

Would the Chair announce the business for the day.

#### RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

#### MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 4:30 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The Senator from Louisiana.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I wish to speak for up to 15 minutes, and I may extend my time as the debate goes.

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

#### FEMA FUNDING

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I wish to follow up on the remarks of Leader REID by reminding everyone how unfortunate but in some ways necessary this situation is.

This whole debate, in my view, is worth having. It is unfortunate it is so close to the end of the year because the Senate actually offered a bill, as the Presiding Officer may remember, earlier in September to try to avoid getting to this last minute. But this whole controversy started just a few days after Hurricane Irene had raked the east coast and wreaked havoc from North Carolina, through Connecticut, into Vermont and New Hampshire, and people are still reeling. The way this controversy started was Representative CANTOR said: Before we can provide help, we need to find an offset in the budget. In other words, before we can help the victims of Irene—the thousands of homes that were flooded, the electrical wires on the ground, the businesses flooded out—we have to go to Washington and find a program to cut. I strongly objected then, and I have objected every day since then to that Cantor doctrine. So this is an argument and a debate worth having.

This could have been completely avoided if, the day after, Representative CANTOR, with all the outcry from his own district and newspapers around the country, many of which editorialized against that position, would have just said: I am sorry, I made a mistake. And I have had to say that in my political career: I am sorry, I made a mistake. But instead of saying that, he doubled down, and he doubled down on the backs of people from Pennsylvania, to New York, and actually to Louisiana and Mississippi because it is our projects that have been stopped for the last 6 weeks. FEMA, as far as Louisiana is concerned, was out of money 6 weeks ago.

This is what the Cantor doctrine looks like to a very clever cartoonist. I am going to put this up in my office and keep it forever. It says:

Welcome to the Republican disaster relief hotline. At the tone, please tell us the emergency and how you plan to offset the cost of your rescue.

Here is Grandmother sitting on the roof, with her little cat on the chimney, with her television and her cane, calling FEMA.

I am the appropriations chair of this committee, as my colleagues know. It is a good thing I am chairing this appropriations committee because I happen to know a lot about disaster relief, having to lead the effort for the gulf coast in the wake of Katrina, Rita, Gustav, and Ike. This is not a little matter, as some of the press reported over the weekend. I have read most of the editorials from coast to coast. Some have written: Why is Congress arguing? This is such a minor matter. I don't think the \$40 billion it took to rebuild the gulf coast is a minor matter, and I don't think any taxpayer in America would think \$40 billion is a minor matter.

This Cantor doctrine must be rejected. I am not the only one who believes this. There are wonderful articles and editorials in papers all across the country. I am going to read some of them today. I am so glad people were working through the weekend and focusing on this debate.

From Colorado, the Denver Post writes:

... and some Members of Congress are so bent on budget cutting—

They are referring to the Republicans, of course—

that they happily seize the opportunity to demand concessions, despite the larger impact on our struggling economy. In this case, it is demanding that money for the Federal Emergency Management Agency to provide emergency disaster assistance to communities hit by flood, fire, and other manner of natural disasters, be offset by comparable cuts to the Federal budget. Demanding such offsets is unprecedented in terms of emergency relief, and it has again manufactured the prospects of a shutdown. To be clear, we are not supporting a blank check—

And neither am I. I have been an appropriator since I was 23 years old. I am 56. I understand balanced budgets and debt limits and curbing government spending. I have been a part of those efforts. The last time we had a balanced budget, a Democrat was in the White House—Bill Clinton—as the Presiding Officer knows. We understand there is no such thing as a free lunch or a blank check, and we are going to pay for these disasters, but we don't have to pay for them while Grandmother is on the roof. We can figure out how to pay for it later and send help to her now.

The article goes on to say:

... but we think any near-term spending cuts are best dealt with by the super committee as opposed to a symbolic standoff that sends ripple effects beyond Washington.

This is the Brattleboro Vermont Reformer:

Though individuals eligible for Federal disaster aid and State and city governments recouping emergency response costs are still receiving funds, projects dating back as far as Hurricane Katrina are once again waiting for money. How did House majority leader Eric Cantor of Virginia respond? He said: "Change like this is hard."

