jump off the cliff with the flag flying. As Governor, I found out that if I could get half a loaf, instead of stalking off angrily, I'd take it.

Ronald Reagan was a man who believed deeply in his core principles. He would not want any of us to compromise our own core principles in his memory.

But there is such a thing as principled compromise. President Reagan understood that. He knew that accommodation was needed to make the system work. We would honor his memory by remembering that lesson and working to restore to our politics the same civility that we associate with him. Let's remember that there is no dishonor in accepting half a loaf. That is how democracy works.

Finally, I wish to express my admiration for Mrs. Reagan. Her love and steadfast devotion to her husband during his illness moved us all, and her courageous work in support of new treatments for Alzheimer's disease will surely help other families. Our thoughts are with her and the rest of President Reagan's family as we mark this historic centennial.

(Mrs. HAGAN assumed the chair.)

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, the FAA authorization expired in October of 2007. For more than 3 years we have been operating on short-term extensions—17 total short-term extensions. The Federal Aviation Administration, airlines, and the flying public, all deserve a long-term authorization to provide certainty to our national aviation system. The bill before us will improve the safety of air travel, modernize our air traffic control system, boost the economy, and create thousands of jobs. This is a jobs bill.

The FAA estimates commercial aviation is responsible for over 5 percent of our gross domestic product and generates \$1.2 trillion a year in economic activity. The aviation industry provides \$346 billion in earnings and 11 million jobs. This bill will help grow those numbers. The funding provided in this bill will support over 280,000 jobs.

Economist Mark Zandi said:

Aviation is the glue that keeps the global economy together.

We know that in Illinois. We know it because of that great airport called O'Hare, which we are currently in the process of modernizing. This bill will boost our economy now and keep the United States competitive in the global marketplace. The Senate Commerce Committee, chaired by Senator ROCKEFELLER, with ranking member Senator INHOFE, has held dozens of hearings over the past few years on aviation. Each was different. All of them focused on safety. Last year we passed into law many safety provisions the committee recommended, but we need to do more.

This bill will improve safety by preventing runway incursions. Improving runway safety, according to the NTSB, is the highest priority. There were 988 runway incursions last year. This year there have already been 66. This bill will require the FAA to review all commercial service airports in the United States and initiate action to improve lighting, signage, and runway and taxiway markings.

Another key component of this bill is NextGen. NextGen is the term we use to describe our transition to a more modern satellite-based air traffic control system. I mentioned on the Senate floor before that I recently read a book by Steve Johnson about innovation. He told a fascinating story that on October 4, 1957, when the Soviets launched sputnik, America was caught by surprise. Here our adversaries in the Cold War had the capacity, with a missile, to launch a satellite that circled the Earth. It was the first manmade satellite. We knew they had the bomb. Now they had these missiles and the capacity to launch a satellite.

The Russians, to prove to the world they had launched the satellite, had this basketball-sized sputnik satellite emitting a signal. There were two scientists near Baltimore working for the Federal Government who decided they would try to track this signal. They found it. As they tracked it, they used their scientific expertise and the Doppler effect to determine not only the trajectory of this satellite but its speed. They reported their findings to the Department of Defense. They could tell the Department of Defense where sputnik was and how fast it was moving.

The Department of Defense challenged them and said: If you can tell us where that satellite is and how fast it is moving, could you tell where that signal is being received on Earth? They went to work. It took them several weeks. They came up with the means

to determine from a satellite where the signal was being received on Earth. We know it as GPS.

GPS is in our pockets. We carry it with our cell phones. People can locate us based on the cell phone we carry in our pockets. The problem is, airplanes don't have GPS. They still rely on aging technology, radar and the like, to locate the planes and to move them safely. This bill is going to move us into this new generation of technology. It is about time.

NextGen will give pilots and air traffic controllers the ability to accurately pinpoint aircraft in the sky, to avoid problems, to move things more smoothly, safely, and efficiently. The FAA has called for action on implementing NextGen.

Last year U.S. airlines carried 704 million passengers, including a lot of Senators and Congressmen. Soon those numbers will increase. The FAA reports that U.S. airlines will carry more than 1 billion passengers by 2023 and more than 1.2 billion by 2030. Our outdated air traffic control system cannot handle this increase in traffic. But with NextGen we hope to triple the capacity of our national aviation system and not compromise at all when it comes to safety. This technology will allow planes to fly the straightest, quickest route from point A to point B. With more precise information and better communication, we can fit more planes safely in our airspace. Doing so will save airlines fuel and money. It will reduce airport delays significantly.

Chicago's Midway Airport was ranked dead last over the past few months for ontime departures. Chicago's O'Hare has won that dubious distinction more than once. The main reason is the lack of capacity in our aviation control system. Fully implementing NextGen could reduce these delays dramatically. It will also save a lot of fuel and money for the airlines. This is a great investment.

Illinois is in the middle of the largest airport expansion project in American history at O'Hare. The \$6.6 billion project will completely reconfigure the runways and make sure traffic moves in and out of O'Hare more efficiently. Moving this project along means a lot to the people of Chicago and Illinois. O'Hare already generates 450,000 jobs and \$38 billion in economic activity for Chicago and my State. This modernization project will create 195,000 more jobs and another \$18 billion in annual economic activity. We need to move forward as a nation, with the FAA, to make certain O'Hare is modern and safe and can accommodate the increased capacity in air service.

I hope we can take up this bill and the amendments that have been offered to it in a timely fashion and pass the legislation soon. This bill will help airports the size of O'Hare, but also smaller airports around the United States. It has already helped us in many ways.

The Essential Air Service Program has been critical for a lot of small airports, and certainly that is true in Illinois. We need to make sure that communities large and small across America have access to passenger air service.

There is a provision in this bill that tries to coordinate some of the bookings between Amtrak and airlines. During floor consideration of this bill in the previous Congress, my amendment was adopted that I hope can help travelers better coordinate and use both passenger rail and air travel. Particularly for travel to and from less urbanized areas, this option will help move people more efficiently. We can do offer this in more communities. And we can do so at less expense to the Federal Government.

I thank both Senator INHOFE and Senator ROCKEFELLER for their leadership on this bill.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, let me say that most everything the Senator from Illinois has talked about I agree with. We have been talking about this bill for a long time.

I join Senator ROCKEFELLER in encouraging anyone, Democrats particularly, to bring any amendment down they want. Procedurally, I don't think I can get my two amendments in the queue until that happens.

For the moment, I ask unanimous consent that I be recognized as in morning business.

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

REMEMBERING PRESIDENT RONALD REAGAN

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, the Senator from Illinois was talking about our friend, our beloved Ronald Reagan. I thought I would make a couple of comments that might surprise a few people.

I was not from Oklahoma originally. I was actually born in Iowa. When I was a very small child, Ronald Reagan was the sports announcer for WHO radio.

My father was a claims adjuster. They officed in the same room—not the same building but the same room. They played the pinball machine together. I can remember at that time they never said Ronald Reagan; they said Dutch Reagan. That was his name. That was his name as a sports announcer too. He would actually come by and we referred to him as Uncle Dutch. That was in Des Moines. That was back during the Depression and shortly after.

When my family moved to Oklahoma, we didn't have a lot of money. So we never went to movies. At that time they didn't have TV. The only time we would ever see a movie is if Dutch Reagan had a movie. I went down once to Atoka, OK, which was probably roundtrip driving about 4 hours. We went down to see a Dutch Reagan movie.

Later on, I became the mayor of Tulsa. During that time Reagan was in

his first term. He had me do all of his domestic work. I was debating Democratic mayors from all over the country on the policies that Ronald Reagan had initiated and tried to perpetuate, and they were all very successful, I might add. Now, in retrospect, a lot of people on the other side of the fence realize they were.

Saying this was a personal relationship, I look beyond what everyone knows about Ronald Reagan, what his persona was, and I can say he was such a warm and personable person. It never occurred to me—I thought of him as one of the family until the time he started running for political office.

It is kind of interesting because his first election, of course, was running for office out in California. At that time, we still did not have a lot of money, but my father—I think that was the first race he got involved with financially, and Ronald Reagan never forgot it. I can remember when I came to Congress he was in his second term, and he would always comment: There is young Congressman INHOFE. His daddy was one of my first financial contributors.

So anyway, I will just say this: When you lose somebody like him, you do not just lose a leader that in retrospect looks good to everyone, but you lose someone who is very warm and loving. Here is a guy who, in the Oval Office, would never ever walk in without a coat and tie on. This is the way he distinguished the office, and this is the way the office distinguished him.

So we dearly miss him on this, his 100th birthday anniversary.

Madam President, let me make one comment about the two amendments I have on the bill. I think it is important we address both of them, but one of them is, in particular, very significant. We have a subpart S version of the FARs that affects scheduled and non-scheduled airlines. A scheduled airline can live with the flight crew rest and duty time because they can adjust their schedules to do that. The unscheduled cannot. So the subpart S in the FARs today allows a subpart S to work longer hours, but they also have longer rest hours in between. They average out actually with longer rest hours per active hours than under the law that affects the scheduled airlines.

Let me give you a couple examples why it is important. Ninety-five percent of our troop movement over in theater, where the Presiding Officer and I just came back from, after having spent New Year's Eve with our troops over in Kabul and Afghanistan—during that time, there were several times when they had to bring blood in.

If a nonscheduled airline has to bring the blood in, they cannot do it because that is too far. They would have to leave the plane there and have crew rest in Kabul and come back. Well, they cannot do that because we have rules against it.

Ninety-five percent of the troop activity, movement, comes from non-

scheduled airlines. Forty percent of the material comes in and out. That is what we are talking about. We are talking about getting blood over to our troops in the AOR.

So it has worked well. There has not been, in 15 years, one case where an accident on a nonscheduled airline has taken place due to the fatigue of anyone. So it is a problem that does not exist, and I have always had this hang-up about fixing things that are not broken. So, consequently, I am hoping we will be able to keep that.

What is happening today is there is a comment period and a rule that would do away with that subpart S, and I would like to have this amendment in here. It would keep that from happening. So I think it is very important, and I think it means a lot to our troops over there. The only alternative—if you take the blood example—is, you would have to find, from maybe Qatar or some other place, a military plane, a C-130 or a C-17, to take them in. As you know, right now the OPTEMPO of our lift capacity is to the point we cannot take on anything more. So I think this is a life-and-death type of thing.

The other amendment I feel strongly about—I mentioned a minute ago when Senator Glenn retired, that left me as the last active commercial pilot in the Senate and I still am and have been flying for 50 years. Many times in the past I have, at my own expense and in my own aircraft, done things where we are helping out people because there is no one else to do it, either taking people for medical treatment or taking, in one case, a limb that had been amputated back to be reattached, this type of thing.

So for people to do it—the pilots and the equipment, such as my equipment—it costs us money to do it. But we feel, in order to encourage them to do it, they should be exempt from liability should something happen so they do not have frivolous lawsuits. If you do, then it discourages people from being generous. So this is kind of a Good Samaritan type of amendment.

These are amendments Nos. 7 and 6. I am hoping to get them in the queue. I cannot do that at this time. I want to cooperate with Senator ROCKEFELLER, but as soon as we can, I want to get these in.

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

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

Mr. NELSON of Florida. I am waiting just momentarily to receive the documentation on offering an amendment. But in the meantime, I would like to speak as in morning business.

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

EGYPT

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Madam President, it is very apparent that President Mubarak must step down. The longer he waits to realize he has to step down, the more difficult it is going to be in order to have an orderly transition and to keep the peace in Egypt. The longer he waits to announce he is stepping down immediately, the more difficult it is to transfer power to his Vice President, General Omar Suleiman.

If he had done this several days ago, then that transition would have been so much easier because General Suleiman is well respected in Egypt, certainly by the military. He is well respected by the Arab neighbors in the region, and he is well respected in Israel, as well as the United States.

But every day there is violence and bloodshed in these clashes, it makes the Arab street much more difficult to accept any semblance of authority that would come from Mubarak, even though, under the Egyptian Constitution, there is a Vice President, albeit that Vice Presidency has been vacant for years and years and years. But, nevertheless, there is a Vice President who is in the constitutional line of succession to become President.

Again, I say what I said several days ago: President Mubarak needs to recognize, despite his long years of great service in keeping Egypt stable, especially in the aftermath of the assassination of President Anwar Sadat, that it is time for him to step down, that there is a new nation of Egypt out there and they want reform and they want free and fair elections and most of them want a peaceful and orderly transition of power.

I would again call on the President of Egypt to step down and step down immediately and let the Presidency be assumed by his Vice President, with the guarantee of free and fair elections in September and the guarantee that President Mubarak is not going to run for reelection.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 34

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside in order to call up amendment No. 34.

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

The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Florida [Mr. NELSON] proposes an amendment numbered 34.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To strike section 605)

Beginning with line 1 on page 236, strike through line 14 on page 237.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Madam President, the NASA bill we passed last fall strongly reaffirmed that aeronautics research is an integral part of the agency and made the point in that bill of increasing a focus on NASA's aeronautics research programs. As a matter of fact, what does NASA stand for? It has become a noun, but it actually stands for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. The first A in NASA stands for "aeronautics." It is vital to our research programs in both air and space, the research that is going on.

We have existing aeronautics research facilities that are national assets, and they are in places such as the Ames Research Center in California; the Glenn Research Center named after our former colleague, Senator John Glenn, which is in Cleveland; Langley Research Center in Virginia; the Dryden Flight Research Center, and that is at Edwards Air Force Base in California.

These NASA centers are unique in their ability to leverage the complementary and ever-increasing synergies between space and aviation systems through these incredibly experienced technical researchers, and they make remarkable advances in aerospace-related disciplines such as materials and structures, flight controls, aerospace systems health management, and high speed aerothermal analysis tools. We take for granted when we get on commercial airliners some of the improvements that have been made. Well, where do we think a lot of that came from? It came from NASA and the research there. These advances not only accelerate space and aviation systems but also other very complex systems such as the smart grid, remote medicine and medical robotics, smart cars, a whole bunch of things.

NASA's fundamental aeronautics research capability happens to be also integrated with enabling the future space missions of NASA. The Nation's aeronautics research and development investment currently is planned and well coordinated through the National Aeronautics Research and Development Policy as well as in Executive Order 13419 in which the roles and responsibilities of executive departments and agencies in Federal aeronautics R&D are clearly defined and delineated all the way through the rest of this decade, until 2020.

What happened when this FAA bill was put together years ago is that it had a transfer to some committee of NASA's successful aeronautics R&D investment leadership and this competitiveness, this investment has supported

springing forth key technologies that directly contradict a national policy of doing this in a committee instead of doing it in NASA. The unnecessary reassignment, when this bill was crafted some time ago, of those responsibilities to other agencies of government would clearly jeopardize the success of this extraordinary R&D program.

The amendment, to which we have no objection, is to take this part out of the bill with the new NASA bill that was passed, with the robust aeronautics research and development that is within NASA, be the operative policy.

If it is appropriate, if this is the proper parliamentary procedure, I ask for the yeas and nays—or I would ask for a voice vote. I am told we are not in the proper venue for that. So I have offered the amendment, it is laid down, and we will deal with it appropriately.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

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

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

REMEMBERING PRESIDENT RONALD REAGAN

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Madam President, as a native Californian, I come to the floor now to honor the 100th birthday of President Ronald Reagan.

Former First Lady Nancy Reagan asked that I serve on the Ronald Reagan Centennial Commission and I was very honored to accept. Today, I join Senator JIM WEBB, also a member, and ORRIN HATCH, to continue President Reagan's spirit of bipartisanship. We have invited Senators on both sides of the aisle to join us here on the floor.

From Simi Valley, in his beloved California, to our Nation's capital, Americans this month are honoring President Ronald Reagan. These centennial events are intended to reach all Americans, including many born after President Reagan left office. Those who remember Ronald Reagan as Governor or as President know how he impacted history. But there are some who may not realize that the society we live in today is, in part, due to the policies of President Reagan. Young adults today grow up without the fear of nuclear war in the back of their mind, and students of tomorrow will work to achieve President Reagan's dream of a world without nuclear weapons.

It can be said that every great President can be remembered in just one sentence. Some examples: "He freed the slaves;" "He made the Louisiana Purchase." Yet, 22 years after he left office and 7 years after his death, the name Ronald Wilson Reagan can still provoke a complex debate. There is no one phrase that can describe his legacy. Some come to mind: "The great

communicator." Or: "Mr. Gorbachev, tear down this wall." That is the one that does it for me.

There is much debate over President Reagan because we all think of him differently, and over time, history sweetens our memories. But no matter what policy disagreements one may have had with him, one has to admire his style of politics. He was a conservative Republican, but he understood that in order to get anything done, he had to work across the aisle, which he did.

In his 1983 State of the Union Address, President Reagan said:

Let us, in these next 2 years—men and women of both parties, every political shade—concentrate on the long-range, bipartisan responsibilities of government, not the short-range or short-term temptations of partisan politics.

Also, Ronald Reagan had common-sense conviction that helped his achievements.

He was a true gentleman in American politics. You would not have seen him giving a speech—like some do today—calling his opponents names or giving out generalized insults. Dignity and wit were his weapons of choice.

Also, President Reagan served during times of divided government, when one party had the White House and the other controlled at least one Chamber of Congress, giving each side some governing responsibility to find solutions.

It was a time when a financial and fiscal crisis brought the two parties together to compromise on tough choices about taxes and spending. In 1983, President Reagan and Speaker Tip O'Neill came together to compromise on Social Security, based on proposals from a commission led by Alan Greenspan. President Reagan is credited with creating the conditions that led to the end of the Cold War, reviving the economy, and returning a sense of optimism to our country.

One of the things I most admired was his work to reduce the number of nuclear weapons in the world and his dream of a world one day free of these awful weapons.

President Reagan expressed this vision during his second inaugural address on January 21, 1985. He declared:

We seek the total elimination one day of nuclear weapons from the face of the Earth.

It was a remarkable statement from a President who had deployed tactical nuclear missiles in Europe to counter the Soviet Union's fearsome SS-20 missile fleet. But President Reagan understood the grave threat that nuclear weapons pose to humanity, and he boldly set himself to achieve their eventual elimination.

My good friend, George Shultz, who was Secretary of State under President Reagan, remembers that many at that time thought the President's initial negotiations to reduce strategic arms were not serious—even quite ridiculous. A classified report released recently showed that President Reagan asked the Joint Chiefs of Staff about the cost of an all-out Soviet attack and

plans for retaliation. He asked Secretary Shultz:

What's so good about keeping the peace after wiping each other out?

Mr. Shultz believes if he were around today, President Reagan would have been in favor of the New START treaty. At the famous Reykjavik Summit with Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev in October 1980, President Reagan went far beyond Gorbachev's proposal to slash strategic arms by 50 percent. He truly believed we should go to zero. The Reykjavik talks may not have worked out, but the idea that we should create a world free of nuclear weapons endures to this day.

Secretary Shultz thinks President Reagan would want to be remembered for his complete faith in freedom and his conviction that you had to be strong to defend that freedom. And that is certainly true.

Ronald Reagan came into office with character and charisma, traits that take other elected officials years to develop. It was that charisma that impressed California's Republicans and led to his nomination as Governor of my great State.

Ronald Reagan was elected Governor of California in 1966 by nearly a 1 million-vote margin. He was elected to a second term in 1970. He did not seem to mind that people underappreciated him at the time.

Decades later, as volumes of his handwritten essays were released to the public, Americans saw just what a thoughtful and visionary man he was. If we remember Ronald Reagan with one sentence, let's remember him as one who took big ideas, a crafting of words, and a conviction of freedom to change the entire world.

On the 100th anniversary of the birth of "The Great Communicator," I hope we can embody his spirit of bipartisanship to keep our country strong and united today.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Madam President, I rise to speak also on the 100th anniversary of the birth of Ronald Reagan, and I am so pleased to follow my colleague from California who has been under the weather for a little while. We are very glad she is back.

I think all of us will have an opportunity to talk about one of the great Presidents of the last century and to mark the 30 years since Ronald Reagan's inauguration.

When Ronald Reagan was elected in 1980, America faced an anemic economy, high unemployment, and a sense of malaise emanated from Washington. But President Reagan never doubted that America's potential was unlimited. During his second inaugural address, he said America "can out-produce, out-compete and out-sell anybody, anywhere in the world." The Reagan Revolution was fueled by the understanding that, given the opportunity, Americans would dream, cre-

ate, and build. He also knew the road to greatness was through an individual's effort, not through expanded government. So President Reagan set about reinvigorating the stagnant economy.

He cut government spending. He reduced government regulation. He ended the practice of wage and price controls. He passed tax cuts for all Americans. He famously noted that "Government's first duty is to protect the people, not run their lives." The American economy responded with sustained growth, and a new era of economic prosperity had been ushered in.

Reagan's vision of the greater good also extended beyond our shores. He was a fierce advocate for freedom. With our Cold War adversary, the Soviet Union, imposing the tight grip of communism on much of the world, President Reagan launched a resurgence of American military might through the Strategic Defense Initiative. As he said:

Of the four wars in my lifetime, none came about because the United States was too strong.

It was his firm resolve to negotiate from a position of strength that led to successful arms talks with the Soviets and ultimately to the downfall of the Soviet Empire. During his first inaugural address, he clearly stated where America stood:

As for the enemies of freedom, those who are potential adversaries, they will be reminded that peace is the highest aspiration of the American people. We will negotiate for it, sacrifice for it; we will not surrender for it—now or ever.

President Reagan understood that all people, regardless of where they live, long for liberty and freedom. He believed that America was a beacon of hope to all of the oppressed people of the world, a "shining city on the hill," as he described it. As Jeffrey Bell wrote in the *Weekly Standard*, Ronald Reagan "believed that people all over the world craved self-government just as much as Americans did." Even today, he is still being proven right. He said:

Concentrated power has always been the enemy of liberty.

These words still echo in today's tumultuous times. We witnessed the poignant photographs of women in Iraq voting and joyously holding up their purple-stained thumbs. We are now seeing the marches of people in Egypt who long to be able to vote in a real election for the first time in 30 years. He also understood the importance of information in promoting freedom, calling it the "oxygen of the modern age. It seeps through the walls topped by barbed wire; it wafts across the electrified borders."

His words are as true today as when he uttered them. Freedom and individual liberty are America's greatest assets. They are the core of our national identity. They are the foundation of our economic prosperity, and these precious assets have been protected by the service and sacrifice of

patriots in every generation from the beginning of America's history to today. Ronald Reagan understood and appreciated the duty we all have to preserve these American ideals.

As he said:

Democracy is worth dying for, because it is the most deeply honorable form of government devised by man.

When President Reagan died in 2004, there was a spontaneous, worldwide outpouring of grief and tribute that caught some seasoned political pundits by surprise. Throughout his political career, Ronald Reagan was underestimated by "establishment" political intellectuals of the day. He was dismissed sometimes by the media. But when he spoke, the American people listened, they understood, and they agreed with this down-to-Earth but very profound man. And so did the world.

We all remember him fondly, with great respect, and are honored to have known him.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, I want to take a quick minute or two to talk about an amendment that will be called up later in the afternoon on my behalf to expand and improve the unmanned aerial systems—known as UAS programs—that are part of the Federal Aviation Administration reauthorization bill. My amendment is No. 27.

I thank Chairman ROCKEFELLER and his staff because they have worked closely with me on this and several other amendments.

Growth in the unmanned aerial systems sector of the aviation business has been extraordinary in the last few years. I think it is well known that these systems are proven critical to military operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. But they also have tremendous potential in the civilian sector whether it is for firefighting, law enforcement, border control, search and rescue, or environmental monitoring.

Law enforcement uses for this technology would be especially helpful in rural areas like much of my home State of Oregon. Unfortunately, the FAA has not yet been able to come up with a real plan for how to integrate these unmanned aerial systems vehicles into our airspace. That is why I am pleased the Rockefeller bill before us includes requirements for the FAA to get to work on a plan in this area and to establish test sites for unmanned aerial systems research.

The bill, however, includes only four of these sites. I would like to see us be bolder, particularly in an area where I think there is so much opportunity for innovation, development, and job creation.

This amendment would expand the number of sites to 10, which would require the FAA to explore the most useful and safest way for unmanned aerial systems to be integrated into the airspace.

The amendment would require at least one of these test sites to investigate how unmanned aerial systems can be useful in monitoring public land. As the chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Lands and Forests, I have heard repeatedly from law enforcement officials that remote public lands are too often being used as a place for criminals to grow drugs without detection. The Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service, two agencies that work in this field, simply don't have the resources to use expensive helicopters and do all the necessary work to root out these illegal operations.

I will conclude by saying that I believe unmanned aerial systems could be a cost-saving way to address this problem. By getting the ball rolling with my amendment, I believe it will be possible to more significantly fight these reprehensible drug operations that are taking place on public lands.

I hope this amendment, No. 27, will be accepted as part of the Rockefeller legislation, and I look forward to working with the bill's managers to encourage the development in this sector, which I think is right at the heart of what we need to do to promote innovation in the aviation field. I thank Chairman ROCKEFELLER.

I yield the floor.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to a period for the transaction of morning business until 3 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each for the purpose of giving remarks relative to the upcoming centennial of the birth of President Ronald Reagan.

The Senator from Arizona.

REMEMBERING PRESIDENT RONALD REAGAN

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, there are many of us who will come to the floor this afternoon to pay tribute to one of the great Presidents in American history. Many of us will recollect times and experiences and contacts we had with President Reagan and the way he inspired us personally as well as a nation.

When I was a prisoner of war in North Vietnam, the Vietnamese went to great lengths to restrict the news from home to the statements and activities of prominent opponents of the war in Vietnam. They wanted us to believe America had forgotten us. They never mentioned Ronald Reagan to us or played his speeches over the camp loud speakers. No matter. We knew about him. New additions to our ranks told us how the Governor and Mrs. Reagan were committed to our liberation and our cause.

When we came home, all of us were eager to meet the Reagans, to thank them for their concern. But more than

gratitude drew us to them. We were drawn to them because they were among the few prominent Americans who did not subscribe to the then-fashionable notion that America had entered her inevitable decline.

We prisoners of war came home to a country that had lost a war and the best sense of itself, a country beset by social and economic problems. Assassinations, riots, scandals, contempt for political, religious, and educational institutions gave the appearance that we had become a dysfunctional society. Patriotism was sneered at, the military scorned. The world anticipated the collapse of our global influence. The great, robust, confident Republic that had given its name to the last century seemed exhausted.

Ronald Reagan believed differently. He possessed an unshakable faith in America's greatness, past and future, that proved more durable than the prevailing political sentiments of the time. His confidence was a tonic to men who had come home eager to put the war behind us and for the country to do likewise.

Our country has a long and honorable history. A lost war or any other calamity should not destroy our confidence or weaken our purpose. We were a good nation before Vietnam, and we are a good nation after Vietnam. In all of history, you cannot find a better one. Of that, Ronald Reagan was supremely confident, and he became President to prove it.

His was a faith that shouted at tyrants to "tear down this wall." Such faith, such patriotism requires a great deal of love to profess, and I will always revere him for it. When walls were all I had for a world, I learned about a man whose love of freedom gave me hope in a desolate place. His faith honored us, as it honored all Americans, as it honored all freedom-loving people.

Let us honor his memory especially today by holding his faith as our own, and let us too tear down walls to freedom. That is what Americans do when they believe in themselves.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SESSIONS. 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. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I was honored to hear Senator MCCAIN's comments on Ronald Reagan. This Sunday is indeed the 100th anniversary of his birth. It is an opportunity for the whole Nation to honor the memory of a man who honored us with his leadership.

In the 1980s, we were a weakened country. Inflation and unemployment were in double digits. The hostage crisis in Iran dragged on, with no end in sight. Our standing abroad was waning

and so too was our military strength. Challenges at home were answered with one failed Washington program after another. We had lost confidence in our future and really in the principles that made us exceptional.

Ronald Reagan changed that. Part of that change began with 12 simple, crucial words:

Government is not the solution to our problem; government is the problem.

It is a big part of our problem.

He stirred the passions of our country, revitalizing not only our economy but our identity and confidence as free people. What some have called the Reagan revolution he called the great rediscovery. He instilled us with a new confidence in our future and in America's role as the last best hope of mankind.

His achievements are well known, but they bear repeating.

Working with Paul Volcker, Chairman of the Federal Reserve, he tamed the inflation which was robbing Americans of their life's work and savings. It was a tough course, a tough road, but he saw it through. He stayed on the course, and we were stronger as a result. We need to get on a tough road and stay the course today.

He lowered taxes dramatically, including a reduction in the top rate from nearly 70 percent, and he reined in a runaway bureaucracy that had trapped innovation and productivity in a labyrinth of regulation and redtape.

His faith in the free market was not misplaced. It rewarded us. He created 20 million new jobs, grew our gross national product by 26 percent, and began the longest peacetime boom in our history. Conditions improved for Americans in every walk of life. The net worth of families earning between \$20,000 and \$50,000 rose by 27 percent.

Reagan's stunning success debunked every myth of those who believe a bigger government is more compassionate and can do more for more people. The growth and potential productivity of the private sector is what has made America the most prosperous Nation.

This success at home was matched by his success abroad. He defended our principles and our way of life with clarity, confidence, and vigor. His policies brought down the Soviet Empire. "Mr. Gorbachev, tear down this wall" still resonates in our minds, and it liberated untold millions.

Today, more than 20 years after President Reagan left office, we find ourselves facing many of the same challenges: a sagging economy, a growing government, and a diminished standing in the world. We would be wise to remember the lessons of that era: peace through strength, prosperity through freedom. He understood that our future greatness lies in the same place it always has—through our pioneering, restless, enterprising spirit that is filled with ambition and excitement, and a deep sense of honor and decency that defines who we are as a people and who we will be tomorrow.

In President Reagan's farewell address, he issued a word of caution:

If we forget what we did, we won't know who we are. I am warning of an eradication of that—of the American memory that could result, ultimately, in an erosion of the American spirit.

As we face daunting, defining challenges of our time, I hope we look back to the leadership he provided.

On a personal note, I was tremendously honored to have been appointed a U.S. attorney in the Southern District of Alabama by President Reagan in 1981. It was an office in which I had served as an assistant a number of years before. To be able to come back and lead that office was such a personal thrill.

The President did not give me any directions as to what we were to do, but I absolutely knew—and I have often said it is a great example of true leadership—I knew exactly what he wanted me to do. I gathered the staff, many of whom I had worked with years before, and used these words: President Reagan sent me here to prosecute criminals and protect the U.S. Treasury. I believe that is what he did. I believe that was implicit in his campaign, his consistent leadership, that he believed in law and order and efficiency, and he wanted us to fight corruption and try to help produce a more efficient government.

I remember in those days we went to a U.S. attorneys conference. I attended with my good friend, recently the Deputy Attorney General of the United States, Larry Thompson. We would share rooms on the trips to save money because we knew and believed President Reagan wanted us to save money. Our spending was out of control, and we had a serious financial problem. Our budgets were frozen. But we worked harder and we produced more.

That can be done today. This whining that we cannot reduce spending—and many times, they define "reducing spending" as a reduction of the projected rate of growth. It is not even a reduction of current level spending.

These kinds of things happened throughout the government. It increased productivity of our government. It reduced the take of the Federal Government of the private economy. The private economy grew, and the government sector became more efficient and more productive. That is what we need to return to.

It was such a fabulous honor to have the opportunity to serve in that position. I hope I was faithful to the values of the President who appointed me. I have to say, I think I knew what they were, and I know I gave my best effort to be worthy of the trust he placed in me. That was true of many more people throughout the Federal Government.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and 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. ISAKSON. 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. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I rise for a moment to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the late Ronald Reagan, President of the United States—a great conservative leader of our country and an inspiration to many, many Americans.

I want to dedicate my remarks to a lady named Kathie Miller. Kathie works for me here in Washington. She has loved Ronald Reagan since the day he came on the scene and can probably quote him verbatim much better than I can. He had a meaningful impact on her life, and so I dedicate these remarks to her today.

My speech will be about two events I happened to attend where Ronald Reagan was speaking and the impact of those events not only on me but on everybody else who was there, and actually on the future of our country. One took place in 1975, when he was beginning his pursuit of the nomination for the Presidency of the United States. Gerald Ford was still President at that time and Ronald Reagan was running for the nomination for a full term.

Ronald Reagan came to Cobb County, GA. Cobb County, GA, is where I live. It is a very Republican county right now, but in 1975 it was not a very Republican county. In fact, there was only one elected official in the entire county who was a Republican, out of literally 100 or more who were Democratic officials.

Ronald Reagan came to the civic center in Cobb County, and an unanticipated thing happened, not by plan, certainly, not by the generation of politicians, but a crowd so large came to hear him that the fire marshals shut the building down. This is a very good-sized, 4,000-seat auditorium. People came to hear a positive message about America.

I was fortunate enough, because I had been in politics a little bit, to be able to get in that room and listen to his speech. In 1975, for America, it was not the most prosperous of times. In fact, a lot of the things we have been suffering through these last couple of years we went through in 1974 and 1975. We had a difficult housing market, higher interest rates, higher unemployment, and things of that nature.

So this former actor came to Cobb County and he lit a fire under everybody, and not necessarily about him but about ourselves. He uplifted people who needed uplifting and he did it with a message of a belief in ourselves, a belief in our country, pride in America, and defense through strength. Those messages were so clearly Ronald Reagan. It inspired me. And it inspired me so much that I hoped he would get that nomination and be elected President of the United States. But he failed. He did not get the nomination. Ultimately, Gerald Ford got it, not

Ronald Reagan. But Ronald Reagan didn't go home and pout. He did not stop participating. He didn't drop out. He set his sights on the 1980 Republican nomination for President of the United States, and history reflects that he achieved it. He won it, and it was 8 great years for our country, 8 great years with a man who could inspire and who could lead.

I have oftentimes said that two of the truly great Presidents we have had—John Kennedy and Ronald Reagan—had something in common. They were from different parties, but they could stand before a group of people and make a speech about a subject they didn't agree with and, by the time they finished, they got a standing ovation. So, first, they were great communicators. Second, they were committed to a safe and prosperous America. They were hawks on defense. They confronted our enemies straight up, as Kennedy did with Khrushchev and President Reagan did. Third, and most important, they reduced taxes and brought prosperity to the economy of the United States.

The second occasion I met Ronald Reagan was an interesting one. It was in the Omni Coliseum in Atlanta, where professional basketball was played at the time. The coliseum seats 16,000 people. I was then the minority leader of the Georgia House of Representatives and was elected to be the MC of a program that featured Senator Mack Mattingly, running for reelection from Georgia, but the keynote speaker was Ronald Reagan. In fact, he flew from Washington to Atlanta to make that speech and then went to Reykjavik, Iceland where he confronted Gorbachev and Brezhnev and the Russians and he stood for peace through strength, and a strong buildup of forces in America so we could be a strong country that could defend ourselves, not a weak country subservient to anybody else.

In that auditorium of 16,000 people, he stood up before them and did the same thing he did in the auditorium in 1975. He inspired them to believe in their country, inspired them to believe in what was right, and inspired them to believe in peace through strength. And when he left, everybody was uplifted.

I think when Ronald Reagan left the Presidency in 1988, we would all agree our country was uplifted. It was a period of prosperity and a period of strength, and it was a renaissance of the American spirit. That is the test of true leadership. So I am honored and privileged to join many of my colleagues on the floor today to pay tribute to the memory and the commitment of Ronald Reagan, President of the United States.

Mr. 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.

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

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

Mr. WEBB. Mr. President, I wish to join my other colleagues who have come to the floor at this time to speak in honor of our late President, Ronald Reagan, on the occasion of his 100th birthday. I wish to begin by giving my best wishes to Mrs. Reagan and wish her all the best for her continued health. Also, as someone who had three different positions in the Reagan administration, I am thinking of a lot of very fine people with whom I had the opportunity to serve, especially Cap Weinberger whom I met and worked with every day for about 4 years, who is one of the finest people I ever worked with, and also John Herrington, who was the Director of White House Personnel, who first brought me into the Reagan administration and later served our country as Secretary of Energy.

As I mentioned, I had three different positions in the Reagan administration, first as a member of the National Advisory Committee, and then I spent 4 years to the day in the Pentagon as Assistant Secretary of Defense, and then as Secretary of the Navy. It was truly an inspiring time in my life, to have worked for an individual who had the leadership qualities Ronald Reagan demonstrated. He knew how to inspire our country. He knew how to bring strong personalities together to work toward the good of the country and for its future. He knew how to make decisions, he knew how to make hard decisions, and one of the great qualities he had was he was never afraid to take responsibility for the consequences of any of those decisions. That is something which I think motivated everybody who served in his administration.

If we go back to that time period, those of us who were of age, 1980 was a bad time in this country. Our country was in tremendous turmoil. We were demoralized in the wake of the fall of South Vietnam and the bitterness that had affected so many of us along class lines, particularly between those who opposed the Vietnam war and those who had fought it, and what we were going to do in terms of resolving those issues here in this country and then our reputation internationally. Inflation was rampant, sometimes in the high teens. People were saying that the Presidency was too big a job for any one person. Our military was overworked, underpaid, and dramatically underappreciated.

I had friends with whom I had served or I had gone to the Naval Academy with, who had gone into the Navy, who were saying during this time period if you make commander you may as well get your divorce because you are going to go to sea for 4 years. The Navy had gone from 930 combatant ships during the Vietnam war down to 479, precipitously, at the same time our country

had assumed the obligations in the Indian Ocean and the Persian Gulf, obligations it didn't have before.

The Soviet Union, it is hard to remember right now, was in a state of high activity, diplomatically and militarily. It had invaded Afghanistan, threatening instability in that part of the world. It had a massive naval buildup in the Pacific following our withdrawal from Vietnam. Our diplomatic and military personnel in Tehran had been taken hostage by the Iranian regime and were being taunted daily on TV. Our national self-image was in a crisis state. Who were we as a country? Did we really have a future?

Ronald Reagan campaigned based on our national greatness and on the intrinsic good of our society and on restoring our place at the top of the world community. I can vividly remember in the summer of 1980 when Ronald Reagan made a speech at the Veterans of Foreign Wars Convention and mentioned, as he was so wont to do, with symbolic phrases that Vietnam had been a noble cause. He had the media following him around the country mocking the comment at this point, only 5 years after the fall of South Vietnam, but for those of us who had stepped forward and served in order to attempt to bring democracy to South Vietnam, that was a great moment of inspiration.

Once he was elected, Ronald Reagan governed with the same sense of certainty about the greatness of our system and the goodness of our people. He convinced strong, talented people to join his administration. With George Shultz as Secretary of State and Cap Weinberger as Secretary of Defense, he brought two lions into his Cabinet who did not always agree—which was rather famous in Washington at the time—but who were able to combine fierce competitive intellects with decades of valuable experience.

When Ronald Reagan left the White House, our military had been rebuilt, our people had regained their pride in our country and their optimism for its future. The United States was again recognized as the leading nation in the world community and the failed governmental concept that had produced the Soviet Union was on the verge of imploding, not because of external attack but soon to disappear at the hands of its own citizens, who could look to the West and see a better way of life. To paraphrase an old saying, "You never know when you are making history. You only know when you did."

Ronald Reagan did make history and I was proud to be a small part of it.

I yield the floor and 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. KIRK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. KIRK. Mr. President, as the junior Senator representing the State of Illinois, and one who will lead a celebration of President Reagan's life in Chicago Saturday night, for Sunday, the 100th birthday of our native Illinoisan, our 40th President, Ronald Reagan, I want to talk for a moment about his life and what he has meant to the United States, now on the 100th anniversary of President Reagan's birth.

On February 6, 1911, in Tampico, IL, with a population of 820, John and Nelle Reagan welcomed a child who would one day change the direction not just of our country but the world. According to the Reagan family lore, when he first gazed upon his son, John Reagan prophetically quipped: "He looks like a fat little Dutchman. But who knows, he might grow up to be President someday."

His father was a strong believer in the American dream and Nelle Reagan passed on to her son her penchant to always look for the good in people, regardless of their current position.

It was those early lessons in perseverance and faith that would inspire Ronald Reagan to pursue his dream of becoming a Hollywood actor. He signed his first professional acting contract in 1935 and went on to enjoy a successful career on the silver screen. But by 1946, after serving 3 years in the Army Air Force Intelligence Corps during the height of World War II, he began to have ambitions beyond Hollywood. A 5-year stint as the president of the Screen Actors Guild laid the foundation for Ronald Reagan's political career. During the turmoil of the Hollywood communism craze, Reagan proved himself to be a skilled dealmaker and an influential leader as he successfully navigated the upheaval in the Hollywood community.

In 1964, Ronald Reagan was thrust into the national spotlight as he gave his televised speech entitled, "A Time for Choosing," in support of the Presidential nominee Barry Goldwater.

Following his speech, a group of influential citizens became convinced that Ronald Reagan should become the next Governor of California. After winning in the primary and enduring a very hard-fought campaign, Ronald Reagan unseated the two-time Governor of California, Pat Brown, to become the 33rd Governor in California's history.

During his 2 terms as Governor, Californians enjoyed a smaller, less costly, and more efficient State government. Governor Reagan returned \$5 billion to the taxpayers and used his line-item veto authority 943 times to ensure that the State's budget matched its priorities.

Ronald Reagan had once again proved himself a determined and capable leader in difficult times, but soon the American people would learn that his best days were very much ahead of him. After an unsuccessful Republican Presidential attempt in 1976, he knew that he wanted to be President but

would only enter the race if the people of the United States actually wanted him to run. In the years following the 1976 primary, Ronald Reagan became increasingly concerned about the direction the country was headed, especially in the areas of national security, unemployment, and the economy. More than anything, Reagan sensed that Americans had lost their sense of confidence, not just in themselves but also in the country.

Interestingly, the concerns Mr. Reagan felt as he weighed the decision to run for President are not unlike many of the challenges we face today.

Ronald Reagan was confident that he was the man who could lead the country out of a dark recession and into the light of a new prosperity and national pride. After winning a landslide election in November, Ronald Reagan was sworn in as our 40th President on January 20, 1981. He immediately went to work on repairing a broken economy by enacting the Economic Recovery Tax Act of 1981, with his solid belief being that if people had more money in their pockets and confidence to invest, the country would get back on a sound financial footing. During his first months in office, Reagan was as much to thank for the new found economic stability as he was for a heightened sense of optimism that was returning to the United States after very hard times.

He thoughtfully guided the country through a series of national tragedies and terrorist attacks on our military forces abroad. Yet through it all, President Reagan's resolve never wavered, his confidence that the American people would meet the myriad challenges they faced never faltered. This was a man who, after surviving an assassination attempt, continued to meet with congressional leaders in his hospital room as he recovered because he believed it in the best interest of the American people that he continue working to the extent his body would allow. It was that type of steadfast determination that allowed the negotiations with Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev to move forward and eventually led to the tearing down of the Berlin Wall, the signing of the I.N.F. Treaty and eventually the end of Soviet oppression in Eastern Europe. The issue that got him into politics, ending the spread of communism, became the crowning achievement of his Presidency.

His constant refrain throughout his time in the White House was that government was becoming too big, too inefficient, too unresponsive and too wasteful. As Governor, Reagan demonstrated the ability to exercise fiscal restraint and he urged leaders in Congress to do the same thing. I think it appropriate that we are celebrating Reagan's 100th birthday at a time when national debt and the deficit are at an all-time high. While we know that Reagan possessed the willingness to tackle such issues, I believe the lesson

we can learn most from his Presidency is the endlessly optimistic attitude he had that the United States and its people would meet challenges of the day and emerge stronger because of the struggle to overcome.

His assertion that America was "the shining city on a hill" guided him, as it should us. A hard-nosed, gritty politician, Reagan would have jumped at the chance to take on the responsibility of leading this country out of this recession, just as he did in 1981. So as we celebrate Ronald Reagan's 100th birthday, let us take a moment to reflect upon the life of a man who, as President, always did what was necessary to move the country forward in the way he felt was most beneficial to those who mattered most, the people.

I know his legacy is most associated with the people of California, but as the junior Senator for Illinois, we will claim our right to note his birth in Tampico, his childhood in Dixon, and his college years at Eureka College. We will be very happy to mark the 100th birthday on Saturday in Chicagoland and through celebrations in other parts of the State, one of our great Presidents who very much changed the course and direction of this country and this world for the better.

I yield the floor, and 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. LIEBERMAN. 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. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, in 3 days' time, across our country, from the North Country of New Hampshire to his final resting place in Simi Valley, CA, Americans will celebrate the legacy of President Ronald Reagan. It will be the occasion of the 100th anniversary of his birth. I am very honored to rise today to join other colleagues of both parties and others throughout the United States and, I am sure, the world in paying tribute to America's 40th President.

I cannot speak as personally about President Reagan as some in this Chamber can. I met him only a few times when, as a visiting State attorney general during the eighties, I was at the White House. He was always gracious, always responsive to us. But I did have one meeting that I might call a virtual meeting with President Reagan that reminds me of his enduring importance for our country today.

Twenty-two years ago, on January 4, 1989, as President Reagan was departing the White House, having completed his second term, I had just arrived in Washington as a freshman Senator from Connecticut. President Reagan was set to give his final weekly radio address on that brisk Saturday morning, and then-Senate majority leader George Mitchell had honored me by

asking me if I would give the Democratic response. It was a real honor, although a daunting one, for me to be asked to do that on that occasion.

Looking back, I believe President Reagan's 331st and final radio address on that January morning was among the most masterful and moving of his career. In it, he captured the very essence of the American spirit. He said:

Whether we seek it or not, whether we like it or not, we Americans are keepers of the miracles. We are asked to be guardians of a place to come to, a place to start again, a place to live in the dignity God meant for his children. May it ever be so.

President Reagan concluded that morning. Needless to say, President Reagan's final radio address was quite literally a tough act to follow. In my remarks, I praised him for his love of country, for his fervent devotion to freedom, and for his commitment to the values of faith, flag, and family. I was, as I put it then, inspired and encouraged by his patriotism, and I urged all Americans to "work on our unfinished business and the challenges ahead with the spirit of purpose and confidence that is the legacy of the Reagan years."

Today, 22 years later, I continue to feel deeply honored that I was able to deliver those remarks and evermore confident of the importance of Ronald Reagan's legacy to us and the generations of Americans to come. The optimism, moral clarity, and confidence President Reagan radiated inspired a generation, and they are precisely the ideals we need today to rekindle and reinspire the current generation of Americans and others, frankly, living without freedom around the world.

I didn't always agree with President Reagan. That is a matter of public record. But I always understood the enduring value and strength and sincerity of his faith in America's values and America's destiny. In 1980, Ronald Reagan promised to make America great again. And he did. He expressed with total confidence that those who would challenge our hard-won freedoms would collapse. And they did.

He led our country and the free world to victory in the Cold War against Soviet communism, and he never doubted for a moment that America and our cause could and would prevail. When in 1977 Ronald Reagan was asked about his vision for the end of the Cold War—remember, he was not yet President—he responded with characteristic and refreshing directness. He said:

My idea of American policy toward the Soviet Union is simple, and some would say simplistic. It is this: We win and they lose.

Well, President Reagan's understanding of world affairs was far from simplistic. He was an optimist without illusions, who guided by and, frankly, expressed moral judgments about what was right and what was wrong. We do not see that enough today. There is a kind of relativism afoot. But some things are just plain wrong, and some things, thank God, are just plain right.

President Reagan had the moral clarity to make distinctions between good and evil and the moral courage to speak the truth of those distinctions unambiguously and to support them unwaveringly.

When he addressed an audience of veterans and world leaders commemorating the 40th anniversary of D-day, standing as he spoke on the windswept coast of northern France, the very cliff-top in Normandy where courageous allied soldiers fought to liberate Europe from the yoke of Nazi tyranny, President Reagan magnificently, masterfully, compellingly revealed again his moral clarity, and I am honored to quote these words today on this floor.

