

WATER RESOURCES
DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2007

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 1495, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1495) to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Boxer/Inhofe amendment No. 1065, in the nature of a substitute.

Boxer (for Feingold) amendment No. 1086 (to amendment No. 1065), to establish a Water Resources Commission to prioritize water resources projects in the United States.

Reid (for Levin/Reid) amendment No. 1097 (to the language proposed to be stricken by amendment No. 1065), to provide for military readiness and benchmarks relative to Iraq.

Reid amendment No. 1098 (to amendment No. 1097), to provide for a transition of the Iraq mission.

Coburn amendment No. 1089 (to amendment No. 1065), to prioritize Federal spending to ensure the needs of Louisiana residents who lost their homes as a result of Hurricanes Katrina and Rita are met before spending money to design or construct a non-essential visitors center.

Coburn amendment No. 1090 (to amendment No. 1065), to prioritize Federal spending to ensure the residents of the city of Sacramento are protected from the threat of floods before spending money to add sand to beaches in San Diego.

AMENDMENT NO. 1090

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 11:45 a.m. shall be equally divided for debate with respect to amendment No. 1090 between the Senator from California and the Senator from Oklahoma or their designees.

The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I have a parliamentary inquiry because I don't know when my ranking member will be here. Do I understand the Chair correctly that I would have 15 minutes and he would have 15 minutes, so I should conclude my remarks after such time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California has 13 minutes.

Mrs. BOXER. Will the Presiding Officer please let me know when that time has come?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I am pleased that the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 is on the floor of the Senate and that Members on both sides of the aisle are very supportive of this legislation. This legislation authorizes the projects and policies of the Civil Works Program of the Army Corps of Engineers. Again, it has very strong support across party lines.

I think it is important for the Senate to know, as well as the American people, that this bill is long overdue. Seven years ago, we passed the last WRDA bill. What does that mean? It means that very important flood con-

trol projects, wetlands restoration, environmental projects, clean water projects—so many of these projects have been delayed. When we are talking about the Nation's economy and public safety and the environment, these are things we all want to address. We address them in this bill. The beauty of it is that although Senator INHOFE and I have some deep differences on issues, this is one bill we both strongly support, and across the board we see support.

Every day I have come to the floor to talk about WRDA. I have stressed the strong support in the country for this legislation. I read yesterday from various letters of support. I want to call to Senators' attention—when they arrive to vote on the first amendment, which I hope we will all be opposing, or at least the vast majority of us—on their desks they will find, due to the good work of our pages, the letters of support I referred to yesterday. We have an amazing coalition. We have the National Association of Manufacturers supporting this bill. We have the American Farm Bureau Federation supporting this legislation, with a direct letter. We have a letter from the National Waterways Conference supporting this bill. We have the Audubon Society supporting this legislation. For those who may not be aware, it is a society of more than 1 million members and supporters who work very hard to restore America's natural resources. We have them supporting this bill. We have the American Society of Civil Engineers supporting this bill. We have the National Construction Alliance, which is made up of the Laborers International Union, the International Union of Operating Engineers, and the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America. This is about as broad a coalition as we can have. It concludes with a letter from the Associated General Contractors of America. We have a bill that, as the National Construction Alliance says, is a \$13.9 billion authorization of Corps projects which is a necessary first step in addressing our country's serious backlog of water projects, from harbor improvement, to flood protection, to lock and dam construction, dredging, and environmental infrastructure.

That is what we address in this very important bill.

We certainly have many contentious debates on the floor of this Senate. We are going to have one again on Iraq. It tugs at the heartstrings. It is very difficult. But this is one piece of legislation which should not be difficult for us. Senator INHOFE and I share a commitment to shoring up our Nation's infrastructure, including our water resources. We have a true partnership on this issue. I hope colleagues will join with us, as we work through the amendments. There will be some amendments we can support, but we have made a pact that even if there are some amendments each of us individually supports, if the four top members

of the Environment and Public Works Committee have not agreed on them, we will be forced to vote no. This is not a pleasant situation for either of us. We think it is the way to maintain the delicate balance of the legislation, because the bill is a product of bipartisanship.