The paper goes on to say:

However, not as hard as waiting for power lines to get restrung along the Auger Hole Road, wondering when, if ever, you will be able to move back into your waterlogged home or when your road might become passable again. Though Congress has about a week to get everything ironed out, we can expect this argument to go down to the last minute.

I wish we weren't here at the last minute. I wish to remind everyone that the Senate passed—with a bipartisan response to this, which provided the money FEMA needed without the offset—it was passed bipartisanly with 10 Republicans and all the Democrats and sent to the House. They could have passed that bill, and we would all be gone now, with FEMA replenished, set up for the next year, and the jobs program, which is really a private sector effort to create jobs in America, would be untouched and would be moving forward.

This argument started when Representative CANTOR came up with a new tea party agenda, which is for flood victims to let FEMA know what offset can be required before they are rescued.

Other newspapers throughout the country, including Pennsylvania, say:

Much of northeast Pennsylvania needs Federal assistance to recover from flooding, but two of the region's representatives—

In this case, both Republican Representatives—

offered an unacceptable condition.

They go on to say—they list the Members.

They say:

The problem isn't the Senate, which earlier had passed a bill by a positive vote that included 10 Republicans to appropriate more than \$7 billion for FEMA that handles disaster relief. That fund could run dry. The House responded with a bill that would provide \$3.7 billion, but only if two loan programs for energy development projects were rescinded.

Senator HARRY REID, they say, "goes on to offer a compromise with the House." But I guess we are in the time of no compromise and take whatever hostages you can. In this case, the tea party Republicans want to take hostage the Grandma who is on her roof asking for help.

Even the New York newspapers:

Congress shouldn't allow disaster aid for people devastated by Tropical Storm Irene to be stalled by a fight over how much is enough and how to cover the tab.

We are willing to negotiate with the House over how much. We believe our number of \$6.1 billion is not enough for the year, and I think the records will show as we move forward that I am accurate. But given the situation we are in, we don't need to fight over that

amount because if \$6.1 billion isn't enough, most certainly \$3.5 billion that the House has offered isn't enough, and we can work that out later on and that is what Leader REID has offered. But requiring an offset, particularly an offset from a program that Republicans themselves supported, that was signed into law by President Bush, and that is supported by the chamber of commerce, the National Manufacturers Association, the League of Cities, the National Conference of Mayors, and an offset that has created 40,000 jobs, that is a road I don't think we should go down.

If it is a manufacturing program today that the new Cantor doctrine requires, as one of these great articles this weekend said, maybe next time we have a disaster, we will have to offer up education programs; and the next time we have a disaster, we will have to offer up a fourth of our transportation budget; and the next time we have a disaster, we will have to offer up aid to Israel; or maybe the next time we have a disaster, we will have to offer up something else. When does the offering up stop?

The worst time to negotiate how to find funding after a disaster is when emotions are high, when people are really at their sort of emotional limit, particularly the disaster victims themselves. We want to argue and debate these things when cool heads prevail and once we get the estimates. It is hard, within a week or two or three of an emergency, to even know what those estimates are. We have to wait for the insurance adjusters to go out, for the FEMA adjusters to go out, for people to even get back to their communities to assess the damage.

Believe me, I have been through this. It was months after the aftermath of Katrina before people in my city of New Orleans and in parts of my State could even get back into their neighborhoods—months. Not days, not weeks, months. I remember people along the gulf coast having to come in on foot with chainsaws to try to get back. It took them days.

That is another reason why we do not want to have to find an offset to fund disasters. We want to do a couple things. We want to budget as carefully as we can in advance. I want to answer this argument that: Oh, well, the reason Congress is in this pickle is because they did not budget for disasters. I am going to put up a chart in a minute—if staff will grab that one for me—to show that we have budgeted for disasters. We have not budgeted as adequately as we should. This has been a problem for Democratic Presidents and Republican Presidents.