The men of Normandy had faith that what they were doing was right, faith that they fought for all humanity, faith that a just God would grant them mercy on this beach-head, or on the next. It was the deep knowledge—and pray God we have not lost it—that there is a profound moral difference between the use of force for liberation and the use of force for conquest. You were here—

He said to the veterans—

to liberate, not to conquer, and so you and those others did not doubt your cause. And you were right not to doubt. You all knew that some things are worth dying for. One's country is worth dying for, and democracy is worth dying for, because it's the most deeply honorable form of government ever devised by man. All of you loved liberty. All of you were willing to fight tyranny, and you knew the people of your countries were behind you.

It is thrilling just to read those words again. Yet President Reagan never spoke about America's enemies belligerently; rather, he spoke firmly and frankly about the deep divide between our morality and that of the Soviet Union. In doing so, I think he re-awakened in all of us the belief that every human being has the potential to change history because history, as Reagan knew, was not by abstract inexorable forces, but by real live men and women.

It was President Ronald Reagan who came to the defense of the dissidents in their fight against the Soviet Union and reminded the world that a single courageous human face, a single courageous voice can tear down the faceless inhumanity of a massive repressive system such as the Soviet Union.

The great Soviet dissident and later Israeli leader and human rights activist Natan Sharansky once shared with me his memory of the moment he first learned of President Reagan's 1982 speech before the British Parliament, the speech in which Reagan described the Soviet Union as an evil empire.

There were some in this country who thought that was much too stark and disrespectful. But Sharansky, who was a prisoner for nearly a decade in the Soviet gulag, described to me how word of Reagan's speech spread through that heartless prison and he and his fellow dissidents tapped on walls and talked through pipes and even toilets to communicate the extraordinary news that the leader of the free world had spoken

the truth, a truth, as Sharansky put it, "that burned inside the heart of each and every one of us."

Indeed, President Reagan was willing to expose an inconvenient truth about the Soviet Union that unsettled and unnerved some of his contemporaries who feared his undiplomatic words were a threat to stability. The truth is, they were. President Reagan refused to accept the stability of an authoritarian status quo that consigned millions of people to live under perpetual tyranny. So he did challenge the stability of the Berlin Wall and the gulag as the Stasi. In doing so, his moral courage helped inspire the men and women who brought down the Iron Curtain and expanded the frontiers of freedom.

In his approach to foreign policy, President Reagan embodied that quintessentially American combination of idealism and pragmatism. He understood what America was about, which is freedom and opportunity. He fought to extend those great values here at home and throughout the world.

In his final words to the Nation as our President, in a radio address on that January morning 22 years ago, President Reagan shared a story about a meeting Winston Churchill had with a group of American journalists in 1952. It was a time when many doubted whether the West could meet the challenges of the Cold War and prevail.

Churchill asked the reporters:

What other nation in history, when it became supremely powerful, has had no thought of territorial aggrandizement, no ambition but to use its resources for the good of the world? I marvel at America's altruism, her sublime disinterestedness.

Churchill's friend and physician, Lord Moran, described the Prime Minister's demeanor as he spoke:

All at once I realized Winston was in tears. His eyes were red. His voice faltered. He was deeply moved.

President Reagan was drawn to that story in his final radio address to the Nation 22 years ago because he understood that in that moment Churchill understood and acknowledged the greatness of the American spirit. Imperfect though we are as human beings, it is the spirit that explains who we are and expresses all we aspire to be. He saw America's devotion to a cause that has defined us for over two centuries, a cause greater than our own individual self-interest or even national self-interest very often and that has given an enduring purpose to our national destiny. That is the cause of human dignity and human freedom.

At a time when we face many challenges both at home and abroad and when it has, unfortunately, become fashionable to suggest that our best days as a nation are behind us, President Reagan's optimism and his abiding faith in America are more important to remember than ever before. They are as wise as they are true. Our shared national destiny has always inspired us as Americans and propelled

us forward together. It is the spirit that Ronald Reagan re-inspired in America at a time of great peril. It is spirit, at this time of peril here at home and around the world, that can carry us forward and continue to make us the greatest Nation on Earth and the last best hope of mankind.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SANDERS). The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Connecticut. I am glad I had the opportunity to hear them.

I, too, am here to celebrate Ronald Reagan's life, born 100 years ago, but also his nearly 50 years of influence on American public policy. I begin in this way. A few years ago when he was President, President Reagan attended one of the many Washington press dinners held here. I think it was the Gridiron dinner. It was well known to 90 percent of the people in the audience that members of the press had a different point of view on politics than he did, but they liked him anyway, and they respected him, just as he respected them. I remember that evening that he strode into the Gridiron dinner smiling and looking like a million bucks. The press rose and smiled back and applauded him. President Reagan stood in front of the media until the applause subsided and then he said:

Thank you very much. I know how hard it is to clap with your fingers crossed.

The media laughed. They had a wonderful time with President Reagan.

The first thing we think about, those of us who had a chance to know him—and that was a great many of us—is that Ronald Reagan was a very friendly, congenial man, an easy person to know, the kind of person one would enjoy spending time with. He was very comfortable, as we say, in his own skin. What we saw in private was what everybody else saw in public.

Ronald Reagan was about more than being friendly and congenial. Each of us has a personal story of his or her connection to President Reagan. I have mine, and I wish this as an example.

Sixteen years ago this month I stood, as a great many Members of this body have, on the front porch of my hometown courthouse. In my case, it was in Maryville, TN. There I announced my candidacy for President of the United States. It was an offer the people of the United States did not accept. My preacher brother-in-law said I should consider that defeat as a reverse calling. I have, and I have gone on to other things.

As an example of the influence President Reagan had on my generation and others, let me read an example of what I said in 1995, 16 years ago:

Thirty years ago Ronald Reagan, before he was elected to any public office, made an address called "A Time For Choosing." He said that in America freedom is our greatest value, and that then there were two great threats: communism abroad and big government at home.

Looking back over those last 30 years, I suppose we could say, one down and one to go. Communism, the evil empire, has virtually disappeared. But big government at home has become an arrogant empire, obnoxious and increasingly irrelevant in a telecommunications age. In every neighborhood in America, the government in Washington is stepping on the promise of American Life. The New American Revolution is about lifting that yoke from the backs of American teachers, farmers, business men and women, college presidents, and homeless shelter directors and giving us the freedom to make decisions for ourselves.

Ronald Reagan put it this way in 1964: "This is the issue of the election. Whether we believe in our capacity for self-government or whether we abandon the American Revolution and confess that a little intellectual elite in a far distant capital can plan our lives for us better than we can plan ourselves."

That was also the issue of the election in 1994. It will be the issue of 1996, and for years to come. It took 30 years of unfashionable principled leadership by the last Republican Washington outsider who became President to help collapse the evil empire. Now is a good time to give another Republican Washington outsider the opportunity to help put some humility into the arrogant empire in Washington, D.C.

So we see that the issues of 1964, the issues of 1994, the issues of 2010, and most likely the issues of 2012 and 2016 and beyond have a lot of similarities.

Over that half century, Ronald Reagan was the finest spokesman for that point of view, the finest and the most persuasive.

We Americans say anything is possible. Nothing symbolizes that more than the American Presidency. We see it in President Obama today, we saw it in President Lincoln, we saw it in President Truman, we saw it in President Eisenhower, and we saw it in Ronald Reagan. No President symbolized that more in the last half century than President Reagan did, though. He reminded us of what it means to be an American. He lifted our spirits, he made us proud, he strengthened our character, and he taught us a great many lessons. We celebrate the centennial of his birth and the half century of his influence in public life.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD Ronald Reagan's speech "A Time for Choosing," given on October 27, 1964, which launched him into public debate in the United States.

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

RONALD REAGAN—"A TIME FOR CHOOSING"
(October 27, 1964)

Thank you. Thank you very much. Thank you and good evening. The sponsor has been identified, but unlike most television programs, the performer hasn't been provided with a script. As a matter of fact, I have been permitted to choose my own words and discuss my own ideas regarding the choice that we face in the next few weeks.

I have spent most of my life as a Democrat. I recently have seen fit to follow another course. I believe that the issues confronting us cross party lines. Now, one side in this campaign has been telling us that the

issues of this election are the maintenance of peace and prosperity. The line has been used, "We've never had it so good."

But I have an uncomfortable feeling that this prosperity isn't something on which we can base our hopes for the future. No nation in history has ever survived a tax burden that reached a third of its national income. Today, 37 cents out of every dollar earned in this country is the tax collector's share, and yet our government continues to spend 17 million dollars a day more than the government takes in. We haven't balanced our budget 28 out of the last 34 years. We've raised our debt limit three times in the last twelve months, and now our national debt is one and a half times bigger than all the combined debts of all the nations of the world. We have 15 billion dollars in gold in our treasury; we don't own an ounce. Foreign dollar claims are 27.3 billion dollars. And we've just had announced that the dollar of 1939 will now purchase 45 cents in its total value.

As for the peace that we would preserve, I wonder who among us would like to approach the wife or mother whose husband or son has died in South Vietnam and ask them if they think this is a peace that should be maintained indefinitely. Do they mean peace, or do they mean we just want to be left in peace? There can be no real peace while one American is dying some place in the world for the rest of us. We're at war with the most dangerous enemy that has ever faced mankind in his long climb from the swamp to the stars, and it's been said if we lose that war, and in so doing lose this way of freedom of ours, history will record with the greatest astonishment that those who had the most to lose did the least to prevent its happening. Well I think it's time we ask ourselves if we still know the freedoms that were intended for us by the Founding Fathers.

Not too long ago, two friends of mine were talking to a Cuban refugee, a businessman who had escaped from Castro, and in the midst of his story one of my friends turned to the other and said, "We don't know how lucky we are." And the Cuban stopped and said, "How lucky you are? I had someplace to escape to." And in that sentence he told us the entire story. If we lose freedom here, there's no place to escape to. This is the last stand on earth.

And this idea that government is beholden to the people, that it has no other source of power except the sovereign people, is still the newest and the most unique idea in all the long history of man's relation to man.

This is the issue of this election: Whether we believe in our capacity for self-government or whether we abandon the American revolution and confess that a little intellectual elite in a far-distant capitol can plan our lives for us better than we can plan them ourselves.

You and I are told increasingly we have to choose between a left or right. Well I'd like to suggest there is no such thing as a left or right. There's only an up or down—[up] man's old—old-aged dream, the ultimate in individual freedom consistent with law and order, or down to the ant heap of totalitarianism. And regardless of their sincerity, their humanitarian motives, those who would trade our freedom for security have embarked on this downward course.

In this vote-harvesting time, they use terms like the "Great Society," or as we were told a few days ago by the President, we must accept a greater government activity in the affairs of the people. But they've been a little more explicit in the past and among themselves; and all of the things I now will quote have appeared in print. These are not Republican accusations. For example, they have voices that say, "The cold war

will end through our acceptance of a not undemocratic socialism." Another voice says, "The profit motive has become outmoded. It must be replaced by the incentives of the welfare state." Or, "Our traditional system of individual freedom is incapable of solving the complex problems of the 20th century." Senator Fullbright has said at Stanford University that the Constitution is outmoded. He referred to the President as "our moral teacher and our leader," and he says he is "hobbled in his task by the restrictions of power imposed on him by this antiquated document." He must "be freed," so that he "can do for us" what he knows "is best." And Senator Clark of Pennsylvania, another articulate spokesman, defines liberalism as "meeting the material needs of the masses through the full power of centralized government."

Well, I, for one, resent it when a representative of the people refers to you and me, the free men and women of this country, as "the masses." This is a term we haven't applied to ourselves in America. But beyond that, "the full power of centralized government"—this was the very thing the Founding Fathers sought to minimize. They knew that governments don't control things. A government can't control the economy without controlling people. And they know when a government sets out to do that, it must use force and coercion to achieve its purpose. They also knew, those Founding Fathers, that outside of its legitimate functions, government does nothing as well or as economically as the private sector of the economy.

Now, we have no better example of this than government's involvement in the farm economy over the last 30 years. Since 1955, the cost of this program has nearly doubled. One-fourth of farming in America is responsible for 85 percent of the farm surplus. Three-fourths of farming is out on the free market and has known a 21 percent increase in the per capita consumption of all its produce. You see, that one-fourth of farming—that's regulated and controlled by the federal government. In the last three years we've spent 43 dollars in the feed grain program for every dollar bushel of corn we don't grow.

Senator Humphrey last week charged that Barry Goldwater, as President, would seek to eliminate farmers. He should do his homework a little better, because he'll find out that we've had a decline of 5 million in the farm population under these government programs. He'll also find that the Democratic administration has sought to get from Congress [an] extension of the farm program to include that three-fourths that is now free. He'll find that they've also asked for the right to imprison farmers who wouldn't keep books as prescribed by the federal government. The Secretary of Agriculture asked for the right to seize farms through condemnation and resell them to other individuals. And contained in that same program was a provision that would have allowed the federal government to remove 2 million farmers from the soil.

At the same time, there's been an increase in the Department of Agriculture employees. There's now one for every 30 farms in the United States, and still they can't tell us how 66 shiploads of grain headed for Austria disappeared without a trace and Billie Sol Estes never left shore.

Every responsible farmer and farm organization has repeatedly asked the government to free the farm economy, but how—who are farmers to know what's best for them? The wheat farmers voted against a wheat program. The government passed it anyway. Now the price of bread goes up; the price of wheat to the farmer goes down.

Meanwhile, back in the city, under urban renewal the assault on freedom carries on.

Private property rights [are] so diluted that public interest is almost anything a few government planners decide it should be. In a program that takes from the needy and gives to the greedy, we see such spectacles as in Cleveland, Ohio, a million-and-a-half-dollar building completed only three years ago must be destroyed to make way for what government officials call a "more compatible use of the land." The President tells us he's now going to start building public housing units in the thousands, where heretofore we've only built them in the hundreds. But FHA [Federal Housing Authority] and the Veterans Administration tell us they have 120,000 housing units they've taken back through mortgage foreclosure. For three decades, we've sought to solve the problems of unemployment through government planning, and the more the plans fail, the more the planners plan. The latest is the Area Redevelopment Agency.

They've just declared Rice County, Kansas, a depressed area. Rice County, Kansas, has two hundred oil wells, and the 14,000 people there have over 30 million dollars on deposit in personal savings in their banks. And when the government tells you you're depressed, lie down and be depressed.

We have so many people who can't see a fat man standing beside a thin one without coming to the conclusion the fat man got that way by taking advantage of the thin one. So they're going to solve all the problems of human misery through government and government planning. Well, now, if government planning and welfare had the answer—and they've had almost 30 years of it—shouldn't we expect government to read the score to us once in a while? Shouldn't they be telling us about the decline each year in the number of people needing help? The reduction in the need for public housing?

But the reverse is true. Each year the need grows greater; the program grows greater. We were told four years ago that 17 million people went to bed hungry each night. Well that was probably true. They were all on a diet. But now we're told that 9.3 million families in this country are poverty-stricken on the basis of earning less than 3,000 dollars a year. Welfare spending [is] 10 times greater than in the dark depths of the Depression. We're spending 45 billion dollars on welfare. Now do a little arithmetic, and you'll find that if we divided the 45 billion dollars up equally among those 9 million poor families, we'd be able to give each family 4,600 dollars a year. And this added to their present income should eliminate poverty. Direct aid to the poor, however, is only running only about 600 dollars per family. It would seem that someplace there must be some overhead.

Now—so now we declare "war on poverty," or "You, too, can be a Bobby Baker." Now do they honestly expect us to believe that if we add 1 billion dollars to the 45 billion we're spending, one more program to the 30-odd we have—and remember, this new program doesn't replace any, it just duplicates existing programs—do they believe that poverty is suddenly going to disappear by magic? Well, in all fairness I should explain there is one part of the new program that isn't duplicated. This is the youth feature. We're now going to solve the dropout problem, juvenile delinquency, by reinstating something like the old CCC camps (Civilian Conservation Corps), and we're going to put our young people in these camps. But again we do some arithmetic, and we find that we're going to spend each year just on room and board for each young person we help 4,700 dollars a year. We can send them to Harvard for 2,700! Course, don't get me wrong. I'm not suggesting Harvard is the answer to juvenile delinquency.

But seriously, what are we doing to those we seek to help? Not too long ago, a judge called me here in Los Angeles. He told me of a young woman who'd come before him for a divorce. She had six children, was pregnant with her seventh. Under his questioning, she revealed her husband was a laborer earning 250 dollars a month. She wanted a divorce to get an 80 dollar raise. She's eligible for 330 dollars a month in the Aid to Dependent Children Program. She got the idea from two women in her neighborhood who'd already done that very thing.

Yet anytime you and I question the schemes of the do-gooders, we're denounced as being against their humanitarian goals. They say we're always "against" things—we're never "for" anything.

Well, the trouble with our liberal friends is not that they're ignorant; it's just that they know so much that isn't so.

Now—we're for a provision that destitution should not follow unemployment by reason of old age, and to that end we've accepted Social Security as a step toward meeting the problem.

But we're against those entrusted with this program when they practice deception regarding its fiscal shortcomings, when they charge that any criticism of the program means that we want to end payments to those people who depend on them for a livelihood. They've called it "insurance" to us in a hundred million pieces of literature. But then they appeared before the Supreme Court and they testified it was a welfare program. They only use the term "insurance" to sell it to the people. And they said Social Security dues are a tax for the general use of the government, and the government has used that tax. There is no fund, because Robert Byers, the actuarial head, appeared before a congressional committee and admitted that Social Security as of this moment is 298 billion dollars in the hole. But he said there should be no cause for worry because as long as they have the power to tax, they could always take away from the people whatever they needed to bail them out of trouble. And they're doing just that.

A young man, 21 years of age, working at an average salary—his Social Security contribution would, in the open market, buy him an insurance policy that would guarantee 220 dollars a month at age 65. The government promises 127. He could live it up until he's 31 and then take out a policy that would pay more than Social Security. Now are we so lacking in business sense that we can't put this program on a sound basis, so that people who do require those payments will find they can get them when they're due—that the cupboard isn't bare?

Barry Goldwater thinks we can.

At the same time, can't we introduce voluntary features that would permit a citizen who can do better on his own to be excused upon presentation of evidence that he had made provision for the non-earning years? Should we not allow a widow with children to work, and not lose the benefits supposedly paid for by her deceased husband? Shouldn't you and I be allowed to declare who our beneficiaries will be under this program, which we cannot do? I think we're for telling our senior citizens that no one in this country should be denied medical care because of a lack of funds. But I think we're against forcing all citizens, regardless of need, into a compulsory government program, especially when we have such examples, as was announced last week, when France admitted that their Medicare program is now bankrupt. They've come to the end of the road.

In addition, was Barry Goldwater so irresponsible when he suggested that our government give up its program of deliberate, planned inflation, so that when you do get

your Social Security pension, a dollar will buy a dollar's worth, and not 45 cents worth?

I think we're for an international organization, where the nations of the world can seek peace. But I think we're against subordinating American interests to an organization that has become so structurally unsound that today you can muster a two-thirds vote on the floor of the General Assembly among nations that represent less than 10 percent of the world's population. I think we're against the hypocrisy of assailing our allies because here and there they cling to a colony, while we engage in a conspiracy of silence and never open our mouths about the millions of people enslaved in the Soviet colonies in the satellite nations.

I think we're for aiding our allies by sharing of our material blessings with those nations which share in our fundamental beliefs, but we're against doling out money government to government, creating bureaucracy, if not socialism, all over the world. We set out to help 19 countries. We're helping 107. We've spent 146 billion dollars. With that money, we bought a 2 million dollar yacht for Haile Selassie. We bought dress suits for Greek undertakers, extra wives for Kenya[n] government officials. We bought a thousand TV sets for a place where they have no electricity. In the last six years, 52 nations have bought 7 billion dollars worth of our gold, and all 52 are receiving foreign aid from this country.

No government ever voluntarily reduces itself in size. So governments' programs, once launched, never disappear.

Actually, a government bureau is the nearest thing to eternal life we'll ever see on this earth.

Federal employees—federal employees number two and a half million; and federal, state, and local, one out of six of the nation's work force employed by government. These proliferating bureaus with their thousands of regulations have cost us many of our constitutional safeguards. How many of us realize that today federal agents can invade a man's property without a warrant? They can impose a fine without a formal hearing, let alone a trial by jury? And they can seize and sell his property at auction to enforce the payment of that fine. In Chico County, Arkansas, James Wier over-planted his rice allotment. The government obtained a 17,000 dollar judgment. And a U.S. marshal sold his 960-acre farm at auction. The government said it was necessary as a warning to others to make the system work.

Last February 19th at the University of Minnesota, Norman Thomas, six-times candidate for President on the Socialist Party ticket, said, "If Barry Goldwater became President, he would stop the advance of socialism in the United States." I think that's exactly what he will do.

But as a former Democrat, I can tell you Norman Thomas isn't the only man who has drawn this parallel to socialism with the present administration, because back in 1936, Mr. Democrat himself, Al Smith, the great American, came before the American people and charged that the leadership of his Party was taking the Party of Jefferson, Jackson, and Cleveland down the road under the banners of Marx, Lenin, and Stalin. And he walked away from his Party, and he never returned til the day he died—because to this day, the leadership of that Party has been taking that Party, that honorable Party, down the road in the image of the labor Socialist Party of England.

Now it doesn't require expropriation or confiscation of private property or business to impose socialism on a people. What does it mean whether you hold the deed to the—or the title to your business or property if the government holds the power of life and death

over that business or property? And such machinery already exists. The government can find some charge to bring against any concern it chooses to prosecute. Every businessman has his own tale of harassment. Somewhere a perversion has taken place. Our natural, unalienable rights are now considered to be a dispensation of government, and freedom has never been so fragile, so close to slipping from our grasp as it is at this moment.

Our Democratic opponents seem unwilling to debate these issues. They want to make you and I believe that this is a contest between two men—that we're to choose just between two personalities.

Well what of this man that they would destroy—and in destroying, they would destroy that which he represents, the ideas that you and I hold dear? Is he the brash and shallow and trigger-happy man they say he is? Well I've been privileged to know him "when." I knew him long before he ever dreamed of trying for high office, and I can tell you personally I've never known a man in my life I believed so incapable of doing a dishonest or dishonorable thing.

This is a man who, in his own business before he entered politics, instituted a profit-sharing plan before unions had ever thought of it. He put in health and medical insurance for all his employees. He took 50 percent of the profits before taxes and set up a retirement program, a pension plan for all his employees. He sent monthly checks for life to an employee who was ill and couldn't work. He provides nursing care for the children of mothers who work in the stores. When Mexico was ravaged by the floods in the Rio Grande, he climbed in his airplane and flew medicine and supplies down there.

An ex-GI told me how he met him. It was the week before Christmas during the Korean War, and he was at the Los Angeles airport trying to get a ride home to Arizona for Christmas. And he said that [there were] a lot of servicemen there and no seats available on the planes. And then a voice came over the loudspeaker and said, "Any men in uniform wanting a ride to Arizona, go to runway such-and-such," and they went down there, and there was a fellow named Barry Goldwater sitting in his plane. Every day in those weeks before Christmas, all day long, he'd load up the plane, fly it to Arizona, fly them to their homes, fly back over to get another load.

During the hectic split-second timing of a campaign, this is a man who took time out to sit beside an old friend who was dying of cancer. His campaign managers were understandably impatient, but he said, "There aren't many left who care what happens to her. I'd like her to know I care." This is a man who said to his 19-year-old son, "There is no foundation like the rock of honesty and fairness, and when you begin to build your life on that rock, with the cement of the faith in God that you have, then you have a real start." This is not a man who could carelessly send other people's sons to war. And that is the issue of this campaign that makes all the other problems I've discussed academic, unless we realize we're in a war that must be won.

Those who would trade our freedom for the soup kitchen of the welfare state have told us they have a utopian solution of peace without victory. They call their policy "accommodation." And they say if we'll only avoid any direct confrontation with the enemy, he'll forget his evil ways and learn to love us. All who oppose them are indicted as warmongers. They say we offer simple answers to complex problems. Well, perhaps there is a simple answer—not an easy answer—but simple: If you and I have the courage to tell our elected officials that we want

our national policy based on what we know in our hearts is morally right.

We cannot buy our security, our freedom from the threat of the bomb by committing an immorality so great as saying to a billion human beings now enslaved behind the Iron Curtain, "Give up your dreams of freedom because to save our own skins, we're willing to make a deal with your slave masters." Alexander Hamilton said, "A nation which can prefer disgrace to danger is prepared for a master, and deserves one." Now let's set the record straight. There's no argument over the choice between peace and war, but there's only one guaranteed way you can have peace—and you can have it in the next second—surrender.

Admittedly, there's a risk in any course we follow other than this, but every lesson of history tells us that the greater risk lies in appeasement, and this is the specter our well-meaning liberal friends refuse to face—that their policy of accommodation is appeasement, and it gives no choice between peace and war, only between fight or surrender. If we continue to accommodate, continue to back and retreat, eventually we have to face the final demand—the ultimatum. And what then—when Nikita Khrushchev has told his people he knows what our answer will be? He has told them that we're retreating under the pressure of the Cold War, and someday when the time comes to deliver the final ultimatum, our surrender will be voluntary, because by that time we will have been weakened from within spiritually, morally, and economically. He believes this because from our side he's heard voices pleading for "peace at any price" or "better Red than dead," or as one commentator put it, he'd rather "live on his knees than die on his feet." And therein lies the road to war, because those voices don't speak for the rest of us.

You and I know and do not believe that life is so dear and peace so sweet as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery. If nothing in life is worth dying for, when did this begin—just in the face of this enemy? Or should Moses have told the children of Israel to live in slavery under the pharaohs? Should Christ have refused the cross? Should the patriots at Concord Bridge have thrown down their guns and refused to fire the shot heard 'round the world? The martyrs of history were not fools, and our honored dead who gave their lives to stop the advance of the Nazis didn't die in vain. Where, then, is the road to peace? Well it's a simple answer after all.

You and I have the courage to say to our enemies, "There is a price we will not pay." "There is a point beyond which they must not advance." And this—this is the meaning in the phrase of Barry Goldwater's "peace through strength." Winston Churchill said, "The destiny of man is not measured by material computations. When great forces are on the move in the world, we learn we're spirits—not animals." And he said, "There's something going on in time and space, and beyond time and space, which, whether we like it or not, spells duty."

You and I have a rendezvous with destiny. We'll preserve for our children this, the last best hope of man on earth, or we'll sentence them to take the last step into a thousand years of darkness.

We will keep in mind and remember that Barry Goldwater has faith in us. He has faith that you and I have the ability and the dignity and the right to make our own decisions and determine our own destiny.

Thank you very much.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD as well remarks I made in Orange County, CA,

on October 28, 1994, on the 30th anniversary of the speech "A Time for Choosing."

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

30TH ANNIVERSARY OF RONALD REAGAN
REVOLUTION

(By Lamar Alexander, Oct. 28, 1994)

I don't think Ronald Reagan would mind if before we get down to business, I told you one Minnie Pearl story. They are pretty good friends. Most people who have run for governor of Tennessee in the past 30-40 years have done so in order to live next door to Minnie Pearl. Her house is next door to the governor's mansion. And, you learn very quickly living next door to Minnie that you don't try to tell a better story than she can; because, she'll one up you.

I was telling her after I left office about how people would look at me, but they could not remember why they knew they had seen me before. One man up in the mountains walked up and stared me in the face and said, "Ain't you Alexander?" I said, "Yes, sir." He stared a while longer and said, "Well, you sure don't favor yourself."

Minnie said, "Well, let me tell you what happened to me. . . . I was in the elevator in Opryland Hotel, minding my own business, and this tourist from California gets on and looks me up and down and says, 'I'll bet a lot of people tell you that you look like Minnie Pearl.'" She said, "and I said very sweetly, 'Yes, sir, they do,' and, he looked me down a while longer and said, 'And, I'll bet it makes you mad, don't it?'"

It was reported that several Goldwater aides warned against letting Ronald Reagan make a speech this summer. He'll be inflammatory, they said. Sen. Goldwater intervened and made sure he didn't. And, Ronald Reagan didn't disappoint those aides. He began in this way, "I am going to speak of controversial things and I make no apologies for this." The speech that we saw has made a landmark. It defines the things we Americans value most, our freedom. And, what most menaced that freedom, communists abroad and big government at home. It became a call to arms for conservatives, a rallying point, a promise of hope for the future.

We are here tonight less than two weeks before another election, one that has taken on all the characteristics of a presidential election. It's become a referendum on the direction of our country. I would like to talk tonight for a few minutes about what the speech, "A Time for Choosing," has meant to America during the last thirty years and what lessons we might learn for the next thirty.

If I had to put it in one sentence, what we have learned from the last thirty, that the principle threat to freedom abroad has been defeated and the principle of threat at home has gotten more menacing. The evil empire in the Kremlin has collapsed but the government in Washington has become an arrogant empire; spreading its tentacles into our everyday lives.

I was a student at New York University on October 27, 1964. And, to tell you the truth, I wasn't paying much attention to politics. So, I was struck when I read what we just saw, what Ronald Reagan said about the 1964 campaign. He said, "This is the issue of the election whether we believe in our capacity for self-government or whether we abandon the American Revolution and confess that a little intellectual elite in a far distant Capitol can plan our lives better than we can plan our lives ourselves."

Replace the words "little intellectual elite" with an arrogant empire and you have

the issue of this election, the one in 10 days, as well. In 1964, Ronald Reagan's talk of peace overseas could have just as easily applied to the dangers of the approaching encroachments of Washington, DC, into our everyday lives at home. He said it. "Every lesson of history teaches us that the greater risk lies in people. There is a price we will not pay. There is a point beyond which our enemies must not advance. You and I have a rendezvous with destiny. We will preserve for our children this, the last best hope of man on earth that we will sentence them to take the last step into a thousand years of darkness."

Those were dramatic words, but these are dramatic events with dramatic consequences. Sometimes we forget just how unproven Ronald Reagan's thinking generally was. Even after he was president. At Westminster, he predicted that the Soviet Union would wind up in the ash heap of history. No other world leader would say anything like that.

I remember one Sunday in 1984, when I was sitting in a church in Amsterdam, our family had just left Anne Frank's house and were remembering the stories how on another Sunday morning the German tanks had unexpectedly arrived in 1940. I was listening to the minister in that church in Amsterdam denounce the cold war policies, as he said, of Reagan and Begin and Hitler.

In 1987, when Pres. Reagan was preparing for his speech at the Brandenburg gate, some nervous aides wanted to eliminate the phrase, "Mr. Gorbachev, tear down this wall." They were afraid it was so unlikely that it would seem un-presidential. Pres. Reagan told Martin Anderson, not long ago, that, "When I called them the evil empire I did it on purpose. I wanted them to know that we saw them for what they were."

The evil empires collapsed; the Berlin Wall has come down. And we should never forget that Germany would not be united, that we and the Russians would not be dismantling weapons of mass destruction, that Arafat and Rapine would not have shaken hands, if the Cold War hadn't ended, and the Cold War would not have ended unless President Reagan had persisted in that bold and unfashionable thinking that he outlined in his speech in 1964.

Unfortunately, the second great menace that Ronald Reagan pointed to in 1964 is if anything more menacing. He said in '64, "Our government continues to spend \$17 million a day more than our government takes in." 30 years later our government spends \$643 million a day more than our government takes in. Ronald Reagan said in 1964, we haven't balanced our budget for 28 out of the last 34 years. Well, that is still true today, except it is 57 out of the last 64.

But we don't need statistics to prove that, we see that in our everyday lives. I saw it this summer. Between the 4th of July and Labor Day when I did something many Americans do, I drove across the country. I came to Orange County on that drive. I spent many of the nights on that drive with families I had never met before; eating supper; staying up late talking.

Driving across America, there are several ways to take the temperature of the country. Bumper stickers, for example. One of them on Interstate 10 in Louisiana said, "Make welfare as hard to get as a building permit." Another one, in Florida said, "I love my country but I fear my government!" But, as I drove along, I found a better way to take the temperature of the country. And that was by asking a question of the families with whom I stayed, and tonight I would like to ask you to ask yourselves that question, and it is this: "Looking ahead 30 years, do you believe your children and your grand-

children will have more opportunities growing up in this country than you have had?"

When I asked that question this summer, I got a lot of long pauses and most people were afraid to say yes. This ambivalence about our future, if it is allowed to persist, will destroy what is special about this country. Namely, our almost irrational belief in the unlimited future of America and that every one of us, no matter where we come from, no matter what our station in life is, has a chance to have a piece of that future. On my drive, I was reminded that we Americans know exactly what is causing that loss of optimism. It is, first, the government in Washington, and it is, second, our drift away from standards and principles and values that have made this such a remarkable country in the first place.

This is not something that I just heard at Republicans dinners. Father Jerry Hill, for example, runs a homeless shelter in Dallas, Texas. He won't take a federal grant anymore because he has grown tired of filling out forms all day Friday to justify what he has done Monday through Thursday. He says federal grants have made a nation of liars of us; applying for money that we don't need to spend for things we do need. And he is absolutely outraged that the government in Washington is paying \$446 a month in Social Security disability benefits to drug addicts. He says, "I can't help it when they have that kind of support for their addiction."

Whether it is a school board member, whether it is a small business man or woman, a teacher, a hospital director, a housing project director, a former Cherokee Indian Chief—I have visited them all and they have had it up to here. They have had it up to here, and they can hardly say in civil terms how much they resent, not just the meddling, but the arrogance of the government in Washington, DC.

Let me give you an example close to home. Many of you are candidates for the school boards of Orange County. I salute you. I cannot think of anything more important, but, let me ask you this in very blunt terms: Do you really believe that you are too stupid to set the weapons policy for the schools of Orange County? Well, your United States Senator does and most of the Congress agrees with her.

In fact, the entire Congress passed a thousand-page education bill that takes a great many decisions from you, if you should be elected: The decision about what to say in a parent/teacher conference. The decision about how much school choice could be granted to parents. A definition of what a family is. The decision about whether text books should be replaced with new textbooks that focus on gender equity as defined by the new Assistant Secretary of Education. That all passed in the last week of this session of this Congress. Congress decided all of it and established in addition a sort of national school board, and they are not even embarrassed about it.

President Clinton and Senator Feinstein held a press conference here in California to say, in effect, that they were proud of the fact that they had taken away the freedom of a thousand California school boards to assign a weapons policy for 7,100 schools and more than 5 million children. Senator Kennedy and President Clinton held a press conference of their own in Massachusetts. And for what? To pat themselves on the back for taking away your freedoms to make decisions in your own neighborhoods in your own schools about how to educate your own children.

Here is the most powerful lesson of "A Time for Choosing" in the last 30 years. With the evil empire, President Reagan did exactly what a president ought to do. He solved

the menace to freedom. He put aside less important issues. He developed a strategy. He persuaded at least half the people he was right. He persisted. He threw himself unfashionably into it until he wore everyone else out, and then he succeeded.

Now we must do the same at home. We should train our sights on the arrogant empire in Washington, DC. That is the issue of this election, and it will be issue of 1996 as well.

In 1992, Bill Clinton had a wonderful opportunity. This country was ready for a new generation of leadership; it wanted to look outside Washington for its answers. President Clinton gave us five minutes of hope and then proceeded to lead us in exactly the wrong direction. Washington taxes, Washington healthcare, a national school board, reinventing everything in Washington, DC. He has help in 2 years to create an even more arrogant empire. Which is why in California, and why in this country, we will be having a Republican sweep in 10 days.

Whether that dream comes, something else will have been created which is an opportunity a mile wide for the Republican Party. Because the voters will then turn around to us and say, "Well, what are you guys for?" And we should not kid ourselves. The voters are not going to be expecting too much from us because our Republican agenda has either been non-existent, or too tempered, so much so that it sounds like usually that about all we can do is be against what the Democrats are for.

So let us remember Ronald Reagan's example and his boldness and train our sights on the menace of freedom at home in the same way he trained his sights on the mask of freedom abroad. For example, instead of congressional reform at the margins, I say we should cut their pay and send them home. I mean by that that the United States Congress should spend six months in Washington; six months at home and have half as much pay. Let them take a real job, live alongside the rest of us. If you want a Congress of citizens who's more responsive to you than to the lobbyist in Washington, this is the way to do it. The eleven states with the lowest taxes have a legislature that is limited to meeting for 90 days. That would be one thing.

Instead of reforming welfare in Washington, DC; let's end welfare in Washington, DC. Send them home and send the tax base with them back to the states. Send most of elementary and secondary education and jobs-related there as well. Send some of the departments and agencies, too. No more entitlements, period. Not one more law that imposes an unfunded mandate on a state government or a federal government. Term limits; balanced budget; line-item veto; a wholesale review of the federal rule making authority and an education bill that would free local schools from Washington control; privatize all public housing. All of this will increase our freedoms at home by preventing someone in Washington, DC, from making those decisions for us.

An agenda like this will catch plenty of flak. Remember Reagan and Begin and Hitler. Already the Washington establishment has said it can't imagine a dumber idea than a citizen Congress. I cannot count the number of nights that I have been in editorial board meetings and been accused of trying to destroy public schools because I suggested that at least poor children ought to have more of the same choices of the best schools—the ones that the members of the editorial board send their children to.

Approved thinking is not always right thinking. We'll be accused of turning and taking America back to the dark ages. We have already been accused by the Democrats

in this election of going as far back as the days of Ronald Reagan. If that is an issue on Election Day, I think I know how the referendum will come out. But, eventually, we will be seen for what we are. Painters of a picture of America's future based on freedom and opportunity.

I have this prediction to make. The arrogant empire at home will also be consigned to the ash heap. It will for a while be unfashionable to say this and it will seem overly dramatic to suggest that calling a halt to this "too big for its britches" government in Washington, DC, is a rendezvous with destiny for this generation but I believe that it is so. And, just as the collapse of the Soviet Union didn't solve all of our problems abroad—in fact it created a much more uncertain and unstable world that we have yet to learn how to grapple with—the devolution of responsibility from Washington, DC, to families, to churches, neighborhoods and schools will put plenty of problems in your hands; the problems that trouble us the most every day. But that is where the responsibility ought to be.

I was reminded every day, on that drive across America, that we know exactly what to do in this country to put our nation back on track. We will have to do it community by community; family by family; school board by school board. In Murfreesboro, TN, families now have choices of schools 12 hours a day; all day, every year at no extra cost to the taxpayer. Reuben Greenberg, the police chief of Charleston, SC, has made even the housing projects as safe as any part of Charleston now that the government lets him kick criminals out of the housing projects. Reverend Henry Delaney has cleaned up the crack houses on 32nd street in Savannah and he knows what to do about welfare if someone in Washington will stop reinventing it long enough to ask him. And, Dan Biederman is taking whole blocks of New York City and with a private company making those blocks safe and clean and free from homeless. My own answer to the question, "Looking ahead 30 years, do you believe your children and grandchildren will have more opportunity growing up in this country than you have had?" is absolutely yes, because I am going to do everything in my power to see that they do, because that was done for me.

When I was appointed Secretary of Education, the New York Times felt obligated to write that, Mr. Alexander grew up in a lower-middle class family in the mountains of Eastern Tennessee. That was alright with me, but not, I discovered, when I called home the next week, alright with my mother, who was literally reading Thessalonians to gain strength for how to deal with this slur on the family. "We never thought of ourselves that way," she said. "You had a library card from the day you were three and music lessons from the day you were four; you had everything you needed that was important."

And, I also had a grandfather who ran away from home when he was eight; somehow got to Oklahoma and became a railroad engineer and finally retired back to the mountains just in time to instruct us growing up in Maryville, "Aim for the top there's more room there." So we grew up thinking we could be the railroad engineer, or the English teacher, or the school board member, or the principal or the governor or even the President of the United States.

If some president had come on the radio offering me and my friends growing up a government credit card with benefits for the rest of my life, my grandfather would have thrown his boot through the radio because that was not his idea of America's future. When I was 5 years old, I visited my grandfather who was then a switch engineer in

Newton, Kansas, a division point of the Santa Fe Railway. His job was to push and pull those huge belching steam engines into the round house put them on the turntable, turn them around and head them in the right direction.

Our country today is like one of those steam engines. It is headed in exactly the wrong direction, and in the election 10 days from now, we have to slow it down and get it on the turntable and turn it around and, at least by 1996, get it headed in the right direction. That is the challenge for our party and for our country.

I couldn't conclude this evening without acknowledging the magic of Ronald Reagan. The storyteller in this case was at least as important as the story. The speech would have just been a speech in anyone else's hands. He made sure he had his feet planted firmly on the ground before he entered public life and he kept them there. He knew and we knew where he stood. He assumed no false importance.

He seemed to know his job was not to change everyone's mind but to speak the mind of the voters, of the citizens, and not be swayed by elites who told ordinary people they were too stupid to know what to do. He was firm and civil and eloquent and optimistic in his presidency. He appealed to the best of us. He knew and knows the value of a good story. And he knew, as President, that with the right purpose in that office, if he threw everything he had into it, he could wear everybody else out. That is how he helped to defeat the evil empire that threatened freedom in his generation and that is how in this generation that we, standing on Ronald Reagan's shoulders, can finish his work and expand our freedoms by dismantling the arrogant empire at home.

Thank you.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD remarks I made in tribute to President Reagan in June of 2004.

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

SENATE FLOOR REMARKS OF SEN. LAMAR ALEXANDER—TRIBUTE TO FORMER PRESIDENT RONALD REAGAN

(June 7, 2004)

Mr. President, a few years ago when Ronald Reagan was President of the United States, he attended one of the many press dinners which are held. I think it was the Gridiron Dinner. I think it is well known that maybe 90 percent of the press corps in Washington had a different point of view on issues than Pres. Reagan did, but they liked him anyway, and they respected him and he had fun with them, just as they did with him.

I remember on that evening he strode into the Gridiron Dinner looking like a million dollars, smiling big. The press rose, smiling back, applauding. Pres. Reagan stood in front of them until it subsided, and then he said to his adversaries in the media, "Thank you very much—I know how hard it is to clap with your fingers crossed." And they laughed, and they had a wonderful time with Pres. Reagan.

The first thing we think about, those of us who had any opportunity to get to know him—a great many of us—was that Ronald Reagan was a very friendly man. He was a congenial person, an easy person to know, the kind of person you want to spend a lot of time with, if you had the opportunity, and that what you saw in private was what everyone else saw in public.

Howard Baker, the former majority leader of the Senate when Ronald Reagan was president, got to know him especially well. And

then in 1987, Pres. Reagan invited former Sen. Baker to come to be his chief of staff, which he was for nearly two years.

I remember Sen. Baker telling me that, to his surprise, when his 9 a.m. meetings came every morning with Pres. Reagan, he discovered that Mr. Reagan had a funny little story to tell to Sen. Baker, his chief of staff. What surprised Sen. Baker even more was Pres. Reagan expected Sen. Baker to have a funny little story to tell back. So for that two years, virtually every morning at 9 a.m., when the president of the United States and the chief of staff of the White House met, they swapped funny little stories. It is very reassuring to me that two men who have maybe the two biggest jobs in the world were comfortable enough with themselves, each other, and their responsibilities to begin the day in that sort of easy way. That is the part of Ronald Reagan we think more about.

Another part of Ronald Reagan which I think is often overlooked is that he was a man of big ideas. I would say intellectual, although I guess there is a little difference between being devoted to ideals and being intellectual but not much difference.

Unlike most people who are candidates for president of the United States, Ronald Reagan wrote many of his own speeches. When he had a few minutes, he would sit in the back of a campaign airplane and make notes on cards in the shorthand that he had. His former aide, Marty Anderson, has written a book about that and told that, to a great extent, Ronald Reagan's words were his own words, ideas he expressed or ideas he gathered himself and ideas he had thought through and wanted to promulgate.

Maybe that is partly why he seemed so comfortable with himself when he finally entered public life. He came to it late in life. He was age 55 when he became governor of California, so by then he knew what he thought, and he had a sense of purpose, and he knew what he wanted to do.

I got an idea of that kind of big thinking when I went to see Pres. Reagan in my third year as governor, his first year as president in 1981. I talked to him about a big swap which I thought would help our country.

I suggested, the Federal Government take over all of Medicaid and let the State and local governments take over all responsibility for kindergarten through 12th grade. That would make it clear, I said, where the responsibility lies. You cannot fix schools from Washington, and it would make more efficient our health care system if we did things that way. He liked the idea. It fit his unconventional brand of thinking. He advocated it. It was a little too revolutionary for most people in Washington in the early 1980s.

He had the same sort of unconventional attitude toward national defense policy. Many people overlooked the fact that Ronald Reagan did not just want us to have as many nuclear weapons as the Soviet empire did; he wanted to get rid of nuclear weapons. He saw them as wrong, as bad, and he wanted a world without nuclear weapons. Instead of mutual assured destruction, which was the doctrine at the time, he built up our strength so we could begin to reduce nuclear weapons and then unilaterally begin to do it before the Soviets did, hoping they would then follow. We can see the results.

At the time, some people said Ronald Reagan was naive to think we could transfer power from Washington, from an arrogant empire at home or naive to think we could face down an evil empire abroad. And especially naive to think our policy should be based upon getting rid of nuclear weapons. It turned out Ronald Reagan saw further than most of those critics did.

Perhaps his most famous speech, not my favorite speech—my favorite speech is the

one we heard a lot about this weekend, 20 years ago at Normandy, which moved the whole world to tears and reminded Americans why we are Americans and what we fought for—but his most famous speech may be the one in 1987 at the Brandenburg Gate in Berlin where he said, “Mr. Gorbachev, tear down this wall.”

Earlier this year, I visited Berlin with John Kornblum who at the time was U.S. minister and deputy commandant in the American sector of West Berlin where tanks challenged tanks and white crosses marked grave sites of those who were killed trying to escape over the wall from East Berlin. Mr. Kornblum talked about the development of that speech that Ronald Reagan gave that day. Those words, or the thought, “tear down this wall,” went into the speech at an early stage. Some fought to keep it in. Many fought to take it out. Those who had thought Ronald Reagan was wrong to say the Soviet Union was an evil empire were not anxious for him to say, “tear down this wall.”

Some suggested that Pres. Reagan try his hand at German as Pres. Kennedy had in a memorable speech at the Berlin Wall in the early 1960s. Some suggested that the speech should not be made at the Brandenburg Gate. That was too provocative, Mr. Kornblum remembers. But the speech was made at the Brandenburg Gate, and Mr. Reagan did keep his words in that speech. He did make his point, and his point was clear, “Mr. Gorbachev, tear down this wall.”

For those of us who had a chance to see the new countries of Eastern Europe and their enthusiasm for freedom and for a free market system, we can see the legacy of Ronald Reagan and his unconventional thinking.

I think it is important for us to remember that this genial president was a man of ideas, of all the presidents I have worked with, as much a man of ideas as any one of those presidents.

Ronald Reagan also taught us something about leadership. I recall in 1980 when he and Mrs. Reagan visited the Tennessee governor's mansion during the presidential campaign. I had not known him very well. He had served as governor. He was several years older. He was from the west. It was really my first chance to meet him. After one hour or an hour-and-a-half of breakfast with him the next morning, I remember going away thinking this man has a better concept of the presidency than anyone I have ever been privileged to meet.

Ronald Reagan understood what George Reedy said in his book, “The Twilight of the Presidency,” is the definition of presidential leadership: First, see an urgent need; second, develop a strategy to meet the need; and, third, persuade at least half the people that you are right. Ronald Reagan was as good as anyone at persuading at least half the people that he was right. He taught that and he also taught us the importance of proceeding from principles.

Sometimes we are described in Washington these days as being too ideological, too uncompromising, too partisan. Pres. Reagan was a principled man. He operated from principles in all of his decisions, insofar as I knew. He advocated his principles as far as he could take them, but he recognized that the great decisions that we make here are often conflicts between principles on which all of us agree. It might be equal opportunity versus the rule of law. And once we have argued our principle and the solution, and strategy has been taken as far as it could go, if we get, as he said 75, 80, or 85 percent of what we advocated, well, then that is a pretty good job.

