

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1901

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

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

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

I yield the floor.

AMENDMENT NO. 1901, AS MODIFIED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

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

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

The amendment, as modified, is as follows:

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

NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE EQUIPMENT

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is so modified.

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

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

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

Mr. STEVENS. I move to reconsider the vote.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is not.

AMENDMENT NO. 1908

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

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

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To ensure that a Federal employee who takes leave without pay in order to perform service as a member of the uniformed services or member of the National Guard shall continue to receive pay in an amount which, when taken together with the pay and allowances such individual is receiving for such service, will be no less than the basic pay such individual would then be receiving if no interruption in employment had occurred)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . NONREDUCTION IN PAY WHILE FEDERAL EMPLOYEE IS PERFORMING ACTIVE SERVICE IN THE UNIFORMED SERVICES OR NATIONAL GUARD.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This section may be cited as the “Reservists Pay Security Act of 2005”.

(b) **IN GENERAL.**—Subchapter IV of chapter 55 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“§ 5538. Nonreduction in pay while serving in the uniformed services or National Guard

“(a) An employee who is absent from a position of employment with the Federal Government in order to perform active duty in the uniformed services pursuant to a call or order to active duty under a provision of law referred to in section 101(a)(13)(B) of title 10 shall be entitled, while serving on active duty, to receive, for each pay period described in subsection (b), an amount equal to the amount by which—

“(1) the amount of basic pay which would otherwise have been payable to such employee for such pay period if such employee’s civilian employment with the Government had not been interrupted by that service, exceeds (if at all)

“(2) the amount of pay and allowances which (as determined under subsection (d))—

“(A) is payable to such employee for that service; and

“(B) is allocable to such pay period.

“(b)(1) Amounts under this section shall be payable with respect to each pay period (which would otherwise apply if the employee’s civilian employment had not been interrupted)—

“(A) during which such employee is entitled to reemployment rights under chapter 43 of title 38 with respect to the position from which such employee is absent (as referred to in subsection (a)); and

“(B) for which such employee does not otherwise receive basic pay (including by taking any annual, military, or other paid leave) to which such employee is entitled by virtue of such employee’s civilian employment with the Government.

“(2) For purposes of this section, the period during which an employee is entitled to reemployment rights under chapter 43 of title 38—

“(A) shall be determined disregarding the provisions of section 4312(d) of title 38; and

“(B) shall include any period of time specified in section 4312(e) of title 38 within which an employee may report or apply for employment or reemployment following completion of service on active duty to which called or ordered as described in subsection (a).

“(c) Any amount payable under this section to an employee shall be paid—

“(1) by such employee’s employing agency;

“(2) from the appropriation or fund which would be used to pay the employee if such employee were in a pay status; and

“(3) to the extent practicable, at the same time and in the same manner as would basic pay if such employee’s civilian employment had not been interrupted.

“(d) The Office of Personnel Management shall, in consultation with Secretary of De-

fense, prescribe any regulations necessary to carry out the preceding provisions of this section.

“(e)(1) The head of each agency referred to in section 2302(a)(2)(C)(ii) shall, in consultation with the Office, prescribe procedures to ensure that the rights under this section apply to the employees of such agency.

“(2) The Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall, in consultation with the Office, prescribe procedures to ensure that the rights under this section apply to the employees of that agency.

“(f) For purposes of this section—

“(1) the terms ‘employee’, ‘Federal Government’, and ‘uniformed services’ have the same respective meanings as given them in section 4303 of title 38;

“(2) the term ‘employing agency’, as used with respect to an employee entitled to any payments under this section, means the agency or other entity of the Government (including an agency referred to in section 2302(a)(2)(C)(ii) with respect to which such employee has reemployment rights under chapter 43 of title 38; and

“(3) the term ‘basic pay’ includes any amount payable under section 5304.”

(c) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections for chapter 55 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 5537 the following:

“5538. Nonreduction in pay while serving in the uniformed services or National Guard.”

(d) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to pay periods (as described in section 5538(b) of title 5, United States Code, as amended by this section) beginning on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, this amendment has been offered before and agreed to before. Unfortunately, it has not been enacted into law. It does very well on the floor of the Senate. It just doesn’t do very well in conference committee. For some reason, when it gets to a conference committee, it is usually removed. I hope this will be an exception because I think what we are talking about with this amendment is something that most Senators on both sides of the aisle would agree with.

The premise behind this amendment is as follows: If you are willing to serve in the Guard or Reserve and if you are willing, when activated, to leave your job and your family behind to risk your life for America, we should do our best as a nation to stand behind you. That is it.