But I have to say, as chair of this committee, I have doubled the amount of money—more than doubled the amount of money—in anticipation of disasters to try to get in front of it. But no one—unless they had a crystal ball—could have predicted that 48 out of 50 States would have had disasters

this year in America. It is unprecedented. We would have had to have a crystal ball that was always right and never, ever wrong to be able to predict we would have had that many disasters.

What can we do in the future? I have offered to my colleagues—Senator BLUNT, Senator SNOWE, and others—that I will work with them in the future to get a bill that mandates that Democratic and Republican Presidents, regardless of party, would have to send to us—budgeted and paid for—at least a 10-year average of previous disasters.

But I have to say, even if we would have had that law in place—which is the best we can all collectively think of; and universities or businesses would recommend the same—we still would have underestimated this last year, and we still would have underestimated Katrina and Rita. That is why I am on the floor making this argument.

I know it is inconvenient for Members to have to come back this week. I know people wanted to be away this week to work in their districts. But this is an argument and a debate worth having. I hope our side will prevail, but if not, at least we put up the fight that I think is necessary to make the argument to the American people.

But even if we had a crystal ball and even if we had budgeted more than the \$1.8 billion we budget every year, approximately, out of Homeland Security, look what happened when Katrina and Rita and Wilma hit. This went up to \$45 billion—Katrina, Rita, and Wilma. Wilma, you will remember, was one of the storms that hit Florida. In the year before, Florida had four storms. Dennis, Ivan, Frances, and Charley hit Florida in 1 year.

I believe that is why Senator RUBIO and Senator NELSON understand the hollowness and the danger of the Cantor doctrine. Because had this doctrine been in effect when these four hurricanes hit Florida back in 2004, the people of Florida would have had to come to Congress, and before we could spend one dime to help them, we would have had to find a \$3 billion offset. Mr. President, maybe we would have gone to your State and taken the money out of your transportation program or gone to my State or gone somewhere to find \$3 billion, but we did not. We sent Florida their \$3 billion, and we will pay for it over time.

I do not know what we would have done on the gulf coast had the people of the United States enforced the Cantor doctrine, which was to find \$45 billion like that—like that—before we could have sent money to Mississippi, Alabama, Louisiana or Texas. I could go on and on and on.

One of the more disappointing positions Republicans are holding, particularly Representative CANTOR, which is very disappointing, is that we have to scramble to find offsets for Americans who are in trouble, but we can just send free money to Iraq and Afghanistan. We do not have to send an offset

to rebuild Iraq. We do not have to find an offset to rebuild Afghanistan. But we have to scramble around here and find an offset to help the people of our country.

Third point. Some of the House Members have stood and said: Senator LANDRIEU is wrong. We have offset emergency funding in the past. That is correct. We have offset emergency funding, but emergency funding is different than FEMA funding. We have emergencies such as dams break and levees break and the Corps of Engineers needs extra money. Over the course of time, we have, occasionally—because we want to be responsible with the budget when we can, and when we have time to figure it out, we most certainly can find offsets in programs that are not working as well. So we can eliminate that and push some of that money to emergency funding. We have done it in the military. We have done it for the Corps of Engineers. But if we do this, this will be the first time we have required an offset for FEMA funding in the history of our country.

I think it is a road we do not want to go down, and it can be avoided. We do not have to walk down this road. We can eliminate the offset completely. FEMA may—under the last 24 to 48 hours—be able to stretch their money through Friday. We can even accept the House number, which is the lower number. It is not going to be adequate. We are going to be back here literally in 8 weeks having the same debate. But they are hardheaded and insistent that they want to continue to have this debate week after week after week. But at least the \$3 billion will jump-start all our programs that are stalled and many of them are in my State, which is why I am spending a lot of time on this, but I am also concerned about everybody else's State. It will give us enough money to get through Thanksgiving, maybe the first of the year. It is not going to be enough for all next year.

That is a reasonable compromise. On the side of that compromise is the Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, four Governors of disaster-hit States—two Republicans and two Democrats—the National League of Cities, and the National Conference of Mayors. That is just to name a few.

There are editorials across the country from Pennsylvania to New York, to Louisiana. The Times-Picayune, my own newspaper, of which I am very proud, editorialized for this position that to require an offset before one can be rescued is not the American way. We do not require it when we declare war or disaster. We go ahead and send the troops, and we fund them later. I do not believe we want to go down this road.

