[Rollcall Vote No. 141 Leg.]

YEAS—45

Alexander	Enzi	McCain
Ayotte	Grassley	McConnell
Barrasso	Hatch	Moran
Blunt	Heller	Murkowski
Boozman	Hoeven	Portman
Brown (MA)	Hutchison	Pryor
Burr	Inhofe	Risch
Chambliss	Isakson	Roberts
Coats	Johanns	Rubio
Coburn	Johnson (WI)	Sessions
Cochran	Kirk	Shelby
Corker	Kyl	Thune
Cornyn	Lee	Toomey
Crapo	Lieberman	Vitter
DeMint	Lugar	Wicker

NAYS—55

Akaka	Graham	Nelson (FL)
Baucus	Hagan	Paul
Begich	Harkin	Reed
Bennet	Inouye	Reid
Bingaman	Johnson (SD)	Rockefeller
Blumenthal	Kerry	Sanders
Boxer	Klobuchar	Schumer
Brown (OH)	Kohl	Shaheen
Cantwell	Landrieu	Snowe
Cardin	Lautenberg	Stabenow
Carper	Leahy	Tester
Casey	Levin	Udall (CO)
Collins	Manchin	Udall (NM)
Conrad	McCaskill	Warner
Coons	Menendez	Webb
Durbin	Merkley	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Mikulski	Wyden
Franken	Murray	
Gillibrand	Nelson (NE)	

The amendment (No. 626), as modified, was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BENNET). On this vote, the yeas are 45, the nays are 55. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is rejected.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I wish to address the Senate for about 6 or 7 minutes on a trade issue that normally I would be offering an amendment on. I am not going to offer an amendment during this debate because I think it is very important we move forward with this legislation so, hopefully, the President will stop moving the goalposts and send to the Senate Panama, Colombia, and South Korea.

But the reason I address the issue of the general system of preferences is because, quite frankly, I am sick and tired of a lot of nations—that may not be considered developed yet but advanced very rapidly in the last 20 years—taking advantage of our GSP system. I do not mind them taking advantage of our GSP system, but what irritates me is a lot of times in WTO negotiations, they are the very same countries that are finding fault with the United States and Europe not giving enough on agricultural issues, as an example, at the very same time these countries have very high tariffs on our products getting into their country, when they get, under GSP, their products into our country duty free.

So, Mr. President, I want you to know I appreciate the fact we are finally debating the merits of trade legislation.

Most people agree that one way we can help our economy is by opening and expanding markets for American-made products. I look forward to the President, as I just said, sending us the free-trade agreements. In the meantime, much of the discussion has centered on the bill before us, the GSP and the Trade Adjustment Assistance Program.

While it is important for us to have a discussion on the merits of TAA, I do not want my colleagues to overlook the significance of the underlying bill. This bill extends the general system of preferences. This program provides one-way—and I want to emphasize—duty-free access to U.S. markets. So over a period of several decades, we have been awfully good to a lot of countries that we think we ought to help and we have been helping.

The basic principle, then, behind the GSP is to provide certain goods made in developing countries with preferential market access to the United States in the form of this duty-free status. The intention is to help spur economic growth in developing nations.

I support the premise that we can help developing countries by promoting trade. But I can also tell you that our patience is getting very thin with some of those countries, particularly when we see them not reciprocating in a way that they have the capability of reciprocating. Our trade relations, however, should increasingly be based upon reciprocity by which other countries will provide the same open access to U.S. exports. In other words, as those countries become more developed, we need to require that they move toward operating on a level playing field with the United States.

Congress needs to take, then, a hard look at GSP and scrutinize whether it is helping accomplish the U.S. trade agenda. I think we would find some of these countries coming up short. In another environment of discussing trade, I would be taking a different approach: that we would send a clear signal to some of these countries of our impatience, and they are going to have to graduate off GSP. If other nations believe they will always enjoy GSP, then what incentives do they have to open their markets to U.S. goods? That is why we ought to very much advance the system of graduating off GSP with some of those countries.

There are nations that benefit from GSP that, quite frankly, have moved beyond what I consider to be developing countries. I continue to question why we provide preferential treatment at all to the products from countries such as Brazil and India. These countries have at times worked against the trade interests of the United States, including resistance to reducing high tariffs on U.S. exports. Both of these countries have countless products competing in the global market with U.S. products.