So, he was very successful because he argued from principles. He argued strenuously. He was good at persuading at least half the

people he was right. Then he was willing to accept a conclusion because most of our politics is about the conflict of principles.

There is another lesson that he taught us, and that was to respect the military. Now, that seems unnecessary to say in the year 2004 where we have a volunteer military that is better than any military we have ever had in our history; when we have witnessed the thousands of acts of courage, charity, kindness, and ingenuity in Iraq and Afghanistan recently; when the men and women of our National Guard and reserves are also being called up. We have a lot of respect for our military.

In 1980, we were showing a lot less respect for the men and women of our military. I remember riding with Pres. Reagan in a car in Knoxville during the 1980 campaign. As we pulled out of the airport by the National Guard unit, there were a number of the soldiers waving at him, understanding and sensing that he respected them. He turned to me and said something like this: I wish we could think of some way to honor these men and women more. He said we used to do that in the movies in the 1930s and 1940s. We would make movies honoring men and women in the military and that is how we showed our respect for them.

Well, he did find a way to honor them during his presidency in the 1980s, and by the time he left at the end of that decade, there was no question that the American people remembered to honor the men and women in the military.

There is one other aspect of Pres. Reagan's leadership that I would like to mention, which is probably the most important aspect of the American character, and that is the belief that anything is possible. The idea that we uniquely believe in this country, and people all around the world think we are a little odd for believing it, is that no matter where you come from, no matter what race you are, no matter what color your skin, if you come here and work hard, anything is possible.

That is why we subscribe to ideals such as all men are created equal, even though we know achieving that goal will always be a work in progress, and we may never reach it. That is why we say we will “pay any price, bear any burden,” as Pres. Kennedy said, to defend peace, even though we know that is a work in progress, and we may never reach it.

That is why we say more recently we want to leave no child behind when it comes to learning to read. We know that is a work in progress, and we may not reach it, but that is our goal.

We Americans say that anything is possible, and nothing symbolizes that more than the American presidency. And no president has symbolized that more in the last century than Ronald Reagan. He has reminded us of what it means to be an American. He lifted our spirits, he made us proud, he strengthened our character, and he taught us a great many lessons.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I rise to join with my colleagues. I appreciate what the Senator from Tennessee had to say about our former President, as we look upon his 100th birthday coming up this weekend and all of us pay tribute to the legacy he gave this country and the tremendous contributions he made during his time in office.

We all have different remembrances of his Presidency. I was a sophomore in college when he was elected to his first term as President. It was the first election in which I had the opportunity to

vote. I guess I could say I was sort of coming of age at the time he was coming on the national political stage. He had run for President 4 years earlier.

I remember, as a young person, beginning to pay a little bit of attention to politics, at the time being so impressed with the attributes that characterized him personally and were primarily responsible for his tremendous success as President and for the great legacy he left behind.

I was someone who grew up in a small town in South Dakota, and my father and mother had both come through the Great Depression. They were similar in terms of their remembrances of that period and could identify in many respects with some of the things President Reagan talked about.

But he was a person of strong convictions. I think he had a strength of conviction that was really appealing to a lot of Americans. He was someone who believed in American exceptionalism. He understood that the greatness of this country was not in its government institutions but in its peoples and its ideals.

He was someone who was willing to confront the threats we faced around the world. The way he took on the threat of communism and promoted freedom and democracy around the globe is something for which he will always be remembered, not only here at home but by other countries around the world.

I think he possessed, in many respects, a lot of the qualities we value in the Midwest. He was a very humble person. I think his humility is something that really stood out. He was always referred to as "Dutch Reagan" in his growing up, his formative years. I think the impact he had on this country was because he saw himself as just an ordinary American like every other American, and he was able to connect and identify with the challenges and the opportunities that were facing Americans across this country at the time.

I think he also possessed, although he was the Governor of California, a midwestern sensibility that never left. He had, in many respects, values that, as I said before, many of us in the Midwest find really important—his belief that you ought to live within your means. His sort of midwestern bedrock values of individual responsibility were things he always touched upon, themes he referenced in his remarks. I think those were the types of qualities that really differentiated him on the national stage.

I remember, too, as a young person being impressed with his sense of humor. Often today there are serious matters we deal with, matters of great gravity and great weight, and they need to be taken with the right level of seriousness. But he also was able to see the best in people and to use his sense of humor to connect with people about what was really distinctive and really unique about America.

I remember the story that was told while we were fighting the Cold War about the guy in the Soviet Union who went in to buy a car, and he said: I want to buy a car.

The guy at the transportation bureau said: Well, you can have your black sedan and you can pick it up 10 years from today.

The guy thought about it for a minute, and he said: Will that be in the morning or in the afternoon?

The guy at the transportation bureau said: What difference does it make? It is 10 years from now.

And the guy said: Well, because I have the plumber coming in the morning.

Ronald Reagan had a way of putting into very simple and understandable and sometimes humorous terms what was so distinctive and unique about the American experience. I think that is something that also really set him apart.

When it came to the big issues of the day, he had a statement he made that I quote. He said: There are no easy answers, but there are simple answers. I think oftentimes we face these complex problems, and we overanalyze a little bit. And the truth is, in a lot of the challenges we face today, not unlike the times when he was President, there are not easy answers, but I believe there are simple answers. Those very basic, core principles and those values that helped shape his Presidency and the things he never lost sight of are what made him an effective President. I believe that is a lesson we can apply today. There are no easy answers, but there are simple answers.

When we believe in the greatness of America, when we look at the foundation of this country—personal freedom, personal liberty, coupled with individual responsibility—he believed profoundly that you achieve peace through strength. He was willing to confront communism at a point in this Nation's history when it posed a great threat to freedom-loving countries around the world. I think those are the types of qualities for which President Reagan will be remembered.

As, again, someone who was very impressionable at that time, he was a great inspiration to public service. I think he represented the very best of public service. He got into it for all the right reasons. He understood the importance of what he was doing, the issues with which he was dealing, but always had an eye toward making a difference and providing a better future for the next generation. That is a lesson that I think all of us need to remember: that sometimes we have a tendency to believe it is about us, it is about today. We always have to keep an eye on tomorrow, on the future, and what we are doing to build a better and brighter and more prosperous and stronger nation for future generations.

When I think about and remember President Reagan as we come upon his 100th birthday, those are the types of

things that strike me as really standing out—his humility, his sense of humor, his belief in American exceptionalism. Those are what history has already written about him, but they certainly are permanently impressed upon my mind, my experience, in my time in public life—just the types of qualities I want to apply and bring to the work we do in the U.S. Senate.

So I rise along with many of my colleagues today to pay tribute to our 40th President and to his family. Of course, we thank them for their great service and sacrifice too, because anybody who has been in this arena knows the sacrifice that comes with public service. But we are indeed grateful for his great service to our country, for the way he impacted so many, both here at home and around the world, and for the way he continues through his legacy to impact generations of Americans today.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I 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. BLUNT. 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. BLUNT. Mr. President, I wish to speak for a few minutes today about Ronald Reagan.

Ronald Reagan inspired freedom and changed the world. Maybe nobody said that better than former British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher in a prerecorded eulogy that was played at President Reagan's funeral at the National Cathedral. I would like to read just a little of that eulogy. It starts:

We have lost a great president, a great American and a great man. And—

Mrs. Thatcher said—

I have lost a dear friend.

In his lifetime, Ronald Reagan was such a cheerful and invigorating presence that it was easy to forget what daunting historic tasks he set for himself. He sought to mend America's wounded spirit, to restore the strength of the free world and to free the slaves of communism. These were causes hard to accomplish and heavy with risk.

Mrs. Thatcher went on:

Yet they were pursued with almost a lightness of spirit. For Ronald Reagan also embodied another great cause—what Arnold Bennett once called "the great cause of cheering us all up." His politics had a freshness and optimism that won converts from every class and every nation—and ultimately from the very heart of the evil empire.

Yet his humor often had a purpose beyond humor. In the terrible hours after the attempt on his life, his easy jokes gave reassurance to an anxious world. They were evidence that in the aftermath of terror and in the midst of hysteria, one great heart at least remained sane and jocular. They were truly grace under pressure.

And perhaps they signified grace of a deeper kind.

Mrs. Thatcher said:

Ronnie himself certainly believed that he had been given back his life for a purpose. As he told a priest after his recovery, "Whatever time I've got left now belongs to the Big Fella Upstairs."

And surely it is hard to deny that Ronald Reagan's life was providential, when we look at what he achieved in the eight years that followed.

Others prophesied the decline of the West; he inspired America and its allies with renewed faith in their mission of freedom.

Others saw only limits to growth; he transformed a stagnant economy into an engine of opportunity.

Others hoped, at best, for an uneasy cohabitation with the Soviet Union; he won the Cold War—not only without firing a shot, but also by inviting enemies out of their fortress and turning them into friends.

Mrs. Thatcher goes on to say:

I cannot imagine how any diplomat, or any dramatist, could improve on his words to Mikhail Gorbachev at the Geneva summit—

Quoting President Reagan—

"Let me tell you why it is we distrust you."

Mrs. Thatcher said:

Those words are candid and tough and they cannot have been easy to hear. But they are also a clear invitation to a new beginning and a new relationship that would be rooted in trust.

Ronald Reagan's truly "only in America" life story began 100 years ago this weekend.

During his lifetime, he was a Democrat and later a Republican, he was a liberal and then a conservative, he was a labor union president and then President of the United States. During his lifetime, he developed a philosophy of faith, life, and government that Americans understood.

During his Presidency, the people of this country had an extraordinary understanding of what their President would think and how their President would react to events and circumstances. The strength of the certain trumpet, the strength of the clarion call is, I believe, impossible to overestimate. Knowing how your President, how your leader views the world and views the circumstances that may meet us in the world is an incredibly comforting feeling.

In fact, there is an epic Greek fable, more often applied to President Lincoln, about the fox and the hedgehog. In the epic Greek fable of the fox and the hedgehog, the fox is wily, the fox is clever, the fox knows lots of little things, but the hedgehog knows one really big thing. In that fable and in reality, the fox can never defeat the hedgehog.

Now, neither Lincoln—I am really not comfortable referring to either Lincoln or Reagan and characterizing them as a hedgehog, but I am comfortable characterizing them as men of big ideas, men who understood the big things, leaders who understood the big things. With President Lincoln, it was the Union. With President Reagan, it was a focus on the big things, with an understanding that you measured the circumstances and events that came up by your view of the big things that

guide the country, that guide us individually, that guide lives and, in fact, guide the lives of a nation.

President Reagan understood big things. He could quickly evaluate any issue or challenge through that prism and the prism of those core values.

Ronald Reagan inspired freedom and changed the world. The centennial celebration of his birth that begins this week and officially begins this weekend gives us an opportunity to think about what it was that made this President great; what it was that puts this President on the cover of news magazines, in the decade before the centennial, in one recent cover arm in arm with the current President of the United States; and what it was that made this extraordinary man so extraordinary.

I will just say again, Ronald Reagan inspired freedom and changed the world.

Mr. President, I 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 California.

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

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

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to one of California's own, President Ronald Reagan.

It has been nearly 7 years since President Reagan passed away, but he is still fondly remembered by so many in California, across this country and across the globe.

The first time I met President Reagan was right after I was elected to Congress in 1982. I was invited to the White House as part of a large Democratic freshman class, and I wondered how President Reagan would greet us. After all, he had campaigned hard for a Republican Congress. When we arrived at the White House, he and First Lady Nancy Reagan could not have been more warm and gracious to us. I still have the photo from that evening hanging in my home office.

Ronald Reagan showed all of us that you can disagree without being disagreeable, and that even if you have sharply different views on some issues, you can still work to find common ground.

President Reagan once said: "I've always believed that a lot of the troubles of the world would disappear if we were talking to each other instead of about each other."

He believed if we were all respectful to each other, we could find those areas of agreement. We could get things done. That was an important lesson for me and for all of us that evening because, in the Senate, with the rules of the Senate, the only way to get things done for our constituents and for our country is by working together.

I believe he had learned this lesson in California, where as a Republican Governor, he worked with a Democratic State legislature. He brought that same approach from Sacramento to the Nation's Capital.

As Governor, in keeping with the values and wishes of most Californians, he helped to establish the Redwood National Park. He regulated auto emissions to reduce pollution. He opposed the State proposition that discriminated against teachers based on sexual orientation. He was willing to reach across party lines and find consensus.

He continued these efforts to work across the aisle when he became President. Although there were serious disagreements on important issues, President Reagan worked closely with a Democratic House to ratify and sign important arms control agreements, increase investments in math and science education, and reauthorize the Superfund hazardous waste cleanup program.

President Reagan was a conservative, but he was not an ideologue. He fulfilled his campaign promise to appoint the first woman to the Supreme Court, choosing Sandra Day O'Connor as the first female Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, even though she was considered too moderate by many conservatives.

Of course, there were many areas of disagreement—from offshore oil drilling to the role of the national government, to the fight against AIDS, to policies in Central America. Those disagreements were deep, but they were never taken personally by President Reagan. He and House Speaker Tip O'Neill were genuinely fond of each other. They often shared a drink after work, and they laughed after a day of locking horns. Their good nature was infectious. It raised the level of comity throughout the Nation's Capital.

I believe that President Reagan will be remembered for his focus on freedom for the people behind the Iron Curtain. He saw in Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev a leader he could successfully challenge to step to the plate. And when President Reagan said, tear down this wall, he said it directly to Mr. Gorbachev. He touched Mr. Gorbachev, he touched America, and he touched people all around the world.

After President Reagan passed away, Mr. Gorbachev wrote in the New York Times: "Reagan was a man of the right. But, while adhering to his convictions, with which one could agree or disagree, he was not dogmatic; he was looking for cooperation. And this was the most important thing to me: he had the trust of the American people."

As we honor President Reagan today, I believe the greatest tribute we can pay is to find a cure for the disease that took his life, took him away from his loved ones and from the world.

Ten years before his death, Ronald Reagan knew he was battling Alzheimer's. He knew he was losing the battle. In an act of enormous courage

and in a handwritten open letter, he told the American people he was suffering from the illness. He wrote: "I now begin the journey that will lead me into the sunset of my life."

And he movingly wrote: "I know that for America there will always be a bright dawn ahead." Even in his darkest hour, President Reagan's eternal optimism shone through.

Nancy Reagan stood by her husband throughout his long ordeal and protected him in his most vulnerable time. She has become a leading champion for increased funding for medical research to fight Alzheimer's and other diseases. She has been brave and courageous in her advocacy.

In memory of Ronald Reagan, in honor of Nancy Reagan and all of the families who have lost loved ones to Alzheimer's, we must continue to seek a brighter dawn for Alzheimer's victims and their families.

As a California Senator, certainly Ronald Reagan is one of our most famous residents as Governor and then as President. I was in the House of Representatives while he was the President. Clearly, there were a lot of disagreements between President Reagan and many of those in Congress such as myself who didn't believe government was the problem, which was his definite belief at that time. We certainly had a loyal opposition, and we certainly worked together when we could.

One of the things that was so interesting to me compared to working with other Presidents—because I have had the honor of serving for so long that actually President Obama is the fifth President I have had the honor of serving with. I went to every State of the Union Address, all of which were very impressive.

I think the thing about Ronald Reagan that I grew to admire was, as hard as one might debate with him on his vision of what the priorities should be—what should we invest in, what was important—when those debates were over and a decision was made, regardless of who won the day, we just moved on to the next issue. We tried to find common ground, and if we didn't we had the respectful debate. It was never taken personally.

Again, there were many things I disagreed with him about. I remember being a young Member of Congress at the time when the AIDS epidemic came out, and I remember I was so frustrated because President Reagan was very compassionate, but he didn't want to discuss the issue of AIDS. We had to work very hard with the Surgeon General at the time, and we finally made a little bit of progress.

So, yes, there were many tough debates. Of course, his presence, his very sunny presence, his optimism about the country's future was very important to a Nation that had been torn asunder because of many tough issues that separated the generations.

I add my voice on this day when we remember former President Ronald

Reagan, someone whom California is very proud of and someone who has obviously gone down in history for the many things he accomplished, particularly his rapprochement with the Soviet Union at that time. It was a big contribution to the world.

Thank you very much.

I yield the floor, and I note 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 Utah.

Mr. HATCH. 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. HATCH. Mr. President, just over 30 years ago, Ronald Reagan was inaugurated as the 40th President of the United States. It is hard to believe that three decades have passed since he stood in front of this Capitol, just yards away, and announced to this Nation and the world that America's moment had not passed. It is hard to think that we have been without him now for over 6 years. I think of him and his wonderful, lovely wife Nancy quite often. I knew them both very well. I know Nancy very well to this day. She is a terrific human being, as was he.

One of my first campaign trips for Ronald Reagan was with Nancy, and I can tell my colleagues there never was a stronger advocate for her husband.

As a man, he had the rare combination of good humor and a commitment to principle. As the leader of his party and as President, he reminded us of the need for constant recommitment to our constitutional ideas, and as a couple Ron and Nancy were a pair for the ages. If there was any doubt, my colleagues have confirmed today in their tributes to President Reagan on the centennial of his birth that Ronald Reagan might have passed on, but he is most certainly not forgotten—not by a long shot.

When Reagan was President, he inspired great reactions from both parties. I can attest, particularly with respect to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, that not all of those reactions were positive. Yet today's bipartisan celebration of President Reagan's legacy shows that he has become as much a part of the American story as his greatest predecessors in office.

Like other great men before him, Ronald Reagan seemed to embody the times during which he lived. The man himself, his personal story, in many ways personified America's 20th century.

Ronald Wilson Reagan was born in the Midwest and became a westerner, moving to California like so many other of his fellow Americans. The country he grew up in looked very different from our own today. As Michael Barone recently reminded us in an article in the *Claremont Review of Books*,

when America entered the Second World War, one-quarter of Americans still lived on farms, and half of those were either without electricity or only recently acquired electricity.

America's population was at the same time both more diffuse and more concentrated than it is today. America's nonrural population was clustered in a few great cities. Again, as Barone explained, at the outbreak of the Second World War, 2 percent of all Americans lived in Brooklyn, NY. America in the 20th century became a less rural, less agricultural nation. Yet instead of concentrating in existing urban centers, new communities grew and suburbs expanded.

That was the story of Ronald Reagan, who was born in tiny Tampico, IL, population 772 as of the 2000 census, and came to the world's attention in California, home of suburban life and the American highway. He became a Californian through and through. He loved his ranch, and he loved being on the back of a horse. The large landscapes of California and of the entire West suggested the boundless opportunity that is afforded those who work hard in this country. It was there that Ronald Reagan found his professional and political success. It was where he met Nancy and raised his family, and it is where he was finally laid to rest.

Ronald Reagan did not have it easy. As he put it, he did not grow up on the wrong side of the tracks. But he could hear the train. He lived through the Great Depression. Yet like countless Americans before and after him, with dogged determination and a good deal of pluck, he succeeded.

At a time when college was a luxury, Ronald Reagan graduated from Eureka College. He went on to have a successful career in radio as a sportscaster. But that was not enough, so he moved to Hollywood where he became an actor. Of all the roles Ronald Reagan would play, we eventually identified him most closely with the character of George Gipp in "Knut Rockne: All American." It should come as little surprise that we would associate a good Irishman such as Ronald Reagan with a movie about Notre Dame and the Fighting Irish.

When George Gipp first appears on screen, Knute Rockne, the head coach of the Irish, is at his wit's end with his team. Seeing Gipp—who was not a member of the team—lying around, Rockne asked him if he could go in and run the ball against the varsity. Reagan's Gipp responded, with an Irish twinkle in his eye: How far? Naturally, he ran down the field, scored a touchdown, and took his place in Notre Dame lore.

For Ronald Reagan, like George Gipp, there was no challenge too big. It is a good thing he thought that way because he faced plenty of obstacles. With the outbreak of World War II, his promising acting career was put on hold. Yet he would go on to serve as President of the Screen Actors Guild,

and later he worked in television as the host of "General Electric Theater." It was that association with General Electric that sent Reagan on his path toward the Presidency.

Going on what he called the "mashed potato circuit," he spoke across the country to the thousands of GE employees, giving what would later be called "The Speech." Giving these after dinner remarks, Reagan honed his thoughts about freedom, the size of government, and the Soviet menace.

In 1964, on the eve of the Presidential election, he would deliver that speech to the Nation. Senator Barry Goldwater went on to lose that election in an epic landslide.

Today we know that conservatives might have lost that battle, but they would ultimately win the war.

A week before the election, Ronald Reagan delivered a taped address—"A Time for Choosing"—on Goldwater's behalf. He spoke as a partisan for liberty, and he urged his fellow Americans to join him in that struggle. He concluded his remarks telling a national television audience:

You and I have a rendezvous with destiny. We'll preserve for our children this, the last best hope of man on earth.

This speech resonated with the American people. It raised \$8 million for Goldwater, an astronomical sum at the time. More importantly, it made Ronald Reagan a formidable presence on the political scene.

I knew Barry Goldwater. I knew him well. When I ran for the Senate, he was one of two people I came to visit in Washington just to get some advice. I admired him so much, and it was a privilege to serve with him. The other one was CHUCK GRASSLEY who was then in the House, and I count him as one of my dearest friends on Earth.

Against the odds and conventional wisdom, Ronald Reagan ran for Governor of California in 1966. The California establishment made the mistake of underestimating this actor from the Midwest, and he went on to beat his more liberal primary opponent and the popular incumbent Governor.

Underestimating Reagan was a mistake that the Washington establishment would make time and again when he arrived there 14 years later. They never seemed to understand what was so obvious to President Reagan.

For all of the superficial differences, Americans of his age were not so different than the generation that founded this Nation, fought the Civil War, worked through the Great Depression, and struggled for civil rights. In the end, Americans of today are committed to the same principles of liberty and equality that animated the authors of our Declaration of Independence and Constitution.

This shared commitment to our founding principles served him well, because he took office at a time of great uncertainty, a time not unlike our own. A combination of factors seemed to be putting the aspirations of Americans out of reach.

To be blunt, America was on its heels. The prime interest rate was 15 percent. Inflation was 12½ percent. And civilian unemployment was at 7 percent. Government regulations and tax rates were smothering American innovation, and with it the American dream. And abroad the picture was just as grim. An imperialist Soviet Union had invaded Afghanistan, and was supporting revolutionary movements across the globe. The American hostages had not yet been freed from Iran.

Yet when Ronald Reagan left office 8 years later, he had left his mark. According to his biographer, Lou Cannon, when he came into office, there were 4,414 individual tax returns with an adjusted gross income of more than \$1 million. By 1987, fueled by tax cuts, the breaking of inflation, and explosive economic growth, there were 34,944 such returns. When he entered the White House, only 1 in 6 Americans owned a microwave, and VCRs were a luxury for the wealthy. By the time he left office, these were common household goods. He helped to restore our understanding of a limited judiciary that respects the traditions of the American people and their elected representatives. And he restored faith in our men and women in uniform.

Just before he left office, President Reagan reviewed the troops at Andrews Air Force Base one last time. During that visit, he said that serving as commander-in-chief was "the most sacred, most important task of the presidency."

Barely five years after America left South Vietnam, Reagan spoke at the Veterans of Foreign Wars convention and reminded America that Vietnam had been a "noble cause." The rush to "blame America first" in our conflict with totalitarian regimes, and the days of holding our military men and women in low esteem, came to an end with the Reagan Presidency. And though his greatest achievement—the collapse of the Soviet Empire—would occur on his successor's watch—the writing was on the wall by the time Ronald Reagan left office. His commitment to freedom during our twilight struggle with what was truly an evil empire quite literally saved the world and liberated millions.

It is no surprise that he will be honored in Prague, Budapest, and Krakow—the home of his great partner Pope John Paul II—later this summer for his role in exposing the great lie that was the Soviet Union.

Ronald Reagan succeeded as president because he knew what he was about. In his farewell address from the Oval Office, he said, "I went into politics in part to put up my hand and say, Stop. I was a citizen politician, and it seemed the right thing for a citizen to do. I think we have stopped a lot of what needed stopping. And I hope we have once again reminded the people that man is not free unless government is limited. There's a clear cause and effect here that is as neat and predict-

able as a law of physics: As government expands, liberty contracts."

I could not agree more.

And that Reagan Revolution—the aspiration of citizens for greater freedom and greater futures for the generations that follow—continues. I am proud to be a part of that revolution.

President Reagan took a flyer on me when I first ran for the Senate, supporting me in my primary. I have tried to do him proud. I remember well the blistering hot day in the Rose Garden when he signed the Hatch-Waxman legislation into law in 1984. In his signing statement, he joked that with this law "[e]veryone wins, particularly our elderly Americans. Senior citizens require more medication than any other segment of our society. I speak with some authority on that."

In my opinion, that law typified the commitments of President Reagan. Since its passage it has saved the Federal Government and consumers hundreds of billions of dollars—some say trillions—and it essentially created the generic drug industry and incentives for the creation of the next generation of life saving drugs.

I worked with him when he was in office. And as I work today for the citizens of Utah, his principled example is always on my mind. We still have work to do. Reagan understood the danger of what is today called progressivism, but was then called liberalism. It knows no bounds.

As he put it, "No government ever voluntarily reduces itself in size. Government programs, once launched, never disappear. Actually, a government bureau is the nearest thing to eternal life we'll ever see on this Earth."

In some respects, Ronald Reagan belonged to a different age. He was governor during the student protests of the 1960s. He entered the national political consciousness during a presidential campaign where the possibility of global nuclear conflict was an imminent threat. When he became President, he was only a few years removed from widespread urban riots and the end of the Vietnam war. When he spoke at Pointe-du-Hoc on the 40th anniversary of D-Day, he spoke to the men who actually scaled those cliffs and liberated a continent. Today, most of those veterans have passed on. But ultimately, Reagan remains one of us. I think that his advisor, David Gergen, got it wrong when he mused that Reagan's legacy was how much he changed our minds.

In my view, Ronald Reagan was a success because he understood that the American people did not need to change their minds. Americans, in 1980, had the same beliefs and hopes that we have always had. Ronald Reagan's genius was in giving voice to those hopes.

Ronald Reagan was a big man, made for a big screen, and eventually the biggest stage. He played his part well. To borrow from Hollywood, he knew

that even as time goes by . . . the fundamental things apply.

Before leaving office, President Reagan addressed the Nation one last time. Speaking to the citizens of this shining city upon a hill, he told us, “[w]e did it. We weren’t just marking time. We made a difference. We made the city stronger. We made the city freer, and we left her in good hands. All in all, not bad, not bad at all.”

Indeed.

It has been said that Ronald Reagan had a love affair with the American people. He did. But it took two to tango. Ronald Reagan loved his country. But I think his country loved him more. That includes people on both sides of the aisle.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, in early 1983, the Soviet dissident Natan Sharansky was in an 8-by-10 foot cell in a Siberian prison when jailers permitted him to read the latest issue of the official Communist Party newspaper.

The front page was filled with global condemnations of American President Ronald Reagan for calling the Soviet Union an “evil empire.” Tapping on the walls and whispering through plumbing pipes, political prisoners spread the word. Rather than being demoralized by the criticisms, they were ecstatic. The leader of the free world had spoken the truth. There was hope.

By the end of the decade, hope became freedom, freedom for the hundreds of thousands imprisoned in the Soviet gulag and for the hundreds of millions trapped behind the Iron Curtain. Countless men and women of courage and determination, their names lost to history, stood up to tyranny and won a great victory with a leader whose name will forever be remembered by history. Lech Walesa, the founder of the valiant Solidarity movement, said this of President Reagan: “We in Poland . . . owe him our liberty.”

In this centennial year, we are experiencing something rare. While many great figures of their time diminish over time, our regard for Ronald Reagan only grows. This cannot be explained by merely citing the qualities for which he was so well known: his confidence in America, his wit, and his optimism. It goes beyond his courage when attacked by an assassin’s bullet or, at the end, a devastating disease or even his skills as the “Great Communicator.” Ronald Reagan looms ever larger because of his ideas and the enduring convictions that gave those ideas their power. “History comes and goes,” he said, “but principles endure and inspire future generations to defend liberty, not as a gift from government, but a blessing from our Creator.”

Ronald Reagan knew that liberty was not a blessing merely to enjoy but one that must always be defended. He expressed his faith in our ability to rise to its defense with these words: “No weapon in the arsenals of the world is so formidable as the will and moral

courage of free men and women.” His nobility sprang from his belief in the nobility of the human spirit.

The very ideas that are the foundation of this great Nation were the foundation of Ronald Reagan’s character. He became President at a time when America had begun to question its place in the world and the values upon which this Nation was built. He tore down the wall of doubt and reminded us that our many blessings carried with them great obligations. Ronald Reagan was a great communicator because he had something great to communicate: the exceptionalism of the United States of America.

The birthday of one who has passed from this life is always a bittersweet occasion as we remember what we had and reflect on what we have lost. I would like to extend my best wishes to President Reagan’s beloved First Lady, Nancy, and to the entire Reagan family.

Ronald Reagan was the right man for his time. He now belongs to the ages. He is missed, but his ideals will always be with us.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, we will soon mark the 100th anniversary of the birth of Ronald Reagan, one of our greatest Presidents. In the days and months to come, in cities and towns all across this great Nation of ours, people will pause for a moment to reflect on the past and remember him, each in their own way, for the greatness in him that inspired a nation. I know he would be humbled by and greatly appreciative of our remembrance of his legacy of service and touched by the great admiration and affection with which we will always remember him.

I don’t think anyone is a better example of the American dream than Ronald Reagan. He was born in Illinois, the son of a shoe salesman. His mother loved to read and she encouraged him to do the same by reading to him. In books Reagan was able to tap into the wisdom of our Founding Fathers and many other great leaders of our past. What he learned from his reading would help to shape his character and ultimately mold his destiny.

It wasn’t long before Reagan’s natural confidence and his determination to do something with his life began to show itself, first during his school years and later when he pursued a career as an actor. He proved to be a born leader and he took a leadership role at every stage of his life. While in college, he served as student body President. In his acting days he served as the president of the Screen Actors Guild. In between he worked hard and built a career as a successful actor in film and television as he became a familiar face in Hollywood.

If that had been all he had done, he would be remembered for his talents and abilities as an actor. He would have earned his reputation for being unafraid of hard work and his life would have inspired others to follow his path just by his success in Holly-

wood. All of the fame and notoriety that came from his acting days would have been enough for most people, but not for Ronald Reagan. He was just getting warmed up. The best was yet to come.

With his beloved wife Nancy by his side, Ronald Reagan began to pursue a bigger dream. He wanted to make an impact on the world that would put him on a bigger stage. He wanted to get more involved in politics and put his principles and values into action in the work that had to be done to solve the problems facing the Nation.

His first effort was a run for Governor of California. People thought that was an impossible dream of his and he would never make it. Ronald Reagan proved them wrong—not for the first or the last time. He took his case to the people, put together a coalition of both Republicans and Democrats and when the votes were counted, he had won.

I still remember meeting him when I was the president of the Wyoming Jaycees. We held our national convention in California and Ronald Reagan spoke to us. I had a chance to meet him and I was quickly impressed by his personality and his style. He clearly had a way not only with words, but to connect to people one on one. Still, I don’t think any of us could have guessed what would happen next in his life.

Reagan had his sights set on the Presidency of the United States. He knew it wasn’t going to be easy, but for Ronald Reagan the only failure would be to fail to try. He wasn’t successful at first, but he never gave up. He kept traveling around the country, speaking to groups, and sharing his message of hope and opportunity with the people who came to hear him speak. This seemed to be another impossible dream, but once again Reagan made it happen. He won the Republican nomination for President, facing an incumbent who spoke often about the terrible problems facing the Nation. Ronald Reagan didn’t speak with doubt and uncertainty about the future; he spoke with strong and passionate certainty that things would get better if we all worked together.

Unfortunately, optimism will only get you so far—so when the time came for him to take the oath of office, he knew he had a lot of work to do. He often referred to our economic problems as the “misery index.” We were in the middle of a time of high unemployment, high interest rates and high inflation. The Nation seemed to have lost its self-confidence and no longer believed that it could dare to do great things—and succeed. The experts all seemed to say that there was little if anything that one person could do to change things and reenergize the Nation.

Once again, Ronald Reagan proved the experts wrong. It seemed almost overnight things changed. There was a renewed sense of confidence in our shared destiny as a nation, a new feeling of hope and opportunity about the

future, and a return to the spirit of America that had been lost. In just a short time, with his words and his actions, he inspired a generation to look to the future with the kind of confidence that comes from our belief in and commitment to the principles upon which our Nation was founded.

I remember those days very well. I was the mayor of Gillette, WY, and when the National League of Cities held its national meeting the President flew to California to speak to our group. I had a chance to meet with him again and enjoyed having an opportunity to speak to him. He was the greatest ambassador for the West and our Western way of life that we have ever had. He understood rural life and because of it he understood the problems of our rural communities. He also understood public service for what it is—service—and he continued to see himself as a public servant throughout his career and his life.

I always thought the years he spent living on his ranch in California were responsible for his passion for speaking the truth, regardless of whether or not it was politically expedient to do so. It is a trait that people in Wyoming appreciate and expect from their leaders. It quickly led to some of his best moments.

I believe we all have strong memories of Ronald Reagan speaking by the Berlin Wall, taking advantage of the occasion to challenge Mikhail Gorbachev to “tear down this wall.” He then went counter to the advice of his staff and referred to the Soviet Union as the “evil empire.” For Ronald Reagan, life was that simple. If it was the truth, it must be said for there are two kinds of people in the world—the good guys and the bad guys. If the good guys worked hard and were willing to sacrifice and do whatever it took to succeed, they won. In Ronald Reagan’s world, we were the good guys and, during his Presidency, more often than not, we won.

Still, no matter how harsh the rhetoric may have seemed, his political opponents always knew that it wasn’t personal—it was principle based. That is why, after all that he said, he was still able to form a friendship with Mr. Gorbachev. Our two countries were two of the biggest superpowers in the world and he knew he would have to find a way to keep the lines of communication, trust and understanding open between them, a necessity that gave way to another of his trademark lines, “Trust but verify.”

Over the years he turned many a phrase that reflected the strength of his character, his sense of humor and more. He had a unique way of expressing complex truths in simple sentences that held great meaning by virtue of their simplicity.

Because of his trademark one liners and other famous remarks, he has often been called the Great Communicator, a title that caused Reagan to remark “I never thought it was my style

that made a difference—it was the content. I wasn’t a great communicator, but I communicated great things.”

Ronald Reagan did communicate great things and he communicated them in a number of ways—most importantly by the way he lived his life. There is an old saying that reminds us that we can play it safe and take the well worn path or we can dare to go where few have gone before and blaze our own trail in life, leaving a path for others to follow. Such was Ronald Reagan’s philosophy and by so doing he helped to give us an example of what was possible for us as individuals and for our Nation.

In the end, Ronald Reagan will be remembered for many things. He found a cure for an ailing economy. He helped to bring an end to the Cold War. He did all of that and so much more but he also did something else that was to prove to be far more important. He helped us to regain our spirit as Americans. He helped us to regain that great pride we had always had for our heritage. He helped us to believe in ourselves again and in our ability to serve as the leaders of the free world, a title we were always meant to carry. Thanks to Ronald Reagan, it is a title we have carried proudly and with purpose ever since. Through his words and his enthusiasm for life and living, the Great Communicator was able to infuse our country with optimism, patriotism and an unshamed hope for a better tomorrow. Thanks to him, the United States of America became a brighter, better place for us all to live as the impact he had on the world around us continues to be felt to this day.

Ronald Reagan’s burial site is inscribed with the words he delivered at the opening of his Presidential Library. “I know in my heart that man is good, that what is right will always eventually triumph and that there is purpose and worth to each and every life.”

As in so many things in life, just like the old show business adage reminds us, he left us wanting more. And that is why he will never be forgotten by those who knew him and those who remember how he touched a generation for the better just by the great strength of his character and the warm gentleness of his soul.

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I am proud to honor Ronald Reagan on the 100th anniversary of his birth. President Reagan was a man who inspired millions of Americans to serve their country and fulfill its promise as the shining city on a hill. His genial demeanor, resilience, no-nonsense approach to governing and rock solid principles attracted flocks of young Americans to the Republican Party, and I am proud to include myself in that number.

I was fortunate to have grown up and come of age politically just as President Reagan was in office. His words and deeds inspired our entire country to take pride in our patriotic values and the free market principles that

have made America exceptional. He also comforted us during moments of national tragedy. And his willingness to speak out against communism—as both a bankrupt economic system and an immoral violation of human dignity—was a ray of sunlight to those living in its darkness.

I will never forget my parents’ reaction the day the Berlin Wall fell in 1989. Having lost their country to Fidel Castro’s communism, they had spent 30 years divided from their homeland, friends, and relatives—just as the Wall had done to millions in Europe.

Especially for my parents’ generation of Cuban exiles, whose hopes and dreams were shattered by communism, the Wall’s fall was a historic event they questioned would ever come. It was a day of celebration and rekindled hope that all lands within communism’s grip would soon be free as well. Ronald Reagan helped bring about the change that made communism’s fall possible. By joining with other world leaders like Pope John Paul II, he seized the opportunity to highlight communism’s failures. In doing so, he helped make millions of oppressed people more self-aware of their intrinsic dignity, more confident that their pursuit of freedom was justified, and more hopeful that they were not alone in their struggles.

In commemorating Ronald Reagan’s 100th birthday, we also remember the work that remains to be done to tear down other oppressive walls that still stand. America’s responsibilities in this effort cannot be underestimated.

Economically, we cannot allow Washington’s borrow-and-spend binges to diminish our free enterprise system, nor can we allow our debt to make our commitment to freedom and human rights subservient to our debt holders.

Militarily, as Ronald Reagan said, “Of the four wars in my lifetime, none came about because the U.S. was too strong.” A free and secure world requires a strong America led by our brave men and women in uniform. America’s commitment to the defense of our allies should never waver. Diplomatically, we must not confuse a desire for security and the promotion of democratic values as mutually exclusive goals.

The United States and the world owe a great debt to Ronald Reagan for his decisive leadership, adherence to conservative principles and inspiring example during a tumultuous period. And we owe a special debt of gratitude to his wife Nancy for her efforts to keep his memory and legacy alive.

Now the question before us is whether we are going to do as Ronald Reagan did and ensure that future generations can inherit the single greatest society in all of human history. I, for one, am fully committed to honoring Ronald Reagan’s legacy by standing up for the principles that defined him and have made America exceptional for more than two centuries.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, today, when our country faces enormous challenges—both domestic and international—we have an opportunity to recognize President Ronald Reagan on the 100th anniversary of his birth.

Today—when we need big doses of optimism and a renewed faith in America—the memory of Ronald Reagan tells us that our challenges can be met and our obstacles can be overcome.

I remember the Reagan era well. The late seventies and early eighties were tough times. I had just finished college and returned to North Dakota, and America was clearly hurting.

It was the era of stagflation—stagged economic growth and inflation, all at the same time.

It was an era of fuel shortages, long lines at the gas station, and sticker shock when you got to the pump.

A few years later, America was emerging from that recession and the country was on the mend. We could see light on the horizon. President Reagan told us: "It's morning again in America." And it was.

It was also the era of the Cold War. For more than a generation, the Soviet Union had kept Eastern Europe and its own people under its heel, and threatened the West with belligerent rhetoric and an arsenal of nuclear weapons.

In 1987, at a time when much of the world was resigned to a tense doctrine of coexistence, with a literal and figurative wall between us, President Ronald Reagan would have none of it. He stood at the Berlin Wall, and challenged: "Mr. Gorbachev, tear down this wall!" And made it happen.

In some of our Nation's darkest hours, President Ronald Wilson Reagan was there to remind us that we are a great nation and a great people—a nation kind and generous beyond measure, when deserved, but tough and enduring when circumstances warranted.

He knew that believing in ourselves was vital, and then working together to get the job done. That is a lesson worth remembering, today, 100 years after the birth of one of America's greatest presidents.

We can—and we will—build a brighter future for ourselves and for future generations. We will continue to truly be that shining city on a hill—a beam of light and liberty for the world.

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I have had numerous opportunities to comment on the amazing life and Presidency of Ronald Reagan. He had bold ideas and the courage to see them through. He was the true embodiment of the American success story. I have often referred to the fact that he was charismatic, determined and consistent, and he enjoyed a remarkable batting average of being right. It has always been a point of great pride to me that my voting record was supportive of President Reagan's positions more than any other Member of the Senate.

As the Senate commemorates the 100th anniversary of President Rea-

gan's birth, I want to share with my colleagues and the public a speech I wrote when President Reagan was given the Hudson Institute James Doolittle Award.

It was November 22, 1991, and it was a tumultuous time for Washington and the world. Yet you could still see the sparkle in the President's eyes and his warmth and good humor. What we did not know was that President Reagan's effort to end the Cold War was quickly coming to fruition. Within days, on December 1, Ukraine would vote to break away from the Soviet Union, and on Christmas Day, Mikhail Gorbachev announced the end of the USSR.

During his Presidency, when President Reagan decided to renew arms control negotiations with the Soviets, he had the wisdom and political strength to ask the Senate to form an official observer group so that there would be understanding and support for any treaty coming out of the negotiations. As cochair of the Arms Control Observer Group, I worked closely with Senator Sam Nunn of Georgia and began a partnership with him that continued for many years.

Subsequently, after the failed coup against Gorbachev in the summer of 1991, we heard from Soviet officials we had met that they were worried about the control of the Soviet nuclear arsenal as political events unfolded. By that November when President Reagan was being honored, Senator Nunn and I succeeded in passage of the Nunn-Lugar Cooperative Threat Reduction Act.

Thanks to his leadership and vision, President Reagan helped build the foundation for the Nunn-Lugar Program. Now thousands of missiles and warheads, any one of which could have destroyed my city of Indianapolis, have been eliminated. The success of the Nunn-Lugar Program is a clear derivative of President Reagan's legacy. Thank you, President Reagan.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the speech I wrote in honor of President Reagan when he received the Hudson Institute James Doolittle Award.

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

ADDRESS BY SENATOR RICHARD G. LUGAR IN
HONOR OF PRESIDENT RONALD REAGAN
(November 22, 1991)

President and Mrs. Reagan, Governor Du Pont, trustees, scholars and friends of the Hudson Institute—We are assembled at the Hudson Institute's James H. Doolittle Award luncheon to Celebrate the Patriotism, personal courage, and strategic wisdom which has made the United States of America historically unique.

I am grateful to Governor Du Pont for the extraordinary public service he gave to the Congress of the United States and to the State of Delaware and for the remarkable years of public witness he has given as a champion of market economics and vital federalism. I admire the strength of his ideas, the skill of his advocacy, and I am grateful for the constancy of his loyal friendship.

I thank the Hudson Institute for giving me this opportunity to visit with President and

Mrs. Reagan. It was my privilege to sit beside Mrs. Reagan during several White House and Republican Party events and to understand the strength of her ideals and her hopes for our country as she worked thoughtfully with the President, day by day, to make those dreams come true.

I begin with mention of dreams, hopes, visions because the service of President Reagan to our country can only be approached by understanding how wide he cast the net of potential achievement.

President Reagan actually believed and articulated that our country had a special destiny, that no barriers were insurmountable because we are Americans. He actually believed and said that the Soviet Union was an Evil Empire, that its political and economic institutions were disintegrating, and that if its leadership and people knew the alternatives which our country presented, they would choose democracy and market economics.

President Reagan was prepared to invest an increasing portion of our national treasure in military defense with the certainty that we would negotiate successfully with our adversaries from a position of strength. He shocked foreign policy and defense specialists by proposing that all intermediate nuclear missiles be destroyed, a negotiating position labelled universally as a bizarre arms-control non-starter.

He affirmed the staying power of NATO by deploying Pershing missiles to Germany and cruise missiles to Italy even after the Soviets declared that such deployment would end all arms control negotiations and stimulate Soviet nuclear buildup.

Add to this President Reagan's startling proposal that the United States should develop a Strategic Defense Initiative to protect our country against incoming missiles fired upon us. He contended that we should and could try to defend ourselves against the so-called balance of terror.

He proposed to President Gorbachev that the United States and the Soviet Union ban all nuclear weapons. In fact, he was confident that if he could take Gorbachev on an extended tour of America that Gorbachev would want to shape the Soviet Union into many of our successful traditions.

Meanwhile, President Reagan knew that substantial new growth must occur in our domestic economy to pay for the special leadership role he had envisioned in foreign policy. He was confident that substantial cuts in individual marginal tax rates and a host of investment incentives would establish and sustain the longest peacetime prosperity we have ever enjoyed. Our prosperity underwrote the magnificent gains in free and fair trade which he championed and world wide wealth grew abundantly.

When Ronald Reagan stood on a balcony of the Reichstag in Berlin and challenged Gorbachev to tear down the Berlin Wall, he could see white crosses just below where courageous persons seeking freedom had lost their lives in that pursuit. Everything still appeared to be so locked up and grim, and sophisticated observers were barely patronizing in comment on his Berlin Wall challenge.

When Germans hacked the Wall down in November of 1989 and Eastern Europeans drove authoritarian communists from positions of power, many scholars and journalists applauded President Gorbachev as Man of the Decade. These awards revealed virtual ignorance of the actual history of Europe in the 1980s and a deliberate attempt to ignore the very public words and leadership of Ronald Reagan for eight years.

The Evil Empire crumbled, the Berlin Wall and other walls fell, all of the intermediate nuclear force weapons were destroyed exactly in three years as the INF Treaty provided, and the United States became the

only superpower with the strongest economy and the ability, uniquely, to extend military authority around the world.

All of this occurred because President Reagan persuaded the Congress and his countrymen to build our armed forces, to build our economy through the growth incentives termed “Reaganomics,” to maintain the successful strategies of our NATO alliance, to utilize military force to support foreign policy as required, and to commence Strategic Defense Initiative research.

We now know that the Soviets were much weaker than experts estimated. We now know that they could not keep up the pace and that desperate attempts to do so led to the collapse of the Soviet Empire and then to the collapse of the Union, itself.

President Reagan advocated two more things which were inspiring and critically important in world history.

First, he rejected the Brezhnev Doctrine—the idea that territory which socialism has occupied can never be reclaimed. When he advocated this roll back of the Iron Curtain, he created deep anxiety and alarm among most international foreign policy advisers who loved liberty a lot, but loved stability even more.

U.S. Stinger missiles shipped to the expert ministrations of the Mujadahin in Afghanistan were a major instrument of the Soviet roll back, and the world watched in awe as the Soviet troops withdrew to a smaller socialist world.

Second, President Reagan enunciated a new policy in a statement sent to Congress after the Philippine election and revolution. He stated that henceforth, we would oppose tyranny of the left and tyranny of the right, that we were for democracy developed by the people who sought to know and enjoy democracy and human rights. This statement was severely criticized by experts who suggested that in the “real world” a good number of dictators were friendly to the U.S. and certainly useful in waging the Cold War against communism.

In articulating his vision on the roll back of the Iron Curtain; in identifying with nations all over the world who applauded our passion for building democratic institutions; in celebrating human rights and free market principles; in all of these areas, Ronald Reagan was far ahead of the prevailing wisdom. Yet he ultimately brought other leaders in America and around the world to his point of view in a relatively short interval.

Surely the spirit of the Doolittle Award strongly commends not only being courageous, and being on the right side of history, but performing these deeds in a very public way which instructs and inspires others. Some of us have learned much from President Reagan as we have watched him speak and act. He is charismatic, he is determined and consistent, and he enjoys a remarkable batting average of being right.

We now have an important responsibility to make certain that our children comprehend the greatness of his presidency, his optimism about the particular uniqueness of our future opportunities in this country, and the foundations for world peace which his leadership established and which we are charged to build upon.

We now also have the opportunity today to correct the historical mistake made a few years ago in designating Mikhail Gorbachev “Man of the Decade.” It has to be a high moment in each of our lives to be able to present to President and to Mrs. Reagan even a small fraction of all of the tributes which well up in our minds and hearts today.