How do we stand behind the men and women of the Guard and Reserve when they are activated to serve in Iraq and Afghanistan? In a variety of ways. Communities come forward, churches, friends, community groups help the family of a soldier who is overseas. But there is one other thing that happens that is as important, if not more. Many times that activated Guard or Reserve member faces a cut in pay. They have a good job. They have been activated. They have to serve for a year or more. They are being paid less during the time they are serving our country. So we encourage employers across America to stand behind their employees. If your employee is activated, stand behind your employee. Make up the difference in their pay.

It turns out that hundreds of corporations across America have said that is the right thing to do. That is the patriotic thing to do. Yes, we will stand behind the men and women activated into the Guard and Reserve. We will make up the difference in pay so that their families back home have financial peace of mind that they can pay the mortgage, the utility bills, keep the family together while that soldier is risking his life overseas.

We think so highly of these companies for their patriotism and dedication to our soldiers that we have created a Web site at the Department of Defense. You can go to it. It is a site that congratulates these employers for their devotion and allegiance to our troops.

Unfortunately, there is one employer that refuses to do this. It turns out it is the largest single employer of all the Guard and Reserve who are being activated. One employer that refuses, despite this Web site, despite all these speeches, one employer that refuses to stand behind the soldiers who were activated in the Guard and Reserve and to make up the difference in pay if they are paid less when they are activated than they were paid in civilian life. Who is this deadbeat employer that won’t listen to these calls for patriotic responsibility to the men and women in uniform? What employer in America, after all that these soldiers have been through, will not stand behind them and make up the difference in pay? That employer is the Federal Government of the United States.

One out of 10 Guard and Reserve serving today are Federal employees. The Federal Government refuses to make up the difference in pay for those who have had a cut in pay because they are risking their lives for America.

I have offered this amendment time and again. I don’t understand why it gets killed in conference committee every time I offer it. So many Senators come to the floor and say what a great idea it is. Yet when it goes to conference committee, it doesn’t survive. This amendment brings the Federal Government into the 21st century and into line with countless other major employers. So many of America’s top companies do the right thing for members of the National Guard and Reserve. So many of these are good patriotic corporate citizens in our private sector. But in the public sector, 24 State governments, including my home State of Illinois, provides the same income protection for their State government workers. Counties do it, cities do it, villages do it at great sacrifice, and we thank them for that.

This amendment simply allows the Federal Government to catch up with the times, to match what other major employers are already doing, and to provide the same type of income protection for our Federal Government civilian employees who also serve in the Guard and Reserve.

I propose this amendment because it is not clear that a real opportunity to

offer it will ever come on the Department of Defense authorization bill this year.

The Senate is on record as supporting this measure. We have passed it on three previous occasions. Two of those occasions were amendments to appropriations bills, such as the one before us.

This is the same language as reported out of the Governmental Affairs Committee last Congress, except this version does not include any retroactivity provision. Though I personally support that, this amendment doesn't go that far.

The Congressional Budget Office has confirmed that this measure has a cost but not a budget score. It is not retroactive. It is prospective only and subject to available appropriations. The funds to provide this differential pay to these Federal employees in the Guard and Reserve can come from funds already appropriated to the agencies for salaries. Twenty-four State governments do this. We have letters from those States attesting to the fact that the benefit has required no additional appropriations.

Many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle have supported this measure in the past, and I thank them from the bottom of my heart for standing with our men and women in uniform.

Let me show data which is illustrative of what we are facing.

Recent data from the Department of Defense's newest "Status of Forces Survey of Reserve Components" tells us that 51 percent of reservists lose income during mobilization, and 11 percent lose more than \$2,500 per month.

So in addition to the sacrifice of being separated from their family, risking their lives in service to their country, many of them are taking substantial cuts in pay.

The new "Status of Forces Survey of Reserve Components" also reveals that income loss is one of the top factors cited by National Guard and Reserve components as reasons they might choose to stop serving in Reserve components. This is not only an injustice that we in the Federal Government are not making up the pay differential, it, in fact, is one of the reasons some in the Reserve and Guard say they are not going to re-up. We cannot retain their good services to our country because of the economic sacrifice which that service creates.