I am not offering an amendment, as I have already said, to this GSP bill, not because I do not think my position is good but because I want to see the pending trade agreements submitted and approved by the Congress. I am not interested in raising any barriers that make that task more difficult than the President has already made it.

However, I will continue to push for reform of GSP. I urge my colleagues to take a close look at this program and consider the points I have raised in the past and I am raising right now but not raising in the form of an amendment that ought to be offered at this time.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

DISASTER RELIEF

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I know the short debate we had, just in the last couple of hours, and the votes are important, about the Senate and the House figuring out a way as to how to move forward on some of the trade agreements that are pending, and the appropriate ways to make sure American workers are not left behind, that they are actually helped and supported. And those issues are very important.

But I come to the floor today to talk again about another important issue that is pending before the Congress right now that is of extreme importance to millions and millions of Americans who are following this debate through the viewing of the procedures here on the Senate floor and in the House, and also following on Twitter and other Internet sites and opportunities on their local news and radio stations about what we are doing on disaster relief.

That is a good question because I think—and many of the Senators, Democrats and Republicans, as well, on the Senate side; particularly 10 of my colleagues from the other side who stood with us last week to say—it is time to fund the disasters in America today.

We are questioning why the House of Representatives is dragging its feet on this important issue or why the leadership, the Republican leadership in the House would be even hesitating to fund the ongoing needs of FEMA, the Corps of Engineers, the Department of Housing and Urban Development through community development block grant funding and agricultural disaster relief, which is so important.

In disasters, sometimes the pictures are focused on cities or suburbs, and it is heartwrenching.

It is heartrending.

I will show you some of those pictures now. This is Joplin, MO, earlier this year. A third of the city was literally destroyed by a group of tornadoes that came through. Some of the weather specialists said they had never clocked winds of this speed and power in the entire time they have been recording this data. They said they believe some of the winds exceeded 300 miles per hour. This is horrifying.

For those of us who shudder at category 4 and 5 hurricanes which can blow up to 150 miles an hour, the idea of 300-mile-an-hour winds is beyond our comprehension. But that is what happened in Joplin, MO.

Then, here we have the Outer Banks of North Carolina. It is heartbreaking to see the water come up on barrier islands. We have many barrier islands where people live safely. When the water rises, everybody doesn't just pick up and leave the island forever. They use their engineering and might to come up with better technology. They invest wisely. That is what we have to do to help these families.

These fires could be California, and it could also be Texas. Texas has had over 20,000 wildfires this year, I understand.

Here is a rural community. Sometimes we see pictures of these urban areas and these coastal areas that make for great television, but we don't always see farm communities underwater. This is what happened around our country. Why the Republican House leadership says that now is the time to try to find offsets for these disasters—had we insisted on that for the Katrina and Rita recoveries, the gulf coast would still be devastated. But year after year as a country, when our people have been harmed by natural disasters this National Government has come together and said: Yes, we as a nation, the United States of America—we are not a divided nation—is going to come to help our brothers and sisters who need help.

Why is this different? The House Republican leadership can't run fast enough to spend money and send money to Iraq and Afghanistan to rebuild those communities and those cities. Yet when our own people from these communities ask for help, they want to now throw up the smokescreen that we have to find an offset.

Let me give two good reasons: One, we are eventually going to have to pay for everything the Federal Government shells out. We are going to have to find the money to pay for it. But we don't have to find it this week. We don't have to find it next month. We can debate that as the process of legislation goes on. We can say yes to full funding for disasters now, not an inadequate amount of money, which is what the House wants to do.

Let me tell you how ridiculous the House position is. Not only do they want to partially fund FEMA and basically fund it for only 6 weeks, which is the extension of the continuing resolution, they want to basically say we will extend the Government of the United States to operate for 6 weeks at the current level of spending, and we will agree that FEMA can operate for another 6 weeks.

If they don't already know this, let me remind them that Governors, mayors, and county commissioners who are struggling to rebuild communities after disasters such as this need a little more than 6 weeks to do planning. They need a year or two sometimes to actually come out of shock, to have public meetings with people.