On behalf of all of your friends assembled to celebrate your life and service, President Reagan, it is my honor to announce that you are the recipient of the James H. Doolittle

Award and to express the unbounded gratitude which we have come here to demonstrate today.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I rise today to join with my colleagues in this august Chamber, especially Senators FEINSTEIN, HATCH, and WEBB, members of the Ronald Reagan Centennial Commission, as we pause to pay tribute to the indelible legacy of one of America’s truly great Presidents, Ronald Reagan, who would have turned 100 years old on February 6, 2011. It is indeed fitting that as this month of February is filled with historic birthdays of transformational Presidents like George Washington, who founded our Nation, and Abraham Lincoln, who preserved it, that we honor the President who reignited its spirit, Ronald Reagan.

A friend of freedom, a foe of tyranny, and always—always an advocate for America, President Reagan inspired our Nation eloquently and powerfully to recapture and reaffirm our founding ideals of individual freedom, common sense, and limited government. He reminded us with unshakable optimism that America, as the great experiment in self-government, had planted an eternal stake along the timeline of human history as, in the words of Abraham Lincoln, “the last best hope of Earth.”

Many of my colleagues will be sharing their own personal remembrances of this threshold figure whom we rank as among the most rarefied of American Presidents. What I recall is a President who brought his passionate belief in the ideals of America to bear in advancing our Nation and projecting the hope of freedom as a force for good in the world and a leader who was, contrary perhaps to conventional wisdom, not averse to consensus-building in implementing his vision for this country.

Like those rising to speak in this venerable Chamber today, I remember well the arduous challenges facing our Nation in 1980. At the time, I had just completed my freshman term as a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives. Internationally, our country was precariously mired in the Cold War, and reeling from the Iran hostage crisis. On the domestic front, our economic vitality had been sapped by double-digit inflation, hampered by interest rates that would soar to 21 percent, stifled by massive tax burdens including a top tax rate of 70 percent, and idled by an energy crisis, exemplified by half mile long lines at the gas pump.

Against that backdrop, President Reagan arrived in Washington with an unflagging conviction that the greatest untapped potential lies in the American people themselves. And by embracing hope, not resignation, he charted a course for America that led to greater prosperity and security.

As Commander-in-Chief, President Reagan was steadfast in his uncompromising foresight and ultimate success in building up our military, and dis-

played unequivocal mettle in confronting the world’s only other superpower, laying the foundation for victory in the Cold War. With peace through strength, Ronald Reagan called America to a purpose he described in his own hand in 1980. He wrote: “I believe it is our pre-ordained destiny to show all mankind that they too can be free without having to leave their native shore.” And nothing evoked that immutable faith in humanity and belief in the possibilities for a better future more than his demand at the Brandenburg Gate forever etched in our memory: “Mr. Gorbachev, tear down this wall!” Two years later, that wall did crumble, and not long after, so too did the Soviet Empire.

President Reagan battled to reduce the size of the Federal bureaucracy—to return tax dollars to the families who had earned them and disseminate power out of Washington and back to local governments. And I well recall meeting with President Reagan numerous times to discuss issues as far ranging as the MX missile, the budget, women’s issues, or the impact of proposed trade policies on traditional Maine industries such as potatoes or lumber.

And I can attest to the fact that, as a problem solver on every front, President Reagan understood that in order to bring to fruition his core principles and also ensure he could be resolute in implementing his vision for the country, he had to make it happen with persuasion and openness. After all, it was President Reagan who believed “if I can get 70 or 80 percent of what it is I’m trying to get . . . I’ll take that and then continue to try to get the rest in the future.”

In the end, President Reagan’s deeds and words summoned America’s resolve and essential goodness, and his steady hand guided this great land in working to foster liberty and kindle the fires of freedom that have always made America as President Reagan said better than anyone—“a shining city on a hill.” On the occasion of his 100th birthday, we express our eternal gratitude to President Reagan for his timeless leadership of our Nation which he aptly described in his first inaugural address as “the breed called Americans.”

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. MCCASKILL). Without objection, it is so ordered.

FINDING COMMONSENSE SOLUTIONS

Mr. MANCHIN. Madam President, it is my great honor to speak on the floor

for the first time as a Senator. I am truly humbled by this auspicious occasion and the enormous privilege to serve the greatest people in America—the people of West Virginia. West Virginia may be a small State, but our impact on our Nation's history and our future is far greater than the size of our geography or population.

West Virginia was borne out of the turmoil of the Civil War, founded by patriots who shared a united pursuit for justice and freedom for all. Since this historic beginning, our lands and vast natural resources have helped build this Nation. Our people's hard work, sacrifices, and patriotism have helped make our Nation stronger and safer. From the mining of the coal that powers our cities to the forging of the steel, we have done and will do the heavy lifting that has built America.

But this great responsibility to serve as a Senator for West Virginia would never have come about had our State not lost a true giant, our beloved Senator Robert C. Byrd. Senator Byrd was a mentor to me, a great friend to West Virginia, and a tireless advocate for us all. West Virginia would not be the State it is today without the inexhaustible commitment he made every day. Every day without Senator Byrd is a loss for us all, but we can all take comfort that he made not just West Virginia a better State, but he made America a greater nation. While no one will be able to fill his shoes, I hope to honor his memory by continuing down the path he blazed fighting to better the lives of West Virginians and all Americans.

I would also like to recognize the unwavering leadership of West Virginia's distinguished senior Senator who has left a dynamic mark on history, my dear friend Senator JAY ROCKEFELLER. He has committed his life to giving outstanding public service to a very grateful State.

Throughout my 20 years in public service, I have been fortunate beyond words to have been able to serve the great people of West Virginia. Again and again, I have been inspired by West Virginians' devotion to family, their love of country, their belief in hard work and sacrifice and, above all, their undeniable spirit to weather any storm by coming together.

I have seen our State endure the most devastating challenges—horrific flooding, the tragic mining accidents—and I have seen our State in the best of times. But at all times, the spirit of West Virginia has never been broken. It is this spirit of working together and finding commonsense solutions to any challenge that inspires me. It is this spirit that also inspired both sets of my grandparents to immigrate to America—one from Italy and the other from Czechoslovakia. My grandparents came here with the same goals shared by countless generations of immigrants: to provide a better quality of life for their families through hard work and sacrifice. They did just that.

This is what I learned growing up in West Virginia: When things are tough, we do not back down. When we are having trouble paying our bills, we do not think of spending more money. When we face difficult times, we work together to make things better. When faced with a problem, we do not avoid what needs to be done; we try to solve it. This is what West Virginians would call common sense.

I was born and raised in Farmington, WV, a small coal mining town. Nothing will teach you common sense like growing up in a town of less than 500 people. I was educated in our public schools and became the first member of my family to graduate from college. I met my partner in life, my wife Gayle, in West Virginia. We raised our three children in the State we love.

I have long believed in the importance of public service, beginning with my days supporting a volunteer rescue squad in Marin County and working with the United Way more than three decades ago.

As for my public life, my first days as a State legislator to my last days as Governor, I realized that none of us in this or any body are simply elected to an office. We are not here for the title. We are here to make a difference.

I am here to work hard and do this job, and I will work with anyone who offers commonsense solutions on how to best move this country forward.

In my maiden inaugural address as West Virginia's 34th Governor, I said that in order for us to be successful, it was going to take the commitment of civic leaders, public employees, businesspeople and laborers, educators, students and parents, lawyers and doctors, veterans, young professionals, senior citizens, and Republicans, Democrats, and Independents.

At the time, very few thought such a diverse coalition could ever be forged, let alone actually accomplish something in the process. But we West Virginians put politics aside. We listened to each other, we worked together, and we came together to find common ground and develop commonsense solutions.

As a result, we changed the direction of our State for the better. We got our financial house in order. We lowered our taxes for both families and businesses. We paid down unfunded liabilities. We created thousands of new jobs.

There was a surplus every year I was Governor. West Virginia became a stronger State and one of the very few fiscally solvent States in this Nation, all during the worst recession in generations. We solved the actual problems that were holding our State back, and those problems were not solved with partisan rhetoric and the mentality "If you win, I lose." Not at all. West Virginians came together with a shared vision and a common purpose. By working together, we found commonsense solutions. In doing so, we made the future we all share better.

This commonsense model is by no means unique to only West Virginia. I truly believe we can develop commonsense solutions to the problems our Nation faces—commonsense solutions defined not by party or ideology but by doing what is right and what makes sense for our State and our country. I am committed to doing just that.

Of course, cynics will argue that gridlock is inevitable and that commonsense solutions are impossible because the partisan division in Washington is too great. I say they are wrong. While the legislative reality we face is divided government, it does not mean we must be divided. In fact, since the day I was sworn in as a Senator, I have been fortunate to sit and talk with many of my Democratic and Republican colleagues. Every time, what I heard was a profound love for this great Nation and an unbreakable commitment to leave this country better and stronger for future generations.

While disagreements in how we solve our Nation's great challenges will occur, they need not divide us. I see these disagreements as an opportunity for us to seek the common ground that will unite us and move our Nation forward. I am committed to working with both sides to do what is right to address the serious economic and policy challenges we face as a nation and which are of deep concern to the hard-working people of West Virginia.

I heard these concerns loudly and clearly during our most recent work period. During those 2 weeks in January, I traveled more than 2,100 miles on my "Call for Common Sense" tour. I held more than 28 events and met with the unemployed, seniors, veterans, small business owners, young professionals, labor leaders, educators, leaders from our coal and energy industry, as well as leaders in manufacturing. I held townhall meetings in Wheeling and Elkins, where West Virginians with diverse concerns came together to share their opinions.

Again and again, I heard their serious concerns about the economy and jobs, the need to protect coal and our energy industry, as well as their fears from rising debt and deficits. I heard about what government was doing or not doing to ensure that we keep our promises to our seniors and our veterans.

What I also heard was a lot of commonsense ideas about what our country needs to focus on and what we must do to provide a more secure future for our children and grandchildren.

Addressing these top concerns—job creation, deficit reduction, energy independence, and keeping our promises to our veterans and our seniors—matters not only to West Virginians and me, but they matter to every one of you and all of America.

With respect to job creation, our Nation continues to struggle with high unemployment and a great recession that feels too much like a Great Depression for the millions of Americans looking for work.

For too long, we have seen America's manufacturing sector decimated by the cruel irony of rules and regulations that make it easier to create jobs abroad than in the United States. West Virginians are not asking for a hand-out. We are asking for a work permit.

We have seen small business owners—the bedrock of our economy and our job growth—increasingly strangled by paperwork and regulatory obstacles that make doing business more difficult.

I believe that to create a thriving economy and jobs, we must lessen the burdens of unnecessary rules and regulations. Bureaucrats should not be able to regulate what has not been legislated. We need to make government work smarter and its agencies operate more efficiently and effectively. We are not asking government to be our provider; we are asking government to be our partner.

I truly hope that we in this session of Congress will work together to reform our Federal bureaucracy so we can make sure our government works for us instead of the other way around.

As a small businessperson, I know firsthand the last thing any small business owner needs is more regulation or paperwork. It is why I was proud to be one of the lead Democrats to work across the aisle to cosponsor legislation with my friend, Senator MIKE JOHANNIS, to repeal the 1099 provision from our health care reform. I was even more proud to add my voice last night to the many Senators from both parties who showed we can and will work together on commonsense reform of health care legislation. It is why I will continue to work with any of my colleagues to ensure we do everything we can to help small businesses, not just by improving health care reform but also by strengthening the access to the capital and investment that small businesses so desperately need to create jobs.

Improving the opportunity for small businesses and boosting job creation will also depend on making difficult choices to rein in wasteful spending and rising debt. As we learned last week, the fiscal 2012 deficit is projected to be \$1.5 trillion. The Congressional Budget Office projects that under current law, our national debt will reach \$25 trillion by 2021.

What I heard from my fellow West Virginians is that we must get our financial house in order. My proud grandfather always told me crippling debt will lead us to make cowardly decisions.

America is not a country of cowards. During a recent townhall meeting I held in Wheeling, a young college student, worried about getting married and having a family in the near future, told me she was worried because of the debt and fiscal burdens her child would inherit. For me, this young woman's words are a tragic reminder of the consequences that will come from inaction. In America, no one should have to

have second thoughts about starting a family because of his or her worries about our Nation's out-of-control spending and rising debt.

As I have said before, we as a nation cannot spend ourselves to prosperity. We must confront our fiscal situation and be willing to make the right investments and the difficult choices. Doing so for West Virginians is just common sense. West Virginians do not go out and spend more money when they face tough financial problems. They cut back and live within their means. I believe we all in America must do the same, especially in Washington. To that end, I believe we must declare a bipartisan war against wasteful spending and begin to take responsible steps to scour our Nation's budget for all waste and redundant programs.

In the coming weeks, I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to develop a commonsense strategy on how to best cut spending and address our rising debt and deficits. While these steps will require difficult decisions, I believe if we put partisanship aside and work together, we can have a bipartisan, commonsense plan that improves our fiscal future and sets our Nation on a new course for fiscal responsibility.

But strengthening our economy will also depend on our Nation achieving not just independence from debt but real energy independence. As a Senator from a true energy State, the second leading producer of coal with abundant resources, a net exporter of electricity, I am very proud of the critical role West Virginians play in providing energy to our Nation. I imagine the lights in this very Chamber would be a little dimmer were it not for West Virginia and West Virginia coal.

Moving forward, achieving true energy independence demands that we not only start realizing the importance coal has in achieving this goal, it means we must stop demonizing one resource and start realizing we must develop a comprehensive plan that utilizes all of our domestic resources—coal, natural gas, the development of nuclear, wind, and solar—so we can, once and for all, end our dependence on foreign oil within this generation.

If we are going to truly be secure, we must declare our country to be energy independent, and every State in this great Nation must do its part. West Virginia is using every ounce of its natural resources—our coal, our abundant supply of natural gas, biomass, wind, hydroelectric, solar—all of which should be used in the most environmentally responsible way.

As a country, we must stop buying oil from the countries that promote violence against their own people and the United States. That is just common sense.

I am also strongly committed to working with my fellow Senators to develop a realistic and responsible clean energy policy for the future that balances the needs of our country and our

environment. I believe we can achieve this commonsense balance while protecting the vital role that coal and natural gas and our other resources play in our Nation's economy.

Defending the critical role coal and West Virginia play in our Nation's energy production is one reason I submitted today my first piece of legislation—the EPA Fair Play Act of 2011—which will check the power of the Environmental Protection Agency.

I believe it is fundamentally wrong for any bureaucratic agency, including the EPA, to regulate what has not been legislated, to have absolute power to change the rules at the end of the game and to revoke a permit, as the EPA did in southern West Virginia's Spruce Mine, after it was lawfully granted and employees were hired. Giving any agency such absolute power will have a chilling effect on investment and job creation far beyond West Virginia, and I am proud there is already bipartisan support for this legislation.

Achieving a brighter future for our Nation will also depend on us keeping our promises to our seniors and veterans. West Virginia's seniors and veterans helped build and defend this Nation and we have an obligation to them we must never break.

As I traveled the State last month, I heard from seniors at breakfasts, in nursing homes, in courthouses, and at townhalls about their Social Security being at risk. I made it clear to them that I will never support going back on our promises. I also heard there are concerns about living for 2 years without a COLA increase, and I am committed to finding a commonsense solution—a recalculation of the COLA formula to make sure it reflects the reality of the cost of living today.

To our seniors, Social Security and Medicare are not just government programs, they are promises made by a thankful nation to ensure a quality of life well earned from years of hard work and sacrifice.

For our veterans, their sacrifices and patriotism know no bounds. They have answered the call of our State and this Nation again and again. They have served with unparalleled honor and distinction. As Governor, I was so proud and honored to have been commander-in-chief of the West Virginia National Guard, the greatest guard in the Nation.

West Virginia is one of the most patriotic States in the country and we are proud of the number of veterans and active-duty members who have served our military and served honorably and proudly. During this session of Congress, I am strongly committed to working with my colleagues on legislation that will ensure our veterans and their families have the best care and benefits they deserve. That is why I am so proud to be a cosponsor with the leader of this bill—Senator JAY ROCKEFELLER's legislation—giving the National Guard their rightful place on the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Our National

Guard and Reserve forces have bravely assumed a major role in our combat missions, and they deserve a seat at the table along with our Active-Duty Forces. West Virginia National Guard and Reserve forces are the best in the Nation, and as Governor I was proud to be their commander-in-chief. Not only are they an operational force to be reckoned with on the front lines defending our Nation abroad, they are also first on the scene during disasters here at home.

Looking ahead, addressing the issues of job creation, rising debt and deficits, energy independence, keeping our promises to our seniors and our veterans will demand not just commonsense policies but a renewed bipartisan spirit. No matter how large a divide may seem at times, we must work together to find common ground to achieve commonsense solutions. I truly believe Republicans and Democrats and Independents can and will work together to chart a new course for this Nation.

It is why I am so proud and honored to have been selected to serve on such esteemed committees as the Armed Services Committee, the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, and the Special Committee on Aging. I look forward to working with Senators LEVIN and MCCAIN, BINGAMAN and MURKOWSKI, KOHL, CORKER, and all my committee colleagues to address the wide array of issues and challenges that will come before these important bodies.

Whether it is my work on these committees or elsewhere, I am committed to working hard and being the best Senator I can be for the State I love. Like all 99 of my colleagues, who are here for the right reasons, I will represent my State to the best of my abilities and work to make America stronger and my State proud. I pledge to you that I will not only work with each and every one of my fellow Senators to find commonsense solutions, I will do what I can to usher in a new bipartisan spirit in the Senate and in this Congress. In that spirit, I will strive to always find that commonsense bridge that unites our parties and reminds us and the world that we, no matter what State we may represent, share one common and unbreakable bond—we are all Americans. We all share a love for this Nation, for our families and for our children, and it is this bond which will unite us in these difficult times and which gives me the hope and optimism that once again we will rise above any challenge we face.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Madam President, you have just heard a classic JOE MANCHIN speech. It truly is. It is full of optimism, strength, common purpose, no problem cannot be solved, and the desire for bipartisan cooperation. If anybody can bring our two sides together, surely he can do that. He is aggressive, he is thoughtful, but above all he is optimistic. He has a positive approach, a constructive approach. He is unafraid of any problem and thrilled about doing whatever kinds of public service he does.

We actually have fairly common careers. We both served in the State legislature. He served in both branches. I served in one branch. We were both Secretaries of State and we both ran for Governor. Now we are both in the Senate. So I have known the Manchin family for years.

I have known JOE MANCHIN for years. I have always been proud of his work. He is fun. He loves sports. That is very important in life—very important in life. He loves sports. He is a devoted Mountaineer. Sometimes I think he calls the plays for our team. This is going to be a better Senate because of JOE MANCHIN, because of his personality.

I have watched him in the couple of months he has been here—couple of weeks, a month, two—and he has been all over the floor. It is fun to watch him. Somebody sits down that side, this side, and all of a sudden Senator JOE MANCHIN is seated right beside him, grabbing an arm, making a point, establishing a friendship, bonding. That is the way he is with our people.

He comes from the very heart of West Virginia—coal mining country—and that is the way he acts. That is the way his father acted. It is the way his family has always acted. They are part and parcel of the blood, the beginning and the struggle of West Virginia.

One of the reasons I am in public service is because West Virginia is always fighting uphill. People don't pay attention to us the way we think they should. They do not pay attention to what our economy has to offer the way they should. That is what motivates JOE MANCHIN. If you are a West Virginian, you simply have to fight harder. If you are a West Virginia public servant, at whatever level, you have to fight harder and you have to have an optimistic view. You have to believe things can work. You have to be determined things can work, and you have to see the course all the way to end. That is exactly who JOE MANCHIN is.

I am incredibly proud to serve with him. I read his speech before. He said some very nice things about me—all accurate. But because we have been colleagues for so long, I can tell you—and those who don't know him as well as you will—that he is a real asset to this body. We are a body which now is in the process of struggling to find out who we are. It is not always a pretty

sight, but everybody here takes public life seriously. Senator MANCHIN has the problem—some would say the opportunity, but not many—to have to be re-elected again in 2 years. So life already is more complicated for him, because that is the way the election system has worked out. But he is a bright light, and a young, aggressive bright light with an absolutely marvelous wife who is now part of us.

I think he has a unique perspective—it is a classic West Virginia perspective—and I look forward to his making an enormous difference in this body, to our State, and to our country. So I welcome him, and I congratulate him on his opening statement.

I made an opening statement some years ago. It was actually one of the most boring speeches I ever listened to. But those were the days when you weren't allowed to make a speech until you had been here for 6 months, and then everybody turned out. All the old guard—you know, such as the senior Senator from New York over there. The guys with gray beards, the wise old men, would turn out, and they all planted themselves around here and listened to this incredibly boring speech of mine, which was all about a steel company because that is what I happened to be working on at the time.

Russell Long stood up afterwards and said: that is the most brilliant speech I ever heard. But those were the days of a certain type of protocol. Times are much faster now. We have to react much faster. We don't have time for that. So Senator MANCHIN has made his speech, but he goes from his speech to his work, and there he will simply not stop until we get a better State and a better country.

I congratulate him and I welcome him officially and forever to the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, I will say that I join the Senator from New York in welcoming another West Virginia Governor to the Senate. Governor Manchin succeeds a man who is irreplaceable in the Senate's history—Senator Byrd—but he brings to our Senate the skills of a Governor. Governor Rockefeller and I are very partial to those skills. We think the Senate needs more Governors. Governors are accustomed to looking for consensus, to making things work, to making things happen. We have a different sort of job here in the legislature, but those qualities are important, and especially important now when we have such large challenges to face, such as the fact that we are spending \$3.7 trillion and collecting \$2.1 trillion. All of us are shocked by that, and we have to deal with it one way or the other.

I welcome him and I welcome his wife, a distinguished educator, to the Senate family. I know she is here today, so we welcome her and look forward to learning from her as well.

I join Governor Rockefeller in saying it was a great speech. Your maiden

speech is always your best speech. I remember walking with the University of Tennessee basketball coach in Knoxville in the dogwood parade—or in some parade before the season started. He was very popular before the season began. And Senators who make maiden speeches always have their best speeches then, as basketball coaches always are most popular at the beginning of the year.

But I look forward to working with Senator MANCHIN. He will make a tremendous contribution to the Senate. I am glad I was here to hear his outstanding address, and I thank the Senator from New York for his courtesy in letting me make my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I too want to join in the accolades for our Senator from West Virginia, Senator MANCHIN. He is one fine guy. I got to know him when he was Governor and then campaigning, and he is doing a wonderful job here already.

To have passion about where you come from is noble. I think the great poets from Greek times on have written that, and nobody has more passion about where he comes from and his roots than Senator MANCHIN—JOE MANCHIN. You can see it and feel it in everything he does, as we could in this speech today. So I too join in thanking him for coming here. America needs his perspective and his wisdom, and I know he will make a great Senator. We are already great friends, and so I thank him.

I also compliment my colleague, the senior Senator from West Virginia as well, Senator ROCKEFELLER, for his kind remarks. He is a great leader. JOE and I have talked about how you cannot go wrong watching and imitating and emulating Senator ROCKEFELLER. With the two of them, I believe West Virginia might have the tallest delegation in the Senate, not just tall in inches but in stature, ability to get things done, and passion for the State they represent. It is my honor to be here as well and to congratulate JOE on a very fine and introductory speech.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Madam President, I also rise today to congratulate the Senator from West Virginia on his speech and welcome him to the Senate and express pleasure in working together. I want to echo the comments of Senator LAMAR ALEXANDER, the good Senator from Tennessee, as well. Being a former Governor, I actually got to know JOE MANCHIN in his days as Governor. We worked together in his days as Governor and certainly I look forward to working with him as Senator.

Our States share many interests. One of those interests is coal. I want to express my intent today to join as a cosponsor on legislation regarding EPA regulation that Senator MANCHIN is putting forward. That is a good exam-

ple where we can work together to create jobs and opportunities. I certainly look forward to doing that.

Again, I congratulate the good Senator on his speech today.

I yield the floor.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Madam President, are we back in regular order?

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

FAA AIR TRANSPORTATION MODERNIZATION AND SAFETY IMPROVEMENT ACT—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. S. 223 is the pending measure.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

AMENDMENT NO. 21

Mr. PAUL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendments and call up amendment No. 21.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. PAUL] proposes an amendment numbered 21.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To reduce the total amount authorized to be appropriated for the Federal Aviation Administration for fiscal year 2011 to the total amount authorized to be appropriated for the Administration for fiscal year 2008)

At the end of title I, add the following:

SEC. 108. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION AT FISCAL YEAR 2008 LEVELS.

Notwithstanding any other provision of, or amendment made by, this title, the total amount authorized to be appropriated by this title to the Federal Aviation Administration for fiscal year 2011 is \$14,719,000,000.

Mr. PAUL. Madam President, the amendment I have presented to the floor for the FAA bill is an amendment that I think is a first step toward looking at budgetary restraint. The President, in his State of the Union Address, talked about freezing spending at 2010 levels. If we were to do that at the inflated levels of 2010, we would add \$3.8 trillion to the debt over the next 5 years. It does nothing to the looming debt crisis to leave things at 2010 levels because these were levels where we had already increased spending by over 20 percent.

What I am asking is a very modest proposal; that is, that all spending go back to the 2008 levels. This is not a

significant cut. We have increased things dramatically in recent years. FAA has been increased in funding by 50 percent over the last 8 years. We can fund the upgrading of NextGen and various things by looking for cost savings within the bill. These are things we must do.

The American people are demanding cost savings. The American people do not understand why we must pay inflated rates for our wages for the workers on Federal projects. They do not understand why Davis-Bacon wages, which were often 30 percent higher than the wages paid on other projects, private projects, must be paid. People are familiar with this even in their home States when you talk about the building of schools, how schools cost 20 and 30 percent more because of having to have inflated wages and extra regulations, extra paperwork that the Davis-Bacon laws require.

What we are looking for is cost savings everywhere—in this bill, in every bill that comes forward. As long as I am able to and as long as I am allowed, we will ask for spending reductions.

Many people in this city are for a balanced budget. They say they are for a balanced budget amendment. But how can they be for a balanced budget amendment if they are not willing to cut spending? This is a very small, almost token cut in spending, but we have to do it everywhere.

When people ask how will you balance the budget, you have to say I will cut spending. This is a very small first step to take the spending for this particular department to 2008 levels. I think it is a step long overdue. It is a chance for Members who say they are for a balanced budget to put their vote where their mouth is.

Let's vote to cut spending. Let's vote to cut spending on this bill now.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 27

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that amendment No. 27, offered by the Senator from Oregon, Mr. WYDEN, be added to the list of pending amendments.

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

The clerk will report the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ROCKEFELLER], for Mr. WYDEN, proposes an amendment numbered 27.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To increase the number of test sites in the National Airspace System used for unmanned aerial vehicles and to require one of those test sites to include a significant portion of public lands)

On page 96, lines 4 and 5, strike “at 4 test sites in the National Airspace System by 2012” and insert “by 2012 at 10 test sites in the National Airspace System, one of which shall include a significant portion of public lands (as defined in section 203 of the Public Lands Corps Act of 1993 (16 U.S.C. 1722))”.

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

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

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I rise to discuss an alarming trend that seems to be developing on this, the first substantive legislation we are considering in this new Congress. At least three amendments have been filed—one of which has already been offered, others expected to be offered shortly—that make unnecessary and misplaced attacks on basic rights and protections for American workers.

I find it deeply disturbing that in this difficult economy, some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle seem to be chomping at the bit to bring American workers down a notch or two more. I don't think the safety of our skies has to come at the expense of fair wages, safe working conditions, and other basic workplace rights. I hope all Republicans in this Chamber don't share that radical viewpoint.

AMENDMENT NO. 14

The first amendment I will focus on today would deny transportation security officers basic collective bargaining rights. That amendment was offered by my friend, the distinguished Senator from Mississippi. Well, that is fundamentally unfair and a poor way to treat hard-working people who are on the frontlines of our effort to keep America safe.

Currently, most Federal employees—including other employees at the Department of Homeland Security, such as Border Patrol, Immigration and Customs officials, and the Coast Guard—all have a voice in the decisions that affect their safety, their families, and their future.

Other Federal security employees also have these protections—the right to collective bargaining—including Border Patrol agents, Capitol Police officers, Customs and Border inspection officers, and Federal Protective Service officers.

That is right. All these wonderful policemen we see out here day after day, who are doing a hard job protecting us, protecting all the people who work in the Capitol and all these buildings around here, all our Capitol Police officers—guess what—have the fundamental right of being organized and

collectively bargaining for their hours, wages, and conditions of employment. Do we feel any less safe because of that? Of course not.

Despite working side by side with these colleagues, transportation security officers, TSOs, are denied the rights these other employees enjoy. They do not have a voice at work. They do not have statutory whistleblower protections or the right to appeal if they are subject to discrimination or unfair treatment by their supervisors.

The absence of collective bargaining rights has made TSA less effective. Our transportation security officers, TSOs, have twice the average rate of injury for Federal employees. A recent Best Places to Work survey ranked TSA 220 out of 224 Federal employers, and turnover rates are among the highest for any Federal agency. Let me repeat that. Turnover rates at TSA are among the highest for any Federal agency.

I submit that low morale and high turnover at a frontline security agency are a recipe for disaster, and Senator WICKER's amendment will only exacerbate the problem and make it worse.

I have heard some deeply disturbing rhetoric from my Republican colleagues about the effects of granting TSOs collective bargaining rights. They say collective bargaining rights keep security workers from performing their jobs effectively. Well, these insinuations are an insult to every man and woman in uniform who works under a collective bargaining agreement across this country. To suggest that unionized workers will not do what is best for our country in the event of an emergency is scandalous.

How many remember that image of 9/11—9/11—when we saw the towers come crumbling down, and we saw men and women running to escape the disaster, running away from it? Who was running into it? Our firefighters, our emergency medical teams, our police officers—all of them unionized, members of organized labor, operating under a collective bargaining agreement.

Does anyone question their loyalty, their devotion to duty—many of whom lost their lives or are severely impaired for life because they did their duty—simply because they were union members? We are saying somehow they are less, they are less than others simply because they belong to a union?

Also, on 9/11, Department of Defense employees, operating under a collective bargaining agreement, were required to report wherever they were told, regardless of their usual work assignments. No Federal union tried to hold up this process in any way to bargain or seek arbitration, and not one single grievance was filed to challenge the redeployments after the fact—not one.

Increasing employees' voices at work has the potential to improve the functioning of our security systems. Think about this: When you travel abroad, you go through screening devices. Go to London, go to Paris, go to Luxem-

bourg, go to Rome, go to Tokyo, go to Brisbane, go to Sydney, go anywhere around the world where they have airport screeners and—guess what—they all work under collective bargaining agreements. The unions that represent these screeners have worked hand in hand with their governments to improve security procedures and to make our skies safer.

Senator WICKER referenced a 2003 memo from the Under Secretary of Transportation for Security for the rationale for his bill. Well, currently TSA is reviewing that 2003 decision and is expected to make a determination soon about the relationship between safety and collective bargaining. I think we should defer to that agency's expertise on this issue rather than hastily approving an amendment that would limit the administration's ability to adapt.

Collective bargaining, I believe, is the best way to bring dignity, consistency, and fairness to a workplace. It will make our TSO workforce more safe and stable, enhancing the security of our skies. Restoring these essential rights is long overdue. I urge my colleagues to oppose the Wicker amendment.

I yield the floor.

I 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. 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.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator PAUL be recognized to call up amendment No. 19 which deals with the Davis-Bacon issue; that there be 30 minutes of debate equally divided between Senators PAUL and ROCKEFELLER or their designees; that upon the use or yielding back of time, there be 10 minutes of debate equally divided on the Whitehouse amendment No. 8 dealing with laser pointers; that this time be equally divided between Senators WHITEHOUSE and HUTCHISON or their designees; that upon the use or yielding back of time, the Senate proceed to vote in relation to the Whitehouse amendment, to be followed by a vote in relation to the Paul amendment; further, that there be no amendments or points of order in order to the amendments prior to the votes; and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

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

Mr. REID. That being the case, we will have votes probably around 5:30, give or take a few minutes. Everyone should be alerted that there is likely to be some time yielded back. If that is the case, we will begin voting sooner.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

AMENDMENT NO. 19

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to temporarily set aside the pending amendment so I may call up my amendment, amendment No. 19, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant editor of the Daily Digest read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. PAUL] proposes an amendment numbered 19.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To limit the application of the Davis-Bacon Act in the case of projects funded under this Act)

On page __, between lines __ and __, insert the following:

SEC. __. NONAPPLICATION OF DAVIS-BACON.

None of the funds made available under this Act (or an amendment made by this Act) may be used to administer or enforce the wage-rate requirements of subchapter IV of chapter 31 of part A of subtitle II of title 40, United States Code (commonly referred to as the "Davis-Bacon Act") with respect to any project or program funded under this Act (or amendment).

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, the amendment I have offered to the FAA bill is an amendment to exempt the FAA from the Davis-Bacon restrictions. Most of us know, when we talk about schools being built in our district or in our neighborhood, the cost of schools and anything built under Davis-Bacon determines prevailing wages. This means if you are a carpenter making usually \$14 an hour in Bowling Green, KY, the government comes in and says, Well, you need to pay \$35 an hour. It inflates the cost of building projects and it does us no good as a society. What happens is we build less schools, less airports, and we are unable to have enough money in our country to provide for the things we want. We can build 20 to 30 percent more airports if we don't force union wages that are above the market wages on our government projects.

I think it is inexcusable, at a time when we run a deficit of between \$1.5 trillion and \$2 trillion in a year, that we want to inflate the cost of government projects. The marketplace should determine market wages, and we should have a marketplace that allows us to build more airports and more schools.

I think it is not a good idea to have the government get involved by forcing wages above the market wage. If you pass this and you allow an exemption from Davis-Bacon, you will save about \$500 million just in this department. If you would allow this across government, you would save \$11 billion.

My point in bringing this up is that this won't balance the budget, but you have to start somewhere. Everybody says we have to do something, but nobody is willing to do anything that will reduce government expenditures. I

think this is one small step forward, and if you can't vote for this one small step forward, you are not serious about balancing the budget. That is why the American people are unhappy with us in Congress, because we won't do anything, we won't step forward, we will not be bold, and we will not start cutting spending.

I recommend to the Senate that we pass this amendment as one small step forward but an important step toward trying to get our fiscal house in order.

I yield to Senator HUTCHISON.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, how much time does Senator PAUL control?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 12½ minutes remaining.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I want to withhold until the other side has had a chance to speak. Then I will take part of Senator PAUL's time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, does the Senator from Iowa wish to speak?

Mr. HARKIN. Yes, I will. Mr. President, I assume the chairman of the committee yields me whatever time I want to consume, and I am reserving some time also for the chairman.

Here we go again. It is not the first time we have had an attack on Davis-Bacon. I am sure it will not be the last. Again, we have to get the facts out and not be led astray by misconceptions and by lack of really good data.

The fact is that Davis-Bacon doesn't just create good jobs, it saves government money in Federal construction costs. Again, my friend from Kentucky has said this is going to cost more money. Well, I would like to see the studies because we have had a lot of studies on this over the years, and they show that prevailing wage laws lead to reductions in the costs and responsible contractors that pay workers at least a prevailing wage, higher productivity, and fewer safety problems.

We need Davis-Bacon so that our infrastructure projects are built safely for the hundreds of millions of Americans who rely on them, because contractors that pay prevailing wages hire higher skilled and better trained workers, and they produce safer buildings, airports, bridges, roads, and tunnels. Senator PAUL's amendment would undermine public safety by making it much easier for less responsible contractors to build important public infrastructure projects with shoddy construction.

Congress has rejected attacks on Davis-Bacon before, going clear back to 1931. It should do so again. In the most recent vote in the Senate, in 2007, a bipartisan vote of Democrats and Republicans voted against an amendment to strip Davis-Bacon protection from funds to repair bridges. There has always been bipartisan support in this body for Davis-Bacon. In fact, we ought to read history. Senator Davis and Representative Bacon were both Re-

publicans. It was originally a Republican bill. I hope my colleagues will recognize the value of continuing to support fair wages in these difficult economic times.

This is the wrong time to start pulling the rug out from underneath our construction workers. Our fair wages that we have under Davis-Bacon are a key component of middle-class security for working families. Now is the wrong time to be attacking these essential protections.

Prevailing-wage laws, such as Davis-Bacon, require that workers be paid the prevailing local wages and benefits. These laws ensure that federally supported construction projects don't undermine local labor standards. By removing these protections, Senator PAUL's amendment would drive down wages, creating a dangerous race to the bottom. Again, that is the wrong approach to take in this troubled economy, the wrong approach to take for worker safety, the wrong approach to take for making sure what we build with taxpayer money is built well, with well-trained, well-motivated, and well-paid workers.

We want a real recovery. These working families—construction workers who haul steel, pour concrete, build the bridges and the walls and do all these things—build the infrastructure of our country. We want to make sure they have good, family-supporting jobs, with fair wages and decent benefits. That is what Davis-Bacon is about.

I urge a defeat of the Paul amendment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I oppose this amendment also. There are reasons for Davis-Bacon. One of them, for example, is it protects communities and employers by keeping the wage standards of low-wage areas from being imported into high-wage areas, and also the reverse. What do I mean by that? Obviously, West Virginia has a very different wage level than New York or Maryland or many parts of Virginia. They could come in and bid on a contract and either bid very low and do a bad job or bid very high and get it, for whatever reason. This prevents artificially inflating wages.

The inference was that it costs more to have Davis-Bacon. Some people don't like Davis-Bacon, and I understand that. But the law specifically requires that all workers must be paid no less than the prevailing wages and benefits that are paid in similar projects in that area. So it attaches the Davis-Bacon concept onto the regional local wage area. Virginia and Maryland are not far from West Virginia, so people want contracts, and they are likely to bid.

Since it was enacted, Davis-Bacon has protected taxpayers and workers from low-ball contractors who try to compete. You know that song. We all see it so much. They come in and bid a

low price, and they get it, and there are all kinds of extra things added on—cost-plus. It doesn't happen under this; it isn't allowed. So the law effectively makes sure the taxpayers get their money's worth. As the Senator from Iowa indicated, numerous studies indicate that projects built under Davis-Bacon are more likely to be completed on time, within budget, and with fewer repair costs.

So this is a very significant amendment. But it is not about bilking the taxpayers. It is protecting the taxpayers. Davis-Bacon puts the contract wages in line with what is prevailing locally. That is the law. It makes sense to me. I strongly oppose the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I rise to speak in favor of the Paul amendment.

The Davis-Bacon Act was passed in 1931. We had a very different labor and diversity of wages. There were not minimum wages to the extent we have today. Today, every State has a different cost of living, different standards of what kinds of construction requirements there are, and thousands of buildings in this country are built in the private sector very safely, very efficiently. But when Davis-Bacon kicks in, for a government program, it skews the entire wage scale of that community, causing an inflation to other projects.

The studies I have seen prove that Davis-Bacon increases costs throughout a community because it sets an artificial standard, not taking into account the cost of living in that area. No one can argue that the cost of living in New York is very different from the cost of living in Texas or West Virginia or Tennessee. We should not be trying to change the norm in an area by artificially inflating the costs, and that is exactly what Davis-Bacon does.

If we are going to hear the voice of the people, who said last November: We are tired of business as usual in Washington and in Congress, we will pass the Paul amendment because this is the first step toward efficiency—to say that the projects going forward in this bill will not be subject to Davis-Bacon; they will be subject to bidding on contracts. And bidders do not necessarily win because they have the lowest bid. The person who is doing the contracting has the leeway to take into account quality and the reputation of the builder. So it is not as if the lowest bidder gets every bid. It is a process that is orderly. But Davis-Bacon does inflate the cost.

I think the Paul amendment is an excellent one. I think it will show that the people in this Senate got the message in November—that we don't have to sit with a 1931 law that is no longer necessary because the protections are in place, and we need to build our taxpayer-funded facilities in the most efficient way that saves taxpayer dollars.

I support the Paul amendment and hope it will pass.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from Kentucky. He is on the mark. Our priorities are two: One, to make it easier and cheaper to create private sector jobs; two, to reduce the Federal debt.

The Paul amendment makes it easier and cheaper to create private sector jobs. Why? Because it permits more contractors to hire more people to do more work at the lowest possible cost to the taxpayer.

Also, according to the General Accounting Office, it will help lower the Federal debt. In fact, the GAO has recommended changes to the Davis-Bacon Act as a means for trimming the Federal deficit. Leaving the law the way it is, applying the Davis-Bacon law to construction projects all over the country, will mean fewer jobs, less construction, higher taxes, and a higher Federal debt.

Passing the Rand Paul amendment will mean that we will make it easier and cheaper to create private sector jobs. Day after day in this Senate, we should be acting on legislation that remembers that in Tennessee, for example, we have had 24 straight months of unemployment above 9 percent.

I am glad to be a cosponsor of the Paul amendment because, in my State and across the country, it will make it easier and cheaper to create private sector jobs instead of adding to the debt, creating fewer jobs, less construction, slower airport contracts, and higher taxes.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FRANKEN). Who yields time?

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, if I may, I ask the Senator from Kentucky if he is ready to yield back time and I ask the majority if they are ready to yield back time on the Paul amendment. If so, we can move on to the Whitehouse amendment.

Mr. HARKIN. I say to my friend from Texas, I would like to have an additional 2 minutes.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. I will reserve an additional 2 minutes for Senator PAUL, and we can close this out.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I heard my friend from Tennessee—and he is my friend—talk about how this will be cheaper, it would be cheaper to build things. The new Senator from Kentucky referred to that too.

Sometimes cheapest is not always the least expensive. Sometimes cheapest can turn out to be the most expensive, depending upon the quality of the work, how long these projects are, and whether they are done on time.

I have a friend in Iowa who happens to be one of the largest contractors in the Midwest, if not in the entire country. He has big earth-moving equipment. He is a huge contractor. He prob-

ably does work in Tennessee, Kentucky, Texas, and everywhere else.

He told me once: I will only hire union labor. I asked him why. He said: Because they have a great apprenticeship and training program. Plus, he said: I know I get well-trained workers on my construction jobs.

He said: I don't mind Davis-Bacon because I get apprenticeship, I get training, plus I get workers I don't have to look over their shoulders all the time. I get quality work done.

He said: I didn't get big by undercutting everybody. I got big because I did good work, and I got good quality.

He is able to go head to head with nonunion contractors, and he has become the largest contractor because of the quality of his work.

That is why I say to my friend, sometimes the cheapest is not always the best in terms of the interest of the taxpayers and of this country.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, this amendment is not about quality. It is not about unions. It is about a Federal Government that is spending too much money, and it is about an enormous debt we have. It is about starting somewhere.

People agree that you save money if you do not have to pay the prevailing wage. Everybody knows it. The gallery knows it. The public knows it. In Kentucky, schools cost 30 percent more if you have prevailing wage. You build less schools. Your money does not go as far. It is not a good efficient use of your money.

With regard to quality, to imply that you cannot have quality unless it is union labor, unless it is prevailing wage, completely ignores what goes on in our economy; that is to say, the 90 percent of things that are made in our country that are nonunion and nonprevailing wage do not have quality. The argument is specious. It has no substance.

What this is about is making a first step toward controlling our deficit. We need to cut costs in government. If we cannot do these little things—this would save \$500 million on this bill. It is a small amount in Washington. It is a large amount to us in Kentucky, to individuals. It is a small amount, but it is a first step toward saying we are going to be responsible as a Congress and say: Enough is enough; we cannot live with \$2 trillion deficits each year. It is out of control. We are headed toward financial ruin, and this is one first step forward.

I hope the rest of the Senate will support this amendment to exempt from the FAA bill the considerations of Davis-Bacon.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is all time yielded back on the pending amendment?

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. We yield back all time.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the Paul amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I move to table the amendment. I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion to table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be set aside.

AMENDMENT NO. 8

There is now 10 minutes evenly divided on the Whitehouse amendment. Who yields time?

The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I wish to speak to this amendment which makes it a Federal criminal offense to target an aircraft with a laser.

The prevalence of this activity has increased enormously. According to the FAA, there were 2,836 instances of lasers aimed at airplanes in 2010, which is a ninefold increase over the past 5 years.

The consequences of one of these attacks in the cockpit of an aircraft are significant. I am reading from a news report:

Glendale, CA, police Sgt. Steve Robertson remembers the first time he encountered a laser strike. He says his helicopter was hit by a powerful beam of green light one night while he was on patrol. "It immediately [lit] up the whole cockpit and it hit both of my eyes and burned both of my corneas," said the veteran pilot. "Instantly, I was blinded. It felt like I was hit in the face with a baseball bat—just an intense, burning pain."

Robertson was momentarily incapacitated and would have crashed if his co-pilot hadn't been able to land the chopper.

Thankfully, he recovered from his injuries.

I express my appreciation to both Senators BOXER and FEINSTEIN who are cosponsors of this amendment. Clearly, it is a major issue in California. I thank Senator MARK KIRK of Illinois who is the lead Republican cosponsor.

O'Hare Airport is one of the busiest airports in the country. It had 98 of these events take place in 2010.

Senator DURBIN also of Illinois is a cosponsor as well. I express my appreciation to him.

The House has passed a similar measure. There is every reason to believe that if we take this step we will be able to help defend our airspace from these attacks. Obviously, they are most dangerous near airports when planes are taking off or landing or in low level flight, as police sergeant Steve Robertson was.

It has the support of the National Association of Police Agencies and the Pilots Association.

I hope very much that my colleagues will vote in favor of it and take this simple step to protect our aircraft travel from a new and emerging risk.

Does the chairman wish to speak? I yield back our time but for the 2 minutes to the chairman.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, this is an enormously important amendment. To be quite truthful, I think Senator WHITEHOUSE would have been satisfied with just having it accepted by both sides, which it would have been. I said: Please bring it to a vote.

This is a national security threat. The technology is going to get much better. He spoke about the pilot who was temporarily blinded, whose corneas were affected. As the technology increases, it is going to blind pilots permanently. Maybe if they are accurate, they can get both the pilot and the copilot.

All of this will take place around airports where there is obviously room to sight in on these people taking off and landing, particularly landing, I would think. It is absolutely a threat, and the numbers in the last 2 years absolutely prove it.

I wish to emphasize, yes; this is on a Federal aviation bill, but it could be on an Armed Services Committee bill. It could be on an Intelligence Committee bill. It could be on a Homeland Security Committee bill. It is a very powerful vote because there will be a future for terrorists in this business, so the criminal penalties have to be established. The Whitehouse amendment, which I strongly support, does that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I support the Whitehouse amendment. It will add to the security of our aircraft flying. I urge my colleagues to support it as well.

If time has been yielded back, I call for a vote.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

If all time is yielded back, the question is on agreeing to amendment No. 8. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) is necessarily absent.

Mr. KYL. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) and the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 96, nays 1, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 10 Leg.]

YEAS—96

Akaka	Feinstein	Merkley
Alexander	Franken	Mikulski
Ayotte	Gillibrand	Moran
Barrasso	Graham	Murkowski
Baucus	Grassley	Murray
Begich	Hagan	Nelson (NE)
Bennet	Harkin	Nelson (FL)
Bingaman	Hoehn	Portman
Blumenthal	Hutchison	Pryor
Blunt	Inhofe	Reed
Boozman	Inouye	Reid
Boxer	Isakson	Risch
Brown (MA)	Johanns	Roberts
Brown (OH)	Johnson (SD)	Rockefeller
Burr	Johnson (WI)	Rubio
Cantwell	Kerry	Sanders
Cardin	Kirk	Schumer
Carper	Klobuchar	Sessions
Casey	Kohl	Shaheen
Chambliss	Kyl	Shelby
Coats	Landrieu	Snowe
Cochran	Lautenberg	Stabenow
Collins	Leahy	Tester
Conrad	Lee	Thune
Coons	Levin	Toomey
Corker	Lieberman	Udall (CO)
Cornyn	Lugar	Udall (NM)
Crapo	Manchin	Vitter
DeMint	McCain	Webb
Durbin	McCaskill	Whitehouse
Ensign	McConnell	Wicker
Enzi	Menendez	Wyden

NAYS—1

Paul

NOT VOTING—3

Coburn Hatch Warner

The amendment (No. 8) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we have made good progress on this bill. We are working through the amendments. The staff has been doing yeomen's work. The Finance Committee is going to meet on Tuesday to report out funding for this bill. They have a path forward to do that. We need to keep the amendments relative to the Federal Aviation Administration and that has been good. We have made, as I indicated, progress. We have had some substantive amendments we worked on. We are voting on a couple here this evening and staff have worked on a number that they can resolve.