I mentioned the other two members of the committee who have worked so hard, Senators BAUCUS and ISAKSON. I thank them.

The whole country is looking to see what we do to help the victims of Hurricane Katrina and what we do to move forward so that we don't see another tragedy as we witnessed recently. About 25 percent of this bill is directed at Louisiana. We have gone very far to meet their needs. We do understand we haven't done 100 percent of what they need, but there will be other WRDAs, and there may well be a couple of amendments on which we can move forward. We don't know at this particular point.

We have waited 7 long years for this bill. We are going to be having a vote at a quarter of 12.

Before I yield to my good friend and colleague, the ranking member of the committee, for his comments, I hope everyone will join in voting no on the Coburn amendment. What he does in his amendment is, he has decided—and he is here in the Chamber now—that one of the projects in California should wait until another project in California is totally funded.

I call this amendment the Russian roulette amendment because the project he wants to delay is an important project in the San Diego area. It is the city of Imperial Beach. There is a very important project the Corps is recommending where the local match will be paid—the initial stages, 30 percent; the final stages, 50 percent. We are talking about protecting 2,083 businesses. There are 812 nonrental property businesses and 1,271 rental properties. We are talking about 22 retail businesses, 217 businesses located along the beachfront, 195 are rental, and 19 businesses near the shoreline. What we are talking about doing is a project that is so cost-effective, it has met every criteria. It has gone through every phase. We received a letter from the mayor which clearly states they will be picking up their share.

This is a project which needs to move forward. You don't say to somebody in the southern part of a State: You don't deserve this flood protection until someone in the northern part of the State gets flood protection. We have to do it all. This is the United States of America. California, if we were a nation, would be the fifth largest economy in the world.

All Members have a right to their opinion and a right to offer amendments. I support my colleague's right to do so. But it is absolutely wrong. He will present it as some kind of a beach project. He makes it sound as if what we are doing is protecting a beach.

Nothing could be further from the truth. We are using the replenishment in this project as a way to absorb the floodwaters.

I will speak for a minute on this later. I hope we will have a resounding “no” vote. Every Member has a right to say what he or she thinks belongs in this bill. But this bill has gone through a rigorous process. We don’t have anything in here that doesn’t meet the criteria. Senator INHOFE was very strong on that. I agreed with him completely.

With my time waning, I yield the floor and look forward to a strong “no” vote on the Coburn amendment in 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. I yield myself such time as I may consume. As I understand, we are now dividing time equally between the junior Senator from Oklahoma and the committee; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. INHOFE. How much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California has 3 minutes 20 seconds remaining.

Mr. INHOFE. We have a total of 3 minutes left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California has 3 minutes 20 seconds. The junior Senator from Oklahoma has 13 minutes. The time is divided between Senator COBURN and Senator BOXER. Senator COBURN has 13 minutes.

Mr. INHOFE. The main thing I want to get across, I can’t get across in 3 minutes. But I can tell you right now—and by the way, the reason I wasn’t here earlier is that I have been, in the last 3 days, in Iraq. And by the way, good things are happening there in spite of what the press will tell you.

I came back somewhat shocked to see some of these amendments because, quite frankly, a lot of people don’t understand the process. I don’t want anyone out there watching what we are doing today saying that we are killing some useless project. It has nothing to do with that. This is an authorization bill. I will make this clear, but I can’t do it in this time unless the Senator from Oklahoma would like to yield 5 minutes of his time.

Mr. COBURN. Sure.

Mr. INHOFE. I thank the Senator.

The amendment we will be talking about is the Imperial Beach amendment. I have to remind my colleagues, as I did in the steering committee last Thursday, this is not an appropriations bill. What we are doing here today is not going to change anything at all in terms of money. I don’t want anyone thinking we will have some useless project or spend money on it. We are not doing it with this bill today. We may be doing it in the future. We may be doing it when the appropriations bills come up. I may be opposing it at that time.

But all we are doing through the WRDA bill is we allow ourselves the opportunity to make sure there is some level of discipline in putting projects forward that people will eventually be voting on. They are not going to be voting on them today. This is the authorization process.