I have been through this and lived through this. You have to organize community meetings neighborhood by neighborhood. Sometimes in a community—let's say in Joplin—I don't know how many schools they had, but in our case out of 147 public schools in New Orleans we had 100 that were damaged beyond repair, uninhabitable. We could not decide in 4 weeks what we were going to do. We had to take a long time, and we needed to know that the Federal funding would be there. This government acted—not as quickly as I would have liked, but it acted under the prior administration.

Finally, we got the long-term funding commitments that our Governors and mayors needed—Democrats and Republicans alike—to lay down good and smart plans because they knew what they could count on. Why the House doesn't want to do that, I don't know.

Second, I have heard criticism of the Senate approach, which I am proud to lead. They say things in the press such as: Well, the Senate just picked a number out of the air.

Let me be very clear. We picked no number out of the air. The clerks of the Appropriations Committees, who are steeped and knowledgeable about what these agencies need now and what they may need in the years ahead, met and crunched the numbers. Senator REID looked at those numbers, took them down a bit to try to accommodate the anxiety on the other side of the aisle about spending too much money, and came up with a rational, reasonable number for FEMA, for agricultural relief, and for community development block grants. I think under the circumstances that is about the best we could do.

Do you know what the House of Representatives did, which makes no sense whatsoever? I hope some of the print press are listening to this so they might write this in the newspapers tomorrow. They took last year's number. These disasters are happening now. They took the number that was in the bill before the disasters happened and plugged that in, like they are doing something good for the country, and basically said: Take 6 weeks of it, and then we are out of here. We are going home for the week.

I don't take kindly to any kind of criticism that the Landrieu numbers or the Senate numbers might not be crunched or reviewed carefully enough. I have done the best review I can possibly do, and I have every confidence that the numbers I have presented to this Senate—about $6.9 billion—are as accurate an assessment I have at my fingertips to say what we are going to need in the next year.

At least I am dealing in reality. In what land do they live? This isn't about a year and a half ago; this is about now. Their number is wrong, their approach is wrong, their approach is totally insignificant and inadequate, and it is morally wrong.

I will not even ask the clerk to do a beautiful job trying to type everything we say—and sometimes it is hard to keep up—because we don't have everything written down, and I am not even going to ask them to print this in the RECORD because it is really too long. I want to read a little bit from this.

This is the whole list of projects that the Republican House leadership, with all their—I will say what it is; it is shenanigans. These are the projects they have stopped. We all know about big cities such as New Orleans and Chicago and New York. We hear about all these big cities such as Denver and Birmingham, AL, but we don't hear about cities like this so often. I will read some of them into the RECORD because these taxpayers deserve to have their cities read into the RECORD. That is where these projects are going on that the Republican leadership in the House says they don't really need the money now and they can wait. These have all been put on hold.

Here is a town I have never been to, Crooked Creek, AL. There is a public building there—a vehicle maintenance shop—that is on hold. Here are Florence, AL, and Lipscomb, AL, and Evergreen, AL. There are five pages for little towns in Arkansas that maybe don't make the front page of the New York Times or the Washington Post, but they are important communities. They are important to our country. Here is Herbert Springs. I have never heard of it, but I am sure it is a lovely place to live. They have several projects that have been held up.

I could go on and on through every State in our country—small towns and counties that have been devastated—roads, bridges, public buildings, and water-sewer control facilities.

Again, I think people at home are looking at and reviewing this debate and saying: Let me get this straight. Speaker BOEHNER and Majority Leader CANTOR rush to fund rebuilding in Iraq and Afghanistan and didn't require offsets when we went into war and this rebuilding effort. But now we have to debate for weeks and months over finding proper offsets to rebuild here?

I hope people will let their voices be heard in the next couple of days. It is very important.

We had a very important vote on the floor of the Senate last week. We don't often have bipartisan cooperation. I thanked by name the 10 Republican

Senators who helped on this effort because they said: Party politics is important, and sometimes party politics dictates the way that I should look and vote and feel, but not on this because this is disaster aid that is either going to my State—or, potentially, in Senator RUBIO's case, who knows what disasters are like in Florida. He said: It could happen, Senator LANDRIEU, and if it happens in Florida, I certainly want to come back and ask the Nation to help and not have to be engaged in a debate in finding an offset. I would rather work with my mayors and county commissioners to find a way to rebuild.

