

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. As I heard the compilation from the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, it was a pretty small percentage of the bill, and I was going through the math in my head. If it was a \$60 billion bill, with a \$150 million appropriation that would have supported the disaster for the fishermen, I think that is 0.25 percent of the total of the bill—one-quarter of 1 percent. Yet somebody over on the House side had to target that and take it out and leave the fishermen high and dry while the rest all went through?

I think it is really important that we as a group stand for the fishermen and try to force some recognition in this body that the disaster they are facing is a real one.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Yes.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. It is not just the people who are fishing directly who are affected by this, it is also all of the other jobs that depend on that fishing industry that are going to be lost.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. The engine repair people, the net repair people, the folks who process the fish that are caught, the folks who sell fuel to the fishermen, the people who do maintenance on the boats—there is an entire economic ecosystem that is knocked down when the fishermen can't bring the catch home. Yes, the Senator is absolutely correct.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. And in my small State of New Hampshire, where we only have 18 miles of coastline, we have 5,000 jobs dependent on this industry. So in Rhode Island and Alaska, I am sure my colleagues have a significant number of jobs dependent on the fishing industry. What happens to those jobs if the industry doesn't survive? They are gone.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I think Alaska may actually have more coastline than Rhode Island.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I think we have 33,000 miles of coastline, not to be bragging on a coastline. But what is so important as part of this discussion—and my colleague Senator SHAHEEN has stated this—our fishermen often are not included when we think about areas of disaster. Yet, in terms of those industries, those parts of our economy that are making things happen as folks are kind of chugging along, it is our fisheries that for decades—and for centuries, as Senator WHITEHOUSE noted—have been producing good jobs and providing a source of sustenance for our families.

Alaska is in somewhat of a unique situation in that we still have so many families who rely on their fisheries for subsistence. This is not just an income source for many. For so many in rural Alaska, this means whether or not you are going to be able to eat this winter. The situation on the Yukon and on the Kuskokwim—when those rivers were shut down to fishing, we had actions of

civil disobedience, where individuals just came to the river and said: We have to put our nets in because we have to be able to feed our families. Down in the Cook Inlet region, it is not so much a subsistence lifestyle there but a commercial fishery as well as sport fishing. So sport guides who are required to be off the river cannot take that tourist who has come to Alaska for their dream fishing trip. They have to cancel that and lose their revenue, and so guides can no longer stay in place.

So Senator SHAHEEN is correct about the ripple effect to the economy. It affects all of our fishing communities and those who support them. So when we talk about disasters in areas and \$150 million that was to be split between all of these different regions and States, it is a recognition that it is quite slight in comparison to the true loss to our economies, the true loss to our families who have suffered.

Again, I appreciate the commitment we have from so many who have been impacted that we don't give up on this. We have gone through the process, we have jumped the hurdles to get the designation that is required by our government through the Secretary of Commerce. We have done that. Now the step is for Congress to provide that funding that makes the difference. It is one thing to get a disaster declaration on paper; it is another to be able to provide the relief. And I certainly intend to push until that relief is provided not only for the families in Alaska but for those who have been impacted by fisheries disasters throughout the country.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. And I will certainly join my colleague in that effort.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I thank my colleague.

With that, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

#### DATA PRIVACY DAY

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today, I join privacy advocates, industry leaders and National, State and local government officials from across our Nation in celebrating Data Privacy Day—a day to recognize the need to better secure our privacy and security in cyberspace. I am also pleased to join Senators on both sides of the aisle in cosponsoring a Senate resolution to commemorate Data Privacy Day.

In the Digital Age, Americans face new threats to their digital privacy and security as consumers and businesses alike collect, share and store more and more information in cyberspace. Data Privacy Day is an important reminder about the need to improve data privacy as we reap the many benefits of new technologies.

Last year the Judiciary Committee approved digital privacy legislation that I authored to update the Electronic Communications Privacy Act, ECPA, to improve the privacy protections for Americans' email and other

electronic communications. That bill would, among other things, require that the Government obtain a search warrant, based upon probable cause, before obtaining email and other electronic communications from a third-party service provider. When I and others in Congress authored ECPA in 1986, email was a novelty and most Americans had never heard of the Internet. Today, communication by email is commonplace and many of us store email and other electronic communications with service providers or "in the cloud" for extended periods of time.

After 3 decades, it is essential that Congress update ECPA to ensure that this critical law keeps pace with new technologies and the way Americans use and store email today. Digital privacy is important to all Americans, regardless of party affiliation or ideology. That is why when Congress first enacted ECPA, we did so with strong bipartisan support. I appreciate the willingness of House Judiciary Committee Chairman GOODLATTE to work in partnership with me to examine and update this critical privacy law. I look forward to working closely with Chairman GOODLATTE and others in Congress to update this law so that it keeps pace with the many new threats to our privacy.

I again thank and commend the many stakeholders and leaders from across the Nation who are holding events to commemorate Data Privacy Day. I look forward to working with them and with Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle, in both Chambers, to enact reforms to the Electronic Communications Privacy Act.

#### TRIBUTE TO JUDGE CHARLES ROMANI, JR.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I would like to acknowledge recently retired Illinois Judge Charles Romani, Jr., who served on the bench for 30 years in Illinois' third circuit. Among many achievements over those years of service, Judge Romani's work setting up a veterans' court stands out.

Veterans' issues have always been close to Judge Romani's heart. Having served in the U.S. Army himself, as a sergeant during the Vietnam War, Judge Romani knows firsthand the difficulties that veterans face when returning home from war.

Judge Romani was born and raised in Greenville, IL. He attended Western Illinois University, before continuing on to law school at St. Louis University. Upon graduation, Romani accepted a position as Assistant State's Attorney for Madison County. Two years later, in 1974, he ran for State's Attorney in Bond County. He was elected and served with great distinction for 7 years.

Romani first became an associate judge of the Third Judicial Circuit in 1983. Five years later, he became a circuit court judge. And, in 1989, Judge Romani became Chief Judge of the Third Judicial Circuit in Illinois.