So Leader REID has brought us back to try to work through it. Again, the Senate, earlier in September, passed a bipartisan resolution. The House rejected it for their own reason, insisting

that we have an offset. We are back saying that is a wrong policy to adopt. This is not the right time in America to adopt it. If we were going to adopt it, this is definitely the wrong program to eliminate. This program has created, with the private sector—this is not government jobs. These are private sector jobs that have been created. Republican leaders in the House—and I am going to read those letters for the RECORD this afternoon again—supported the program, wrote letters to the Secretary asking for this funding to be spent in their districts, and then they turn around and offer this as an offset when it is unnecessary, unprecedented, and absolutely wrongheaded.

For the legislators, the Congress men and women along the gulf coast, it is particularly disturbing. After receiving \$45 billion—Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas—after Katrina and Rita and not one penny offset while it was going on—we are all going to be paying for it for many years to come in our regular budgeting process—to then turn around and say, when the east coast needs help: Oh, no, we need to find an offset today.

That is how this argument started. I do not like to fight. I like to cooperate. I am one of nine siblings. I have two children myself. I have been happily married to my husband for 23 years. We resolve things by talking and negotiating in our home. We do not like to fight in our family.

But I have learned one thing: Some things are worth fighting for, win or lose. I have led this effort. I have been proud to lead it. I am so grateful to my colleagues on the Democratic side, both in the House and the Senate, who have spoken on this point, who have changed their schedules to support this. Win or lose, it is right to stand against the Cantor doctrine and the tea party agenda.

I guess this is where this comes from. We have never seen this before. Never have we offset a dime of FEMA funding. We have offset emergency funding, we have offset defense emergencies, Corps of Engineers emergencies, HUD community development block grant money we have offset but not FEMA.

But the Republican caucus in the House has run us right down to the wire, not willing to negotiate, not willing to even recognize the bipartisan bill we sent over there. Sometimes we say “bipartisan” around here if we have one Republican and all the Democrats. We kind of brag because we have bipartisanship. This was 10–10—Republican Senators. That is a big number today. We broke a Republican filibuster on this with 10 Republican Senators who said ERIC CANTOR was wrong. Now is not the time. We do not have to find an offset. Let's negotiate. Let's work through this. They were right. I hope they will stand strong. I hope the leadership can work this out. But, again, if we cannot, it was worth, in my view, the fight over this to say: The Cantor doctrine is dangerous for the country.

Let me just remind everyone—because I have spoken about the gulf coast—these are 48 States represented that have been hit by disasters. The only States that have been spared a natural disaster are Michigan and West Virginia. But as the Senators from Michigan will tell us, they have been experiencing their own economic disaster now for almost 6 years, an economic meltdown in Michigan. Because of the crash of the auto industry and the foreclosure disaster and the crash of some of the Wall Street banks and other banks, Michigan has been very hard hit. West Virginia is always one of our poorer States, with great assets, but they struggle all the time. So we can honestly say all 50 States are in need of help.

Why don't we help them? We have a supercommittee set up. Many of us are working hard on closing the deficit gap. We have already cut trillions, literally trillions, of dollars from this budget over the last 2 years. We have trillions more to cut and we have revenues to raise. But this time we have to find money in this budget—in this case for something that is wholly unprecedented and unnecessary—they recommend a program that is actually helping to turn around a very weak job outlook. It is creating jobs. It has created 40,000. It could create more public-private partnerships, promoting loans to auto companies that are creating new and different kinds of automobiles so we can minimize our dependence on foreign oil, we can start building again in America, we can start manufacturing again in America.

Again, it is a program—some of the newspapers reported it—Democrats support. This is a program George Bush signed into law. This is a program that Republicans and Democrats have supported. This is a program that actually works to put Americans back to work. Why would they pick this one? Why would they pick any one? But why would they pick this one? Because they wanted to pick a fight, and they knew we were not just going to say: OK, fine. So we did not pick this fight. I did not pick this fight. Representative CANTOR started it when he decided on a Cantor doctrine that would make disaster victims have to find an offset before they could be helped.