We are going to make more progress next week. We hope to complete action early in the week of February 14. As indicated—it has been scheduled for a long period of time—the Democratic Senators have a retreat next week. We are going to have votes Monday night and Tuesday morning. Everyone can count on that. But we believe, looking at the schedule tomorrow, we can accomplish just as much with having the Senate in session tomorrow. The majority will be here taking amendments or doing whatever is necessary on this bill. If somebody wants to give a speech on whatever their heart desires, they will be able to do that tomorrow also.

This next vote will be the last vote of the week.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, we are making good progress on this bill. This bill is being handled as we have been accustomed in the old days to

handling bills in the Senate. I commend the majority leader for that. We are going to be able to work our way through it with amendments related to the subject from here on in and wrap it up, as he suggests, the week of February 14.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to table the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) is necessarily absent.

Mr. KYL. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) and the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH).

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 55, nays 42, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 11 Leg.]

YEAS—55

Akaka	Harkin	Murray
Baucus	Inouye	Nelson (NE)
Begich	Johanns	Nelson (FL)
Bennet	Johnson (SD)	Pryor
Bingaman	Kerry	Reed
Blumenthal	Kirk	Reid
Boxer	Klobuchar	Rockefeller
Brown (OH)	Kohl	Sanders
Cantwell	Landrieu	Schumer
Cardin	Lautenberg	Shaheen
Carper	Leahy	Stabenow
Casey	Levin	Tester
Conrad	Lieberman	Udall (CO)
Coons	Manchin	Udall (NM)
Durbin	McCaskill	Udall (NM)
Feinstein	Menendez	Webb
Franken	Merkley	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Mikulski	Wyden
Hagan	Murkowski	

NAYS—42

Alexander	DeMint	McConnell
Ayotte	Ensign	Moran
Barrasso	Enzi	Paul
Blunt	Graham	Portman
Boozman	Grassley	Risch
Brown (MA)	Hoeven	Roberts
Burr	Hutchison	Rubio
Chambliss	Inhofe	Sessions
Coats	Isakson	Shelby
Cochran	Johnson (WI)	Snowe
Collins	Kyl	Thune
Corker	Lee	Toomey
Cornyn	Lugar	Vitter
Crapo	McCain	Wicker

NOT VOTING—3

Coburn	Hatch	Warner
--------	-------	--------

The motion was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 6

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment for consideration of Inhofe amendment No. 6.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. KERRY. Reserving the right to object, I ask the indulgence of the Senator, before he engages in a discussion of his amendment, if he would permit Senator MCCAIN and me to send to the desk a resolution with respect to Egypt. We would both like to speak very briefly on it.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, all I want to do is get two amendments in the queue in 30 seconds.

Mr. KERRY. I have no objection.

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

The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. INHOFE] proposes an amendment numbered 6.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To provide liability protection to volunteer pilot nonprofit organizations that fly for public benefit and to the pilots and staff of such nonprofit organizations, and for other purposes)

At the end of title VII, insert the following:

SECTION 732. LIABILITY PROTECTION FOR CERTAIN VOLUNTEER PILOTS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This section may be cited as the “Volunteer Pilot Organization Protection Act of 2011”.

(b) **FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.**—

(1) **FINDINGS.**—Congress finds the following:

(A) Many volunteer pilot nonprofit organizations fly for public benefit and provide valuable services to communities and individuals.

(B) In calendar year 2006, volunteer pilot nonprofit organizations provided long-distance, no-cost transportation for more than 58,000 people during times of special need.

(C) Such nonprofit organizations are no longer able to purchase non-owned aircraft liability insurance to provide liability protection at a reasonable price, and therefore face a highly detrimental liability risk.

(D) Such nonprofit organizations have supported the homeland security of the United States by providing volunteer pilot services during times of national emergency.

(2) **PURPOSE.**—The purpose of this section is to promote the activities of volunteer pilot nonprofit organizations that fly for public benefit and to sustain the availability of the services that such nonprofit organizations provide, including the following:

(A) Transportation at no cost to financially needy medical patients for medical treatment, evaluation, and diagnosis.

(B) Flights for humanitarian and charitable purposes.

(C) Other flights of compassion.

(c) **LIABILITY PROTECTION FOR VOLUNTEER PILOT NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS THAT FLY FOR PUBLIC BENEFIT AND TO PILOTS AND STAFF OF SUCH NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS.**—Section 4 of the Volunteer Protection Act of 1997 (42 U.S.C. 14503) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(4)—

(A) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as clauses (i) and (ii), respectively;

(B) by striking “the harm” and inserting “(A) except in the case of subparagraph (B), the harm”;

(C) in subparagraph (A)(ii), as redesignated by this paragraph, by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) the volunteer—

“(i) was operating an aircraft in furtherance of the purpose of a volunteer pilot nonprofit organization that flies for public benefit; and

“(ii) was properly licensed and insured for the operation of such aircraft.”; and

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) by striking “Nothing in this section” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), nothing in this section”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) EXCEPTION.—A volunteer pilot nonprofit organization that flies for public benefit, the staff, mission coordinators, officers, and directors (whether volunteer or otherwise) of such nonprofit organization, and a referring agency of such nonprofit organization shall not be liable for harm caused to any person by a volunteer of such nonprofit organization while such volunteer—

“(A) is operating an aircraft in furtherance of the purpose of such nonprofit organization;

“(B) is properly licensed for the operation of such aircraft; and

“(C) has certified to such nonprofit organization that such volunteer has insurance covering the volunteer’s operation of such aircraft.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 7

Mr. INHOFE. I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment for the consideration of Inhofe amendment No. 7.

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

The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. INHOFE] proposes an amendment numbered 7.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To require the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to initiate a new rulemaking proceeding with respect to the flight time limitations and rest requirements for supplemental operations before any of such limitations or requirements may be altered)

On page 230, between lines 7 and 8, insert the following:

SEC. 565. RESTRICTION ON ALTERATION OF FLIGHT TIME LIMITATIONS AND REST REQUIREMENTS FOR SUPPLEMENTAL OPERATIONS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The flight time limitations and rest requirements for supplemental operations under subpart S of part 121 of title 14, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act), shall remain in effect unless and until the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration issues a final rule in a rulemaking proceeding described in subsection (b).

(b) **RULEMAKING PROCEEDING DESCRIBED.**—A rulemaking proceeding described in this subsection is a rulemaking proceeding—

(1) with respect to modernizing the flight time limitations and rest requirements only with respect to supplemental operations under subpart S of part 121 of title 14, Code of Federal Regulations; and

(2) that is not a part of, or otherwise connected to, the rulemaking proceeding under Docket No. FAA-2009-1093, as described in the notice of proposed rulemaking published in the Federal Register on September 14, 2010 (75 Fed. Reg. 55852).

(c) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section requires the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to conduct a rulemaking proceeding with respect to the flight time limitations and rest requirements for supplemental operations

under subpart S of part 121 of title 14, Code of Federal Regulations, if the Administrator determines that the flight time limitations and rest requirements under that subpart (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act) are sufficient to ensure the safety of supplemental operations.

Mr. INHOFE. I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Massachusetts.

EGYPT

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I will not send the resolution to the desk. It is currently being hotlined in both offices. It may actually be dealt with in a short period in wrap-up. Senator MCCAIN and I wish to speak briefly to this resolution.

This is a resolution which expresses the deep concern of the Senate over the events taking place in Egypt at this time. We acknowledge the long relationship and importance of the relationship with Egypt. Most important, we call attention to the need at this moment for the Government of Egypt and for all the parties involved to take every step possible to avoid violence, to respect the rights of people to assemble, to express their rights, to fight for and demonstrate for a transition in their lives and in their country.

This is now a many-days-long demonstration, the longest in the history of Egypt. Hundreds have been killed, many thousands wounded. It is our hope—and we express this—that over the next days, responsible leadership will stand on all sides and work toward a transition process that respects people's rights and that builds a future that meets the aspirations expressed so passionately in the streets of cities all across Egypt. We hope this process will respect the right of journalists to report on the events in Egypt to the people of Egypt as well as the people of the world who are watching. We ask the leadership there to find a path by which they can transition to some kind of interim government over these next days that will build toward elections that can be free and fair and set an example for how any country in this kind of crisis can deal with it and, most importantly, meet the aspirations of their people.

I am privileged to join with Senator MCCAIN, Senator GRAHAM, and others in an effort to try to send this message from the Senate about our deep concern over the violence and our hopes and prayers that in the next hours and days responsible leadership will step up and do what is right.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, on behalf of Senator KERRY, the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, myself, and others, we will send this resolution to the desk. I will send it after I finish my remarks. We will not be seeking a vote at this time because we are hotlining the resolution.

This is a seminal moment in the history of the Middle East and the world.

We are seeing an uprising and a movement that spread across the entire Middle East. Egypt is the heart and soul of the Arab world. What we have been watching unfold in the last week has grieved and concerned all of us. There is every possibility that this crisis lurches into a genuine massacre. We cannot afford that. We must do everything in our power to see that it stops. Our resolution urges the Egyptian military to demonstrate maximum professionalism and restraint and emphasizes the importance of working to peacefully restore common order, while allowing for free and nonviolent freedom of expression. We do not want the Egyptian military to encourage thugs. We do not want the Egyptian military to be a party to increased violence.

We are concerned about an interim government. That interim government must be representative of all democratic forces within Egypt. In the resolution, we call on President Mubarak to immediately begin an orderly and peaceful transition to a democratic political system, including the transfer of power to an inclusive interim caretaker government in coordination with leaders from Egypt's opposition, civil society, and the military.

Again, I emphasize, I know my colleagues know, the Egyptian military is the most respected institution in Egypt. They risk turning the people of Egypt against them unless they act as a genuine peacemaker in Egypt.

I have been involved in Middle Eastern affairs for many years. I have traveled many times to the region. What is happening is a seminal event. How it turns out will affect the future of the 21st century. If Egypt turns to radical Islamic extremism and other countries as well, it poses not only a threat to America's national security but to the well-being of tens or hundreds of millions of people who have the God-given right of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness as we guarantee to all people.

I thank Senator KERRY again. We are sending a message from the Senate that I am sure the overwhelming majority of my colleagues will agree with: Stop the bloodletting. Let's start a peaceful transition to a free and open society and a government that can regain and hold the trust of the people of Egypt. This is a seminal moment and one that I believe the future of peace in the world will be relied upon.

I thank my colleagues. We look forward to further discussion. We wanted to bring this up now. It is very important, since tomorrow could be a very critical day in the history of the Egyptian people's struggle for independence and freedom.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I congratulate and compliment my colleagues from Massachusetts and Arizona. This resolution represents the best of the Senate. We have two people

who are very well versed in the ways of the world and understand America and what we stand for. They have crafted a document I would like to cosponsor.

I ask unanimous consent that I be added as a cosponsor.

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

Mr. GRAHAM. Tomorrow is a big day for the future of Egypt. Senator MCCAIN said it well: To the Army, I doubt if they are watching C-SPAN, but they have a chance to bring order out of chaos and to continue to have respect throughout the world and within the borders of Egypt. Do not let this opportunity pass. An interim government should be formed quickly, as this resolution urges. When it comes to the Egyptian people, I have faith that the young women who are risking life and limb in the square tonight and tomorrow are not doing so to be required to wear a burqa in the future. I have faith that the young men who are risking life and limb tonight and tomorrow would not want such a fate for their daughters and their wives. I have great respect for Islam. Radical Islam, similar to any other form of radical religion, is a threat to all we hold dear. The Egyptian people have a chance to chart a new way for the future of the Arab world and the world at large. This resolution is a statement of principle by the Senate that we stand with you and all those who believe in tolerance and the dignity of mankind.

This statement is bipartisan. It is well thought out. I think it reflects where the American people want to be in relation to Egypt.

To those in Congress who want to act quickly about defunding our relationship with Egypt, please consider the consequences of such action. Give the Egyptian people a chance to work this out. Give the Army a chance to bring order out of chaos. It is in our national security interest that we have a stable Egypt. The army is the most respected institution.

Mr. MCCAIN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. MCCAIN. Isn't it time to urge democracy and freedom and not the time to threaten? There is plenty of time to threaten the Government and people of Egypt with reprisal. The time now is to urge democracy and freedom.

Mr. GRAHAM. Well said. It is now time for the United States to say what we are for and urge the Egyptian people to realize their hopes and dreams and that we want to be their partner. Now is not the time to sever the partnership. Now is the time to stand by a future partnership that would be beneficial to both countries. This resolution is a statement of principle that I hope the Egyptian people will see as an acknowledgment by the Senate that we are with them when it comes to their best hopes and dreams.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. I also ask unanimous consent to be added as a cosponsor of the resolution.

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

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. I also commend these two great leaders, Senator KERRY and Senator MCCAIN, for coming together on this resolution. A lot of people try to bring us apart in this institution. But they were counted here today with one voice. I was in Vietnam with Senator MCCAIN. I couldn't get over all the people who came up to him and still talked about the work he and Senator KERRY had done together, with POWs and other issues, how they had gone to Vietnam together. Well, once again, they have come together at a time of great crisis to have the Senate tell the people of Egypt that we are there with them and we are behind them.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Hawaii is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 14

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I rise today to strongly oppose Senator WICKER's amendment to prevent Transportation Security Administration employees from being able to collectively bargain.

There is no need for the Senate to use valuable time considering this issue right now. Congress gave the Administrator of TSA the authority to determine if and how collective bargaining should take place in the Air Transportation Security Act, which established TSA in the wake of the attacks of September 11.

Administrator Pistole, who has a strong national security background, is evaluating this issue in detail and I believe we should let him complete his review.

Although I believe Administrator Pistole should be given time to make the decision on granting collective bargaining rights to TSA employees, I want to address the arguments some are making in opposing TSA workers' rights.

I believe giving TSA employees a greater voice in the workplace would be good for security. TSA suffers from low morale, high attrition, and high injury rates.

National security is jeopardized when agencies charged with protecting our safety continually lose trained and talented employees due to workplace injuries and a lack of employee protections.

Moreover, the vast majority of Federal employees have collective bargaining rights. This includes other employees of the Department of Homeland Security performing similar security functions, such as Border Patrol agents, Federal Protective Service officers, and Immigration and Customs Enforcement officers.

In addition, there currently are some private airport screeners with full collective bargaining rights. Airport security is handled by contract screeners in a handful of airports, including some

large ones. These contract employees have full collective bargaining rights. Ironically, some have recently been arguing for contracting security at more airports, saying the security is better there. To be clear, I strongly support federalized airport security, but if there are any benefits where security is contracted, perhaps it is because the screeners are unionized, not because they are privatized.

Proponents of collective bargaining restrictions say they are necessary so that TSA has the flexibility to respond to emergencies. That is simply not true. Under Federal law, agencies are provided authority to take any actions they deem necessary to carry out their missions during an emergency. Granting collective bargaining rights would not in any way hinder TSA's flexibility to transfer employees in the event of a national emergency.

Moreover, under civil service laws, TSA employees, as other Federal employees, would be prohibited from striking if they are granted collective bargaining rights.

We all remember the heroic first responders who rushed into the World Trade Center and the Pentagon on September 11, 2001. I vividly recall the Capitol Police officers working frantically to protect our safety when it appeared the fourth plane could strike the Capitol. These were unionized workers. Like the heroes of 9/11, the brave men and women of TSA have dedicated themselves to protect our security. There is absolutely no basis for the Republicans to argue that TSA employees would invoke union contract restrictions rather than rise to the occasion in an emergency.

I urge all Senators to protect TSA employees' opportunity to have a voice in their workforce by opposing the Wicker amendment.

Mr. President, I yield back my time.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 32

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment to call up, on behalf of Senator ENSIGN, Ensign amendment No. 32.

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

The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ROCKEFELLER], for Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. CONRAD, and Mr. HOEVEN, proposes an amendment numbered 32.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To improve provisions relating to certification and flight standards for military remotely piloted aerial systems in the National Airspace System)

Beginning on page 96, strike line 9 and all that follows through page 97, line 8, and insert the following:

(3) establishes a process to develop—

(A) air traffic requirements for all unmanned aerial systems at the test sites; and
(B) certification and flight standards for nonmilitary unmanned aerial systems at the test sites;

(4) dedicates funding for unmanned aerial systems research and development relating to—

(A) air traffic requirements; and
(B) certification and flight standards for nonmilitary unmanned aerial systems in the National Airspace System;

(5) encourages leveraging and coordination of such research and development activities with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the Department of Defense;

(6) uniquely addresses the requirements of military and nonmilitary unmanned aerial system operations;

(7) ensures the unmanned aircraft systems integration plan is incorporated in the Administration's NextGen Air Transportation System implementation plan; and

(8) provides for integration into the National Airspace System of safety standards and navigation procedures validated—

(A) under the pilot project created pursuant to paragraph (1); or

(B) through other related research and development activities carried out pursuant to paragraph (4).

(b) TEST SITE CRITERIA.—The Administrator shall take into consideration geographical and climate diversity in determining where the test sites to be established under the pilot project required by subsection (a)(1) are to be located.

(c) CERTIFICATION AND FLIGHT STANDARDS FOR MILITARY UNMANNED AERIAL SYSTEMS.—The Secretary of Defense shall establish a process to develop certification and flight standards for military unmanned aerial systems at the test sites referred to in subsection (a)(1).

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I was unable to vote today because of a family emergency. I want to be clear that if I were present in the Chamber, I would have voted in favor of Senator SHELDON WHITEHOUSE's amendment No. 8 to provide penalties for pointing laser pointers at airplanes. Instances of this dangerous practice doubled last year, and I believe we need to take the strong actions necessary to protect our flight crews and the flying public from dangers such as this.

I also would have voted in support of the motion to table Senator RAND PAUL's amendment No. 19 to prohibit any funds made available by the FAA Reauthorization Act to be used to administer or enforce wage-rate requirements with respect to any project or program funded under the bill. I will continue to work with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to protect American workers, especially in these tough economic times.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President. I am in strong support of Senator LEVIN's effort to repeal the enhanced tax form 1099 reporting requirements enacted in the Patient Protection and Affordable Health Care Act. Since passage of the bill, I have heard from hundreds of Rhode Island small business owners about the paperwork and record-keeping costs of complying with the new 1099 standards. The provision, which was intended to cut down on fraud and generate revenue, has simply proven too burdensome on small businesses. I support the repeal of the new 1099 provision and am pleased to have voted in favor of the Levin amendment which would do so.

While I support the Levin approach to repealing the 1099 provision, I cannot lend my support to Senator STABENOW's amendment which would pay for the repeal by rescinding \$44 billion in appropriated funds. The rescission could endanger priorities for Rhode Island like funds appropriated for water infrastructure, housing assistance, and to help Rhode Island recover from the historic floods of March 2010. Senator REED and I fought hard to bring Federal help to Rhode Islanders struggling to rebuild after the worst flood in 200 years, and I simply am not willing jeopardize that relief.

Once again, I fully support the repeal of the enhanced 1099 reporting requirements, and I hope we can pass a measure to do that without endangering funding for critical programs like flood recovery.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I support Senator MCCONNELL's effort to fully repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Act. I opposed the final passage of this new law because it was the product of a seriously flawed process that was rushed on a host of artificial timelines resulting in fundamentally defective policy that did not resolve the issue of affordability of health care in Maine and across the country. In addition, the preponderance of the beneficial reforms and subsidies do not kick in until 2014, so between now and then most Mainers will continue to experience what they know all too well—a continuation of premiums that have skyrocketed by 426 percent over the past decade and diminishing competition and plan choices in our markets.

Regrettably, what the Democratic majority rushed through the Senate floor last Congress was a 2,740-page bill, which we were forced to complete by Christmas day after a mere 21 days on the floor. As the result of this massive bill, we have a bloated and over-extended new law that dramatically augments the reach of the Federal Government in health care. According to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the new health reform law mandates 41 separate rulemakings, at least 100 additional regulatory guidance documents, and 129 reports. In addition, the new law is paid for with a job-killing \$210 billion increase in Medicare taxes on businesses and an estimated \$500 bil-

lion overall increase in taxes at this time of economic peril.

I happen to believe the details matter of what we do here in Congress. And I also believe the American people would agree. It is not irrational for them to expect that we actually know what is in this bill, how it will work, and whether we can reasonably expect it to be effective and bring down costs for the American people. And there is mounting evidence that it will not, as a recent study projects an 8.8-percent premium increase for employer-sponsored coverage in 2011—up from 6.9 percent in 2010 and 6 percent in 2009—and out-of-pocket premium costs for employees will rise 12.4 percent next year.

During consideration of the health reform bill, I had serious concerns about affordability—and whether an affordable coverage option would be available to all Americans in the private insurance market. That is why I requested an analysis from the non-partisan Congressional Budget Office, CBO, back in December 2009, with a State-specific analysis of premium affordability, but regrettably a complete analysis was never provided.

So I support efforts to fully repeal of the health care reform law. And because the majority has endorsed once again their misguided health law by defeating today's full repeal vote, I will also support targeted efforts to repeal other provisions—starting with the onerous 1099 mandate that we have just repealed that would have required millions of businesses to send billions of new information reporting forms to the IRS and other businesses. I want to commend Senator JOHANNIS for his recognition of this onerous burden and his tireless efforts to repeal it. Since last summer he has done a yeoman's job of leading on this issue.

If this amendment was not adopted here in the Senate, every business in America, starting in 2012, must report to the IRS on business purchases that exceed a threshold of only \$600 per vendor or supplier—for purchases of supplies and equipment and also services ranging from cell phone coverage to window washing to utilities.

This new mandate was imposed in the health reform law, yet it had absolutely nothing to do with health insurance reform. What it does is make the Federal Government a more intrusive and burdensome presence in every aspect of American business—which is the very last thing American business needs during these tumultuous economic times. What small firms are clamoring for is certainty and relief from these extreme regulatory nuisances. They need the Federal Government to help foster an entrepreneurial environment under which they can do what they do best—create new jobs—and not saddle them with an incessant and unnecessary paperwork burden such as this new 1099 filing requirement.

Missing from the amendment we just passed is the fact that rental real es-

tate would still be subject to this 1099 reporting requirement. Rental real estate was added to this paperwork morass as part of the Small Business Jobs Act last year at a time when the 1099 reporting quagmire was already known. Yet, remarkably, the majority forged ahead regardless and inexplicably expanded rather fixing this problem. For those parts of the country that have tourism as an economic foundation, rental real estate is a major factor, and for Maine, for which the State motto is "Vacationland" this is a major problem—and it is something we need to repeal this year.

We also need to strike the employer mandate from the bill, which is something of critical importance to me as ranking member of the Senate Small Business Committee. Under the new law, starting in 2014, firms with more than 50 workers would have to pay \$2,000 per employee with just the first 30 employees exempted. And if that is not enough, part-time workers will be counted in determining if the mandate would apply. That means countless more middle-sized firms such as restaurants and retailers would be subject to the mandate, which will raise \$52 billion in revenue.

Mr. President, exactly how is this going to help our Nation's greatest job generators—our small businesses—to lead us out of this recession, especially since we are also now going to hit them with increased Medicare taxes? And that is another tax increase we must repeal. That is right—starting in 2013, the new law includes \$87 billion in Medicare taxes that disproportionately harm small businesses because they apply to the income those businesses would normally reinvest. Plain and simple, this 0.9 percentage point increase in Medicare HI payroll taxes, coupled with a 3.8-percent Medicare tax that is unprecedented because it will impose a payroll tax on investment income, will result in a grand total of \$210 billion in new Medicare taxes—a job killer as it essentially takes away capital from the very small business owners who are the most likely to employ between 20 and 250 employees.

Furthermore, I am deeply troubled by the manner in which the Medicare tax increases in this bill are to be utilized. According to CBO—and these are their exact words—"To describe the full amount of HI trust fund savings as both improving the government's ability to pay future Medicare benefits and financing new spending outside of Medicare would essentially double count a large share of those savings and thus overstate the improvement in the government's fiscal position."

Speaking of double counting, we need to repeal the so-called CLASS Act. Now, while proponents point to estimates that this provision would raise \$72 billion over the first 10 years, that savings only occurs as a result of a fiscal shell game of using funds promised to beneficiaries later to lower the deficit today. As CBO says, "The program

would pay out far less in benefits than it would receive in premiums over the 10-year budget window," raising \$70 billion in premiums that will fund benefits outside the window. As a result, CBO further concluded that "in the decade following 2029, the CLASS program would begin to increase the deficit." Again, this is exactly the wrong direction for America.

We also need to repeal the administration's "grandfathering" regulations. Not even a year after the administration promised that if you like the coverage you have, you can keep it, we find out that buried in 121 pages of regulations, which resulted from just 2 pages of legislative text, I might add that, no, that is not exactly true—far from it. In fact, the administration itself projects that up to 69 percent of all businesses and 80 percent of small businesses will not be able to retain the coverage they currently provide and will be forced to offer more costly coverage as opposed to hiring new workers and growing their businesses. So we must repeal these regulations this year.

Finally, I also strongly oppose the individual mandate in the new law, which would require, starting in 2014, Americans to have maintain insurance coverage or be subject to a financial penalty that would ultimately be the greater of \$695 per uninsured individual or 2.5 percent of income. How can the Federal Government require its citizens to purchase health coverage without first guaranteeing that an affordable coverage option will be available to all Americans in the private insurance market?

Numerous court challenges are underway questioning the constitutionality of the individual mandate. Last November, I joined with Republican Leader McCONNELL with 30 other GOP Senators to file a friend-of-the-court brief in the lawsuit in a Florida Federal court brought by the National Federation of Independent Business and now 26 States, including Maine, and I am pleased that just this week, the Florida judge agreed with us and struck down not just the individual mandate but the entire bill.

In its ruling, the court held that the "individual mandate is outside Congress' Commerce Clause power" and that it is not constitutional. The court concluded that the new law has "450 separate pieces, but one essential piece (the individual mandate) is defective and must be removed. It cannot function as originally designed." In the courts view, and I agree, "that the individual mandate and the remaining provisions are inextricably bound together in purpose and must stand or fall as a single unit."

So moving forward, with serious questions about the constitutionality and workability of this new law, a top priority this Congress must be to repeal the health reform bill and replace it with workable alternatives that would result in more competitive

health insurance markets. That is why, first and foremost, we must expedite allowing individuals and small businesses to purchase health insurance across State lines, which, as I have long said, would interject unfettered competition and new coverage options into stagnant insurance markets like those in Maine, where we have just two carriers offering coverage in the individual insurance market. That is why in the Senate, I long championed association health plan, AHP, legislation—and developed regional compact proposals—that would have allowed small business and the self-employed to band together, across State lines, to secure quality coverage made affordable through administrative cost savings and greater bargaining power.

We must also develop a plan for affordability by maintaining certain widely agreed upon elements of reform, such as outlawing unconscionable insurance industry practices, banning preexisting condition limitations, and allowing parents to keep children on plans until age 26.

MORNING BUSINESS

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

REMEMBERING EDDIE ESCOBEDO

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I extend my condolences to the family of my good friend Mr. Eddie Escobedo, who passed away in Las Vegas, NV, on October 15, 2010. He was 77 years old.

Eddie left behind his loving wife of 50 years, Doña Maria Escobedo, his children, Eddie, Jr., Hilda, Nicolas, Victor, and nine grandchildren. His passing leaves an empty place in the lives of those who knew and loved him, but it also leaves an enormous void in the Las Vegas community.

Eddie was best known as the publisher of the Spanish-language *El Mundo* newspaper and a strong advocate for the Hispanic community. He arrived in southern Nevada when approximately 60,000 people lived in the Las Vegas Valley. His assertive leadership drew attention to the issues that pertain specifically to the Latino community, paving the way for hundreds of thousands of them who now reside in Nevada.

Eddie was born in Juarez, Mexico, in 1932, and as a teenager immigrated to the United States. He recognized early on that in America he would have the opportunity to accomplish his dreams. He enlisted in the Air Force and earned his citizenship after serving with distinction.

Several years ago I received a call from my friend Eddie to invite me to Christmas in the Barrio, where he

would help give toys to needy children. Seeing those little faces glow because they would have a little bit of Christmas even though their families were struggling is a memory that I keep very fondly. Eddie's actions that day crystallized who he was in this community, and it reinforced my commitment to public service.

Eddie spread democracy through his incisive columns published in his newspaper, which often became the voice of the Latino community in Las Vegas. His columns also inspired his 175,000 weekly readers to become active in the community and to exercise their right to vote.

Eddie Escobedo's dedication to Nevada changed the community that he loved and fought for. He will be missed. His legacy and big heart will live on through his publication—*El Mundo* Newspaper—as it continues to play a vital role in the lives of Hispanics throughout Nevada by conveying the challenges and experiences Latino families face on a daily basis.

SUPER BOWL XLV

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, when we tune in this Sunday night to watch Super Bowl XLV, we will cheer players from all across our Nation. But as a Michigander, I will take special pride in watching the several players from Michigan colleges. I will cheer Flozell Adams of Michigan State University; Charlie Batch and T.J. Lang of Eastern Michigan University; Larry Foote, LaMarr Woodley and Charles Woodson of the University of Michigan; Greg Jennings of Western Michigan University; and Nick McDonald of Grand Valley State University.

But what is perhaps most extraordinary is the fact that four of the players on the field this Sunday will come from a single Michigan institution, Central Michigan University. As reported by the *Morning Sun* of Mount Pleasant, CMU's hometown paper, only three other schools—Louisiana State, Ohio State and Tennessee—will have as many players on the field, and none will have more.

The four CMU players—Steelers receiver Antonio Brown and Packers cornerback Josh Gordy, linebacker Frank Zombo and defensive tackle Cullen Jenkins—each enjoyed stellar careers for the Chippewas. Brown, Gordy and Zombo all played on multiple Mid-American Conference championship teams. The presence of these four players shows that it's not the size or the fame of the football program, but the effort and determination of its people, that bring success.

That is true not just in athletics, but academics as well. CMU is ranked among the Nation's top 20 research institutions with 16 or fewer doctoral programs. It offers groundbreaking programs in fields such as athletic

training and public relations. Its research efforts are helping the Department of Defense develop water filtration technology to protect servicemembers from harm, and helping develop new treatments for Parkinson's disease. CMU's efforts to educate the next generation and conduct research that improves lives embody the school's motto, "Sapientia, Virtus, Amicitia"—wisdom, virtue, friendship.

So Sunday's game will be a great reminder to all who are watching of what Central Michigan University and its students have accomplished. And in addition to cheers for the Packers and Steelers, I hope we will hear a few cries of "Fire Up, Chips!"

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

MISSOURI RIVER RELIEF

• Mrs. MCCASKILL. Mr. President, I ask the Senate to join me in honoring the 10th anniversary of Missouri River Relief and their dedication to preserving Missouri rivers.

As a lifelong Missourian, I have visited and enjoyed the natural beauty and recreational opportunities along the Missouri River. These riverbanks and waterways are treasured attractions throughout Missouri. The Missouri River enjoys over 1 million visitors from across the Nation each year who have the opportunity to experience the splendor and excitement these natural resources provide for our state. That is why I am so thrilled to acknowledge the work of the Missouri River Relief program.

Founded in 2001, Missouri River Relief began with just a few Missouri River enthusiasts dedicated to cleaning up our State waters. Ten years later, 12,000 Missourians have joined their communities in fighting for this cause, removing over 1 million pounds of trash and debris, making our waters safer for all to enjoy. In 2010 alone, over 1,100 student and teacher volunteers helped clean over 70 miles of river.

Missouri River Relief has contributed to promoting river education throughout the State. By sponsoring recreational activities and festivals that incorporate the arts alongside river education, this organization has made it their mission to teach Missouri families about our local rivers and how the rivers contribute to our environment.

This project has received an outpouring of State and corporate sponsorships that have made this growing cause a reality. Neighboring States have also included their support, cleaning up almost 400 miles of the Missouri River. The trash gathered from these clean ups have included recyclable and environmental friendly particles that have been turned into useful resources.

Working to preserve one of our country's most affluent and beautiful rivers, this organization deserves our gratitude and commemoration. Mis-

souri River Relief is committed to water safety and education and its service to the community stands as an inspiration to all Missourians and a strong signal of our State's continued growth and success.

Mr. President, I ask that the Senate join me in recognizing the 10th anniversary of the Missouri River Relief.●

NORTHEAST ORGANIC FARMING ASSOCIATION OF VERMONT

• Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, today I honor the Northeast Organic Farming Association of Vermont. NOFA Vermont is a nonprofit association of farmers, gardeners, and consumers working to promote an economically viable and ecologically sound Vermont food system for the benefit of current and future generations. This year it celebrates its 40th anniversary of helping farms thrive, making locally grown and organic foods available to all, and increasing consumer access at farmers markets across our Green Mountain State.

NOFA Vermont was founded in Putney in 1971, making it one of the oldest organic farming associations in the United States. Today, they are proud to have more than 1,200 members throughout the State and to certify over 525 farms and processors to the USDA national organic program standards. They are passionate about increasing the acreage of certified organic land in Vermont, while also increasing access to local organic food by all Vermonters. The entirety of their programs strives to meet these goals, whether it involves working with schools to bring local foods into the cafeteria, or providing business planning services to farmers to ensure their businesses stay viable.

With a vision that consists of small farms and agriculturally based businesses that are improving the ecology of Vermont foodscapes, where organic farms and gardens supply food to all members of their communities and where everyone knows their farmers, I see NOFA-VT as an exemplary national leader for the USDA campaign "Know your Farmer, Know your Food."

Executive director, Enid Wonnacott, has led this exceptional organization for the past 30 years. She and her dedicated team offer technical assistance and revolving loan funds; and supply information on energy management, apprenticeships, and educational and electronic resources. They have built direct markets between farmers and consumers through the VT Farmers Market Association and have sponsored outstanding conferences yearly. This year they expect more than 1,500 farmers to attend their winter conference, which is extremely well-run, worthwhile, and fun. They provide knowledgeable speakers, workshops brimming with information and healthy attitudes for the 21st century of farming.

Finally, I have been very impressed with their commitment to Vermont's

future and our children as NOFA-VT has been a significant partner in the advancement of the Vermont Food and Farm Education program, FEED. This critical program provides schools, farmers, food service directors, and community partners with technical assistance, training, and professional development to advance student achievement, improve childhood nutrition, and create community-based farm to school programs. It is through programs such as these that children are able to connect with the farm in their community, understand where their food comes from, and have the opportunity to eat local healthy food in their school meal programs.

I offer my sincerest congratulations to NOFA-VT on the occasion of their 40th anniversary of service to our great State of Vermont and wish them many more years of continued success.●

RECOGNIZING NORTH EAST WIPERS

• Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, America is home to millions of innovative and forward-thinking small businesses, which is critical to our future. And, as President Obama said in this State of the Union Address, "We need to out-innovate the . . . rest of the world" to maintain our position of global economic power. As such, I rise today to recognize a small company from my home State of Maine that represents a shining example of America's ingenuity and innovative spirit.

North East Wipers got its start a little over a year ago after a conversation between two long-time friends. Gerard Dubois, the owner of Pioneer Transport in Waterville, told his friend Ray Lawrence, a machinist with 25 years experience, about an idea to create mini wiper blades that can be affixed to rearview mirrors on big rig trucks, so that the driver would not have to stop every few minutes during inclement weather to clear off snow or remove dirt and salt. Not only was this a commonsense idea, it was a matter of safety for truckers who are often forced to drive in unforgiving weather conditions to deliver timely goods on which the American people rely.

As a result of the conversation, Ray and Gerard gathered \$10,000 in startup costs and set to work on creating a number of prototypes. They eventually coalesced around a simple yet durable model that attaches to mirror mounts without using electrical or motorized parts that cannot clog or freeze. Once affixed to the mirror, all the driver has to do is push a button for the wipers to work. Even more appealing is that the system costs \$500, roughly the amount it costs to fill a tractor trailer with diesel fuel.

While originally designed for logging trucks facing difficult conditions on roads across Maine and other snow-plagued States, Gerard Dubois and Ray

Lawrence are seeking to make their invention available to other major commercial vehicles on the road. Recognizing the merits of North East Wipers' product, the Maine Technology Institute recently announced it will be providing the company with a seed grant to support further development and commercialization of the wiper blades. Such capital is critical for the success of a project like this, and it recognizes the value and practicality of this unique invention. Gerard and Ray's ultimate goal is to work with a truck manufacturer on making the wipers standard equipment for its big rigs.

Maine is home to scores of groundbreaking entrepreneurs and creative thinkers, and clearly Gerard Dubois and Ray Lawrence fit that bill. I am extremely proud of the ingenuity they have demonstrated and the dedication they have shown in making their product a reality. I thank them for their inventiveness, and wish them much success in the future.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mrs. Neiman, 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.)

MEASURES DISCHARGED

The following bill was discharged from the Committee on Rules and Administration, and referred as indicated:

S. 126. A bill to reduce the amount of financial assistance provided to the Government of Mexico in response to the illegal border crossings from Mexico into the United States, which serve to dissipate the political discontent with the higher unemployment rate within Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The following bill was discharged from the Committee on Finance, and referred as indicated:

S. 109. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to require congressional approval of agreements for peaceful nuclear cooperation with foreign countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bills were read the first time:

S. 289. A bill to extend expiring provisions of the USA PATRIOT Improvement and Reauthorization Act of 2005, the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004, and the FISA Amendments Act of 2008

until December 31, 2013, and for other purposes.

S. 290. A bill to extend the sunset of certain provisions of the USA PATRIOT Act, and for other purposes.

S. 291. A bill to repeal the sunset provisions in the USA PATRIOT Improvement and Reauthorization Act of 2005 and other related provisions and permanently reauthorize the USA PATRIOT Act.

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-417. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Suspension of Community Eligibility" ((44 CFR Part 64)(Docket No. FEMA-2011-0002)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 2, 2011; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-418. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Television Broadcasting Services; Huntsville, AL" (MB Docket No. 08-194, DA 11-27) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 1, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-419. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Preserving the Open Internet; Broadband Industry Practices" ((FCC 10-201)(GN Docket No. 09-191)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 2, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-420. 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; Sculpins, Sharks, Squid, and Octopus in the Gulf of Alaska" (RIN0648-XA156) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 2, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-421. A communication from the Attorney, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Passenger Weight and Inspected Vessel Stability Requirements" ((RIN1625-AB20)(Docket No. USCG-2007-0030)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 2, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-422. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 18-651 "Closing and Dedication of Portions of a Public Alley in Square 5260, S.O. 10-13494, Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-423. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 18-652 "Corrupt Election Practices Amendment Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-424. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report

on D.C. Act 18-653 "Sustainability Energy Utility Amendment Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-425. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 18-654 "Thelma Jones Way Designation Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-426. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 18-655 "Closing of Public Streets, Dedication of Land for Street Purposes, and the Elimination of Highway Plan Encumbrances, in and abutting Squares 3655, 3656, and 3657, S.O. 09-10589, Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-427. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 18-656 "District of Columbia Housing Authority Board of Commissioners Amendment Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-428. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 18-679 "Prohibition on Government Employee Engagement in Political Activity Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-429. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 18-680 "Human and Environmental Health Protection Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-430. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 18-681 "Private Fire Hydrant Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-431. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 18-682 "Health and Safety 911 Abuse Prevention Amendment Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-432. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 18-683 "Adams Morgan Main Street Group Clarification Amendment Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-433. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 18-684 "Transportation Infrastructure Amendment Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-434. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 18-685 "Returning Citizen Public Employment Inclusion Amendment Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-435. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 18-686 "Ballpark Fee Clarification Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-436. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report

on D.C. Act 18-687 "Perry Street Affordable Housing Tax Exemption and Relief Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-437. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 18-688 "Kelsey Gardens Redevelopment Project Real Property Limited Tax Abatement Assistance Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-438. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 18-689 "Rhode Island Avenue Metro Plaza Revenue Bonds Amendment Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-439. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 18-690 "Not-for-Profit Hospital Corporation Personnel Administration Temporary Amendment Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-440. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 18-691 "Southeast Federal Center Yards Non-Discriminatory Grocery Store Temporary Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-441. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 18-692 "Rent Administrator Hearing Authority Second Temporary Amendment Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-442. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 18-696 "Residential Tranquility Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-443. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 18-697 "Lead Hazard Prevention and Elimination Amendment Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-444. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 18-698 "Green Building Technical Corrections, Clarification, and Revision Amendment Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-445. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 18-699 "Disorderly Conduct Amendment Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-446. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 18-700 "Open Meetings Amendment Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-447. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 18-701 "Anti-SLAPP Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-448. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 18-702 "Residential Housing Tax

Abatement Clarification Amendment Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. LEAHY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 23. A bill to amend title 35, United States Code, to provide for patent reform.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. LEAHY for the Committee on the Judiciary.

James E. Graves, Jr., of Mississippi, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Fifth Circuit.

Amy Totenberg, of Georgia, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Georgia.

Paul Kinloch Holmes III, of Arkansas, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Arkansas.

Anthony J. Battaglia, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of California.

Edward J. Davila, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of California.

Diana Saldana, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Texas.

Max Oliver Cogburn, Jr., of North Carolina, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of North Carolina.

Marco A. Hernandez, of Oregon, to be United States District Judge for the District of Oregon.

Steve C. Jones, of Georgia, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Georgia.

James Emanuel Boasberg, of the District of Columbia, to be United States District Judge for the District of Columbia.

Amy Berman Jackson, of the District of Columbia, to be United States District Judge for the District of Columbia.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

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. BROWN of Massachusetts:

S. 262. A bill to repeal the excise tax on medical device manufacturers; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. LANDRIEU (for herself, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mr. COCHRAN):

S. 263. A bill to provide for child safety, care, and education continuity in the event of a presidentially declared disaster; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. COCHRAN (for himself and Mr. WICKER):

S. 264. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the State of Mississippi 2 parcels of surplus land within the boundary of the Natchez Trace Parkway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. COCHRAN (for himself and Mr. WICKER):

S. 265. A bill to authorize the acquisition of core battlefield land at Champion Hill, Port Gibson, and Raymond for addition to Vicksburg National Military Park; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. COCHRAN:

S. 266. A bill to redesignate the Noxubee National Wildlife Refuge as the Sam D. Hamilton Noxubee National Wildlife Refuge; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. BINGAMAN (for himself, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. KOHL):

S. 267. A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to require a lifetime income disclosure; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself and Mr. BAUCUS):

S. 268. A bill to sustain the economic development and recreational use of National Forest System land and other public land in the State of Montana, to add certain land to the National Wilderness Preservation System, to release certain wilderness study areas, to designate new areas for recreation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mrs. HUTCHISON):

S. 269. A bill to designate the Department of Veterans Affairs medical center in Big Spring, Texas, as the George H. O'Brien, Jr., Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 270. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Federal land to Deschutes County, Oregon; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 271. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into a property conveyance with the city of Wallowa, Oregon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. MANCHIN (for himself, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. WICKER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. HOEVEN, and Mr. PORTMAN):

S. 272. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to clarify and confirm the authority of the Environmental Protection Agency to deny or restrict the use of defined areas as disposal sites for the discharge of dredged or fill material; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. LAUTENBERG (for himself, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. FRANKEN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. BEGICH):

S. 273. A bill to amend chapter 1 of title 23, United States Code, to condition the receipt of certain highway funding by States on the enactment and enforcement by States of certain laws to prevent repeat intoxicated driving; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mrs. HAGAN (for herself, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota):

S. 274. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to expand access to medication therapy management services under the Medicare prescription drug program; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LAUTENBERG (for himself, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. BEGICH):

S. 275. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to provide for enhanced safety and environmental protection in pipeline

transportation, to provide for enhanced reliability in the transportation of the Nation's energy products by pipeline, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BENNETT (for himself and Mr. UDALL of Colorado):

S. 276. A bill to amend the National Trails System Act to provide for the study of the Pike National Historic Trail; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. BURR (for himself, Mrs. HAGAN, Mr. NELSON of Florida, and Mr. GRASSLEY):

S. 277. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to furnish hospital care, medical services, and nursing home care to veterans who were stationed at Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, while the water was contaminated at Camp Lejeune, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself and Mr. BENNETT):

S. 278. A bill to provide for the exchange of certain land located in the Arapaho-Roosevelt National Forests in the State of Colorado, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself and Mr. BENNETT):

S. 279. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to carry out a study to determine the suitability and feasibility of establishing Camp Hale as a unit of the National Park System; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Ms. SNOWE):

S. 280. A bill to provide for flexibility and improvements in elementary and secondary education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pension.

By Mrs. HUTCHISON (for herself, Mr. COBURN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. JOHANNES, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mr. KYL, Mr. MORAN, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. WICKER, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. COATS, Mr. BLUNT, and Mr. CORNYN):

S. 281. A bill to delay the implementation of the health reform law in the United States until there is a final resolution in pending lawsuits; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. COBURN (for himself and Mr. BEGICH):

S. 282. A bill to rescind unused earmarks; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. LEVIN:

S. 283. A bill for the relief of Marco Antonio Sanchez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEVIN:

S. 284. A bill for the relief of Guy Vang, Genevieve Chong Fong, Caroline Vang, and Meline "Melanie" Vang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEVIN:

S. 285. A bill for the relief of Sopuruchi Chukwueke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEVIN:

S. 286. A bill for the relief of Anton Dodaj, Gjyljana Dodaj, Franc Dodaj, and Kristjan Dodaj; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEVIN:

S. 287. A bill for the relief of Luay Lufti Hadad; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEVIN:

S. 288. A bill for the relief of Josephina Valera Lopez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 289. A bill to extend expiring provisions of the USA PATRIOT Improvement and Reauthorization Act of 2005, the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of

2004, and the FISA Amendments Act of 2008 until December 31, 2013, and for other purposes; read the first time.

By Mr. LEAHY:

S. 290. A bill to extend the sunset of certain provisions of the USA PATRIOT Act, and for other purposes; read the first time.

By Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, and Mr. CHAMBLISS):

S. 291. A bill to repeal the sunset provisions in the USA PATRIOT Improvement and Reauthorization Act of 2005 and other related provisions and permanently reauthorize the USA PATRIOT Act; read the first time.

By Mr. LEE (for himself, Mr. KYL, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BURR, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. PAUL, Mr. RISCH, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. VITTER, Mr. CRAPO, and Ms. AYOTTE):

S.J. Res. 5. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States requiring that the Federal budget be balanced; 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. NELSON of Nebraska:

S. Res. 41. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that Congress should reduce spending by the amount resulting from the recently announced earmark moratorium; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. REID:

S. Res. 42. A resolution to constitute the majority party's membership on certain committees for the One Hundred Twelfth Congress, or until their successors are chosen; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. MCCONNELL:

S. Res. 43. A resolution to constitute the minority party's membership on certain committees for the One Hundred Twelfth Congress, or until their successors are chosen; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. KERRY (for himself, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. GRAHAM, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. LEVIN):

S. Res. 44. A resolution supporting democracy, universal rights, and the peaceful transition to a representative government in Egypt; considered and agreed to.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Ms. CANTWELL):

S. Res. 45. A resolution congratulating the Eastern Washington University football team for winning the 2010 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division 1 Football Championship Subdivision title; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 21

At the request of Mr. REID, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 21, a bill to secure the United States against cyber attack, to enhance American competitiveness and create jobs in the information technology industry, and to protect the identities and sensitive information of American citizens and businesses.