The Department of Defense operates a program called Employer Support of Guard and Reserve—ESGR for short—which recognizes and pays tribute to those patriotic, outstanding employers who go beyond the legal minimum job protections in support of their workers who are citizen soldiers. ESGR operates this Web site which lists 900 companies, nonprofits, and State and local governments which offer this pay differential for mobilized workers. Search our Government Web site all you will, but you will not find the Federal Government on the list. We do not provide

the same benefit to these men and women in service to our country as these other employers.

The number of employers providing this type of support to their workers in the National Guard and Reserve has grown steadily, and we owe them a great debt of gratitude for the love of country and devotion to our men and women in uniform, but the Federal Government is still not one of those employers.

I think this measure is long overdue. The Federal Government should not be lagging behind major corporations and roughly half of the governments of the States of the United States in terms of the quality of support for the men and women in the Guard and Reserve.

We should be a leader, not a follower. We should set the example right now with this amendment. We can fix this problem, and we can do it quickly.

Let me briefly make a few points for the minority of my colleagues who might continue to have reservations about this concept.

This measure does not bust the budget. Certainly, it results in some expenditures, but the money to make up for any lost income by these mobilized Federal workers is drawn from the funds already previously appropriated to the same agency the workers were serving in before they were activated. The money is already there. State governments that provide similar benefits report that they require no additional appropriations to meet this responsibility.

Second, this measure is not additional pay for military service. Reservists continue to receive the same military pay for the same military job. Any differential pay they receive from their Federal civilian employer is separate and apart from that and is simply intended to keep such employees financially whole while they are away. It is a reflection of the value they provided to their Federal agency before they were mobilized and a reflection of the value they will provide again when they return.

The military pay a reservist gets during mobilization is for the military role he or she performs and is utterly unchanged by this amendment.

Third, the wisdom of this amendment is readily understandable by the entire force, whether Active Duty or Reserve. Some people ask how to explain to an Active-Duty soldier or his or her family why a Reserve soldier sharing the same foxhole—to use an old colloquialism—performing the same duties, is allowed to draw both military pay as well as the lost portion of their civilian income. This is easy to explain and easy to understand.

Unlike Active component troops, Reserve component troops structure their lives and make their financial commitments based on their regular civilian income. Their house payments, their car payments, the kids' tuition payments—everything in their financial picture is based on the income of a ci-

vilian life. When that income disappears during mobilization and is replaced by lower military income, the family suffers a real hardship.

The Active component family may not suffer that hardship. They understood going in what the parameters of their family budgets were. Allowing a Federal civilian employer to alleviate this hardship for their workers, as many private employers already do, makes clearly explainable and understandable sense.

Soldiers take care of one another. No troop wants to see his buddy struggle or suffer problems with their family. Certainly, no Active-Duty soldier wants that Reserve soldier standing by his side helping him to fight this war to be distracted by financial hardship back home.

Let me tell you who endorses this legislation: the American Legion, the National Military Family Association, the Reserve Officers Association, the National Guard Association of the United States, and the Enlisted Association of the National Guard of the United States.

The reason to support this measure is simple and straightforward: the Federal Government cannot and should not do less for its employees in the Guard and Reserve than other major employers in America. It is time for the U.S. Government to be an employer which is as supportive of our troops as Sears, IBM, Home Depot, General Motors, and 24 State governments. They have already passed similar legislation. They have already made a commitment to our troops. How can we commend all these other employers who go the extra mile to support our troops while we fail to do so? Can we hold them up as examples and not be an example ourselves? I think the answer is no.

What we can do is adopt this amendment. I invite all my colleagues to come together once more to adopt the Reservist Pay Security Act, and I urge my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee, when this amendment is adopted, for goodness' sake and for the sake of these soldiers, don't kill it in conference committee. Stand by these soldiers all the way through the process. For years now, these soldiers have been shortchanged. It is time for us to make a difference in their lives and make a commitment to these great men and women.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHAFEE). Is there a sufficient second?

At this moment, there is not a sufficient second.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I withdraw that request and ask for the adoption of the pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate? If not, the question is on agreeing to amendment No. 1908.

The amendment (No. 1908) was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. I move to reconsider the vote.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, for the information of Senators, there will be no further action on the Defense appropriations bill tonight.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. STEVENS. I ask unanimous consent that we go into a period for morning business.

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

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

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

CONTINUING RESOLUTION

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, here we go again, yes, here we go again. The fiscal year ends tomorrow at midnight. Only two of the annual appropriations bills required to fund the Federal Government have been sent to the President. This is *deja vu* all over again.

As a result, the Congress is rushing through the stopgap money measure called a continuing resolution in order to prevent a massive shutdown of the departments and agencies of the Federal Government.