I have embellished a little bit of the conversation, but I know that is what was on his mind. He said: I can't think of what Florida would do.

Senator VITTER from Louisiana, who has been shoulder to shoulder with me in helping with our disaster recovery—we have pages. Jefferson Parish called me the other day—a Republican mayor of Jefferson Parish—and said he has $100 million in help for Jefferson Parish stopped up because of this unnecessary debate.

We have the two Senators from Maine, Ms. COLLINS and Ms. SNOWE, who most certainly felt the effects of Hurricane Irene up the east coast. We also had Senator TOOMEY from Pennsylvania whose State also received record amounts of flooding. We had Senator BLUNT from Missouri—the people of Missouri not only are desperate for FEMA money, they need agricultural help immediately, community development block grant funding, and they need Corps of Engineers funding. Is there Corps of Engineers funding in the House approach? Zero. Zero for the Corps of Engineers.

If you are representing a community that has had flooding because your levee failed or you don't have a levee and you need one or because your runoff or streams were not regulated appropriately, you most certainly don't need to call Craig Fugate. You need to call the Corps of Engineers. They are going to tell you they are out of money. We have grossly underfunded the Corps, in my view, in capital projects year after year. And, frankly, both Republican and Democratic Presidents have been guilty of underfunding the Corps of Engineers and their budgets because in the old days, when we could earmark, we would add back money to the Corps. But those days are over, A, because we are not earmarking and, B, because we are on tight constraints.

The Corps of Engineers has no emergency funding. If you are interested in protecting your communities and levees and flood control, and you vote against the Senate position, you are going to have a lot of explaining to do because even when you go home and pound your chest and say: I voted for the House number that was last year's number, there is no money there for the Corps of Engineers. So good luck explaining that to your constituents. I could not explain it to mine and remain a Senator from Louisiana.

This is an example of what some of my coastal levees look like.

The other thing we have to battle—but this is a battle for another day—is when the levees break up like this—and this is the coastal barrier—the Corps of Engineers is actually prohibited from building them better. We have had solutions for this. We are going to try to get that changed. But this is a constant battle and a big issue not just for the State of Louisiana but for the gulf coast, the eastern seaboard, and the west coast as well. So we will continue to work in that regard.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for an additional 5 minutes. I don't see anyone else on the floor wishing to speak.

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

Ms. LANDRIEU. Let me show what some of the Republican leaders who are not in the House of Representatives are saying. And we should listen to them because this is from the Governor of New Jersey, Governor Christie, a leader in the Republican Party, a conservative leader of the Republican Party. No one would accuse him of not being a strong voice for conservative philosophy. He said: Now is not the time, ladies and gentlemen in Congress, to argue for weeks and weeks or months and months about finding offsets for these disasters. Let's fund them. Let's fund them robustly. These are job-creation opportunities for our communities. It is about smart planning and being a reliable partner with the State of New Jersey and my counties. He said: Let's get about the business.

In fact, he specifically said:

> You want to figure out budget cuts, that's fine. You expect the citizens of my State to wait? They're not going to wait, and I'm going to fight to make sure that they do not. Our people are suffering now and they need support now. We need support now here in New Jersey, and that is not a Republican or a Democratic issue.

I just got off the phone with Governor Christie within the hour, and this is still his position. He said he is not backing down, and he is going to continue to give voice to this issue. I wish the Republican leaders in the House would listen to him.

We have had Republican leaders in the Senate—I named about six of them—and I want to compliment the others later on when I get back to that point.

This is what Gov. Bob McDonnell of Virginia said:

> My concern is that we help people in need. For the FEMA money that's going to flow, it's up to them on how they get it. I don't think it's the time to get into that deficit debate.

I want people to think about this. Let's say we have another hurricane season like we had—I believe it was right before Hurricane Katrina. I believe it was in 2004 that we had four hurricanes hit the State of Florida—four in 1 year. It was devastating to the State of Florida.