S. 81

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the name of the Senator from Colorado

(Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 81, a bill to direct unused appropriations for Senate Official Personnel and Office Expense Accounts to be deposited in the Treasury and used for deficit reduction or to reduce the Federal debt.

S. 210

At the request of Mr. COBURN, the names of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) were added as cosponsors of S. 210, a bill to amend title 44, United States Code, to eliminate the mandatory printing of bills and resolutions for the use of offices of Members of Congress.

S. 244

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 244, a bill to enable States to opt out of certain provisions of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

S. 249

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 249, a bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to provide that Act shall not apply to any gray wolf (*Canis lupus*).

S. 255

At the request of Mr. ENSIGN, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 255, a bill to require the Congressional Budget Office and the Joint Committee on Taxation to use dynamic economic modeling in addition to static economic modeling in the preparation of budgetary estimates of proposed changes in Federal revenue law.

S. 260

At the request of Mr. NELSON of Florida, the names of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) were added as cosponsors of S. 260, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to repeal the requirement for reduction of survivor annuities under the Survivor Benefit Plan by veterans' dependency and indemnity compensation.

S.J. RES. 3

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 3, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to balancing the budget.

S. CON. RES. 4

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) were added as cosponsors of S. Con. Res. 4, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that an appropriate site on Chaplains Hill in Arlington National Cemetery should be provided for a memorial marker to honor the memory of the Jewish chaplains who died while on active duty in the Armed Forces of the United States.

S. CON. RES. 5

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 5, a concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the rotunda of the Capitol to honor Frank W. Buckles, the longest surviving United States veteran of the First World War.

S. RES. 20

At the request of Mr. JOHANNIS, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 20, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the United States should immediately approve the United States-Korea Free Trade Agreement, the United States-Colombia Trade Promotion Agreement, and the United States-Panama Trade Promotion Agreement.

AMENDMENT NO. 8

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUE) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 8 proposed to S. 223, a bill to modernize the air traffic control system, improve the safety, reliability, and availability of transportation by air in the United States, provide modernization of the air traffic control system, reauthorize the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 11

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 11 intended to be proposed to S. 223, a bill to modernize the air traffic control system, improve the safety, reliability, and availability of transportation by air in the United States, provide modernization of the air traffic control system, reauthorize the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 19

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 19 proposed to S. 223, a bill to modernize the air traffic control system, improve the safety, reliability, and availability of transportation by air in the United States, provide modernization of the air traffic control system, reauthorize the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 27

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 27 proposed to S. 223, a bill to modernize the air traffic control system, improve the safety, reliability, and availability of transportation by air in the United States, provide modernization of the air traffic control system, reauthorize the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 29

At the request of Mr. NELSON of Nebraska, the names of the Senator from

New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. AKAKA) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 29 intended to be proposed to S. 223, a bill to modernize the air traffic control system, improve the safety, reliability, and availability of transportation by air in the United States, provide modernization of the air traffic control system, reauthorize the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 32

At the request of Mr. ENSIGN, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. BINGAMAN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 32 proposed to S. 223, a bill to modernize the air traffic control system, improve the safety, reliability, and availability of transportation by air in the United States, provide modernization of the air traffic control system, reauthorize the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 34

At the request of Mr. NELSON of Florida, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 34 proposed to S. 223, a bill to modernize the air traffic control system, improve the safety, reliability, and availability of transportation by air in the United States, provide modernization of the air traffic control system, reauthorize the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. BROWN of Massachusetts: S. 262. A bill to repeal the excise tax on medical device manufacturers; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. BROWN of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation to repeal the tax imposed on medical device manufacturers.

As my colleagues know, this 2.3 percent sales tax imposed on medical device manufacturers—a tax that will ultimately be passed on to consumers—is part-and-parcel of the Federal health care reform bill that passed last Congress.

Like others in this chamber, I am extremely concerned that this tax could threaten jobs in my State, reduce domestic investment in research and development and ultimately diminish access to life-saving medical devices for patients.

Medical technology companies employ more than 375,000 workers in the United States. In Massachusetts alone, we have more than 225 medical device firms, which employ more than 20,000 workers, and contribute nearly \$1 billion in payroll. Medical devices are one of our State's top exports, contributing \$6 billion to our State's economy.

These are powerfully good numbers. These are the numbers that make my State tick, help drive our economy,

and keep people working. I want to make certain that what happens in Washington does not reverse these numbers, does not undermine my State's ability to compete, and does not hamper our chances to grow and hire workers.

Massachusetts' position as an industry leader, a hub of innovation and entrepreneurship must be preserved. That has been and will continue to be my focus in the U.S. Senate.

So how do I intend to accomplish this?

For starters it means working to eliminate the medical device tax, which I believe will diminish our ability to compete, will increase costs for consumers, and could result in our medical device and technology jobs being sent overseas, where the costs of labor and production are cheaper.

The effort that I am spearheading—and that I ask my colleagues to join—eliminates the medical device tax in a way that does not add to the deficit. I propose eliminating this harmful tax—a tax that will stifle innovation, be passed on to consumers, and increase the cost of care—and propose that we offset the cost by using unobligated discretionary dollars. This is the same source of funding, the same offset, that 81 of my colleagues supported yesterday.

As my colleagues know, I worked on an amendment that would repeal the medical device tax last Congress. I will continue this work because the harmful effects of this tax are the last thing Massachusetts needs—more industry jobs lost, our workers at a competitive disadvantage.

But the medical device tax doesn't just lead to job uncertainty, it leads to investment uncertainty as well, which results in private capital staying on the sidelines rather than being invested in Massachusetts based companies and their workers.

The medical device tax, coupled with other provisions in the Federal health reform bill, increases the level of uncertainty at a time when businesses, consumers and investors are craving the exact opposite.

For example, some medical devices are approved as combination products, both as medical devices and drugs and/or biologics. The Secretary has yet to determine how these medical devices will be captured under the law, how they will be taxed.

I pledge to work with my Senate colleagues—and during the Medical Device User Fee Modernization Act reauthorization slated for next year—to ensure that the medical device companies whose products are approved as combination products by the FDA are not double-taxed by way of the medical device tax and the pharmaceutical tax.

With the rolling implementation of the Federal health care reform bill, this Congress will provide many opportunities for me to protect the interests of and work on behalf of Massachusetts families, Massachusetts taxpayers,

Massachusetts workers, and Massachusetts businesses.

I hope my colleagues will join my efforts to find opportunities to correct what is wrong with the Federal health reform law—to protect innovation, the jobs, and the development and growth that can occur in a sector that is vitally important to our Nation's health.

I know that a robust medical device sector translates into a healthier America—physically, economically, and socially. The same is true for Massachusetts.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 270. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Federal land to Deschutes County, Oregon; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, today I am pleased to introduce two bills that will provide two important communities in rural Oregon with the means to promote their cultural history and their economic development opportunities. These are bills that I introduced in the last Congress and were reported out of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, but were unfortunately not passed in the Senate. I am pleased to be joined by Senator MERKLEY in this effort.

These bills both are intended to help leaders in rural communities in my State continue to grow their economies and make the most of the abundant resources surrounding their communities. As in many rural communities in my State and in many places in the Western United States, not much happens without the Federal Government's involvement. In fact, the Federal Government owns much of the land surrounding these small communities. While many of these lands are treasures, this high percentage of Federal land ownership sometimes limits the ability of local governments and civic leaders to solve problems and serve the public. I firmly believe the Federal Government can and should be an active partner in strengthening communities and improving a region's quality of life.

That is why I am re-introducing these two pieces of legislation today. These bills—both passed out of the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee in the last Congress with minor modifications—demonstrate the possibilities that can come when the Federal Government partners with proactive, innovative communities to tackle challenging economic conditions and the pattern of Federal land ownership.

My first bill, the La Pine Land Conveyance Act, would convey two parcels of property to Deschutes County, Oregon and a third parcel to the City of La Pine. The bill directs the transfer of Bureau of Land Management, BLM, lands to Deschutes County and the City of La Pine to enable the small town of La Pine to develop rodeo and

equestrian facilities, expand a sewage treatment site, and develop the library or other public facilities.

La Pine has a set of unique challenges but the town's incorporation has brought a feeling in the community that good things can happen if they work together to make their town as good as it can possibly be.

My bill proposes the transfer of 150 acres of BLM land contiguous to the La Pine city limit to enable construction of public equestrian and rodeo facilities that have become increasingly important in La Pine. In addition, the land will provide a location for development of ball fields, parks, and recreation facilities, which can be developed as the town grows and budgets allow.

My bill also directs the transfer of approximately 750 acres of BLM lands to Deschutes County for the purpose of expanding the town's wastewater treatment operation. For several years this has been the City's top priority for a land transfer under the Recreation and Public Purposes Act. Although the BLM began an administrative transfer it was not completed, limiting this small community's ability to be competitive for state and federal economic stimulus funds. This project is too important to let languish.

Perhaps the most important issue affecting water quality in Deschutes County involves the threat to groundwater and the Deschutes River from household septic systems in southern Deschutes County, the region around La Pine. This project directly reduces nitrate loading into south county groundwater in two ways. First, by enabling expansion of the District service boundary to residential areas where septic systems are generating elevated groundwater nitrate levels; and second, by closing the current location for spreading treated effluent, over a relatively high groundwater area, to this new location which is judged not to threaten groundwater. That is why I am introducing legislation today to make sure this transfer moves forward.

The third parcel that would be transferred under this legislation would convey approximately 10 acres to the City of La Pine. This is a parcel right in the heart of downtown La Pine. The City is exploring its use for expansion of library space or using it as an open space.

My second bill, S. 271, the Wallowa Forest Service Compound Conveyance Act would convey an old Forest Service Ranger Station compound to the City of Wallowa, OR. In Wallowa County, this Forest Service compound was built by the Civilian Conservation Corps in the 1930's. For many years it was the center of town and this site continues to represent the natural and cultural history of one of Eastern Oregon's most beautiful communities. The City of Wallowa, along with County Commissioners, the local arts organizations, and a broad group of community leaders intend to restore this important example of Pacific Northwest rus-

tic architecture and tribute to bygone times, making a valuable community interpretive center at this site. The conveyance of this property will allow the community to move forward with this project. The community worked hard to list the Ranger Station on the National Register of Historic Places, and ownership by the City will allow this coalition to restore the buildings and again develop a vibrant community center. Oregon Public Broadcasting aired a segment depicting an early 20th century railroad logging community—a significant part of the rich and diverse history and traditions that will be preserved and celebrated as this Forest Service Compound is developed as an interpretive center.

I want to express my thanks to all the citizens and community leaders who have worked to build their communities and develop these projects. They represent the pioneering spirit and vision that defines my State.

By Mrs. HAGAN (for herself, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota):

S. 274. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to expand access to medication therapy management services under the Medicare prescription drug program; to the Committee on Finance.

Mrs. HAGAN. Mr. President, today, I am proud to reintroduce the Medication Therapy Management, MTM, Empowerment Act of 2011, with my colleagues from Minnesota, Senator FRANKEN, from Ohio, Senator BROWN, and from South Dakota, Senator JOHNSON.

A recent analysis conducted by the New England Healthcare Institute estimates that the overall cost of medication nonadherence is as much as \$290 billion per year. According to a recent article published in the New England Journal of Medicine, over \$100 billion is spent annually on avoidable hospitalizations because patients do not take their medications correctly.

Not only does nonadherence cost our system billions of dollars, nonadherence to medication regimens also affects the quality of life for seniors and may lead to early death. The elderly typically take many more prescription medicines than the general population and therefore are at greater risk for problems associated with improper use of medications. For example, the same New England Journal of Medicine article I just referenced found that better adherence to antihypertensive treatment alone could prevent 89,000 premature deaths in the U.S. annually.

With as much as one half of all patients in the U.S. not following their doctors' orders regarding their medications, medication therapy management could help reduce some of the wasted health care costs in our system.

North Carolina has implemented some very successful MTM programs.

The Asheville Project, which focuses on diabetes, asthma, and cardiovascular disease, has seen improved

health outcomes and significant savings among city employees since it began in 1997. For example, in the Asheville Project's diabetes MTM Project, they have seen a decrease in medical costs of between \$1,622 to \$3,356 per patient per year; a decrease in insurance claims of \$2,704 per patient in year one and a \$6,502 decrease in year five; a 50 percent decrease in use of sick days; and increased productivity gains estimated at \$18,000 annually.

In 2007, the North Carolina Health and Wellness Trust Fund Commission launched an innovative statewide program, Checkmeds NC, to provide MTM services to North Carolina seniors. During the program's first year, more than 15,000 North Carolina seniors and 285 pharmacists participated. A total of 31,000 seniors have participated since 2007. The seniors bring all of their prescriptions, over-the-counter medicines, vitamins and supplements to the pharmacy to be thoroughly reviewed in a one-on-one session. The pharmacist follows up and educates the patient about his or her medication regimen. The program has saved an estimated \$34 million to date, and countless health problems have been avoided.

During consideration of health care reform, I was pleased to have successfully secured language in the bill that built off these North Carolina models and implemented MTM nationally for seniors suffering from two or more chronic conditions.

The bill I am reintroducing today takes MTM one step further. Specifically, this bill would expand MTM eligibility to seniors with any chronic condition that accounts for high spending in our health care system, such as heart failure and diabetes. Currently, only 12.9 percent of Part D beneficiaries are eligible under the MTM criteria for multiple chronic conditions. However, of those, more than 85 percent have chosen to participate in the benefit. Clearly this program is very popular and widely utilized by those who are already eligible. By expanding eligibility to more seniors, MTM will certainly result in Medicare savings.

The bill also ensures access to MTM for seniors at a pharmacy or with a qualified health care provider of their choice.

To ensure pharmacists and health care providers are able to provide MTM to seniors, this bill requires that they are appropriately reimbursed for their time and service. This provision will permit pharmacies and other health care providers to spend considerable time and resources evaluating a person's drug routine and educating them on proper usage—all critical components of a successful MTM program.

Finally, this bill would establish standards for data collection to evaluate and improve the Part D MTM benefit.

The value of MTM is widely known and discussed. I am proud that North Carolina is a leader in this arena. Ex-

pansion of MTM to more seniors will no doubt improve their overall health, while at the same time reducing waste in our health care system.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself and Mr. BENNET):

S. 278. A bill to provide for the exchange of certain land located in the Arapaho-Roosevelt National Forests in the State of Colorado, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. President, fighting fires is very serious business in my home State of Colorado. Just a few months ago, we experienced the most expensive fire in our history—the Fourmile Fire, near Boulder. This fire destroyed more than 150 homes and burned over 6,000 acres.

We could not have stopped this fire without the dedicated efforts of hundreds of public servants, including volunteer firefighters from local fire districts. These individuals saved lives and property, often risking their own lives. That is, in part, why I believe we should do everything we can to help these fire districts and the volunteers who serve them.

One fire district involved in the Fourmile Fire—the Sugar Loaf Fire District—lost 17 homes in the fire. The Sugar Loaf Fire District is critical to protecting thousands of Coloradans, but instead of being able to focus on fighting fires this District has been wrapped up trying to resolve a land issue with the Forest Service for many years now. It is a very simple land exchange to make sure that the Fire District owns the land under two of its three fire stations.

The Fire District has occupied and operated the fire stations on these properties for nearly 40 years. If they can secure ownership, the lands will continue to be used as sites for fire stations and training. The Fire District is willing to trade the property it owns, an undeveloped inholding in Forest Service land, for the property under the stations. This is a simple and fair exchange that will serve the public good and help protect the local area from growing wildfire threats.

The Fire District has made a strong, persistent, and good faith effort to acquire the land under the stations through administrative means by working with the Forest Service. Furthermore, the Fire District has demonstrated its sincere commitment to this project by expending its monetary resources and the time of its staff to satisfy the requirements set forth by the Forest Service.

However, those efforts have not succeeded and it has become evident that legislation is required to resolve the situation.

To help facilitate this land exchange, I am introducing the Sugar Loaf Fire Station Land Exchange Act of 2011 today. This language is the same as

what passed the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee in the last Congress.

Under the bill, the land exchange will proceed if the Fire District offers to convey acceptable title to a specified parcel of land amounting to about 5.17 acres. This land resides between the communities of Boulder and Nederland in an unincorporated part of Boulder County within the boundaries of the Arapaho-Roosevelt National Forest. In return, the land—about 5.08 acres—where the two fire stations are located will be transferred to the Fire District.

The lands transferred to the Federal Government will become part of the Arapaho-Roosevelt National Forest and managed accordingly.

This is a relatively minor bill but one that is important to the Sugar Loaf Fire District and the people it serves. As public lands bills pile up in Congress because of ideological obstruction, this fire district is being forced into wasting time and money trying to resolve an otherwise commonsense and technical public lands fix. I think this bill deserves enactment without unnecessary delay.

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. 278

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 “Sugar Loaf Fire Protection District Land Exchange Act of 2011”.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) DISTRICT.—The term “District” means the Sugar Loaf Fire Protection District of Boulder, Colorado.

(2) FEDERAL LAND.—The term “Federal land” means—

(A) the parcel of approximately 1.52 acres of land in the National Forest that is generally depicted on the map numbered 1, entitled “Sugarloaf Fire Protection District Proposed Land Exchange”, and dated November 12, 2009; and

(B) the parcel of approximately 3.56 acres of land in the National Forest that is generally depicted on the map numbered 2, entitled “Sugarloaf Fire Protection District Proposed Land Exchange”, and dated November 12, 2009.

(3) NATIONAL FOREST.—The term “National Forest” means the Arapaho-Roosevelt National Forests located in the State of Colorado.

(4) NON-FEDERAL LAND.—The term “non-Federal land” means the parcel of approximately 5.17 acres of non-Federal land in unincorporated Boulder County, Colorado, that is generally depicted on the map numbered 3, entitled “Sugarloaf Fire Protection District Proposed Land Exchange”, and dated November 12, 2009.

(5) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Agriculture.

SEC. 3. LAND EXCHANGE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the provisions of this Act, if the District offers to convey to the Secretary all right, title, and interest of the District in and to the non-Federal land, and the offer is acceptable to the Secretary—

(1) the Secretary shall accept the offer; and
 (2) on receipt of acceptable title to the non-Federal land, the Secretary shall convey to the District all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the Federal land.

(b) **APPLICABLE LAW.**—Section 206 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1716) shall apply to the land exchange authorized under subsection (a), except that—

(1) the Secretary may accept a cash equalization payment in excess of 25 percent of the value of the Federal land; and

(2) as a condition of the land exchange under subsection (a), the District shall—

(A) pay each cost relating to any land surveys and appraisals of the Federal land and non-Federal land; and

(B) enter into an agreement with the Secretary that allocates any other administrative costs between the Secretary and the District.

(c) **ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.**—The land exchange under subsection (a) shall be subject to—

(1) valid existing rights; and

(2) any terms and conditions that the Secretary may require.

(d) **TIME FOR COMPLETION OF LAND EXCHANGE.**—It is the intent of Congress that the land exchange under subsection (a) shall be completed not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.

(e) **AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY TO CONDUCT SALE OF FEDERAL LAND.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—In accordance with paragraph (2), if the land exchange under subsection (a) is not completed by the date that is 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary may offer to sell to the District the Federal land.

(2) **VALUE OF FEDERAL LAND.**—The Secretary may offer to sell to the District the Federal land for the fair market value of the Federal land.

(f) **DISPOSITION OF PROCEEDS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall deposit in the fund established under Public Law 90-171 (commonly known as the “Sisk Act”) (16 U.S.C. 484a) any amount received by the Secretary as the result of—

(A) any cash equalization payment made under subsection (b); and

(B) any sale carried out under subsection (e).

(2) **USE OF PROCEEDS.**—Amounts deposited under paragraph (1) shall be available to the Secretary, without further appropriation and until expended, for the acquisition of land or interests in land in the National Forest.

(g) **MANAGEMENT AND STATUS OF ACQUIRED LAND.**—The non-Federal land acquired by the Secretary under this section shall be—

(1) added to, and administered as part of, the National Forest; and

(2) managed by the Secretary in accordance with—

(A) the Act of March 1, 1911 (commonly known as the “Weeks Law”) (16 U.S.C. 480 et seq.); and

(B) any laws (including regulations) applicable to the National Forest.

(h) **REVOCACTION OF ORDERS; WITHDRAWAL.**—

(1) **REVOCACTION OF ORDERS.**—Any public order withdrawing the Federal land from entry, appropriation, or disposal under the public land laws is revoked to the extent necessary to permit the conveyance of the Federal land to the District.

(2) **WITHDRAWAL.**—On the date of enactment of this Act, if not already withdrawn or segregated from entry and appropriation under the public land laws (including the mining and mineral leasing laws) and the Geothermal Steam Act of 1970 (30 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.), the Federal land is withdrawn until the date of the conveyance of the Federal land to the District.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself and Mr. BENNET):

S. 279. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to carry out a study to determine the suitability and feasibility of establishing Camp Hale as a unit of the National Park System; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. President, today I am introducing the Camp Hale Study Act of 2011, which would direct the Secretary of the Interior to study the feasibility and suitability of establishing Camp Hale, near Leadville, CO, as a national historic district. Camp Hale is an important part of our Nation’s proud national defense legacy, and it deserves to be recognized and protected.

This bill concerns an important military legacy from the World War II and Cold War eras. Camp Hale, located in the mountains of central Colorado, was a training facility for combat in high alpine and mountainous conditions. Principally, it was a training venue for the Army’s 10th Mountain Division and other elements of the U.S. Armed Forces. The geography of the area was ideal for winter and high-altitude training, with steep mountains surrounding a level valley suitable for housing and other facilities. The facility itself was located in Eagle County along the Eagle River, and its training boundary included lands in Eagle, Summit, Lake, and Pitkin Counties.

In addition to the 10th Mountain Division, the 38th Regimental Combat Team, 99th Infantry Battalion, and soldiers from Fort Carson were trained at Camp Hale from 1942 to 1965. Throughout this time, the Army tested a variety of weapons and equipment at Camp Hale.

Between 1956 and 1965, the camp was also used by the Central Intelligence Agency as a secret center for training Tibetan refugees in guerilla warfare to resist the Chinese occupation of their mountainous country. Just last year, at my urging, the Forest Service put in place a plaque honoring these Tibetan Freedom Fighters. I joined many of those brave Tibetans, their CIA trainers, and their families in a moving ceremony to honor those who trained at Camp Hale.

In July 1965, Camp Hale was deactivated, and in 1966, control of the lands was returned to the Forest Service. Today the site is part of the White River and San Isabel National Forests. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is working to clean up potentially hazardous munitions left over from weapons testing at the site, particularly in the East Fork.

Camp Hale was placed on the National Register of Historic Places in 1992, but this bill would direct the Secretary of the Interior to complete a special resource study of Camp Hale to determine the suitability and feasibility of designating Camp Hale as a separate unit of the National Park System. That would include an analysis of

the significance of Camp Hale in relation to the defense of our Nation during World War II and the Cold War, including the use of Camp Hale for training of the 10th Mountain Division and for training by the Central Intelligence Agency of Tibetan refugees seeking to resist the Chinese occupation of Tibet.

I have worked with Representative LAMBORN on this bill since he first introduced it in the House in the 110th Congress, when I proudly cosponsored it. I introduced this bill in the Senate in the last Congress and shepherded it through the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee. However, because of opposition from a few Senators to all public lands bills, we could not pass this bipartisan bill on the Senate floor.

Camp Hale should be recognized for the role it played in our country’s national security. The people who trained there are proud of their accomplishments, and I am proud to join Representative LAMBORN in supporting this legislation. I am confident that we will have more success in passing this legislation in this Congress.

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. 279

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 “Camp Hale Study Act”.

SEC. 2. SPECIAL RESOURCE STUDY OF THE SUITABILITY AND FEASIBILITY OF ESTABLISHING CAMP HALE AS A UNIT OF THE NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Director of the National Park Service, (hereinafter referred to as the “Secretary”) shall complete a special resource study of Camp Hale to determine—

(1) the suitability and feasibility of designating Camp Hale as a separate unit of the National Park System; and

(2) the methods and means for the protection and interpretation of Camp Hale by the National Park Service, other Federal, State, or local government entities or private or nonprofit organizations.

(b) **STUDY REQUIREMENTS.**—The Secretary shall conduct the study in accordance with section 8(c) of Public Law 91-383 (16 U.S.C. 1a-5(c)).

(c) **REPORT.**—Not later than 3 years after the date on which funds are made available to carry out this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report containing—

(1) the results of the study; and

(2) any recommendations of the Secretary.

SEC. 3. EFFECT OF STUDY.

Nothing in this Act shall affect valid existing rights or the exercise of such rights, including—

(1) all interstate water compacts in existence on the date of the enactment of this Act (including full development of any apportionment made in accordance with the compacts);

(2) water rights decreed at the Camp Hale site or flowing within, below, or through the Camp Hale site;

(3) water rights in the State of Colorado;

(4) water rights held by the United States;

(5) the management and operation of any reservoir, including the storage, management, release, or transportation of water; and

(6) the ability, subject to compliance with lawful existing local, State, and Federal regulatory requirements, to construct and operate that infrastructure determined necessary by those with decreed water rights to develop and place to beneficial use such rights.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Ms. SNOWE):

S. 280. A bill to provide for flexibility and improvements in elementary and secondary education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the No Child Left Behind Flexibility and Improvements Act. I am pleased to be joined in this effort by my colleague from Maine, Senator SNOWE. Our legislation would give greater local control and flexibility to Maine and other states in their efforts to implement the No Child Left Behind Act, NCLB. It provides common sense reforms in the statute while retaining elements to help ensure transparency and accountability.

Since the enactment of NCLB 9 years ago, I have had the opportunity to meet with numerous Maine educators to discuss their concerns with the law. In response to their concerns, Senator SNOWE and I commissioned the Maine NCLB Task Force to examine the implementation issues facing Maine under both NCLB and the Maine Learning Results. Our task force included members from every county in our State, and had superintendents, teachers, principals, school board members, parents, business leaders, former State legislators, special education specialists, assessment experts, officials from the Maine Department of Education, and was chaired by a former Maine commissioner of education and a dean from the University of Maine's College of Education and Human Development. In other words, it was a broad-based commission that brought a great deal of expertise, experience, and perspective to the task force's work.

After a year of study, the task force presented us with its final report outlining recommendations for possible statutory and regulatory changes to the act. The task force recommendations highlighted the need for greater flexibility for the Maine Department of Education and local schools in order to address various implementation concerns facing Maine. The legislation we are introducing today would make significant statutory changes designed to provide greater local control to Maine and greater flexibility to all States in their implementation efforts, not just Maine.

First, our legislation would provide greater flexibility to states in the ways that they measure student progress in

meeting state education standards. Current NCLB law has proven to be too restrictive. Our legislation would permit states to use additional models to more accurately track the progress of all students over time. Specifically, it would allow States to use a cohort growth model, which tracks the progress of the same group of students over time. It would also permit the use of an "indexing" model, where progress is measured based on the number of students whose scores improve from, for example, a "below-basic" to a "basic" level, and not simply on the number of students who cross the "proficient" line. Even if a school is unable to meet the trajectory targets set by the NCLB time-line, a school would not be identified as failing to make AYP provided it demonstrates improved student achievement according to these additional models. We would also require the Secretary to provide examples of these models to give practical assistance to States in the design of these systems. While the trajectory goals set in the statute are certainly valuable, our legislation seeks to clarify that States should be granted greater flexibility in the design of different accountability systems provided that they are consistent with the principle of improved student performance.

Second, our legislation would provide schools with better notice regarding possible performance issues, allowing schools a chance to identify and work with a particular group of students before being identified. It would expand the existing "safe-harbor" provisions to allow more schools to qualify for this important protection. The changes made in our bill are in keeping with what assessment experts and teachers know—that significant gains in academic achievement tend to occur gradually and over time. In addition, the legislation addresses my concern about the statute's current requirement that all schools reach 100 percent proficiency by 2013–2014 by requiring the Secretary of Education to review progress by the States toward meeting this goal every three years, and allowing him to modify the time-line as necessary.

Furthermore, the Task Force report raised important concerns that in some schools, special education students fear that they are being blamed for their school not making adequate yearly progress. Our legislation would allow the members of a special education student's Individual Education Plan, IEP, team to determine the best assessment for that individual student, and would permit the student's performance on that assessment to count for all NCLB purposes. This legislative change is also based on principles of fairness and common sense. Many times, it simply does not make sense to require a special needs student to take a grade-level assessment that educators and parents know he or she is not ready to take. Many special education students are referred for special

education services precisely because they cannot meet grade-level expectations. Allowing the IEP team to determine the best test for each special needs student will bring an important improvement to the act while still ensuring accountability.

Finally, our legislation would provide new flexibility for teachers of multiple subjects at the secondary school level to help them meet the "highly qualified teacher" requirements. Unfortunately, the current regulations place undue burdens on teachers at small and rural schools who often teach multiple subjects due to staffing needs, and on special education teachers who work with students on a variety of subjects throughout the day. Under the bill, provided these teachers are highly qualified for one subject they teach, they will be provided additional time and less burdensome avenues to satisfy the remaining requirements.

While it has been some time since Maine's Task Force issued its report, its findings and recommendations remain valid. Our legislation is still necessary to provide greater flexibility and common sense modifications to address those key NCLB challenges identified in Maine. Our goals remain the same as those in NCLB: a good education for each and every child; well-qualified, committed teachers in every classroom; and increased transparency and accountability for every school. I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle on these issues during the upcoming NCLB reauthorization process.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 289. A bill to extend expiring provisions of the USA PATRIOT Improvement and Reauthorization Act of 2005, the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004, and the FISA Amendments Act of 2008 until December 31, 2013, and for other purposes; read the first time.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, on January 25, I introduced S. 149, the FISA Sunsets Extension Act of 2011 to extend the three expiring provisions of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act—the authority to conduct, subject to court order, so-called "roving wiretaps," "lone wolf" surveillance, and collection of business records. S. 149 was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Today, I am reintroducing that legislation with a new, identical bill. This new bill, just as S. 149 would do, will extend these three authorities, otherwise set to expire on February 28, to December 31, 2013. The bill will also change the expiration date of the intelligence collection authorities provided in the FISA Amendments Act of 2008 so they, too, last until the end of 2013.

The sole purpose of reintroducing the measure is to begin the process under Senate rule XIV to place the reintroduced extension bill on the Senate calendar. The three provisions of FISA

will sunset in a little more than 3 weeks. One of those weeks is a congressional recess. By placing the extension bill on the Senate calendar, we will, at least, be one procedural step closer to acting.

On January 28, Attorney General Eric Holder and Director of National Intelligence James Clapper wrote to urge Congress to grant a reauthorization of sufficient duration to provide intelligence and law enforcement agencies with reasonable certainty and predictability concerning the tools available to them.

The FISA sunsets have most recently been the subject of two short-term extensions: a 2-month extension from December 31, 2009 to February 28, 2010, and then a 1-year extension from that date to February 28, 2011.

In their January 28 letter, the DNI and the Attorney General expressed their concern about the devolution of FISA sunsets “into a series of short-term extensions that increase the uncertainties borne by our intelligence and law enforcement agencies in carrying out their missions.”

The letter states that “S. 149, the FISA Sunsets Extension Act of 2011, would avoid these difficulties by reauthorizing the three expiring provisions until December 2013, together with the provisions of Title VII of FISA that are currently scheduled to sunset next year. We look forward to working with you to ensure the prompt enactment of this or similar legislation.”

Yesterday, the House and Senate Intelligence Committees also received a classified report from the Attorney General and the DNI on the important intelligence collection made possible by authority that is subject to the approaching sunset. The Department of Justice and the Office of the DNI have asked for our assistance in making this classified report available, in a secure setting, directly and personally to any Member of the Senate. We did so for a similar report a year ago when Congress considered the last sunset extension.

Each Senator is invited to read this classified report in the Intelligence Committee’s offices in 211 Hart Senate Office Building. The Attorney General and DNI have offered to make Justice Department and intelligence community personnel available to meet with any Member who has questions. Our Intelligence Committee staff is also prepared to meet with Members. Vice Chairman CHAMBLISS and I are sending a Dear Colleague letter to each Senator conveying this invitation.

In concluding, I call upon my colleagues in the Senate and House to heed the Attorney General’s and DNI’s concern about the uncertainty created by short-term extensions. The 3-year extension that my legislation proposes will give our law enforcement and intelligence officials the tools and certainty they need in protecting the Nation. It will align the several sunsets so that Congress can review FISA more

comprehensively in 2013. In setting that date Congress will wisely be separating that review of FISA from the debates of a presidential election.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter of support be printed in the RECORD.

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

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. HARRY REID,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Democratic Leader, U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Republican Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER AND LEADERS REID, PELOSI, AND MCCONNELL:

In the current threat environment, it is imperative that our intelligence and law enforcement agencies have the tools they need to protect our national security. The Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (“FISA”) is a critical tool that has been used in numerous highly sensitive intelligence collection operations. Three vital provisions of FISA are scheduled to expire on February 28, 2011: section 206 of the USA PATRIOT Act, which provides authority for roving surveillance of targets who take steps that may thwart FISA surveillance; section 215 of the USA PATRIOT Act, which provides expanded authority to compel production of business records and other tangible things with the approval of the FISA court; and section 6001 of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act, which provides the authority under FISA to target non-United States persons who engage in international terrorism or activities in preparation therefor, but are not necessarily associated with an identified terrorist group (the so-called “lone wolf” amendment).

It is essential that these intelligence tools be reauthorized before they expire, and we are committed to working with Congress to ensure the speedy enactment of legislation to achieve this result.

We also urge Congress to grant a reauthorization of sufficient duration to provide those charged with protecting our nation with reasonable certainty and predictability. When Congress enacted the PATRIOT Act, it included a three-year sunset on these authorities. While we welcome Congressional oversight into the use of these tools, Congress did not contemplate that this sunset would devolve into a series of short-term extensions that increase the uncertainties borne by our intelligence and law enforcement agencies in carrying out their missions.

S. 149, the FISA Sunsets Extension Act of 2011, would avoid these difficulties by reauthorizing the three expiring provisions until December 2013, together with the provisions of Title VII of FISA that are currently scheduled to sunset next year. We look forward to working with you to ensure the prompt enactment of this or similar legislation.

The Administration also remains open to proposals that enhance protections for civil liberties and privacy while maintaining the effectiveness of these and other intelligence collection tools.

Finally, we are prepared to provide additional information to Members concerning these critical authorities in a classified set-

ting, as we did in connection with the previous reauthorization of the expiring provisions.

The Office of Management and Budget has advised us that there is no objection to this letter from the perspective of the Administration’s program.

Sincerely,

JAMES R. CLAPPER,
Director of National Intelligence.
ERIC H. HOLDER, JR.,
Attorney General.

By Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself,
Mr. GRASSLEY, and Mr.
CHAMBLISS):

S. 291. A bill to repeal the sunset provisions in the USA PATRIOT Improvement and Reauthorization Act of 2005 and other related provisions and permanently reauthorize the USA PATRIOT Act; read the first time.

Mr. MCCONNELL. 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. 291

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 “USA PATRIOT Reauthorization Act of 2011.”

SEC. 2. USA PATRIOT IMPROVEMENT AND REAUTHORIZATION ACT REPEAL OF SUNSET PROVISIONS.

Section 102(b) of the USA PATRIOT Improvement and Reauthorization Act of 2005 (Public Law 109-177; 50 U.S.C. 1805 note, 50 U.S.C. 1861 note, and 50 U.S.C. 1862 note) is repealed.

SEC. 3. REPEAL OF SUNSET RELATING TO INDIVIDUAL TERRORISTS AS AGENTS OF FOREIGN POWERS.

Section 6001(b) of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (Public Law 108-458; 50 U.S.C. 1801 note) is repealed.

By Mr. LEE (for himself, Mr. KYL, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BURR, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. PAUL, Mr. RISCH, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. VITTER, Mr. CRAPO, and Ms. AYOTTE):

S.J. Res. 5. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States requiring that the Federal budget be balanced; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the joint resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S.J. RES. 5

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

“ARTICLE—

“SECTION 1. Total outlays for any fiscal year shall not exceed total receipts for that fiscal year.

"SECTION 2. Total outlays shall not exceed 18 percent of the gross domestic product of the United States for the calendar year ending prior to the beginning of such fiscal year.

"SECTION 3. The Congress may provide for suspension of the limitations imposed by section 1 or 2 of this article for any fiscal year for which two-thirds of the whole number of each House shall provide, by a roll call vote, for a specific excess of outlays over receipts or over 18 percent of the gross domestic product of the United States for the calendar year ending prior to the beginning of such fiscal year.

"SECTION 4. Any bill to levy a new tax or increase the rate of any tax shall not become law unless approved by two-thirds of the whole number of each House of Congress by a roll call vote.

"SECTION 5. The limit on the debt of the United States held by the public shall not be increased, unless two-thirds of the whole number of each House of Congress shall provide for such an increase by a roll call vote.

"SECTION 6. Any Member of Congress shall have standing and a cause of action to seek judicial enforcement of this article, when authorized to do so by a petition signed by one-third of the Members of either House of Congress. No court of the United States or of any State shall order any increase in revenue to enforce this article.

"SECTION 7. The Congress shall have the power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

"SECTION 8. Total receipts shall include all receipts of the United States except those derived from borrowing. Total outlays shall include all outlays of the United States except those for repayment of debt principal.

"SECTION 9. This article shall become effective beginning with the second fiscal year commencing after its ratification by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States."

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 41—EX-PRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT CONGRESS SHOULD REDUCE SPENDING BY THE AMOUNT RESULTING FROM THE RECENTLY ANNOUNCED EARMARK MORATORIUM

Mr. NELSON of Nebraska submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Budget:

S. RES. 41

Whereas the debt of the United States exceeds \$14,000,000,000,000;

Whereas it is important for Congress to use all tools at its disposal to address the national debt crisis;

Whereas Congress will not earmark funds for projects requested by Members of Congress; and

Whereas the earmark ban should be utilized to realize actual savings: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that Congress should reduce spending by the amount resulting from the recently announced earmark moratorium.

SENATE RESOLUTION 42—TO CONSTITUTE THE MAJORITY PARTY'S MEMBERSHIP ON CERTAIN COMMITTEES FOR THE ONE HUNDRED TWELFTH CONGRESS, OR UNTIL THEIR SUCCESSORS ARE CHOSEN

Mr. REID of Nevada submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 42

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, and FORESTRY: Ms. Stabenow (Chairman), Mr. Leahy, Mr. Harkin, Mr. Conrad, Mr. Baucus, Mr. Nelson (Nebraska), Mr. Brown (Ohio), Mr. Casey, Ms. Klobuchar, Mr. Bennet, and Mrs. Gillibrand.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS: Mr. Inouye (Chairman), Mr. Leahy, Mr. Harkin, Ms. Mikulski, Mr. Kohl, Mrs. Murray, Mrs. Feinstein, Mr. Durbin, Mr. Johnson (South Dakota), Ms. Landrieu, Mr. Reed, Mr. Lautenberg, Mr. Nelson (Nebraska), Mr. Pryor, Mr. Tester, and Mr. Brown (Ohio).

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES: Mr. Levin (Chairman), Mr. Lieberman, Mr. Reed, Mr. Akaka, Mr. Nelson (Nebraska), Mr. Webb, Mrs. McCaskill, Mr. Udall (Colorado), Mrs. Hagan, Mr. Begich, Mr. Manchin, Mrs. Shaheen, Mrs. Gillibrand, and Mr. Blumenthal.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS: Mr. Johnson (South Dakota) (Chairman), Mr. Reed, Mr. Schumer, Mr. Menendez, Mr. Akaka, Mr. Brown (Ohio), Mr. Tester, Mr. Kohl, Mr. Warner, Mr. Merkley, Mr. Bennet, and Mrs. Hagan.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION: Mr. Rockefeller (Chairman), Mr. Inouye, Mr. Kerry, Mrs. Boxer, Mr. Nelson (Florida), Ms. Cantwell, Mr. Lautenberg, Mr. Pryor, Mrs. McCaskill, Ms. Klobuchar, Mr. Udall (New Mexico), Mr. Warner, and Mr. Begich.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES: Mr. Bingaman (Chairman), Mr. Wyden, Mr. Johnson (South Dakota), Ms. Landrieu, Ms. Cantwell, Mr. Sanders, Ms. Stabenow, Mr. Udall (Colorado), Mrs. Shaheen, Mr. Franken, Mr. Manchin, and Mr. Coons.

COMMITTEE ON THE ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS: Mrs. Boxer (Chairman), Mr. Baucus, Mr. Carper, Mr. Lautenberg, Mr. Cardin, Mr. Sanders, Mr. Whitehouse, Mr. Udall (New Mexico), Mr. Merkley, and Mrs. Gillibrand.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE: Mr. Baucus (Chairman), Mr. Rockefeller, Mr. Conrad, Mr. Bingaman, Mr. Kerry, Mr. Wyden, Mr. Schumer, Ms. Stabenow, Ms. Cantwell, Mr. Nelson (Florida), Mr. Menendez, Mr. Carper, and Mr. Cardin.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS: Mr. Kerry (Chairman), Mrs. Boxer, Mr. Menendez, Mr. Cardin, Mr. Casey, Mr. Webb, Mrs. Shaheen, Mr. Coons, Mr. Durbin, and Mr. Udall (New Mexico).

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS: Mr. Harkin (Chairman), Ms. Mikulski, Mr. Bingaman, Mrs. Murray, Mr. Sanders, Mr. Casey, Mrs. Hagan, Mr. Merkley, Mr. Franken, Mr. Bennet, Mr. Whitehouse, and Mr. Blumenthal.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS: Mr. Lieberman (Chairman), Mr. Levin, Mr. Akaka, Mr. Carper, Mr. Pryor, Ms. Landrieu, Mrs. McCaskill, Mr. Tester, and Mr. Begich.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY: Mr. Leahy (Chairman), Mr. Kohl, Mrs. Feinstein, Mr. Schumer, Mr. Durbin, Mr. Whitehouse, Ms. Klobuchar, Mr. Franken, Mr. Coons, and Mr. Blumenthal.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE: Mrs. Feinstein (Chairman), Mr.

Rockefeller, Mr. Wyden, Ms. Mikulski, Mr. Nelson (Florida), Mr. Conrad, Mr. Udall (Colorado), and Mr. Warner.

COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET: Mr. Conrad (Chairman), Mrs. Murray, Mr. Wyden, Mr. Nelson (Florida), Ms. Stabenow, Mr. Cardin, Mr. Sanders, Mr. Whitehouse, Mr. Warner, Mr. Merkley, Mr. Begich, and Mr. Coons.

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION: Mr. Schumer (Chairman), Mr. Inouye, Mrs. Feinstein, Mr. Durbin, Mr. Nelson (Nebraska), Mrs. Murray, Mr. Pryor, Mr. Udall (New Mexico), Mr. Warner, and Mr. Leahy.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP: Ms. Landrieu (Chairman), Mr. Levin, Mr. Harkin, Mr. Kerry, Mr. Lieberman, Ms. Cantwell, Mr. Pryor, Mr. Cardin, Mrs. Shaheen, and Mrs. Hagan.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS: Mrs. Murray (Chairman), Mr. Rockefeller, Mr. Akaka, Mr. Sanders, Mr. Brown (Ohio), Mr. Webb, Mr. Tester, and Mr. Begich.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING: Mr. Kohl (Chairman), Mr. Wyden, Mr. Nelson (Florida), Mr. Casey, Mrs. McCaskill, Mr. Whitehouse, Mr. Udall (Colorado), Mr. Bennet, Mrs. Gillibrand, Mr. Manchin, and Mr. Blumenthal.

JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE: Mr. Casey (Chairman), Mr. Bingaman, Ms. Klobuchar, Mr. Webb, Mr. Warner, and Mr. Sanders.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON ETHICS: Mrs. Boxer (Chairman), Mr. Pryor, and Mr. Brown (Ohio).

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS: Mr. Akaka (Chairman), Mr. Inouye, Mr. Conrad, Mr. Johnson (South Dakota), Ms. Cantwell, Mr. Tester, Mr. Udall (New Mexico), and Mr. Franken.

SENATE RESOLUTION 43—TO CONSTITUTE THE MINORITY PARTY'S MEMBERSHIP ON CERTAIN COMMITTEES FOR THE ONE HUNDRED TWELFTH CONGRESS, OR UNTIL THEIR SUCCESSORS ARE CHOSEN

Mr. McCONNELL submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 43

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY: Mr. Roberts, Mr. Lugar, Mr. Cochran, Mr. McConnell, Mr. Chambliss, Mr. Johanns, Mr. Boozman, Mr. Grassley, Mr. Thune, and Mr. Hoeven.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS: Mr. Cochran, Mr. McConnell, Mr. Shelby, Mrs. Hutchison, Mr. Alexander, Ms. Collins, Ms. Murkowski, Mr. Graham, Mr. Kirk, Mr. Coats, Mr. Blunt, Mr. Moran, Mr. Hoeven, and Mr. Johnson (Wisconsin).

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES: Mr. McCain, Mr. Inhofe, Mr. Sessions, Mr. Chambliss, Mr. Wicker, Mr. Brown (Massachusetts), Mr. Portman, Ms. Ayotte, Ms. Collins, Mr. Graham, Mr. Cornyn, and Mr. Vitter.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS: Mr. Shelby, Mr. Crapo, Mr. Corker, Mr. DeMint, Mr. Vitter, Mr. Johanns, Mr. Toomey, Mr. Kirk, Mr. Moran, and Mr. Wicker.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION: Mrs. Hutchison, Ms. Snowe, Mr. Ensign, Mr. DeMint, Mr. Thune, Mr. Wicker, Mr. Isakson, Mr. Blunt, Mr. Boozman, Mr. Toomey, Mr. Rubio, and Ms. Ayotte.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES: Ms. Murkowski, Mr.

Burr, Mr. Barrasso, Mr. Risch, Mr. Lee, Mr. Paul, Mr. Coats, Mr. Portman, Mr. Hoeven, and Mr. Corker.

COMMITTEE ON THE ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS: Mr. Inhofe, Mr. Vitter, Mr. Barrasso, Mr. Sessions, Mr. Crapo, Mr. Alexander, Mr. Johanns, and Mr. Boozman.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE: Mr. Hatch, Mr. Grassley, Ms. Snowe, Mr. Kyl, Mr. Crapo, Mr. Roberts, Mr. Ensign, Mr. Enzi, Mr. Cornyn, Mr. Coburn, and Mr. Thune.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS: Mr. Lugar, Mr. Corker, Mr. Risch, Mr. Rubio, Mr. Inhofe, Mr. DeMint, Mr. Isakson, Mr. Barrasso, and Mr. Lee.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS: Mr. Enzi, Mr. Alexander, Mr. Burr, Mr. Isakson, Mr. Paul, Mr. Hatch, Mr. McCain, Mr. Roberts, Ms. Murkowski, and Mr. Kirk.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS: Ms. Collins, Mr. Coburn, Mr. Brown (Massachusetts), Mr. McCain, Mr. Johnson (Wisconsin), Mr. Ensign, Mr. Portman, and Mr. Paul.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY: Mr. Grassley, Mr. Hatch, Mr. Kyl, Mr. Sessions, Mr. Graham, Mr. Cornyn, Mr. Lee, and Mr. Coburn.

COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET: Mr. Sessions, Mr. Grassley, Mr. Enzi, Mr. Crapo, Mr. Ensign, Mr. Cornyn, Mr. Graham, Mr. Thune, Mr. Portman, Mr. Toomey, and Mr. Johnson (Wisconsin).

