

to amidst the confusion and distortion and vitriol on this debate on immigration, children such as Marie Gonzalez? She was brought to this country from Costa Rica by her parents at the age of 5. Her parents have been deported as illegals. Because I have made a special request, she has been allowed to continue to finish her college education at Westminster College in Missouri. Her goal is to be an American and to give to the only country she has ever known. Costa Rica is not her country; America is her country.

What we are talking about is turning these children out. And what sin, what crime did they commit? They obeyed their parents; they followed their parents. And for some, that is going to be a mark of Cain on their head forever in America. Is that what we are all about? Give these kids a chance. Meet them. Take time to see these children. Many of us have.

And what you will see in their eyes is the same kind of hope for this country we want to see in our own children's eyes, to be doctors and nurses and teachers, engineers, to find cures for diseases, start businesses, the things that make America grow.

Give these kids a chance. Do not take your anger out on illegal immigration on children who have nothing to say about this. They were brought to this country, they have lived a good life, they have proven themselves, they have beaten the odds. We need them.

Do not turn around and tell me tomorrow that you need H1-B visas to bring in talented people to America because we do not have enough. Do not tell me you need H2-B, H2-A, and all of the rest of them if you are going to turn away these children, if you are going to say: America doesn't need you, go about your business, find someplace in the world. Do not come back to me and tell me that we need a bigger labor pool and more talent in America.

How can we say no to hope? How can we say no to these kids when all they want is a piece of the American dream? Please, vote to proceed to the DREAM Act. I will work with Senator HUTCHISON on a bipartisan amendment. We will do our best. I think we can come up with something. Give us a chance. Give these kids a chance.

I yield the floor.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I need to correct one statement I made previously. I said the President had issued a veto threat. He does not normally do that on a motion for cloture situation. It was a statement of objection for the bill without an explicit threat of veto.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule

XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 431, S. 2205, DREAM Act.

Richard J. Durbin, Robert Menendez, Daniel K. Inouye, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Joe Lieberman, Patty Murray, Jeff Bingaman, Jack Reed, Patrick Leahy, Charles Schumer, Daniel K. Akaka, Frank R. Lautenberg, Benjamin L. Cardin, John Kerry, S. Whitehouse, Barbara Boxer, Harry Reid.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The questions is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to S. 2205, a bill to authorize the cancellation of removal and adjustment of status of certain alien students who are long-term United States residents and who entered the United States as children, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) would vote "yea."

Mr. LOTT. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. McCAIN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MENENDEZ). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 394 Leg.]

YEAS—52

Akaka	Hagel	Mikulski
Bayh	Harkin	Murray
Bennett	Hatch	Nelson (FL)
Biden	Hutchison	Nelson (NE)
Bingaman	Inouye	Obama
Brown	Johnson	Reed
Brownback	Kerry	Reid
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Rockefeller
Cardin	Kohl	Salazar
Carper	Lautenberg	Sanders
Casey	Leahy	Schumer
Clinton	Levin	Snowe
Coleman	Lieberman	Stabenow
Collins	Lincoln	Webb
Craig	Lott	Whitehouse
Durbin	Lugar	Wyden
Feingold	Martinez	
Feinstein	Menendez	

NAYS—44

Alexander	DeMint	Murkowski
Allard	Dole	Pryor
Barrasso	Domenici	Roberts
Baucus	Dorgan	Sessions
Bond	Ensign	Shelby
Bunning	Enzi	Smith
Burr	Graham	Specter
Byrd	Grassley	Stevens
Chambliss	Gregg	Sununu
Coburn	Inhofe	Tester
Cochran	Isakson	Thune
Conrad	Kyl	Vitter
Corker	Landrieu	Voinovich
Cornyn	McCaskill	Warner
Crapo	McConnell	

NOT VOTING—4

Boxer	Kennedy
Dodd	McCain

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 52, the nays are 44. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

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

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I now tell all Members, I have had a conversation with the distinguished Republican leader, and we are going to make a decision in the next hour or so as to what we are going to go to next. We were planning, of course, to go to this legislation. Cloture on the motion to proceed was not invoked. We have a number of things we are talking about, and we will make that decision this afternoon.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators allowed to speak therein for a period not to exceed 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. 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.

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

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

CALIFORNIA WILDFIRES

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, either my colleague Senator BOXER or I have updated the Senate each day on the California wildfire situation. Senator BOXER is in California now, and I believe the President is as well. I wish to give a brief update to the Senate.

So far, this is the largest evacuation of people in California history. It is the largest evacuation in the United States since Katrina. San Diego remains the worst of the burning regions.

As of this morning, the President has approved individual assistance programs that will allow FEMA, the Federal Emergency Management Agency, to make payments for rental assistance, home repair, and pay for some home replacement costs.

As soon as the fires die down and the wind in places is easing, FEMA will set up centers. I urge Californians, who have been evacuated from their homes, who have had their homes partially

burned or burned to the ground, to go to FEMA centers and see what assistance is available to you.

This morning, on television, I heard a family speak. I think they are from Escondido. I think they have a few acres—12. They had a home. They have children. The home was burned down, but the father said: We have fire insurance.

Then I heard of another family, with four young children, and no fire insurance. The father has no relatives in the area. Fortunately, the wife has a mother with whom the family will be in the near term. But they said: We don't know what we will do.

For those people who are in the "We don't know what we will do" category, this is the job of FEMA, to be out there, to open those centers, and to offer help and aid to these people.

So please, Californians, use this.

More than 950,000 people have been ordered evacuated.

More than 420,000 acres have burned. That is roughly 656 square miles. If you think of it, it is a huge area.