I am going to close with where I started, with this cartoon that says it all:

Welcome to the Republican disaster relief hotline. At the tone, please tell us the emergency and how you plan to offset the cost of your rescue. . . .

This is not America. We have gone too far. If this kind of government is on the tea party agenda, I suggest they remove that item for consideration. This is not the way we operate our government in the United States. We are there for people in their time of need.

We do not ask them to find an offset. We will pay for this. We are working to have our budget balanced. But we do not put this kind of pressure on tax-

paying Americans, who hardly ask us for anything. But when their home is washed away, when their business is destroyed, they expect FEMA to be there and they do not have to scramble around with their congressional delegation or their mayors or their counsel members or their local representatives to wring their hands and say: What program can we suggest Congress cut so we can get our meals today or our shelter for next week?

It is not the way we do business. I hope as Members come back tonight to talk about this, we can find a way forward, keep our government operating, and do what is right for Americans and our country.

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

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

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. LANDRIEU. 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.

Ms. LANDRIEU. There are other Members who are coming down to speak. But while I have this time, I wanted to just add a few other comments to the RECORD.

First of all, over the weekend, there were some reports and some statements made that this was a manufactured crisis by one of our colleagues on one of the big talk shows on Sunday morning.

First of all, that infers this is not a real crisis, that it was just made up because we enjoy fighting here in Washington. Nothing could be further from the truth.

This is not fun to do, but sometimes this is necessary. Sometimes it is necessary to draw sharp lines between policies because the outcome affects people's lives. Where would we have been along the gulf coast had that Cantor doctrine been in effect and used when Katrina hit the gulf coast? Instead of New Orleans and Biloxi and large portions of the gulf coast being rebuilt today, we would still probably be debating where we were going to find the money to do the work. Now, that is No. 1.

No. 2, the crisis may not be real for the whole country right now, today, as we speak on Monday, but I promise, for people in many States—and I will find this document which I have used several times in debate on the Senate floor—it is pages and pages, too numerous to mention—they are already having a crisis because these line items and numbers represent projects that have already been pink-slipped, shut down.

Government is still operating through this week, and we are going to work this out. We are not going to let the government shut down over this. I promise you—if I have anything to say about it. I might not, and my caucus

may overrule me, but it is worth arguing about to try to see if we can come to some reasonable compromise, which Leader REID has offered.

But there is already a crisis. For those who think this is manufactured, why don't they spend time this afternoon calling some of these small businesspeople who have shut down their operations?

They were building a road in Alaska, and they stopped because FEMA stopped their funding weeks and weeks ago. This isn't made up by MARY LANDRIEU. We can call Craig Fugate or anybody on this list if anyone thinks this is manufactured. They have stopped their projects because FEMA technically ran out of money months ago. They are operating on fumes. They stopped paying for all of their regular work that was going on rebuilding lots of places in America so they could give out their emergency aid to the east coast. They had no choice because we didn't give them enough money to make it through the year.

I sent a letter to the leadership on this issue months ago because I know this; I am the chair of the committee. They keep saying to me: Senator, we are running out of money. I have been saying this—and I will present letters for the RECORD. Anyone who follows this knows this is true. This is not a manufactured crisis.

This whole issue started when Representative CANTOR decided that the way to fix this problem was to cut something in the budget and have to offset something in order for us to move forward, and then the gears stopped. It was like he just threw a wrench in the gears. Everything was going along quite smoothly.

I know the American people are tired of the fighting and the name calling. I am, proudly, a centrist Democrat. I am still proud to say that. I have negotiated on probably every major deal that has been done—or compromised. I have been a part of almost every one for the 15 years I have been here. Some people don't like that about me, but I think that is good, and I am proud of it.

I most certainly am not one of the ones who like to start a partisan brawl just for the heck of it. This is an important principle. The principle is this: Should Americans have to scramble to find offsets while the water is rising and the wind is blowing, when we don't require the same for emergencies overseas? We don't scramble to find offsets when a famine happens or a drought hits in Africa. We send money because that is what Americans do. Yet our people are calling for help at home and somehow—this is on the tea party agenda—before we can send them help we have to find an offset in Washington, an offset that everybody agrees to. Good luck.