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION: Mr. Alexander, Mr. McConnell, Mr. Cochran, Mr. Chambliss, Mrs. Hutchison, Mr. Roberts, Mr. Shelby, and Mr. Blunt.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP: Ms. Snowe, Mr. Vitter, Mr. Risch, Mr. Rubio, Mr. Paul, Ms. Ayotte, Mr. Enzi, Mr. Brown (Massachusetts), and Mr. Moran.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS: Mr. Burr, Mr. Isakson, Mr. Wicker, Mr. Johanns, Mr. Brown (Massachusetts), Mr. Moran, and Mr. Boozman.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING: Mr. Corker, Ms. Collins, Mr. Hatch, Mr. Kirk, Mr. Moran, Mr. Johnson (Wisconsin), Ms. Ayotte, Mr. Shelby, Mr. Graham, and Mr. Chambliss.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE: Mr. Chambliss, Ms. Snowe, Mr. Burr, Mr. Risch, Mr. Coats, Mr. Blunt, and Mr. Rubio.

JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE: Mr. DeMint, Mr. Coats, Mr. Lee, and Mr. Toomey.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON ETHICS: Mr. Isakson, Mr. Roberts, and Mr. Risch.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS: Mr. Barrasso, Mr. McCain, Ms. Murkowski, Mr. Hoeven, Mr. Crapo, and Mr. Johanns.

SENATE RESOLUTION 44—SUPPORTING DEMOCRACY, UNIVERSAL RIGHTS, AND THE PEACEFUL TRANSITION TO A REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT IN EGYPT

Mr. KERRY (for himself, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. GRAHAM, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. LEVIN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 44

Whereas the United States and Egypt have long shared a strong bilateral relationship;

Whereas Egypt plays an important role in global and regional politics as well as in the broader Middle East and North Africa;

Whereas Egypt has been, and continues to be, an intellectual and cultural center of the Arab world;

Whereas on January 25, 2011, demonstrations began across Egypt with thousands of protesters peacefully calling for a new government, free and fair elections, significant constitutional and political reforms, greater economic opportunity, and an end to government corruption;

Whereas on January 28, 2011, the Government of Egypt shut down Internet and mobile phone networks almost entirely and blocked social networking websites;

Whereas on January 29, 2011, President Hosni Mubarak appointed Omar Suleiman, former head of the Egyptian General Intelligence Directorate, as Vice President and Ahmed Shafik, former Minister for Civil Aviation, as Prime Minister;

Whereas the demonstrations have continued, making this the longest protest in modern Egyptian history, and on February 1, 2011, millions of protesters took to the streets across the country;

Whereas hundreds of Egyptians have been killed and injured since the protests began;

Whereas on February 1, 2011, President Hosni Mubarak announced that he would not run for reelection later this year, but widespread protests against his government continue;

Whereas on February 1, 2011, President Barack Obama called for an orderly transition, stating that it "must be meaningful, it must be peaceful, and it must begin now." He also affirmed that: "The process must include a broad spectrum of Egyptian voices and opposition parties. It should lead to elections that are free and fair. And it should result in a government that's not only grounded in democratic principles, but is also responsive to the aspirations of the Egyptian people.";

Whereas despite President Hosni Mubarak's pledge in 2005 that Egypt's controversial emergency law would be used only to fight terrorism and that he planned to abolish the state of emergency and adopt new antiterrorism legislation as an alternative, in May 2010, the Government of Egypt again extended the emergency law, which has been in place continuously since 1981, for another 2 years, giving police broad powers of arrest and allowing indefinite detention without charge;

Whereas the Department of State's 2009 Human Rights Report notes with respect to Egypt, "[t]he government's respect for human rights remained poor, and serious abuses continued in many areas. The government limited citizens' right to change their government and continued a state of emergency that has been in place almost continuously since 1967.";

Whereas past elections in Egypt, including the most recent November 2010 parliamentary elections, have seen serious irregularities at polling and counting stations, security force intimidation and coercion of voters, and obstruction of peaceful political rallies and demonstrations; and

Whereas any election must be honest and open to all legitimate candidates and conducted without interference from the military or security apparatus and under the oversight of international monitors: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) acknowledges the central and historic importance of the United States-Egyptian strategic partnership in advancing the common interests of both countries, including peace and security in the broader Middle East and North Africa;

(2) reaffirms the United States' commitment to the universal rights of freedom of assembly, freedom of speech, and freedom of access to information, including the Internet, and expresses strong support for the people of Egypt in their peaceful calls for a

representative and responsive democratic government that respects these rights;

(3) condemns any efforts to provoke or instigate violence, and calls upon all parties to refrain from all violent and criminal acts;

(4) supports freedom of the press and strongly condemns the intimidation, targeting, or detention of journalists.

(5) urges the Egyptian military to demonstrate maximum professionalism and restraint, and emphasizes the importance of working to peacefully restore calm and order while allowing for free and non-violent freedom of expression;

(6) calls on President Mubarak to immediately begin an orderly and peaceful transition to a democratic political system, including the transfer of power to an inclusive interim caretaker government, in coordination with leaders from Egypt's opposition, civil society, and military, to enact the necessary reforms to hold free, fair, and internationally credible elections this year;

(7) affirms that a real transition to a legitimate representative democracy in Egypt requires concrete steps to be taken as soon as possible, including lifting the state of emergency, allowing Egyptians to organize independent political parties without interference, enhancing the transparency of governmental institutions, restoring judicial supervision of elections, allowing credible international monitors to observe the preparation and conduct of elections, and amending the laws and Constitution of Egypt as necessary to implement these and other critical reforms;

(8) pledges full support for Egypt's transition to a representative democracy that is responsive to the needs of the Egyptian people, and calls on all nations to support the people of Egypt as they work to conduct a successful transition to democracy;

(9) expresses deep concern over any organization that espouses an extremist ideology, including the Muslim Brotherhood, and calls upon all political movements and parties in Egypt, including an interim government, to affirm their commitment to non-violence and the rule of law, the equal rights of all individuals, accountable institutions of justice, religious tolerance, peaceful relations with Egypt's neighbors, and the fundamental principles and practices of democracy, including the regular conduct of free and fair elections;

(10) underscores the vital importance of any Egyptian Government continuing to fulfill its international obligations, including its commitments under the Egypt-Israel Peace Treaty signed on March 26, 1979 and the freedom of navigation through the Suez Canal; and

(11) ensures that United States assistance to the Egyptian Government, military, and people will advance the goal of ensuring respect for the universal rights of the Egyptian people and will further the national security interests of the United States in the region.

SENATE RESOLUTION 45—CONGRATULATING THE EASTERN WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY FOOTBALL TEAM FOR WINNING THE 2010 NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION DIVISION I FOOTBALL CHAMPIONSHIP SUBDIVISION TITLE

Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Ms. CANTWELL) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 45

Whereas on January 7, 2011, the Eastern Washington University football team (referred to in this preamble as the “Eagles”) defeated the University of Delaware Blue Hens by a score of 20 to 19, to win the 2010 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division 1 Football Championship Subdivision title;

Whereas the Eagles were down for most of the championship game, trailing 0 to 19 until late in the third quarter;

Whereas, it was not until 1 minute and 48 seconds remained in the third quarter of the championship game that quarterback Bo Levi Mitchell threw a 22-yard touchdown pass to Brandon Kaufman;

Whereas Mitchell then threw another touchdown to Nicholas Edwards with 8 minutes and 16 seconds left in the fourth quarter;

Whereas Mitchell threw a third touchdown, again to Kaufman, with 2 minutes and 47 seconds left in the game, clinching a win in the Eagles’ first trip to the National Collegiate Athletic Association Division 1 Football Championship Subdivision game;

Whereas the Eagles began the 2010 season in the newly renovated and dedicated Roos Field, named after Eastern Washington University alumnus and offensive lineman Michael Roos of the National Football League’s Tennessee Titans;

Whereas Roos Field is the only Division 1 college football stadium to feature a red playing surface, leading Roos Field to be aptly nicknamed “The Inferno”;

Whereas head coach Beau Baldwin was named the Coach of the Year by College Sporting News;

Whereas the 2010 Buck Buchanan Award, honoring the most outstanding defensive player in the Division I Football Championship Subdivision, was awarded to Eagles linebacker J.C. Sherritt;

Whereas Big Sky Conference honors were awarded to Eagles running back Taiwan Jones, who was named Offensive Player of the Year, and Eagles linebacker J.C. Sherritt, who was named Defensive Player of the Year;

Whereas the Eagles clinched a share of the 2010 Big Sky Conference title, with a conference record of 7-1 and an overall season record of 13-2, and finished the 2010 season with an 11-game win streak; and

Whereas the Eagles enjoyed widespread support from their dedicated and spirited fans, as well as the entire Eastern Washington University community: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates the Eastern Washington University football team for winning the National Collegiate Athletic Association Division 1 Football Championship Subdivision title;

(2) recognizes the hard work and dedication of the players, head coach Beau Baldwin, and the assistant coaches and support personnel who all played critical roles in helping the Eastern Washington University Eagles win the Subdivision title; and

(3) respectfully requests the Secretary of the Senate to transmit an enrolled copy of the resolution to—

(A) the President of Eastern Washington University, Dr. Rodolfo Arévalo;

(B) the Athletic Director of Eastern Washington University, Bill Chaves; and

(C) the Head Coach of the Eastern Washington University football team, Beau Baldwin.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 36. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 223, to modernize the air traffic control system, improve the safety, reliability, and availability of transportation by air in the United States, provide modernization of the air traffic control system, reauthorize the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 37. Ms. KLOBUCHAR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 223, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 38. Mr. BROWN of Ohio (for himself and Mr. PORTMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 223, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 39. Mr. CHAMBLISS (for himself and Mr. ISAKSON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 223, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 40. Mr. BEGICH (for himself and Ms. MURKOWSKI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 223, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 41. Mr. BAUCUS (for himself and Mr. TESTER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 223, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 42. Mr. MERKLEY (for himself and Mr. WYDEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 223, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 43. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 223, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 44. Ms. CANTWELL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 223, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 45. Ms. CANTWELL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 223, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 46. Ms. CANTWELL (for herself, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. CHAMBLISS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 223, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 36. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 223, to modernize the air traffic control system, improve the safety, reliability, and availability of transportation by air in the United States, provide modernization of the air traffic control system, reauthorize the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 311, between lines 11 and 12, insert the following:

SEC. 7. UPDATES TO FEDERAL BUDGET DEFICIT CALCULATIONS; OMB REPORT TO CONGRESS.

(a) UPDATES TO FEDERAL BUDGET DEFICIT CALCULATIONS.—Thirty days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget and the Director of the Congressional Budget Office shall update the Federal budget deficit calculations to take into account any loss of Federal revenue resulting from projected reductions in oil and gas production during each of the 5- and 10-year periods beginning

on the date of enactment of this Act due to the moratorium on oil and gas leasing in the Gulf of Mexico set forth on May 25, 2010, and all following notice to lessees, rules, and regulations by the Department of Interior pertaining to offshore energy production.

(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall submit to Congress a report that provides—

(1) an estimate of the total revenues generated by Department of the Interior due to domestic offshore oil and gas production during each of the preceding 10 fiscal years; and

(2) projections of the total revenues to be generated by the Department of the Interior due to domestic resource production for each of fiscal years 2011 through 2015.

SA 37. Ms. KLOBUCHAR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 223, to modernize the air traffic control system, improve the safety, reliability, and availability of transportation by air in the United States, provide modernization of the air traffic control system, reauthorize the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 214, and insert the following:

SECTION 214. ALLOWABLE PROJECT COSTS FOR AIRPORT DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM.

Section 47110(b)(2)(D) is amended to read as follows:

“(D) if the cost is for airport development and is incurred before execution of the grant agreement, but in the same fiscal year as execution of the grant agreement, and if—

“(i) the cost was incurred before execution of the grant agreement due to the short construction season in the vicinity of the airport;

“(ii) the cost is in accordance with an airport layout plan approved by the Secretary and with all statutory and administrative requirements that would have been applicable to the project if the project had been carried out after execution of the grant agreement;

“(iii) the sponsor notifies the Secretary before authorizing work to commence on the project; and

“(iv) the sponsor’s decision to proceed with the project in advance of execution of the grant agreement does not affect the priority assigned to the project by the Secretary for the allocation of discretionary funds;”.

SA 38. Mr. BROWN of Ohio (for himself and Mr. PORTMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 223, to modernize the air traffic control system, improve the safety, reliability, and availability of transportation by air in the United States, provide modernization of the air traffic control system, reauthorize the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 97, strike lines 4 through 8 and insert the following:

(b) TEST SITE CRITERIA.—In determining where the test sites to be established under the pilot project required by subsection (a)(1) are to be located, the Administrator shall—

(1) take into consideration geographical and climate diversity; and

(2) consult with the Secretary of the Air Force and the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to determine the test sites with available research radars to most efficiently meet national defense and civilian aerospace needs.

(c) SYSTEMS AND DETECTION TECHNIQUES.—Within 6 months after date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a report describing and assessing the progress being made in establishing special use airspace to fill the immediate need of the Air Force to develop detection techniques for small unmanned aerial vehicles and validate sensor integration and operation of unmanned aerial systems.

SA 39. Mr. CHAMBLISS (for himself and Mr. ISAKSON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 223, to modernize the air traffic control system, improve the safety, reliability, and availability of transportation by air in the United States, provide modernization of the air traffic control system, reauthorize the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title II, add the following:

SEC. 224. TWO-YEAR PROHIBITION ON EXPANSION OF BULLDOG MILITARY OPERATING AREAS.

The Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration may not amend, expand, or modify, or approve an amendment, expansion, or modification of, the Bulldog Military Operating Area (MOA) A or Bulldog Military Operating Area (MOA) B until 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

SA 40. Mr. BEGICH (for himself and Ms. MURKOWSKI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 223, to modernize the air traffic control system, improve the safety, reliability, and availability of transportation by air in the United States, provide modernization of the air traffic control system, reauthorize the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 307, strike line 1 and all that follows through page 310, line 10, and insert the following:

SEC. 730. TRANSPORTATION OF COMPRESSED OXYGEN AND OXIDIZING GASES WITHIN ALASKA.

In circumstances in which it is impracticable to transport compressed oxygen and other oxidizing gases within the State of Alaska through transportation modes other than by aircraft, the transportation of such gases within Alaska shall not be subject to the requirements under—

(1) paragraphs (3), (4), and (5) of section 173.302(f) of title 49, Code of Federal Regulations;

(2) paragraphs (3), (4), and (5) of section 173.304(f) of such title; and

(3) appendices D and E of part 178 of such title.

SA 41. Mr. BAUCUS (for himself and Mr. TESTER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 223, to modernize the air traffic control system, improve the safety, reliability, and availability of transportation by air in the United States, provide modernization of the air traffic control system, reauthorize the Federal Aviation Administration,

and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 320, and insert the following:

SEC. 320. UNMANNED AERIAL SYSTEMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall develop and implement a plan to accelerate the integration of unmanned aerial systems into the National Airspace System. The plan shall—

(1) create a pilot project to integrate unmanned aerial systems into the National Airspace System at 4 test sites in the National Airspace System by 2012;

(2) create a test and development center to research new applications for unmanned aerial systems in the National Airspace System through a partnership with public universities and private industry;

(3) create a safe, nonexclusionary airspace designation for cooperative manned and unmanned flight operations in the National Airspace System;

(4) establish a process to develop certification, flight standards, and air traffic requirements for such unmanned aerial systems at each of the test sites;

(5) dedicate funding for unmanned aerial systems research and development for certification, flight standards, and air traffic requirements;

(6) encourage leveraging and coordination of such research and development activities with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the Department of Defense;

(7) address both military and civilian unmanned aerial system operations;

(8) ensure the unmanned aircraft systems integration plan is incorporated in the Federal Aviation Administration's NextGen Air Transportation System implementation plan; and

(9) provide for verification of the safety of the unmanned aerial systems and navigation procedures before their integration into the National Airspace System.

(b) TEST SITE CRITERIA.—The Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall take into consideration geographical and climate diversity in determining where the test sites authorized under subsection (a)(1) are to be located.

(c) UNMANNED AERIAL SYSTEMS TEST AND DEVELOPMENT CENTER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 12 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall designate, through partnerships with State public universities and private industry, an Unmanned Aerial Systems (UAS) Test and Development Center that focuses on the development of new commercial unmanned aircraft systems. The Center shall focus on—

(A) the use of biofuels and alternative fuels to power the unmanned aerial systems;

(B) the applied research of commercial applications of unmanned aircraft systems, including the application of such systems in forest and wildfire management;

(C) the application of such systems in agriculture and livestock management;

(D) the application of such systems in wildlife and predator management; and

(E) the application of such systems in a maritime and gulf environment.

(2) LOCATION OF CENTER.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Center shall be in close proximity to a test area that is suitable for unmanned aircraft systems that includes—

(i) Class G airspace with low air traffic volume located in a sparsely populated, low-density area within the continental United States;

(ii) a diversity of climate and weather conditions; and

(iii) a variety of terrain, topography, and vegetation, including forested and mountainous terrain, a diversity of crop and grazing lands, and areas inhabited by wildlife and livestock.

(B) ACCESS TO MARITIME AREAS.—The Center shall also have access to maritime and gulf areas through collaborative agreements with other universities and research institutes.

(3) CERTIFICATION PROCESS.—The Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall expedite the approval process for Certificate of Authorization (COA) requests from the UAS Test and Development Center.

(d) REPORT.—Not later than 12 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall report to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives on the progress of integrating unmanned aerial systems into the National Airspace System.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration for each of the fiscal years 2011 through 2013 such sums as may be necessary to carry out this section.

SA 42. Mr. MERKLEY (for himself and Mr. WYDEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 223, to modernize the air traffic control system, improve the safety, reliability, and availability of transportation by air in the United States, provide modernization of the air traffic control system, reauthorize the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 146, after line 23, add the following:

SEC. 435. FLIGHT OPERATIONS AT RONALD REAGAN WASHINGTON NATIONAL AIRPORT.

(a) BEYOND PERIMETER EXEMPTIONS.—Section 41718(a) is amended by striking “24” and inserting “40”.

(b) LIMITATIONS.—Section 41718(c)(2) is amended by striking “3 operations” and inserting “6 operations”.

(c) ALLOCATION OF BEYOND-PERIMETER EXEMPTIONS.—Section 41718(c) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (3) and (4) as paragraphs (4) and (5), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

“(3) SLOTS.—The Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall reduce the hourly air carrier slot quota for Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport in section 93.123(a) of title 14, Code of Federal Regulations, by a total of 16 slots that are available for allocation. Such reductions shall be taken in the 6:00 a.m., 10:00 p.m., or 11:00 p.m. hours, as determined by the Administrator, in order to grant exemptions under subsection (a).”.

(d) SCHEDULING PRIORITY.—Section 41718 is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (e) and (f) as subsections (f) and (g), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (d) the following:

“(e) SCHEDULING PRIORITY.—Operations conducted by new entrant air carriers and limited incumbent air carriers shall be afforded a scheduling priority over operations conducted by other air carriers granted exemptions pursuant to this section, with the highest scheduling priority to be afforded to

beyond-perimeter operations conducted by new entrant air carriers and limited incumbent air carriers.”.

SA 43. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 223, to modernize the air traffic control system, improve the safety, reliability, and availability of transportation by air in the United States, provide modernization of the air traffic control system, reauthorize the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title II, add the following:

SEC. 224. REPAYMENT OF FEDERAL GRANTS BEFORE PRIVATIZATION OF AIRPORTS.

Section 47134(b)(2) is amended to read as follows:

“(2) REPAYMENT REQUIREMENTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Before a sponsor that has received an exemption under this section sells or leases an airport as described in subsection (a), the sponsor shall repay to the Secretary—

“(i) the Federal share of the fair-market value of any land that is part of the airport and that was purchased after September 3, 1982, with a Federal grant; and

“(ii) the lesser of—

“(I) the Federal share of the remaining unamortized portion, as determined by the Secretary, of any grant made under this subchapter after September 3, 1982, for improvements to the airport; or

“(II) the Federal share of the value of the improvements to the airport made with the grant described in subclause (I).

“(B) DETERMINATION OF VALUE OF IMPROVEMENTS.—For purposes of subparagraph (A)(i)(II), the value of the improvements to the airport shall be the value of the improvements at the time of the sale or lease of the airport approved under subsection (a), as determined by the Secretary.

“(C) EFFECT OF AMOUNT OF COMPENSATION.—A sponsor shall repay the amounts required by subparagraph (A) without regard to the amount of compensation received pursuant to the sale or lease of the airport approved under subsection (a).

“(D) EFFECT OF REPAYMENT ON CERTAIN OBLIGATIONS.—The repayment of the amounts required under subparagraph (A) shall not terminate—

“(i) any obligation of the Federal Government to operate the airport; or

“(ii) any obligation of the sponsor, or owner or lessee of the airport, with respect to—

“(I) funding airport land or improvements to the airport; or

“(II) any Federal land conveyed to be used for airport purposes.”.

SA 44. Ms. CANTWELL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 223, to modernize the air traffic control system, improve the safety, reliability, and availability of transportation by air in the United States, provide modernization of the air traffic control system, reauthorize the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place insert the following:

SEC. . PUBLIC INTEREST CONSIDERATIONS IN CERTAIN REGULATIONS.

(a) USE OF AIRSPACE.—Section 40103(b)(1) is amended by adding at the end the following: “The Administrator may take into account

the matters considered under section 40101(a) in determining what is in the public interest under this paragraph in matters related to—

“(A) carrying out subpart II of this sub-title; and

“(B) those provisions of subpart IV applicable in carrying out subpart II.”.

(b) SAFETY REGULATION.—Section 40109(b) is amended by adding at the end the following: “The Administrator may take into account the matters considered under section 40101(a) in determining what is in the public interest under this paragraph in matters related to—

“(1) carrying out subpart II of this sub-title; and

“(2) those provisions of subpart IV applicable in carrying out subpart II.”.

SA 45. Ms. CANTWELL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 223, to modernize the air traffic control system, improve the safety, reliability, and availability of transportation by air in the United States, provide modernization of the air traffic control system, reauthorize the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 297, line 19, insert “(a) IN GENERAL.—” before “Not”.

On page 298, strike lines 7 through 10 and insert the following:

(2) the potential impact to the aerospace industry from the degradation of capabilities due to the loss or change to the radio frequency spectrum allocated to the aeronautical mobile telemetry service.

(b) NO IMPACT ON FCC ORDER.—Nothing in this section shall prohibit, delay, or interfere with the Federal Communications Commission’s issuance of an order in FCC ET Docket No. 08–59.

SA 46. Ms. CANTWELL (for herself, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. CHAMBLISS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 223, to modernize the air traffic control system, improve the safety, reliability, and availability of transportation by air in the United States, provide modernization of the air traffic control system, reauthorize the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . ROLLOVER OF AMOUNTS RECEIVED IN AIRLINE CARRIER BANKRUPTCY.

(a) GENERAL RULES.—

(1) ROLLOVER OF AIRLINE PAYMENT AMOUNT.—If a qualified airline employee receives any airline payment amount and transfers any portion of such amount to a traditional IRA within 180 days of receipt of such amount (or, if later, within 180 days of the date of the enactment of this Act), then such amount (to the extent so transferred) shall be treated as a rollover contribution described in section 402(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986. A qualified airline employee making such a transfer may exclude from gross income the amount transferred, in the taxable year in which the airline payment amount was paid to the qualified airline employee by the commercial passenger airline carrier.

(2) TRANSFER OF AMOUNTS ATTRIBUTABLE TO AIRLINE PAYMENT AMOUNT FOLLOWING ROLLOVER TO ROTH IRA.—A qualified airline employee who has contributed an airline pay-

ment amount to a Roth IRA that is treated as a qualified rollover contribution pursuant to section 125 of the Worker, Retiree, and Employer Recovery Act of 2008, may transfer to a traditional IRA, in a trustee-to-trustee transfer, all or any part of the contribution (together with any net income allocable to such contribution), and the transfer to the traditional IRA will be deemed to have been made at the time of the rollover to the Roth IRA, if such transfer is made within 180 days of the date of the enactment of this Act. A qualified airline employee making such a transfer may exclude from gross income the airline payment amount previously rolled over to the Roth IRA, to the extent an amount attributable to the previous rollover was transferred to a traditional IRA, in the taxable year in which the airline payment amount was paid to the qualified airline employee by the commercial passenger airline carrier. No amount so transferred to a traditional IRA may be treated as a qualified rollover contribution with respect to a Roth IRA within the 5-taxable year period beginning with the taxable year in which such transfer was made.

(3) EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE CLAIM FOR REFUND.—A qualified airline employee who excludes an amount from gross income in a prior taxable year under paragraph (1) or (2) may reflect such exclusion in a claim for refund filed within the period of limitation under section 6511(a) (or, if later, April 15, 2012).

(b) TREATMENT OF AIRLINE PAYMENT AMOUNTS AND TRANSFERS FOR EMPLOYMENT TAXES.—For purposes of chapter 21 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and section 209 of the Social Security Act, an airline payment amount shall not fail to be treated as a payment of wages by the commercial passenger airline carrier to the qualified airline employee in the taxable year of payment because such amount is excluded from the qualified airline employee’s gross income under subsection (a).

(c) DEFINITIONS AND SPECIAL RULES.—For purposes of this section—

(1) AIRLINE PAYMENT AMOUNT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term “airline payment amount” means any payment of any money or other property which is payable by a commercial passenger airline carrier to a qualified airline employee—

(i) under the approval of an order of a Federal bankruptcy court in a case filed after September 11, 2001, and before January 1, 2007, and

(ii) in respect of the qualified airline employee’s interest in a bankruptcy claim against the carrier, any note of the carrier (or amount paid in lieu of a note being issued), or any other fixed obligation of the carrier to pay a lump sum amount.

The amount of such payment shall be determined without regard to any requirement to deduct and withhold tax from such payment under sections 3102(a) and 3402(a).

(B) EXCEPTION.—An airline payment amount shall not include any amount payable on the basis of the carrier’s future earnings or profits.

(2) QUALIFIED AIRLINE EMPLOYEE.—The term “qualified airline employee” means an employee or former employee of a commercial passenger airline carrier who was a participant in a defined benefit plan maintained by the carrier which—

(A) is a plan described in section 401(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 which includes a trust exempt from tax under section 501(a) of such Code, and

(B) was terminated or became subject to the restrictions contained in paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 402(b) of the Pension Protection Act of 2006.

(3) **TRADITIONAL IRA.**—The term “traditional IRA” means an individual retirement plan (as defined in section 7701(a)(37) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) which is not a Roth IRA.

(4) **ROTH IRA.**—The term “Roth IRA” has the meaning given such term by section 408A(b) of such Code.

(d) **SURVIVING SPOUSE.**—If a qualified airline employee died after receiving an airline payment amount, or if an airline payment amount was paid to the surviving spouse of a qualified airline employee in respect of the qualified airline employee, the surviving spouse of the qualified airline employee may take all actions permitted under section 125 of the Worker, Retiree and Employer Recovery Act of 2008, or under this section, to the same extent that the qualified airline employee could have done had the qualified airline employee survived.

(e) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—This section shall apply to transfers made after the date of the enactment of this Act with respect to airline payment amounts paid before, on, or after such date.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on February 3, 2011, at 10 a.m.

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

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate to conduct a hearing on February 3, at 9:30 a.m., in room SH-216 of the Hart Senate Building.

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

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on February 3, 2011, at 10 a.m., in room 215 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled “Status of the Airport and Airway Trust Fund.”

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

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. 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 “Simplifying Security: Encouraging Better Retirement Decisions” on February 3, 2011, at 2 p.m.

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

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Sen-

ate, on February 3, 2011, at 10 a.m., in SD-226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct an executive business meeting.

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

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on February 3, 2011, at 10:30 a.m.

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

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on February 3, 2011 at 2:30 p.m.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SUPERFUND, TOXICS, AND ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Superfund, Toxics, and Environmental Health of the Committee on Environment and Public Works be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate at 10 a.m., on February 3, 2011, in Dirksen 406.

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

COMMITTEE FUNDING

Mr. REID. Mr. President, over the last 20 years, the apportionment of committee funding has gone a straight two-thirds for majority and one-third for minority during the 1990s, regardless of the size of the majority and minority, to biannual negotiations during the past decade. It is my intention that the approach adopted for this Congress will be used in the future. This new funding allocation for Senate committees is based on the party division of the Senate, with 10 percent of the total majority and minority salary baseline going to the majority for administrative expenses. However, regardless of the party division of the Senate, it is also intended that the minority share will never be less than 40 percent, and the majority share will never exceed 60 percent.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, it is my intention also that this new approach will serve us for the Congress and future Congresses. In addition, we are making a transition to restore Special Reserves to its historic purpose. We know that we will face tight budgets for the foreseeable future and cannot expect increases in funding. We have to move toward funding authorizations that are in line with our actual resources and I look forward to working with my friend, the majority leader, to accomplish this.

Mr. REID. I thank my friend, the Republican leader, and ask unanimous consent that a joint leadership letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

JOINT LEADERSHIP LETTER

We mutually commit to the following for the 112th Congress:

The budgets of the Committees of the Senate, including Joint and Special Committees, and all other subgroups, shall be apportioned to reflect the ratio of the Senate as of this date, including an additional ten percent (10%) to be allocated to the Chairmen for administrative expenses, to be determined by the Rules Committee. However, the amount of funding authorized for each individual Committee in the 112th Congress is being reduced by the amount that was allocated to that Committee from Special Reserves in the last Congress.

Special Reserves is being restored to its historic purpose. Requests for funding will only be considered when submitted by a Committee Chairman and Ranking Member for unanticipated, non-recurring needs. Such requests shall be granted only upon the approval of the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Rules Committee.

Funds for Committee expenses shall be available to each Chairman consistent with Senate rules and practices of the 111th Congress.

The Chairman and Ranking Member of any Committee may, by mutual agreement, modify the apportionment of Committee funding and office space.

The division of Committee office space shall be commensurate with this funding agreement.

CONSTITUTING MAJORITY PARTY'S MEMBERSHIP ON CERTAIN COMMITTEES FOR THE ONE HUNDRED TWELFTH CONGRESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 42.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 42) to constitute the majority party's membership on certain committees for the One Hundred Twelfth Congress, or until their successors are chosen.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate, and any statements relating to the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 42) was agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 42

Resolved, That the following shall constitute the majority party's membership on the following committees for the One Hundred Twelfth Congress, or until their successors are chosen:

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY: Ms. Stabenow (Chairman), Mr. Leahy, Mr. Harkin, Mr. Conrad, Mr. Baucus, Mr. Nelson (Nebraska), Mr. Brown (Ohio), Mr. Casey, Ms. Klobuchar, Mr. Bennet, and Mrs. Gillibrand.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS: Mr. Inouye (Chairman), Mr. Leahy, Mr. Harkin, Ms. Mikulski, Mr. Kohl, Mrs. Murray, Mrs. Feinstein, Mr. Durbin, Mr. Johnson (South Dakota), Ms. Landrieu, Mr. Reed, Mr. Lautenberg, Mr. Nelson (Nebraska), Mr. Pryor, Mr. Tester, and Mr. Brown (Ohio).

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES: Mr. Levin (Chairman), Mr. Lieberman, Mr. Reed, Mr. Akaka, Mr. Nelson (Nebraska), Mr. Webb, Mrs. McCaskill, Mr. Udall (Colorado), Mrs. Hagan, Mr. Begich, Mr. Manchin, Mrs. Shaheen, Mrs. Gillibrand, and Mr. Blumenthal.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS: Mr. Johnson (South Dakota) (Chairman), Mr. Reed, Mr. Schumer, Mr. Menendez, Mr. Akaka, Mr. Brown (Ohio), Mr. Tester, Mr. Kohl, Mr. Warner, Mr. Merkley, Mr. Bennet, and Mrs. Hagan.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION: Mr. Rockefeller (Chairman), Mr. Inouye, Mr. Kerry, Mrs. Boxer, Mr. Nelson (Florida), Ms. Cantwell, Mr. Lautenberg, Mr. Pryor, Mrs. McCaskill, Ms. Klobuchar, Mr. Udall (New Mexico), Mr. Warner, and Mr. Begich.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES: Mr. Bingaman (Chairman), Mr. Wyden, Mr. Johnson (South Dakota), Ms. Landrieu, Ms. Cantwell, Mr. Sanders, Ms. Stabenow, Mr. Udall (Colorado), Mrs. Shaheen, Mr. Franken, Mr. Manchin, and Mr. Coons.

COMMITTEE ON THE ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS: Mrs. Boxer (Chairman), Mr. Baucus, Mr. Carper, Mr. Lautenberg, Mr. Cardin, Mr. Sanders, Mr. Whitehouse, Mr. Udall (New Mexico), Mr. Merkley, and Mrs. Gillibrand.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE: Mr. Baucus (Chairman), Mr. Rockefeller, Mr. Conrad, Mr. Bingaman, Mr. Kerry, Mr. Wyden, Mr. Schumer, Ms. Stabenow, Ms. Cantwell, Mr. Nelson (Florida), Mr. Menendez, Mr. Carper, and Mr. Cardin.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS: Mr. Kerry (Chairman), Mrs. Boxer, Mr. Menendez, Mr. Cardin, Mr. Casey, Mr. Webb, Mrs. Shaheen, Mr. Coons, Mr. Durbin, and Mr. Udall (New Mexico).

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS: Mr. Harkin (Chairman), Ms. Mikulski, Mr. Bingaman, Mrs. Murray, Mr. Sanders, Mr. Casey, Mrs. Hagan, Mr. Merkley, Mr. Franken, Mr. Bennet, Mr. Whitehouse, and Mr. Blumenthal.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS: Mr. Lieberman (Chairman), Mr. Levin, Mr. Akaka, Mr. Carper, Mr. Pryor, Ms. Landrieu, Mrs. McCaskill, Mr. Tester, and Mr. Begich.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY: Mr. Leahy (Chairman), Mr. Kohl, Mrs. Feinstein, Mr. Schumer, Mr. Durbin, Mr. Whitehouse, Ms. Klobuchar, Mr. Franken, Mr. Coons, and Mr. Blumenthal.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE: Mrs. Feinstein (Chairman), Mr. Rockefeller, Mr. Wyden, Ms. Mikulski, Mr. Nelson (Florida), Mr. Conrad, Mr. Udall (Colorado), and Mr. Warner.

COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET: Mr. Conrad (Chairman), Mrs. Murray, Mr. Wyden, Mr. Nelson (Florida), Ms. Stabenow, Mr. Cardin, Mr. Sanders, Mr. Whitehouse, Mr. Warner, Mr. Merkley, Mr. Begich, and Mr. Coons.

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION: Mr. Schumer (Chairman), Mr. Inouye, Mrs. Feinstein, Mr. Durbin, Mr. Nelson (Nebraska), Mrs. Murray, Mr. Pryor, Mr. Udall (New Mexico), Mr. Warner, and Mr. Leahy.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP: Ms. Landrieu (Chairman), Mr. Levin, Mr. Harkin, Mr. Kerry, Mr. Lieberman, Ms. Cantwell, Mr.

Pryor, Mr. Cardin, Mrs. Shaheen, and Mrs. Hagan.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS: Mrs. Murray (Chairman), Mr. Rockefeller, Mr. Akaka, Mr. Sanders, Mr. Brown (Ohio), Mr. Webb, Mr. Tester, and Mr. Begich.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING: Mr. Kohl (Chairman), Mr. Wyden, Mr. Nelson (Florida), Mr. Casey, Mrs. McCaskill, Mr. Whitehouse, Mr. Udall (Colorado), Mr. Bennet, Mrs. Gillibrand, Mr. Manchin, and Mr. Blumenthal.

JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE: Mr. Casey (Chairman), Mr. Bingaman, Ms. Klobuchar, Mr. Webb, Mr. Warner, and Mr. Sanders.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON ETHICS: Mrs. Boxer (Chairman), Mr. Pryor, and Mr. Brown (Ohio).

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS: Mr. Akaka (Chairman), Mr. Inouye, Mr. Conrad, Mr. Johnson (South Dakota), Ms. Cantwell, Mr. Tester, Mr. Udall (New Mexico), and Mr. Franken.

CONSTITUTING MINORITY PARTY'S MEMBERSHIP ON CERTAIN COMMITTEES FOR THE ONE HUNDRED TWELFTH CONGRESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 43.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 43) to constitute the minority party's membership on certain committees for the One Hundred Twelfth Congress, or until their successors are chosen.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate, and any statements related to the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 43) was agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 43

Resolved, That the following shall constitute the minority party's membership on the following committees for the One Hundred Twelfth Congress, or until their successors are chosen:

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY: Mr. Roberts, Mr. Lugar, Mr. Cochran, Mr. McConnell, Mr. Chambliss, Mr. Johanns, Mr. Boozman, Mr. Grassley, Mr. Thune, and Mr. Hoeven.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS: Mr. Cochran, Mr. McConnell, Mr. Shelby, Mrs. Hutchison, Mr. Alexander, Ms. Collins, Ms. Murkowski, Mr. Graham, Mr. Kirk, Mr. Coats, Mr. Blunt, Mr. Moran, Mr. Hoeven, and Mr. Johnson (Wisconsin).

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES: Mr. McCain, Mr. Inhofe, Mr. Sessions, Mr. Chambliss, Mr. Wicker, Mr. Brown (Massachusetts), Mr. Portman, Ms. Ayotte, Ms. Collins, Mr. Graham, Mr. Cornyn, and Mr. Vitter.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS: Mr. Shelby, Mr. Crapo, Mr. Corker, Mr. DeMint, Mr. Vitter, Mr. Johanns, Mr. Toomey, Mr. Kirk, Mr. Moran, and Mr. Wicker.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION: Mrs. Hutchison, Ms. Snowe, Mr. Ensign, Mr. DeMint, Mr. Thune, Mr. Wicker, Mr. Isakson, Mr. Blunt, Mr. Boozman, Mr. Toomey, Mr. Rubio, and Ms. Ayotte.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES: Ms. Murkowski, Mr. Burr, Mr. Barrasso, Mr. Risch, Mr. Lee, Mr. Paul, Mr. Coats, Mr. Portman, Mr. Hoeven, and Mr. Corker.

COMMITTEE ON THE ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS: Mr. Inhofe, Mr. Vitter, Mr. Barrasso, Mr. Sessions, Mr. Crapo, Mr. Alexander, Mr. Johanns, and Mr. Boozman.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE: Mr. Hatch, Mr. Grassley, Ms. Snowe, Mr. Kyl, Mr. Crapo, Mr. Roberts, Mr. Ensign, Mr. Enzi, Mr. Cornyn, Mr. Coburn, and Mr. Thune.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS: Mr. Lugar, Mr. Corker, Mr. Risch, Mr. Rubio, Mr. Inhofe, Mr. DeMint, Mr. Isakson, Mr. Barrasso, and Mr. Lee.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS: Mr. Enzi, Mr. Alexander, Mr. Burr, Mr. Isakson, Mr. Paul, Mr. Hatch, Mr. McCain, Mr. Roberts, Ms. Murkowski, and Mr. Kirk.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS: Ms. Collins, Mr. Coburn, Mr. Brown (Massachusetts), Mr. McCain, Mr. Johnson (Wisconsin), Mr. Ensign, Mr. Portman, and Mr. Paul.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY: Mr. Grassley, Mr. Hatch, Mr. Kyl, Mr. Sessions, Mr. Graham, Mr. Cornyn, Mr. Lee, and Mr. Coburn.

COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET: Mr. Sessions, Mr. Grassley, Mr. Enzi, Mr. Crapo, Mr. Ensign, Mr. Cornyn, Mr. Graham, Mr. Thune, Mr. Portman, Mr. Toomey, and Mr. Johnson (Wisconsin).

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION: Mr. Alexander, Mr. McConnell, Mr. Cochran, Mr. Chambliss, Mrs. Hutchison, Mr. Roberts, Mr. Shelby, and Mr. Blunt.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP: Ms. Snowe, Mr. Vitter, Mr. Risch, Mr. Rubio, Mr. Paul, Ms. Ayotte, Mr. Enzi, Mr. Brown (Massachusetts), and Mr. Moran.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS: Mr. Burr, Mr. Isakson, Mr. Wicker, Mr. Johanns, Mr. Brown (Massachusetts), Mr. Moran, and Mr. Boozman.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING: Mr. Corker, Ms. Collins, Mr. Hatch, Mr. Kirk, Mr. Moran, Mr. Johnson (Wisconsin), Ms. Ayotte, Mr. Shelby, Mr. Graham, and Mr. Chambliss.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE: Mr. Chambliss, Ms. Snowe, Mr. Burr, Mr. Risch, Mr. Coats, Mr. Blunt, and Mr. Rubio.

JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE: Mr. DeMint, Mr. Coats, Mr. Lee, and Mr. Toomey.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON ETHICS: Mr. Isakson, Mr. Roberts, and Mr. Risch.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS: Mr. Barrasso, Mr. McCain, Ms. Murkowski, Mr. Hoeven, Mr. Crapo, and Mr. Johanns.

SUPPORTING DEMOCRACY, UNIVERSAL RIGHTS, AND PEACEFUL TRANSITION TO A REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT IN EGYPT

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 44.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows: A resolution (S. Res. 44) supporting democracy, universal rights, and the peaceful transition to a representative government in Egypt.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate, and that any statements relating to the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 44) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 44

Whereas the United States and Egypt have long shared a strong bilateral relationship;

Whereas Egypt plays an important role in global and regional politics as well as in the broader Middle East and North Africa;

Whereas Egypt has been, and continues to be, an intellectual and cultural center of the Arab world;

Whereas on January 25, 2011, demonstrations began across Egypt with thousands of protesters peacefully calling for a new government, free and fair elections, significant constitutional and political reforms, greater economic opportunity, and an end to government corruption;

Whereas on January 28, 2011, the Government of Egypt shut down Internet and mobile phone networks almost entirely and blocked social networking websites;

Whereas on January 29, 2011, President Hosni Mubarak appointed Omar Suleiman, former head of the Egyptian General Intelligence Directorate, as Vice President and Ahmed Shafik, former Minister for Civil Aviation, as Prime Minister;

Whereas the demonstrations have continued, making this the longest protest in modern Egyptian history, and on February 1, 2011, millions of protesters took to the streets across the country;

Whereas hundreds of Egyptians have been killed and injured since the protests began;

Whereas on February 1, 2011, President Hosni Mubarak announced that he would not run for reelection later this year, but widespread protests against his government continue;

Whereas on February 1, 2011, President Barack Obama called for an orderly transition, stating that it "must be meaningful, it must be peaceful, and it must begin now." He also affirmed that: "The process must include a broad spectrum of Egyptian voices and opposition parties. It should lead to elections that are free and fair. And it should result in a government that's not only grounded in democratic principles, but is also responsive to the aspirations of the Egyptian people.";

Whereas despite President Hosni Mubarak's pledge in 2005 that Egypt's controversial emergency law would be used only to fight terrorism and that he planned to abolish the state of emergency and adopt new antiterrorism legislation as an alternative, in May 2010, the Government of Egypt again extended the emergency law, which has been in place continuously since 1981, for another 2 years, giving police broad powers of arrest and allowing indefinite detention without charge;

Whereas the Department of State's 2009 Human Rights Report notes with respect to Egypt, "[t]he government's respect for human rights remained poor, and serious abuses continued in many areas. The govern-

ment limited citizens' right to change their government and continued a state of emergency that has been in place almost continuously since 1967.";

Whereas past elections in Egypt, including the most recent November 2010 parliamentary elections, have seen serious irregularities at polling and counting stations, security force intimidation and coercion of voters, and obstruction of peaceful political rallies and demonstrations; and

Whereas any election must be honest and open to all legitimate candidates and conducted without interference from the military or security apparatus and under the oversight of international monitors: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) acknowledges the central and historic importance of the United States-Egyptian strategic partnership in advancing the common interests of both countries, including peace and security in the broader Middle East and North Africa;

(2) reaffirms the United States' commitment to the universal rights of freedom of assembly, freedom of speech, and freedom of access to information, including the Internet, and expresses strong support for the people of Egypt in their peaceful calls for a representative and responsive democratic government that respects these rights;

(3) condemns any efforts to provoke or instigate violence, and calls upon all parties to refrain from all violent and criminal acts;

(4) supports freedom of the press and strongly condemns the intimidation, targeting, or detention of journalists.

(5) urges the Egyptian military to demonstrate maximum professionalism and restraint, and emphasizes the importance of working to peacefully restore calm and order while allowing for free and non-violent freedom of expression;

(6) calls on President Mubarak to immediately begin an orderly and peaceful transition to a democratic political system, including the transfer of power to an inclusive interim caretaker government, in coordination with leaders from Egypt's opposition, civil society, and military, to enact the necessary reforms to hold free, fair, and internationally credible elections this year;

(7) affirms that a real transition to a legitimate representative democracy in Egypt requires concrete steps to be taken as soon as possible, including lifting the state of emergency, allowing Egyptians to organize independent political parties without interference, enhancing the transparency of governmental institutions, restoring judicial supervision of elections, allowing credible international monitors to observe the preparation and conduct of elections, and amending the laws and Constitution of Egypt as necessary to implement these and other critical reforms;

(8) pledges full support for Egypt's transition to a representative democracy that is responsive to the needs of the Egyptian people, and calls on all nations to support the people of Egypt as they work to conduct a successful transition to democracy;

(9) expresses deep concern over any organization that espouses an extremist ideology, including the Muslim Brotherhood, and calls upon all political movements and parties in Egypt, including an interim government, to affirm their commitment to non-violence and the rule of law, the equal rights of all individuals, accountable institutions of justice, religious, tolerance, peaceful relations with Egypt's neighbors, and the fundamental principles and practices of democracy, including the regular conduct of free and fair elections;

(10) underscores the vital importance of any Egyptian Government continuing to ful-

fill its international obligations, including its commitments under the Egypt-Israel Peace Treaty signed on March 26, 1979 and the freedom of navigation through the Suez Canal; and

(11) ensures that United States assistance to the Egyptian Government, military, and people will advance the goal of ensuring respect for the universal rights of the Egyptian people and will further the national security interests of the United States in the region.

CONGRATULATING THE EASTERN WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY FOOTBALL TEAM

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 45, submitted earlier today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 45) congratulating the Eastern Washington University football team for winning the 2010 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division 1 Football Championship Subdivision title.

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 motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate, and any statements be printed in the RECORD.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 45) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 45

Whereas on January 7, 2011, the Eastern Washington University football team (referred to in this preamble as the "Eagles") defeated the University of Delaware Blue Hens by a score of 20 to 19, to win the 2010 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division 1 Football Championship Subdivision title;

Whereas the Eagles were down for most of the championship game, trailing 0 to 19 until late in the third quarter;

Whereas, it was not until 1 minute and 48 seconds remained in the third quarter of the championship game that quarterback Bo Levi Mitchell threw a 22-yard touchdown pass to Brandon Kaufman;

Whereas Mitchell then threw another touchdown to Nicholas Edwards with 8 minutes and 16 seconds left in the fourth quarter;

Whereas Mitchell threw a third touchdown, again to Kaufman, with 2 minutes and 47 seconds left in the game, clinching a win in the Eagles' first trip to the National Collegiate Athletic Association Division 1 Football Championship Subdivision game;

Whereas the Eagles began the 2010 season in the newly renovated and dedicated Roos Field, named after Eastern Washington University alumnus and offensive lineman Michael Roos of the National Football League's Tennessee Titans;

Whereas Roos Field is the only Division 1 college football stadium to feature a red playing surface, leading Roos Field to be aptly nicknamed "The Inferno";

Whereas head coach Beau Baldwin was named the Coach of the Year by College Sporting News;

Whereas the 2010 Buck Buchanan Award, honoring the most outstanding defensive player in the Division I Football Championship Subdivision, was awarded to Eagles linebacker J.C. Sherritt;

Whereas Big Sky Conference honors were awarded to Eagles running back Taiwan Jones, who was named Offensive Player of the Year, and Eagles linebacker J.C. Sherritt, who was named Defensive Player of the Year;

Whereas the Eagles clinched a share of the 2010 Big Sky Conference title, with a conference record of 7-1 and an overall season record of 13-2, and finished the 2010 season with an 11-game win streak; and

Whereas the Eagles enjoyed widespread support from their dedicated and spirited fans, as well as the entire Eastern Washington University community: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates the Eastern Washington University football team for winning the National Collegiate Athletic Association Division 1 Football Championship Subdivision title;

(2) recognizes the hard work and dedication of the players, head coach Beau Baldwin, and the assistant coaches and support personnel who all played critical roles in helping the Eastern Washington University Eagles win the Subdivision title; and

(3) respectfully requests the Secretary of the Senate to transmit an enrolled copy of the resolution to—

(A) the President of Eastern Washington University, Dr. Rodolfo Arévalo;

(B) the Athletic Director of Eastern Washington University, Bill Chaves; and

(C) the Head Coach of the Eastern Washington University football team, Beau Baldwin.