More than 6,000 firefighters are battling 19 active fires. They range from north of Los Angeles to San Diego, and they have crossed the Mexican border.

More than 1,155 homes have been destroyed and 68,000 are threatened.

Two deaths are reported so far. I believe there are others.

Now, if the winds die down today, we will be able, hopefully, to get a handle on it. The vast bulk of the damage now is occurring in populated areas.

The good news: The canyon fire in Malibu is 75 percent contained.

The bad news: Most of the other fires are uncontained and out of control.

Interstate 5, the main artery between San Diego and Los Angeles, was closed in both directions earlier, near Camp Pendleton, because of smoke. Northeast of San Diego, the town of Julian has been evacuated.

I am particularly concerned about the coming days and the Herculean task of feeding, caring, and providing shelter to hundreds of thousands of displaced Californians. We have more than 10,000 in Qualcomm Stadium, another 2,000 at the clubhouse at the Del Mar Race Track.

The Red Cross is doing great. Thank you, Red Cross. Thank you, Red Cross volunteers. They are manning at least three shelters that I know about, and up to this point food, water, and sanitary facilities have been adequate.

I think there is a lot of food for thought for Californians in what is happening in terms of the future, and perhaps it is too early to begin to talk about it.

I do not think there is any blame to be cast on anyone. I think everyone is responding: the Governor, the mayors, Homeland Security, FEMA, and, of course, the President. I am very grateful for this, and I know I am joined by my colleague Senator BOXER. She will be back tonight, and I know she will have stories to tell on the floor of the Senate tomorrow.

But I think we need to think a little bit in the future, particularly those of us who come from local government. I spent 18 years in local government, 9 as a county supervisor and 9 as a mayor, and there is one thing I know, and that is that local governments control zoning. I think the local governments have to begin to look at their zoning about the siting of new housing developments in floodplains in the northern part of the State, around levees and the siting of large subdivisions in the path of Santa Ana winds in parched, dry areas of the State where these winds blow hard and hot.

In this case, at least up to this point, we believe power lines blew down. The winds were so forceful they actually turned large container trucks on their side, and the fires were so strong and burned so hot that they melted the metal of automobiles so that, literally, nothing was left. It could sweep off of a ridge and within minutes come down that ridge and just devour homes and take pieces of board, which are called embers, and send them a mile or two away to start a new fire.

In San Diego 4 years ago, there was the cedar fire. It destroyed 2,000 homes. And now there is this fire in the same area.

So the question comes: Would local officials be well advised to take a look at zoning codes and to begin to protect areas that are prone to catastrophic wildfire from housing developments?

Secondly, community fire plans. Community fire plans are very good. Communities can come together—they did it in the cedar fire area, and they have done it quite successfully—to be able to establish fire plans: how they keep a fire break from their house, what they can take down, the kind of ground cover they should have, the kind of roof that is fire resistant, the siding that is fire resistant—and actually get some Government help to implement these fire plans. This is now going on in the Nevada Tahoe area and in the California Tahoe area as well.

So I believe very strongly that local officials should exercise their zoning control to see that citizens in the future are protected by staying out of heavily fire-prone and heavily flood-prone areas. I will be having more to say about that in the future.

It is also pretty clear to me that we have to develop some Government-helped catastrophic insurance. I have been very concerned. Allstate Insurance Company pulled out of California, and they pulled out of California because they said: It is catastrophe prone, it is fire prone, it is earthquake prone, and we—Allstate—don't want any part of it. So they are not insuring in California any longer. This must not be allowed to happen. Companies must not be allowed to cherry-pick the United States and only insure areas that are safe and secure and say to other areas: You are on your own.

So we are kind of rethinking this area. I think the State of California,

which has an earthquake authority which helps underwrite insurance in earthquake-prone areas, perhaps should also develop a flood and fire authority where they can enter into the same kind of undertaking. Just think about what it would be like to have four children standing in front of a television camera and saying: My house burned down. With it, all my possessions, all my children's possessions, all our photographs and albums and memories, and virtually everything we held dear, and we have no insurance. Think about it. Think about how you would feel if you were in that situation.

So I think there is going to be a lot of food for thought coming out of these fires in terms of public policy, and I am delighted that my colleague, Senator BOXER, is there, and I look forward to her report tomorrow. I believe we will have much more to say about the public policy that goes into the future for our State and other States that are catastrophe prone.

I will just tell my colleagues one other little story. I received a call a while ago from the head of the San Francisco Fine Arts Museum saying that they had an opportunity to bring two paintings to show in San Francisco from the Met, and the insurance for those two paintings was \$8 billion, just to bring them out for show. Why? Because insurance was being denied because California was a catastrophe-prone area. This is just one other example of what is ricocheting out there under the surface now, and I think this body has to become involved. Any one of us can have a catastrophe. Any one of us can have a major bombing. Any one of us can have a major earthquake, a major flood, or major fires. I think it is up to us to see that we have in place the regulations and the laws that enable people to get the insurance they need on a cost-effective basis to be able to restore their lives and rebuild once again.

I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama is recognized.

Mr. SESSIONS. Is there any pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are in morning business, with Senators recognized for up to 10 minutes.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I wish to speak in morning business. Before I do, I just want to express my concern and sympathy to Senator FEINSTEIN and the people of California. It has been horrendous. I caught some of it last night, and my wife has been watching it off and on all day. It is a horrifying spectacle to see the power of that fire and the helplessness you face when the winds are right. I think it does, I say to the Senator, indicate, as she has suggested, whether we are talking about hurricanes or earthquakes or fires or floods, we can probably do a better job with policy and reaction to that. I look forward to working with the Senator from California.