Does anyone think it would be the right thing to do to get the Governor of the State of Florida, the Senators of the State of Florida, the entire congressional delegation of the State of Florida and every accountant working for every county to come up to Washington and go through the Federal budget to find where they can cut, right there, that week, while the winds have just died down? Would we have to get the Florida accountants to come up here to find an offset so we could send the help to Florida?

That argument is ludicrous on its face. I wouldn't want Senator RUBIO worrying about that. I wouldn't want Senator NELSON worrying about that. I would want them comforting their people. That is what I would want to see them do because I had to do an awful lot of that. And I am sure they would do it naturally. I would want them going shelter to shelter and telling people it is going to be OK. I would want them visiting with businesspeople, pleading with them not to pick up stakes now but to invest in Florida because it can be a good place to come back to. I would want them saving their universities and working on that as well. The last thing they would need to be doing—and their staff—would be taking out a pencil and putting on their green eyeshades and going through the Federal budget to see where we could eliminate this from Colorado, with no time for hearings or oversight because we have to act now. Let's just cut out all these programs.

That is hogwash. It is ludicrous on its face. It is not the way a government should be run. It is not about conservatives or liberals; it is truly just stupidity. It makes me so angry that anyone would suggest this.

So, again, let's send the help now. We can find a way to pay for this. We are finding a way to pay for Katrina now. We do it through the ordinary budget process. We are finding a way to reduce the deficit substantially. That is what the committee of 12 is about. That is what all our debates are about. That is what the appropriations process is about. But not now.

Tom Ridge. If you don't think the Governor of Virginia is an expert on this or the Governor of New Jersey—though I think they are pretty strong public figures—how about the first Secretary of the department that oversees disaster response, Tom Ridge himself? Here is what Tom Ridge said last week when this debate started:

> Never in the history of the country have we worried about budget around emergency appropriations for natural disasters. And frankly, in my view, we shouldn't be worried about it now. We're all in this as a country. And when Mother Nature devastates a community, we may need emergency appropriations and we ought to just deal with it and then deal with the fiscal issues later on.

Thank you. That is exactly what we should be doing.

So, Mr. President, I have tried, as the leader of this committee, not to make

this a Democratic or Republican issue. I have asked and succeeded in getting 10 of my Republican colleagues to join the effort. So this isn't trying to make one party look good or one party look bad. All we want to do is help disaster victims and help the Governors and the mayors and the county commissioners who, right now, believe me, are just pulling their hair out. They have very limited tools. They are not sure what they can do.

People are angry, they are devastated, and they are shocked. Families are having to bunch in and live together. Some people are still in shelters. I have been through this nightmare. I know what they are going through. And then they have to hear from Washington that the ERIC CANTOR crowd decided now is the time for us—even though for 50 years we have been doing emergency funding—to figure out where to get offsets before we can send them help. This is no way to run a railroad, and it is no way to fund disaster assistance.

As I said earlier, this color is too pleasant—this green on this map—to really reflect what this map shows. These are all the States in the Nation that are experiencing disasters this year. For the first time in a very long time—maybe in our history—we have had Presidential disasters declared in all but two States. They are different kinds of disasters—some fire, some floods, some earthquakes—but nonetheless devastating to the communities trying to rebuild. So this isn't a Texas or Louisiana or just a west coast issue, this is an entire nation that is waiting for Congress to act and to send not just FEMA money but FEMA, the Corps of Engineers, Agriculture, and community development block grant funding. For the life of me, I cannot understand why we are having this debate at all.

Just to recap, here is the list. And I will not ask that it be submitted for the record because it is too long and comprehensive. It is very fine print of project after project that has now been stopped—stopped—because FEMA is operating on fumes. They are virtually out of money.

Now, yes, the new fiscal year for the Federal Government starts next week, but, remember, the House of Representatives only offered 6 weeks of help based on last year's reality. They are not even taking into account what actually happened. They are just saying: Well, we budgeted $2.65 billion last year; that must be good enough for this next year—not taking into account any of the realities of what I have just talked about. And by the way, you can have basically a 6-week rate—no money for the Corps of Engineers, no money for Agriculture.