DISCHARGE AND REFERRAL—S. 126 AND S. 109

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that S. 126 be discharged from the Committee on Rules and Administration and be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

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

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent the Finance Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 109 and the bill be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

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

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME EN BLOC—S. 289, S. 290, AND S. 291

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I am told there are three bills at the desk due for their first reading.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the bills en bloc.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 289) to extend expiring provisions of the USA PATRIOT Improvement and Reauthorization Act of 2005, the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004, and the FISA Amendments Act of 2008 until December 31, 2013, and for other purposes.

A bill (S. 290) to extend the sunset of certain provisions of the USA PATRIOT Act, and for other purposes.

A bill (S. 291) to repeal the sunset provisions in the USA PATRIOT Improvement and Reauthorization Act of 2005 and other related provisions and permanently reauthorize the USA PATRIOT Act.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask for a second reading of these matters en bloc but object to my own request en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard. The bills will be read the second time on the next legislative day.

APPOINTMENT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair announces, on behalf of the majority leader, pursuant to the provisions of S. Res. 105, adopted April 13, 1989, as amended by S. Res. 149, adopted October 5, 1993, as amended by Public Law 105-275, adopted October 21, 1998, further amended by S. Res. 75, adopted March 25, 1999, amended by S. Res. 383, adopted October 27, 2000, and amended by S. Res. 355, adopted November 13, 2002, and further amended by S. Res. 480, adopted November 21, 2004, further amended by S. Res. 625, adopted December 6, 2006, and further amended by S. Res. 715, adopted November 28, 2008, and amended by S. Res. 706, adopted December 22, 2010, the appointment of the following Senator as a member of the Senate National Security Working Group for the 112th Congress: the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN).

ORDERS FOR FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 2011

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m. on Friday, February 4, 2011; that following the prayer and pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and following any leader remarks, the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:27 p.m., adjourned until Friday, February 4, 2011, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

JENNIFER A. DI TORO, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ASSOCIATE JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FOR THE TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS, VICE JUDITH E. RETCHIN, RETIRED.

DONNA MARY MURPHY, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ASSOCIATE JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FOR THE TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS, VICE KAYE K. CHRISTIAN, RETIRED.

YVONNE M. WILLIAMS, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ASSOCIATE JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FOR THE TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS, VICE BROOK HEDGE, RETIRED.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE 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. ELLEN M. PAWLKOWSKI

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE 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. MICHAEL J. BASLA

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. RHETT A. HERNANDEZ

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

LT. GEN. PURL K. KEEN

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be brigadier general

COL. JOHNNY M. SELLERS

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be brigadier general

COL. JANSON D. BOYLES

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUALS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531(A):

To be major

STEPHEN L. BUSE
CYNTHIA J. CAPUTO
ANGELA P. PETTIS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

THOMAS J. COLLINS
JUDITH P. PATTON
LINDA A. STOKESCROWE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

PHILLIP M. ARMSTRONG
THOMAS D. KELLY
ROBERT C. LEIVERS
RICHARD E. SPEARMAN, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

LLOYD H. ANSETH
BRENDAN M. DONOGHUE
DON A. GOLDSMITH
MARK T. MEANS
KARL B. ROSS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

KATHLEEN M. FLARITY
KATHLEEN Z. MAGUIRE
JANET D. POUNCY
JULIA K. SCOTT
KAREN R. WADE
TONI L. WILKINS
JENNETTE L. ZMAEFF

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUALS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531(A):

To be major

MELINA T. DOAN
MEDIRINA B. GILLIAM
LENONIE M. HANLEY
EDWARD M. LOPEZ
GREGORY L. MASIELLO
MICHAEL C. OTT
FELIPE D. VILLENA, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

MICHAEL D. DIETZ
BRENT J. ERICKSON
BONNIE E. GOODALE
FREDERICK H. GRANTHAM
NORMAN T. GREENLEE
DAVID L. JOHNSON
JOHL K. KLEIN
DANIEL S. MCNULTY
STEPHEN M. MOUNTS
CATHERINE M. NELSON
SUSAN J. PIETRYKOWSKI
DOREEN F. WILDER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

VILLA L. GULLORY
MARTIN J. HAMILTON
MARK R. HENDERSON
KENN K. KANESHIRO
JOHN W. KERSEY, JR.
JAMES F. KNOWLES
SCOTT C. MALTHANER
DONALD SHEETS, JR.
CHARLES A. STOCK
BRADLEY A. TURNER
MICHAEL N. WAJDOWICZ
DANNY K. WONG

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

ALFRED P. BOWLES II
CURTISS B. COOK
RICHARD J. DINSDALE
JIMMIE J. DRUMMOND, JR.
MANUEL H. ENRIQUEZ
THOMAS EARL FRANKLIN
BRAD S. GOLDMAN
MEREDITH ANN GOODWIN
EVAN ZACHARY KAPP
HENRY T. LEIS
JUAN C. NARVAEZ
REBECCA A. REYNOLDS
JOSEPH W. THOMPSON
HERMINGILDO V. VALLE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

BRIAN F. AGEY
DANIEL J. BALOG
CATHERINE A. BOBENRIETH
MARK E. BOSTON
DANIEL B. BRUZZINI
WILLIAM D. CLOUSE
DAVID L. CUNNINGHAM
CARLO GREG N. DEMANDANTE
DEVIN L. DONNELLY
MARK D. ERVIN
CARLOS R. ESQUIVEL
MERLIN B. FAUSETT
EARL E. FERGUSON III
MICHAEL R. GAURON
WILLIAM HALLER
ALDEN D. HILTON
MARK E. HUBNER
KEITH W. HUNSAKER
RONALD B. JOHNSTON, JR.
KATHLEEN M. JONES
KATRICK J. KEARNEY
LESLIE A. KNIGHT
ERIK K. KODA
TAMMY J. LINDSAY
JOSEPH A. LOPEZ
PATRICK D. LOWRY
DAVID J. LUTHER
LOUIS MARTINEZ, JR.
RICHARD J. MAYERS
TIMOTHY A. MCGRAW
JEFFREY D. MCGRAW
WILLIAM P. MUELLER
ALAN D. MURDOCK
STEVEN E. PFLANZ
BILLY D. PRUETT
CHARLES D. REILLY
MATTHEW G. RETZLOFF
DAVID M. ROSSO
WANDA L. SALZER
JAMES L. SANDERSON
DALE M. SELBY
PAUL M. SHERMAN

DANIEL A. SHOOR
PAMELA D. SMITH
ERIKA J. STRUBLE
LYNDA K. VU
KELLY N. WEST
BRADFORD WILLIAMS
ANITA JO ANNE WINKLER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

To be colonel

EARL R. ALAMEIDA, JR.
DAVID J. ALEXANDER
JOHN R. ANDERSON
JEFFREY F. ARNDT
JAMIE L. BAGGSTROM
JANEL K. BENNETT
DONALD R. BEVIS, JR.
DAVID A. BRADLEY
DAVID SCOTT BRENTON
NICHOLAS A. BROCCOLI
BARBRA S. BULS
STEVEN JOSEPH BUTOW
KEVIN J. CAMPBELL
DAVID ALAN CASS
DOUGLAS SCOTT CHAMPAGNE
CHRISTOPHER J. CHARNEY
JULIAN L. CLAY
KIRBY R. COLAS
MAC ALAN CRAWFORD
KEVIN K. DAWKINS
ROBERT CARL DESKO
ANTHONY JOHN DEVITO
JOHN R. DIDONNA
REED C. DRAKE
THOMAS C. DUKE
ANNE MARIE DUTCHER
RICHARD LEWIS EDWARDS, JR.
BRIAN C. ELBERT
ERIC K. ELY
ROBERT R. ERICKSON
LAURIE M. FARRIS
JOHN T. FERRY
PAUL E. FOLLETT
FREDERICK W. FRENCH
JOHN M. GAEDKE
CLAY L. GARRISON
SHARON ALINE GATTENS
BARRY D. GORTER
BRADLEY G. GRAFF
ROBERT J. GREGORY III
CHET P. HAHN
JOEL LON HARRIS
PETER K. HARRIS
JAMES P. HARTLINE, JR.
MARK A. HEDLUND
GREGORY MICHAEL HENDERSON
MERLE ELISE HERETH
ELIZABETH ANNE HILL
STEVEN R. HILSDON
RICHARD DALLAS HOWARD
TIMOTHY M. JONES
LORINDA C. KECK
PAUL K. KINGSLEY
PETER L. LINDE
WAYNE A. LITHELAND
JOHNNY S. LIZAMA
KERRY RAYELLE LOVELY
KEITH G. MACDONALD
MATTHEW J. MANIFOLD
MICHAEL J. MAWSON
WAYNE M. MCCAUGHEY
THOMAS J. MCENTEE
CURTIS N. MCLAIN
MICHAEL A. METZLER
DAVID J. MEYER
GREGORY SCOTT MYERS
JEFFREY T. NAMIHIRA
SCOTT W. NORMANDEAU
MAYNARD S. OSBORNE
BARTLEY MITCHELL OTOOLE
ERIK A. PETERSON
KEVIN D. PHILPOT
RUSSELL L. PONDER
BRIAN L. PRESTON
KYLE DOUGLAS REID
FERMIN ANTHONY RUBIO
MICHAEL D. RUMSEY
MARK SAKADOLSKY
LORI J. SCHEUERMAN
JOSEPH H. SCHULZ
JAY NELSON SELANDERS
JOSEPH B. SIMMONS II
BRIAN MALCOLM SIMPLER
DAVID ANDREW SMITH
WILLIAM LEBARON SPARROW
KARL BRIAN STARK
CHARLES G. STEVENSON
JAMES ROBERT STEVENSON, JR.
URIEL B. STRICKLAND
CLAUDE C. SWAMMY
DAVID T. TRIMBLE
GLEN R. WASS
JOHN MARK WEK
PATTY R. WILBANKS
WALTER FREDERICK WINTSCH, JR.
MICHAEL C. WOLFE
JOHN F. WOLVERTON
CHARLES E. WOODS
BRIAN P. WYNEKEN
DANIEL S. YENCHESKY

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED

STATES ARMY JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be lieutenant colonel

EDWARD J. BENZ III

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

CHARLES E. LYNDE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUALS 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

OZREN T. BUNTAK
ADAM R. LIBERMAN
JOSEPH MIR
RUTH NELSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUALS 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

MARCIA A. BRIMM
PENNY H. CUNNINGHAM
HEATHER V. SOUTHWY

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

DUSTIN C. FRAZIER
WAYNE W. KIM

To be major

JAN I. MABY

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

ROBERT L. BIERENGA
DOUGLAS A. ETTER
ANDREW L. GIBSON
GENE G. HENKE
BENJAMIN K. HODGE
PETER J. LAWSON
CARL N. STEELE
JOHNNIE M. TOBY

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

DON A. CAMPBELL
AUSTIN J. COE
STEVEN M. EDDY
JOHN W. GIBBON
LEONARD R. HIGGINS
RONALD R. HUFFMAN
DAVID J. HUNTER
HOWARD R. LUCAS, JR.
THOMAS R. SHEPARD
JOSEPH W. SMITH
BENNIE J. WIGGINS II
KEVIN T. WILKINSON

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

ERNEST L. ACKISS III
WILLIAM S. EBELING
ROBERT F. JABLONSKI
GEORGE A. MASSEY
JAMES P. MCGUIRE
CLAY O. RUNZI
THEODORE SILVESTER III

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

PHILIP Q. APPLEGATE
RODERICK T. ARRINGTON
KENNETH M. BRANDEL
JOSEPH A. CABELL
JOHN G. CHURCH, JR.
MICHAEL K. CLAUSEN
STANTON S. COERR
DAVID B. CRIST
MARTIN F. CROXTON
ROBERT A. DEROZIERE
DAVID C. DEVORE
DANIEL J. DEWHIRST
DOUGLAS A. DREW
WALTER B. ESTEP III
ROBERT D. FREEMAN
JAVIER GARCIA

ROBERT J. GOETZ
 JAMES W. F. GREEN
 RICHARD HAROOTUNIAN
 MARK V. HARRISON
 ROBERT H. HASHIMOTO
 ROBERT W. JACKSON
 WILLIAM B. JOHNSON
 BARRY R. KIMBROUGH
 GUS KOSTAS
 THOMAS M. KRUGLER
 CURTIS T. LEE
 DAVID V. LITTLE
 STEVEN P. LOGAN
 MARIA S. LONG
 ROBERT B. LUCAS III
 TODD J. MACDONALD
 STEVEN R. MARAVILLAS
 DONALD A. MARKWARD
 MICHAEL P. MCCARTHY
 PAUL H. MCCONNELL
 JOHN G. MCGINNIS
 JAMES E. MEAD
 JULIA A. MEADE
 JOSEPH C. MORRIS
 STEPHEN B. NORDHOFF
 DARIUS NOVICKIS
 HARRY D. OAKLEY
 PAUL R. OZMER
 KOREEN K. PARRY
 JAMES W. PRICE
 STEVEN T. RAMOS
 TIMOTHY A. RAYNOR
 MICHAEL J. REILLY II
 DARREN L. RICHARDSON
 ROB B. ROBERSON
 ANDREW T. ROBERTO
 JAY R. RODNE
 GEOFFREY R. ROLLINS
 WILLIAM J. RUSCIOLELLI
 HOWARD D. RUSSELL
 WILLIAM T. RYAN
 LUIS R. SANCHEZ
 STEPHEN P. SANTIAGO
 JON W. SHELburne
 SCOTT H. SMITH
 PAUL L. STARITA
 KURT W. STEIN
 BRADLEY R. STILLABOWER
 MARSHALL L. SWOR
 RICHARD D. THOMPSON, JR.
 MICHAEL A. TORMENTI
 ROBERT J. VEHE, JR.
 RICHARD R. WARBOLD II
 STEVEN D. WEINTRAUB
 SCOTT C. WERTZ
 KURTIS P. WHEELER
 LAWRENCE L. WHITE III
 JAMES D. WILMOTT

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
 TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MA-
 RINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

CARLTON W. ADAMS
 JOHN B. ADAMS
 JOSEPH S. AGRES
 ANDREW P. ALBANO
 JUSTIN J. ANDERSON
 KAIN C. ANDERSON
 RYAN L. ANDERSON
 ERIC M. ARBOGAST
 JOSEPH J. ATHERALL
 THOMAS A. ATKINSON
 JOSEPH T. BACHMANN
 ANTHONY BAGGS
 ANTHONY J. BANGO
 DAVID M. BANNING
 STEVEN K. BARRIGER
 JOHN C. BERRY
 SHAWN M. BASCO
 SHAWN B. BELTRAN
 BRIAN D. BERNTH
 JAMES W. BISHOP
 WILLIAM E. BLANCHARD
 SPENCER S. BLODGETT
 JAMES A. BOERICTER
 DARYL S. BOERSMA
 JAMES Y. BOUNDS II
 MICHAEL A. BOWERS
 COLIN J. BRAINARD
 SEAN C. BRAZIEL
 CHRISTOPHER J. BRONZI
 JAMES J. BROWN
 JASON P. BROWN
 MICHAEL D. BROYAN
 VINCENT R. BRYAN
 SHAWN J. BUDD
 BRYANT E. BUDDE
 THOMAS A. BUDREJKO
 MICHAEL J. BUTLER
 WALTER J. BUTLER, JR.
 RUSSELL P. BUTTRAM
 MICHAEL K. CAGLE
 RICHARD D. CALLAHAN
 LOUIS A. CAMARDO II
 LEO J. CANNON
 CHARLOTTE J. CARPENTER
 MICHAEL J. CARREIRO
 ANITA W. CARROLL
 MICHAEL A. CARTER
 ROMAN K. CASON
 MICHAEL V. CAVA
 GABRIELLE M. CHAPIN
 MICHAEL J. CHARNNEY
 JAMES F. CHERRY, JR.
 WILLIAM D. CHESAREK, JR.

LESLEY W. CHIU
 BRETT A. CLARK
 ADRIAN K. CLEYMANS
 THOMAS E. CLINTON, JR.
 SCOTT E. COBB
 DANIEL H. COLEMAN
 COREY M. COLLIER
 TERENCE M. CONNELLY
 WILLIAM J. CONNER
 JAMES B. CONWAY
 SCOTT M. CONWAY
 TOMMY D. CORNSTUBBLE, JR.
 BRIAN P. COYNE
 PATRICK R. CRAWFORD
 CHRISTOPHER J. CURTIN
 JON W. DAVENPORT
 BRADLEY T. DAVIN
 CORY E. DEKRAAI
 JOHN Y. DELATEUR
 ERIC R. DENT
 JOHN J. DEPINTO, JR.
 KEVIN L. DIGMAN
 KEVIN J. DOBZYNIAK
 JOSEPH E. DONALD III
 WILLIAM P. DONNELLY III
 ERIC J. DOUGHERTY
 BRIAN S. DRYZGA
 JAN R. DURHAM
 JUSTIN W. DYAL
 ANDREW D. DYER
 AMY R. EBITZ
 JASON M. EBY
 AARON D. ECKERBERG
 JUSTIN W. EGGSTAFF
 GEORGES T. EGLI
 MARK W. ELFERS
 JHAKE ELMAMUWALDI
 KEVIN M. ERKER
 ARMANDO ESPINOZA
 JAMEY M. FEDERICO
 JOHN D. FERGUSON
 GREGORY L. FIELD
 PAUL F. FILLMORE
 MICHAEL J. FITZGERALD
 KISHA M. FLAGG
 JOHN P. FLYNN
 DARIN J. FOX
 FRANK I. FRITTMAN
 TRAVIS T. GAINES
 MATTHEW C. GANLEY
 THOMAS H. GARNETT IV
 CHRISTOPHER E. GEORGI
 JEREMY L. GETTINGS
 TRENT A. GIBSON
 STEVE E. GILLETTE
 STEAN M. GLEASON
 ARMANDO GONZALEZ
 MATTHEW T. GOOD
 MICHAEL S. GOODWIN
 JOSHUA S. GORDON
 BRIAN T. GRANA
 DANIEL GRANADO
 EDWARD C. GREELEY
 BRUCE V. GREENE
 JOHN F. GRIFFIN
 RICHARD E. GRIMM
 JAIME L. GUTIERREZ
 MATTHEW J. HAEFNER
 EDWARD J. HANDLER IV
 SEAN M. HANKARD
 JEFFREY D. HANSON
 JOHN W. HARRIS
 JOHN E. HARRIS
 BRIAN K. HARWELL
 KELLY K. HASTINGS
 ROBERT C. HAWKINS
 BRIAN G. HEATHERMAN
 WILLIAM D. HILL
 GREGORY S. HOFFMAN
 JOEL M. HOFFMAN
 CHRISTOPHER L. HOLLOWAY
 ROBERT A. HUBBARD
 DAVID T. HUDAK
 ROBERT C. HUNTER
 JOSEPH R. HUTCHESON
 CHRISTOPHER S. IEVA
 JOHN B. JACKSON III
 SAMUEL E. JACKSON
 TIMOTHY J. JENT
 JASON E. JOLLIFF
 JAMES B. JONES
 RICHARD D. JOYCE
 STEPHEN P. KAHN
 JEFFREY S. KAWADA
 JOHN K. KELLEY
 MELISSA P. KELLEY
 ERIC W. KELLY
 JEFFREY R. KENNEY
 MATTHEW D. KERLIN
 JASON D. KINDRED
 CHESTER J. KING
 JUSTIN W. KNIX
 BRIAN T. KOCH
 SCOTT M. KOLTICK
 KEVIN R. KORPINEN
 JAMES R. KYTE
 SAMUEL LABOY
 MATTHEW J. LANDRY
 DAVID L. LANE
 GREGORY J. LANE
 LUIS F. LARA
 VINCENT G. LARATTA
 DANNY B. LEDFORD
 BRIAN R. LEWIS
 FREDERICK L. LEWIS
 MICHAEL E. LINDBLOM
 MICHAEL J. LIVINGSTON

JONATHAN P. LONEY
 JOHN P. LONGSHORE
 HENRY K. LYLES
 JOHN J. LYNCH II
 JAIME MACIAS
 FRANK A. MAKOSKI, JR.
 ERIC C. MALINOWSKI
 STEPHANIE L. MALMANGER
 SCOTT D. MANNING
 TODD M. MANYX
 DONALD G. MARASKA
 CHRISTOPHER M. MARISE
 ANDREW V. MARTINEZ
 JACOB M. MATT
 KRISTIN L. MCCANN
 FRANK L. MCCLINTICK
 ROBERT W. MCCRACKEN IV
 LYLE L. MCDANIEL, JR.
 ERIC P. MCDOWELL
 GEOFFREY J. MCKEEL
 ANDREW J. MCNULTY
 JOHN L. MEDeiros, JR.
 JOSE R. MEDINA
 CHRISTOPHER L. MEDLIN
 DOWAL E. MEGGS, JR.
 PAUL C. MERIDA
 MANUEL A. MERINO
 MARK A. MERRILL
 THOMAS B. MERRITT, JR.
 ANDREW A. MERZ
 MARK W. MICKE
 BRIAN L. MILAN
 NATHAN A. MILLER
 PAUL R. MILNE
 MICHAEL J. MONROE
 DONALD B. MOOR
 TOBY F. MOORE
 JONATHAN C. MOREL
 MICHAEL M. MOTLEY
 DAVID A. MUELLER
 BRIAN W. MULLERY
 KENNETH C. MUSIAL
 BARTON K. NAGLE
 KIRK B. NELSON
 BRIAN J. NEWBOLD
 JASON L. NICKERL
 THOMAS B. NOEL
 BRENDAN G. O'CONNELL
 CHRISTOPHER P. O'CONNOR
 JONATHAN R. OHMAN
 WILLIAM C. OLIVER
 DAVID A. OLSON
 JEFFREY M. ONEILL
 JEFFREY M. OPSITOS
 NEIL J. OWENS
 BENJAMIN J. PAPPAS
 RICHARD A. PARADISE
 TEAGUE A. PASTEL
 LANCE G. PATRICK
 TOBY D. PATTERSON
 TERRY M. PAUSTENBAUGH
 CORNELL A. PAYNE
 LESLIE T. PAYTON
 CHRISTOPHER M. PERRINE
 FORD C. PHILLIPS
 JOSEPH M. PLENZLER
 JEFFREY S. POOL
 TIMOTHY R. POWLEDGE
 KEVIN J. PRINDIVILLE
 THOMAS R. PRZYBELSKI
 STEVEN D. PUCKETT
 RORY B. QUINN
 MICHAEL P. QUINTO
 MARK A. RAFFETTO
 OMAR J. RANDALL
 DANIEL N. REBER
 CHESTER T. REESE
 JABARI J. RENAU
 JEREMY Y. REYEU
 BRIAN T. RIBBOUT
 JOSHUA A. RIGGS
 WILFRED RIVERA
 MICHAEL J. ROACH
 MARK C. ROBINSON
 PATRICK R. ROBINSON
 ADRIAN B. ROMERO
 ERIC S. ROTH, JR.
 WILLIAM H. ROTHERMEL
 RICHARD A. ROYSE
 LEE M. RUSH
 BRIAN E. RUSSELL
 RAUL L. SALCIDO
 ALFRED M. SANCHEZ
 DENNIS A. SANCHEZ
 DOUGLAS C. SANDERS
 MARK K. SAUER
 KURT J. SCHILLER
 WILLIAM F. SCHOEN, JR.
 SAMUEL C. SCHOOLFIELD
 LOUIS M. SCHOTEMEYER
 DEAN A. SCHULZ
 GREGORY G. SELMAN
 ANDROY D. SENEGAR
 BRIAN P. SHARP
 RYAN P. SHEEHY
 JAMES L. SHELTON, JR.
 LADD W. SHEPARD
 WILLIAM SHERIDAN IV
 MATTHEW R. SIMMONS
 DANIEL B. SMITH
 TRES C. SMITH
 ROBERT B. SOTIRE II
 MARTIN V. STARTA
 ERIC I. STEFANYSHYN
 GARRY T. STEFFEN
 MICHAEL W. STEHLE
 JEFFREY R. STEVENSON

WILLIAM C. STOPHEL
 JARROD W. STOUTENBOROUGH
 ROBERT A. SUCHER
 BYRON D. SULLIVAN
 JAMES G. SWEENEY
 DANIEL E. TARBUTTON
 JAMES T. TAYLOR
 DANIEL W. TEMPLE
 GARY W. THOMASON
 ANDREW J. THOMPSON
 ERIC N. THOMPSON
 JEREMY S. THOMPSON
 KELSEY R. THOMPSON
 BRADFORD W. TIPPETT
 KEITH H. TOPEL
 STEWART T. UPTON
 SCOTT E. VASQUEZ
 CHARLIE R. VONBERGEN
 BRIAN J. VONHERBULIS
 DANIEL C. WAGNER
 WILLIAM F. WAHLE
 STEVEN O. WALLACE
 RANDAL M. WALSH
 LAWRENCE M. WALZER
 CHRISTIAN M. WARD
 ROBERT S. WASHINGTON
 ROBERT S. WEILER
 ANDREW J. WEIS
 SIDNEY R. WELCH
 BRADLEY C. WESTON
 DON M. WHITE
 WILLIAM T. WILBURN, JR.
 MICHAEL B. WILLIAMS
 PHILIP A. WILLIAMS
 CHARLES P. WINCHESTER
 ERIC S. WOLF
 MATTHEW J. WORSHAM
 JUDY J. YODER
 ERIC W. YOUNG
 THOMAS G. ZIEGLER, JR.
 WAYNE R. ZUBER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
 TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MA-
 RINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

PAUL M. ABOUD
 ADRIAN S. ADAME
 BENJAMIN S. ADAMS
 JOSEPH K. ADAMS, JR.
 MATTHEW J. AGNOLI
 TOM E. AGUILAR
 ANTONY E. ALEXANDER
 STEVEN ALFONSO
 JAMES G. ALLEN
 KELLY B. ALLEN
 MICHAEL D. ALLEN
 STEVEN C. ALLSHOUSE
 ROBERT C. ALMENDAREZ
 CHRISTOPHER D. ALVINO
 ANDREW M. ARANDA
 JUSTIN K. ARCHIBALD
 DAVID ARJONA
 JASON C. ARMAS
 CHERYL A. ARMSTRONG
 JOHN P. ARNOLD
 ERIK L. AUBEL
 GREGORY H. AVEDEKIAN
 WILLIAM V. BACKLUND III
 JOHN BACON, JR.
 SHAWN S. BAHK
 BARET L. BAILEY
 CARL A. BAILEY
 MARK E. BAILEY
 CHRISTOPHER M. BAKER
 KATHRYN E. BAKER
 PETER A. BAKER
 GABRIEL M. BALCH
 JENNIFER P. BALLARD
 JEREMIAH S. BARBRE
 JASON T. BARNES
 GEORGE R. BARTIMUS
 PAUL T. BARTOK
 NATHAN P. BASTAR
 ANDREW J. BAUCHER
 BENJAMIN J. BEACH
 MICHAEL S. BEACH
 STANLEY B. BEDNAR
 IVAN L. BEJARANO
 SHON S. BELCHER
 CHARLES F. BENBOW
 NOAH K. BENGUR
 LYNN W. BERENDSEN
 JUSTIN P. BETZ
 HENRY G. BILLINGS, JR.
 RICHARD A. BIRT II
 MICHAEL D. BLAKEMORE
 JEFFREY C. BLAND
 CHARLES B. BLANKENSHIP
 CHRISTOPHER G. BLOSSER
 PAUL B. BOCK
 BRETT A. BOHNE
 NUTE A. BONNER
 JOSHUA C. BOOMER
 PETER T. BORSAY
 CHRISTOPHER E. BOURBEAU
 ZAHER BOUZA
 ROBERT L. BOYCE III
 ROBERT D. BRADLEY
 RYAN T. BRANNON
 BRIAN K. BRISCOE
 CASEY M. BROCK
 CHRISTOPHER R. BROUWER
 LANCE E. BROWN
 ARTHUR Q. BRUGGEMAN
 THEODORE A. BUCIERKA

KEITH W. BUCKLEW
 JOSHUA A. BULLARD
 JASON R. BURGAN
 SCOTT R. BURLISON
 SHANE J. BURSAE
 ALFRED L. BUTLER IV
 JACOB D. BUTZ
 LAUCLIN D. BYRD IV
 ARMANDO D. CABRALES
 BRYAN M. CADDEN
 MARC W. CALDWELL
 JAMES D. CALLICOAPT
 CARIN O. CALVIN
 JULIET H. CALVIN
 SHAWN M. CAMPBELL
 BETHANNE CANERO
 SHAWN A. CAPPS
 TRAVIS D. CARLSON
 DANIEL W. CAROFFINO
 EMMANUEL T. CARPER
 DOUGLAS N. CARR
 JOSE L. CASTILLO
 MARCELO B. CASTRO
 NATHAN B. CHANDLER
 JESUS A. CHAPAGARCIA
 JOHN T. CHARLTON II
 KENNY K. CHASE
 TUNG T. CHAU
 BENJAMIN J. CHAVEZ
 CARLOS CHAVEZ
 NEAL J. CHERAMIE, JR.
 LORENA CHILDERS
 JOSHUA C. CHRISMON
 RYAN E. CHRIST
 TRAVIS E. CHRISTENSEN
 JEFFREY J. CISEK
 JASON K. CLARK
 NICOLE M. CLARK
 MATTHEW B. CLINGER
 ZACHARY A. COATES
 GARRY M. COLBERT
 AMANDA A. COLEMAN
 LEE G. COLLINS
 CRAIG J. COLTEY
 DARREL F. COMMANDER
 JEFFREY A. COMPTON
 ANTONIO M. CONTRERAS
 BENJAMIN G. COOK
 DUSTIN B. COOK
 THEODORE D. CORBEILL, JR.
 RICARDO J. CORDEROTORRES
 LEROY R. CORTERREAL
 DAVID J. COTE
 SEAN P. COX
 ZANE K. CRAWFORD
 HEATHER M. CRENSHAW
 KEITH S. CRIM, JR.
 DORIAN L. CROCKER
 BENJAMIN L. CROES
 TODD A. CRUMBO
 EDWARD F. CUNNINGHAM IV
 SAHUEL M. DABNEY
 SALEH P. DAGHER
 JASON N. DALE
 SHAWN H. DALEY
 ANTHONY G. DAVIS
 JEREMY H. DAVIS
 PHILLIP B. DAVIS
 JIMMY W. DEAN
 ROBERT C. DEIS
 LOUIS T. DELLA III
 CHRISTOPHER J. DENARDO
 DAVID R. DENIAL
 NATHAN N. DENSFORD
 ARTURO J. DERRYBERRY
 JARROD A. DEVORE
 GABRIEL L. DIANA
 ERIC S. DICKERSON
 JOHN B. DIEFENBACH
 NICHOLAS J. DIGUIDO
 EDWIN B. DILLARD, JR.
 JOSEPH R. DIMAMBRO
 JONATHAN S. DISBRO
 DAVID W. DODGE
 ORONDE S. DOMINIQUE
 ALXA R. DONES
 GREGORY G. DONO
 ANGELA S. DOTSON
 JAMES P. DOYLE
 TIMOTHY R. DRIESLEIN
 JASON T. DUKE
 ANDREW M. DURNING
 ROBERT M. DYKMAN
 WILLIAM B. EASTER
 BRETT H. EBERHARDT
 TIMOTHY B. EGAN
 MAJDI M. ELAHWAL
 DAVID M. ELLIOTT
 JON S. ERSKINE
 EDWIN A. ESPINET
 ALEXANDER X. ESPINOZA
 CHRISTOPHER Z. ESREY
 PHILLIP A. ESTRELLA
 MELVIN K. EURING
 CAMERON P. EVANS
 JAMAHL K. EVANS
 THOMAS H. EVANS
 DOMINIC I. EWERS
 SALLY A. FALCO
 JESSE M. FALERIS
 JASON T. FALVENE
 ANDREW L. FANNING
 SEAN C. FAY
 CHRISTIAN R. FELDER
 DALE R. FENTON
 MICHAEL E. FEQUQUAY
 AARON F. FISHER

DANIEL S. FIUST
 JOHN V. FLANAGAN
 JAMES D. FLEMING
 JULIAN X. FLORES
 GEORGE J. FLYNN III
 SEAN C. FLYNN
 CHAD G. FOLEY
 DAVID W. FORBELL
 SEAN M. FORESTER
 GARRY L. FRANCIS II
 DANIEL B. FRANK
 JOSEPH F. FRESHOUR
 JAMES C. FULLER, JR.
 BRADLEY N. FULTZ
 THOMAS D. FUSS
 JOHN L. GALLAGHER IV
 BLAIR J. GARNER
 ROMMUELLE E. GATONGAY
 TODD P. GAY
 BETTINA L. GEHRIS
 ORLANDO GIARRATANO
 THOMAS J. GIBBONS
 JOSHUA B. GIBBS
 RAYMOND N. GILETA
 DOUGLAS A. GIVEN
 FRED GLENCAMP III
 JONATHAN C. GLOVER
 SEAN D. GOBIN
 JERRY A. GODFREY
 CHARLES D. GODWIN, JR.
 RUSSELL G. GOGAN
 ALBERT J. GOLDBERG
 DANIEL O. GOMES
 EVERETT M. GOOD
 MELISSA I. GORDON
 BRANDON J. GORMAN
 CAINE M. GOYETTE
 MATTHEW J. GRABOWSKI
 ANDREW J. GRAHAM
 EDWARD P. GRAHAM
 MICHAEL R. GREENE
 INDIGO M. GREGORY
 ERIC D. GRENERT
 CHAD R. GRIMMETT
 MATTHEW J. GRUBA
 ADAM C. GUGELMEYER
 DOUGLAS L. HACKL
 GARRETT W. HAGER
 MATTHEW L. HAGER
 JAMES D. HALE
 DONALD P. HALL II
 RICHARD D. HALLETT
 BRADLEY W. HANSON
 MACKALYNN J. HARMON
 RYAN F. HARRINGTON
 ADRIAN E. HASKAMP
 JONATHAN L. HAYES
 JOHN D. HECKER
 WILLIAM A. HEPTY
 TERRY W. HEICHELBECH
 AARON E. HEISINGER
 LEE W. HEMMING
 JOSE H. HERNANDEZ, JR.
 OMAAR HERNANDEZ
 PAUL M. HERZBERG
 RONALD A. HESS
 MICHAEL S. HESTER
 BRAD A. HIGGINS
 JUSTIN J. HILL
 COLE B. HODGE
 BENJAMIN J. HODGINS
 BRETT D. HOHMANN
 TYLER J. HOLLAND
 ROGER A. HOLLIDAY, JR.
 GEOFFREY M. HOLLOPETER
 WILLIAM J. HORTON
 JOSEPH C. HORVATH
 DONALD L. HOTCHKISS
 CHRISTINE M. HOUSER
 JONATHAN C. HOWARD
 THOMAS W. HUDSON
 MELVIN L. HUNGATE, JR.
 ALFRED E. HUNTER
 CHRISTIAN P. HUP
 CHARLES E. INGOLD, JR.
 JAMES K. ISAACS II
 BROGAN C. ISSITT
 WILLIAM D. IVINS III
 JOSHUA M. JABIN
 WILLIAM T. JACOBS
 PAUL D. JARR
 JAMES S. JERABEK IV
 JASON T. JEWELL
 ADAM L. JOHNS
 CHRISTOPHER I. JOHNSON
 KELLY M. JOHNSON
 NICKOLI C. JOHNSON
 JASON R. JOHNSTON
 CHRISTOPHER A. JONES
 CHRISTOPHER E. JONES
 COURTNEY D. JONES
 DANTE A. JONES
 JACOB M. JONES
 CHRISTOPHER A. JULIAN
 KALLE G. KANGAS
 CLINTON C. KAPPEL
 AMELIA B. KAYS
 JOHN P. KEARNS
 KIM T. KEEFER
 SEAN P. KEENAN
 ANDREW W. KELEMEN
 PETER V. KEOUGH
 CATALINA E. KESLER
 DAVID S. KIM
 SUNGWOOK KIM
 DANIEL R. KING
 DAVID A. KING

KARL M. KINGRY
CHRISTOPHER P. KLEMPAY
JOSHUA B. KLING
JAMES F. KNIPE
DANIEL P. KNOTSON
DAVID A. KOBIE II
JASON P. KOECK
ANDREW J. KONICKI
CRISTA D. KRAICS
DANIEL E. KREHLING
ANGELA G. KUHN
STEPHEN R. KULAS
MATTHEW J. KUTILEK
ANDREW L. LADNER II
KAVAN O. LAKE
KEVIN R. LAMPINEN
JOSEPH B. LANDGRAF III
ALLEN T. LAPINSKY
KENNETH A. LARETTO
JARED A. LAURIN
BRYAN E. LEAHY
THOMAS B. LEE
DOUGLAS H. LEHTINEN
KEVAN D. LEWIS
CHARLIE LICHTENBERGER
BRIAN A. LIONBARGER
GREGORY A. LIZAK
KIP M. LODER
JOSEPH P. LOGAN
HOWARD L. LONGWELL
BRAULIO LOPEZ
CHARLES W. LOWRY, JR.
NICHOLAS J. LOZAR
ERIC C. LUM
SERGIO H. LUNA III
MICHAEL R. LUPIENT
MICHAEL F. LYNCH
RYAN A. LYNCH
KEVIN T. LYSTER
ROBERT A. MACDOUGALL, JR.
DANIEL J. MACSAI
JAMES H. MADRINAN
JAY C. MALLORY II
SAMUEL B. MALONE
JASON MALONEY
TIMOTHY P. MALONEY
RUBEN E. MARIN
ANGELA L. MARKEY
MARK A. MARKLEY
PETER B. MARKS
RICHARD D. MARSHALL, JR.
ERIC J. MARTINDALE
ISAAH G. MARTINEZ
ADAM C. MARTZKE
MONICA A. MARUSCEAC
CHEDDY W. MATTHEWS
JUSTIN W. MAY
DONALD R. MAYO, JR.
JOSHUA J. MAYORAL
CHRISTOPHER B. MAYS
CHRISTY L. MCCUTCHAN
CRAIG W. MCDERMOTT
CHARLES T. MCDONALD
SEAN P. MCGEE
RICHARD P. MCKENZIE
DAX R. MCLENDON
JOSEPH J. MCMENAMIN
TAVIS C. MCNEE
JOSEPH A. MCNULTY
MATTHEW T. MCSORLEY
MICHAEL S. MCTEAGUE
SHAUN M. MEALING
FRANK P. MEASE, JR.
JOE M. MEDEROS
JENNIFER L. MEEK
LUIS F. MEJIA
ANTHONY M. MERCADO
CARLOS A. MERCADO
MICHAEL J. MIKLOS
SHAWN A. MILLER
TIMOTHY M. MILLER
TODD A. MILLER
SANTIAGO MIRAMONTES
KEVIN A. MISNER
NORMAN A. MITCHELL III
JON D. MOHLER
SAMUEL MONK
MARK L. MONTGOMERY
ISAAC D. MOORE
NATALIE E. MOORE
SEAN R. MOORE
JOHN C. MORGAN
RICHARD E. MORITZ
KENNETH W. MORROW
WILLIAM J. MURPHY II
STEPHEN L. MUSICK
CHAD E. NAGEL
SUMMER J. NAGY
CAROLYN M. NELSON
LINDSAY M. NELSON
BRANDON H. NEWELL
FRANKLIN S. NEWTON
MARK D. NICHOLSON
RANDALL L. NICKEL, JR.
ANDREW S. NIX
JAMES W. NOLAN
KYLE M. NUNEMACHER
RUSSELL G. OBAR
CHAD A. OBRIEN
JOSEPH E. OCONNOR
DAVID A. ODELL
DEAN R. OLTMAN
RYAN J. OROZCO
SANFORD C. ORRICK
ANDREW M. OSBORN
NATHAN I. OSBRACH
MOMI PAGADOR

MICHAEL P. PARROTT
PAGE C. PAYNE
MATTHEW R. PEARCE
PETER M. PEDRAZA
JAYSON L. PERGANDE
LUKE A. PERNOTTO
BRECK L. PERRY
ARIC J. PETERSON
DOUGLAS K. PETERSON
MATTHEW H. PETERSON
THOMAS L. PETERSON
CHRISTIAN J. PFEFFER
PAUL D. PFEIFER
JEFFREY M. PHELPS
MARADA D. PHILLIPS
JAMES N. PHILPOT
ZEBULON C. PHILPOTT
ERIC W. PICKELSIMER
RACHAEL E. PITTS
DUANE D. POELLNITZ
RUSSELL E. POUND
JUSTIN D. POWELL
THANOUSONE PRAVONGVIENGGHAM
PETER F. PRIESTER
JAMES J. PRUDEN
THOMAS G. PUCKETT
CHAD J. PUFF
MARC A. PULLEY
COREY L. PULLIG
LEONARD H. PUSSINEN, JR.
MATTHEW W. QUIGLEY
SEAMUS M. QUINN
ERIC R. RAASCH
JOHN J. RADAASY IV
TROY REES
CRAIG Q. REESE
TRAVIS T. REEVES
JAMES E. REGAN
ANNA V. REVES
JUAN L. REYNA
JAMES V. REYNOLDS
RYAN A. REYNOLDS
KEITH W. RICHARDSON
SHAWN A. RICKRODE
ZACHRY S. RIGGLE
MATTHEW T. RITCHEE
DAVID N. ROBERTS
NATHAN M. ROBERTS
BENJAMIN A. ROBLES
MICHAEL C. ROBY
ROBERTO RODRIGUEZ
PAULINA S. ROJAS
MATTHEW C. ROMOSER
JEFFREY M. ROPER
JULIAN D. ROSEMOND
KIM R. ROSSITER
KENNETH K. ROSSMAN
JAMES M. ROWLETT III
BENJAMIN B. ROY
JESSE RUBIO
CHRIS RUGE
KEVIN A. SAMUELS
JUSTIN M. SANDERS
ELIEZER SANTANA, JR.
KURTIS L. SARGENT
LARRY L. SATTERFIELD
DAVID E. SAUNDERS
TROY M. SAYLER
JONATHAN D. SCHAAFSMA
LAURAL T. SCHINDLER
LAURA A. SCHMITZ
BENJAMIN M. SCHNEIDER
MARK D. SCHOUTEN
MARK C. SCHUMACHER
ROBERT D. SCHWAAB
RAYMOND J. SCOTT, JR.
ROBERTO SCRIBNER
MICHAEL S. SEELY
ARNOLD B. SELVIDGE
SCOTT G. SHADFORTH
THOMAS F. SHORT
CHARLES S. SIEDLECKI, JR.
THOMAS A. SIKORA
CHRISTINE M. SILVA
MARK J. SIMPSON
WILLIAM H. SIMS IV
MATTHEW J. SINNOTT
PATRICK J. SISE
RAY B. SLABBEKORN
ARLON D. SMITH
THEODORE R. SMITH
TIMOTHY J. SMITH
AARON C. SMITHLEY
DAVID P. SNIPES
RICHARD A. SOFGE
ALAN J. SOLIS
JOHN F. SOTO, JR.
RICHARD M. SOUTHWORTH
BROOKE J. SPEERS
LESLIE M. STANSBERRY
ERIC N. STARR
PAULEEN D. STEVENS
RICHARD J. STINNETT, JR.
ERVIN R. STONE
DANIEL C. STONER
CHRISTOPHER D. STORY
THERESA F. STREBEL
GEORGE A. SWEETLAND, JR.
BENJAMIN T. TAGGART
BRANDON R. TATTERSALL
GLEN W. TAYLOR
LE E. TAYLOR
JOHN A. TEMPONE, JR.
PAUL L. TETZLOFF
DUANE R. THOMPSON
RYAN E. THOMPSON
BRENT A. THORUD, JR.

DANIEL L. THUNEN
LUIS M. TIGLAO
ANTHONY A. TIRELLI
CHRISTOPHER R. TIMMS
MIGUEL J. TOLEDANO
CHRISTOPHER M. TOMS
STEVEN E. TORGERSON
CHRISTOPHER M. TOUSANT
DAVID M. TRAXLER
AN K. TRUNG
CHRISTOPHER S. TSIRLIS
DEBORAH TURLEY
NICHOLAS A. TURNER
JUSTIN K. TWIGG
ANDREW J. TYSON
JACLYN N. URSO
RICHARD D. VALLEE
MIGUEL A. VALLEPORTILLO
JEFFREY VANBOURGONDEN
ALEXANDER J. VANSTON
HENRY A. VANWINKLE
DAVID J. VENETTOZZI, JR.
KIMBERLY A. VERHEGGE
ADAM VILLALPANDO
JON K. VONSEGGERN
ANNA M. VOYNE
BRIAN D. VUKELIC
BENJAMIN P. WAGNER
ETHAN D. WAITE
CLIFFORD C. WAKEMAN
ROBERT J. WALKER
STEVEN L. WALKER
WILLIAM R. WALLACE
SCOTT W. WARMAN
NICHOLAS G. WARREN
PAUL M. WEBBER
DANIEL P. WEBSTER
RYAN P. WELBORN
LIZETTE G. WELCH
JOSHUA A. WELLS
SCOTT J. WERT
DANIEL W. WHITE
ROBERT F. WHITE, JR.
BRAD E. WHITED
NEIL D. WHITNEY
JAMES Y. WHITTAKER
MICHAEL W. WIEDL
STEPHEN F. WILDST, JR.
JEREMY S. WILKINSON
MICHAEL P. WILLIAMS
PATRICK S. WILLIAMS
ROBERT G. WILLIAMS
JOHN D. WILSON
MARSHALL N. WIMBERLY III
JOSHUA D. WINFREY
JUSTIN R. WIRTH
ARON K. WISHERD
RICHARD H. WITT III
MARLA J. WOHLFELD
LUCAS M. WOOD
JAMES P. WOODARD
DAVID E. WRIGHT
SEAN B. WRIGHT
MICHAEL D. WYRSCH
CHRISTOPHER R. YANITY
SHAYNE P. YENZER
TAYLOR N. YOUNG
RICHARD V. YUDT, JR.
JAY M. ZARRA
DEREK C. ZEIGLER
MANUEL O. ZEPEDA
RICHARD M. ZJAWIN

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

JEFFREY K. HAYHURST

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant commander

STEVEN D. ELIAS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

BRADLEY S. HAWKSWORTH

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUALS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE REGULAR NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be commander

AMY R. GAVRIL

To be lieutenant commander

GRANT A. KIDD

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

STEVEN L. ARGIRIOU
PATRICIA N. BEYER
CHRISTINE R. BOSAU
MICHAEL E. JONASSON

THOMAS A. MONHEIM
CARL J. TIERNEY
ADAM E. TOREM

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUALS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531(A) AND 716:

To be major

RICHARD C. ALES
DEREK C. UNDERHILL

IN THE COAST GUARD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203(A):

To be captain

PHILLIP F. BROOKING

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUALS FOR APPOINTMENT AS PERMANENT COMMISSIONED REGULAR OFFICERS IN THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD IN THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 14, U.S.C., SECTION 211:

To be lieutenant commander

IVAN R. MENESES

To be lieutenant

WILLIAM A. SCHULZ