There are very few things here that two people agree to, let alone 535. If I had to do that, Mr. President, for

Katrina and Rita, I don't know what I would have done.

We are in a crisis. It may not be for everybody in the country right now, like it could be next week if the government shuts down, which it will not. We are going to find a way forward. But for these people it has been a crisis for several months. Bridge projects are shut down, libraries are shut down, and all the workers have been sent home or told not to expect a paycheck on this project. I don't know how many people will continue to work without receiving a paycheck. Maybe some people are still doing that.

No. 2, we sent \$1.3 trillion to Iraq and Afghanistan in the last 7 years—\$1.3 trillion, not requiring one offset. Yet people in Florida are looking for help as are people in Vermont, and the Cantor doctrine says we have to find cuts in the budget.

The Senator from Florida wants to speak. I want to be accurate in this debate, so I want to correct one thing I said. I said that never before have we offset FEMA money. My staff corrected me and said that one time in history, in recent memory, we did that for a small amount of FEMA money when President Clinton was the President because the Republicans had just come into power and argued about it back then. President Clinton, to his credit, found an offset they could agree to, and they did it.

I don't think we should make this a routine exercise. It is not right for the flood victims or the taxpayers in the long run. Eventually, we will find a way to pay for these things, so let's reason together.

HARRY REID sent us a reasonable compromise. The House should focus on this and try to take this compromise—if we can. It has been worth discussing because this is going to go into law one way or the other, and we are going to be living with the consequences. Those of us on the gulf coast who are in hurricane alley—I will show this chart, and it is quite disturbing. I will put it up again.

This chart shows from 1851 to 2008. These lines represent every hurricane that has hit the lower 48. These large colored lines are Katrina, Gustav, Rita, and Ike. Most certainly, along the east coast people should know that this is just what happened. There was also a tornado chart that showed where the tornadoes hit, and there was one for the earthquakes. Every part of the country at some time experiences a disaster. We don't have to run up to Washington and gut the education programs overnight or gut our transportation programs overnight or try to call a special committee meeting to find out where we can come up with \$1 billion by Friday to send to FEMA. We send it, and then we make those decisions over time. It is the way any corporation would operate, it is the way any family would operate, and it is the way our government should operate.

Again, if we take this Cantor doctrine to its ridiculous extreme, we

would have firetrucks screaming down the street while a house is on fire, and before they turn the hose on, they would ask the family to come out and they would ask them what they should cut in the city budget before they turned on the water. We can only make reasonable assumptions about what disasters there will be—their frequency and their rate. If we go under a little bit, then we have to provide the money until we can fix it in the long run.

I am going to yield the floor. I thank the Members for engaging in this debate.

---

#### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

---

#### SMALL BUSINESS PROGRAM EXTENSION AND REFORM ACT OF 2011

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the House message to accompany H.R. 2608, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

Motion to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 2608, an act to provide for an additional temporary extension of programs under the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and for other purposes, with an amendment.

Pending:

Reid motion to concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives to the amendment of the Senate to the bill, with Reid amendment No. 656 (to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill), to provide continuing appropriations in fiscal year 2011 and additional appropriations for disaster relief in fiscal years 2011 and 2012.

Reid amendment No. 657 (to amendment No. 656), to change the enactment date.

Reid motion to refer the message of the House on the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions, Reid amendment No. 658, to change the enactment date.

Reid amendment No. 659 (to (the instructions) amendment No. 658), of a perfecting nature.

Reid amendment No. 660 (to amendment No. 659), of a perfecting nature.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 5:30 will be equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees.

The Senator from Florida is recognized.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, I want to comment before the Senator from Louisiana leaves the floor. It is kind of like we have seen this movie before. If I recall, it was Friday. The Senator from Louisiana and I were out here with this chart talking about the same thing, showing all of these paths of hurricanes and how those folks who live along the gulf and the Atlantic coast understand what natural disaster is.

We are playing with people's lives when we threaten not to fund FEMA,