Is this the way to run a government?

This is no way to run a government.

The appropriations process is a very simple process, in reality. The President sends his recommendations to the Congress in the form of a budget, usually in early February. Subsequently, the House formulates reports, debates and passes 11 annual appropriations bills. To its credit, the House has done exactly that. It has done its job.

What is wrong with the Senate?

I commend the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. COCHRAN. Yes, I commend him. With his steady leadership, the Senate Appropriations Committee has formulated and reported all of the annual appropriations bills. Eight of those appropriations bills have been passed by the Senate. Four appropriations bills are now pending in the Senate. This includes the Defense appropriations bill, the Transportation-Treasury appropriations bill,

Labor-Health and Human Services-Education appropriations bill, and the District of Columbia appropriations bill, which is likely to be added to the Transportation appropriations bill in order to conform to the House version.

That is where we stand today.

What is the problem?

Regrettably, the Senate Leadership has not seen fit to bring three of our appropriations bills to the floor. This is not the fault of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee. He has called upon the leadership, as did I, to give the appropriations bills high priority in the scheduling of floor time.

The Labor-HHS-Education appropriations bill, the Transportation-Treasury appropriations bill, and the District of Columbia appropriations bill were approved by our Appropriations Committee over 2 months ago. I simply do not understand why the leadership is dragging its feet! Why not debate legislation that will fund critical investments in our schools, in our healthcare systems, and for our Nation's transportation infrastructure? Are Senators not going to have the opportunity to debate bills that provide over \$211 billion?

We need to debate each of these funding bills individually. We need to conference them individually with our House counterparts—not just consider them as sub-parts of a large omnibus package. That is what I believe the chairman of the Appropriations Committee wants, and that is what I, too, would like to see happen. I urge my colleagues to work toward that goal.

It is unfortunate that most of the regular programs of the departments and agencies of Government will limp into the new fiscal year, which begins—when? this Saturday, the day after tomorrow, under the terms and conditions of a very restrictive continuing resolution. Here we are in the midst of one of the largest natural disasters to hit the United States, and only two regular appropriations bills have been enacted. One would think that the Congress would want to enact all of the annual appropriations bills before the beginning of the fiscal year so that the Federal agencies can hit the road running on October 1st and deal with the problems confronting the American people. Instead, we are enacting a very restrictive stop-gap measure that merely prevents the Government from shutting down. What a shame. It is very unfortunate that the House majority refused to fix the problem created by the continuing resolution for the Community Services Block Grant program, which provides critical healthcare and nutrition services to the neediest Americans. It is very unfortunate that, as we approach winter with fuel prices expected to grow dramatically, this continuing resolution reduces funding for the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program.

In conclusion, I am disappointed that the appropriations bills have not been enacted on a timely basis. Having said

that, I urge my colleagues to support the continuing resolution. We have no other choice.

I urge the leadership to call up the remaining appropriations bills, debate them, and send them to conference with the House. We have an obligation to the American people to get our work done. Debate and deliberation is what the Senate is supposed to be about—debate and deliberation and amending. The American people expect us to debate these bills and to protect the power of the purse and, thereby, protect their hard-earned tax dollars. These matters should not be swept under a carpet somewhere. More, not less, transparency is needed in debating appropriations bills. The Congress should have completed action on all the appropriations bills—not just two—on all the appropriations bills before the end of the fiscal year tomorrow night. Failing that, we should enact eleven individual, fiscally responsible annual appropriations bills before the termination of this continuing resolution on November 18th.

Mr. President, I yield the floor. 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.

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

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

IN REMEMBRANCE OF SAM VOLPENTEST

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I rise today to commemorate and pay tribute to the life of a great Washingtonian, a great American, and someone that I know even in the Nation's Capital will be remembered for his great contributions. Yesterday, I learned of the death of Sam Volpentest, a resident of Washington State, who lived to be 101-year-old.

Sam has continued to play a leadership role in our State. We were all proud of the fact that we all attended his 100th birthday party last year and that for the last several months he has continued to play a vital role in the State of Washington on important economic issues.

I am proud to say that Sam was a friend, and I am grateful for his mentorship and his wisdom. My thoughts are with his family and the larger Tri-City community that mourn his loss. This is a man who had a list of unending accomplishments and literally touched thousands of lives of his fellow citizens. He changed the course of history in Washington State and left his mark on this Nation's history, as well.

Sam's legacy was one of generosity, of leadership, of commitment, of inspiration—important lessons for Washingtonians to still benefit from.