Please, if you hear one thing—any of the Members of the House who are considering voting for this—please don't try to go home and explain this to your constituents because hopefully they will be smart enough by listening to this debate and understanding that you really didn't vote to help them. You voted for some philosophy that is hard for even some in your party to understand, but you did not vote to help your constituents.

One final point. People on the other side will say: Well, I voted for this $2.65 billion, and I know it is not a real number, but it is sort of enough to get everybody through, and then we will pass the regular appropriations. Mr. President, I have heard that as well. And then when the regular appropriations bills come, this money can be tucked into these bills and help will be on the way, they will say.

Well, I want to say again that 1994 was the last time this Congress passed all 13 appropriations bills on time and got them to the President's desk. So that is wishful thinking. That is not going to happen this year, no matter how hard we try, because it hasn't happened since 1994.

So don't think you can fool your people and say: Well, I voted for this, but we are going to help you through the appropriations process. I am on the Appropriations Committee. We have had a very difficult time because of all sorts of reasons in getting our process back on track. We are supposed to be finished with all of our bills in November. It is already the end of September, and we still don't have all our bills out of committee. And even if the House has their bills out of committee, getting those numbers reconciled between the House and the Senate sometimes takes months. Sometimes, Mr. President, as you know, we never get to it and we just do a continuing resolution. So there is not enough appropriations in the regular bills.

So for all the reasons I spoke of—and I will end where I started—let's fund disasters now. Let's fund the help to our people now. We are going to be here until Friday—potentially our leadership will keep us in until we get this resolved. But the Senate has made a great bipartisan effort, with Senators such as Senator BLUNT and Senator TOOMEY and Senator VITTER and the Senators from Maine and other Senators from the other side who have joined this effort.

I am asking the House: Please reconsider your position. Please fund disasters now. We will figure out the way to pay for this over time. We have already made provision for this in the negotiations that were done a month ago between the Republican and House leaders. Our people are depending on us to act.

Mr. President, again I urge my colleagues in the House, please reconsider your position. Join the bipartisan work underway in the Senate to get this job done for the people we represent and the people of our country who are truly desperate for us to act right now.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I was unavoidably detained for rollcall vote No. 139, a vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to consider H.R. 2832, a bill to extend the Generalized System of Preferences, and for other purposes. Had I been present, I would have voted yea to the motion to invoke cloture.

RECOGNIZING SOUTHEAST KENTUCKY COMMUNITY AND TECHNICAL COLLEGE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize one of Kentucky's most successful educational institutions, Southeast Kentucky Community and Technical College, SKCTC. Beginning last year, SKCTC celebrated its 50th anniversary of providing higher education in southeastern Kentucky across five full-service campuses. To commemorate the event, SKCTC's Pineville campus held an open house for over 500 high school students from the area. To highlight the school's success over the years, President Dr. W. Bruce Ayers gave a presentation of SKCTC's history to all who attended.

SKCTC's Pineville campus was originally launched in the early 1960s as a nursing school. Over the years, the school expanded its buildings and curriculum and has become the main location for many of SKCTC's medical programs.

The campus is home to about 50 percent of the school's allied health students, who are enrolled in programs such as respiratory therapy, radiologic technology, surgical technology, clinical lab technology, or one of several nursing programs to become a licensed practical nurse or a registered nurse. As a whole, SKCTC holds a remarkably high pass rate on licensing exams for graduated students—some of the medical programs maintain a pass rate of 100 percent. As a result, the majority of SKCTC students leave the school with a medical license of some kind.

The people of southeastern Kentucky are privileged to have such a reputable institution that continues to provide future generations of Kentuckians with a quality education year after year. To help celebrate this landmark occasion, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article describing the anniversary celebration at SKCTC—Pineville be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Middlesboro Daily News, Mar. 22, 2011]

SKCTC ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATED AT PINEVILLE CAMPUS

(By Lorie Settles)

PINEVILLE.—The fiftieth anniversary of Southeast Kentucky Community and Technical College (SKCTC) was commemorated at the Pineville campus on Friday with an open house for area high-school students.

Members of the faculty and staff of SKCTC Pineville welcomed nearly 500 teens on Thursday and Friday, reported Kim Ayers, the college's recruiter. The guests hailed from high schools including Jellico, Harlan Independent, Cumberland Gap, and Knox Central.