Now, we have criteria. We have to have an engineer’s report from the Corps of Engineers. It has to say it is economically feasible, it takes care of the environmental problems—all these things—and it ensures there is cost sharing.

Let me tell you what would happen if we did not do this. If we did not do it, and we had everyone coming up, swapping out their deals, and saying: I have a project over here; it is my sweetheart project; the Corps of Engineers has never been there. We don’t care. No one has ever evaluated it, but this is my humble opinion, since we are here in Washington making all these decisions in violation of what people back home want. Then we will have a project.

That is the alternative. This is the same as the transportation authorization bill. There we had criteria where we would talk about the qualifications of various projects, and they would have to be in that criteria. Then we would bring it up later on and decide whether we were going to fund these things.

Now, on the project that is going to take place at Imperial Beach, it was authorized. The Corps recommended this storm damage reduction project because it is technically sound, economically justified, environmentally acceptable, and it will have the local cost share.

I have a letter from the mayor of Imperial Beach saying this is what they want out there. It may not be what they want in Washington, but this is what they want.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

CITY OF IMPERIAL BEACH, CA
OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
July 18, 2002.

Colonel RICHARD G. THOMPSON,
Los Angeles District Engineer, U.S. Army Corps
of Engineers, Los Angeles, CA.

DEAR COLONEL THOMPSON: This letter should serve as a formal indication of interest and intent by the City of Imperial Beach to proceed with the recommended project indicated in the Silver Strand Shoreline, Imperial Beach, California Draft General Re-evaluation Report dated, June 2002.

The City of Imperial Beach is willing and able to provide all non-Federal requirements of the project including 36% of the cost to construct the initial project and 50% of the construction costs for each renourishment cycle.

It is anticipated that funds for the local share of initial construction will come from \$4.2 million currently earmarked for this project in the California State Department of Boating and Waterways FY 2002/2003 budget.

We thank you for your continued interest in this worthwhile project.

Sincerely,

DIANE ROSE,
Mayor.

Mr. INHOFE. Hopefully, when we get down toward the end of the debate, after I hear what my colleague says about this issue, I will use more time. I yield the floor.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today with Senator BOXER in opposition to the Coburn amendment. This amendment limits our ability to appropriate funding to projects in our State, and I would ask all Senators to vote against the amendment.

My colleagues may remember that during consideration of the fiscal year 2006 emergency supplemental, we had an extended debate over flood control projects in the bill for California because Senator COBURN offered an amendment to strip them out of the bill. I understand that yesterday, Senator COBURN acknowledged that he made a mistake in opposing the Sacramento River Bank project, which he now believes was legitimate emergency funding. However, he has now offered another amendment affecting California and this same project.

Senator COBURN’s amendment would require that the Army Corps complete its work on the Sacramento riverbank flood control project before it can begin any work on the Imperial Beach replenishment project. These two projects are separated by 500 miles and have no relation to each other, except that both protect homes and families.

I would like to briefly discuss these two projects. The Sacramento riverbank flood protection project is a long-term levee restoration project. The project area is along 210 miles of the Sacramento River that is constantly at risk of erosion. Areas protected by the levees comprise over 1 million acres, 50 communities, \$38 billion worth of improvements, and approximately 2.3 million people.

The Corps of Engineers is dangerously close to the ceiling set in the current authorization, with many more projects to be done. Senator BOXER and I support language in this bill to increase the Corps’ authorization by another 80,000 linear feet. It will be several years before the Corps will reach that threshold if we are able to fund the project at full capability annually.

Yesterday, Senator COBURN referred to our discussion last year and that I had said that life and property lay in the balance with the restoration of these levees. I would say to my colleagues that statement also holds true on other projects to protect homes in a different part of my State that Senator COBURN will inhibit with this amendment.

Imperial Beach is a small city adjacent to the U.S./Mexico border and just south of San Diego Bay and the naval installations on Coronado. Its beach, the Silver Strand, is losing 100,000 cubic yards of sand per year, corresponding to a loss of 6.6 feet of beach.

So much shoreline has been lost that there is no longer dry beach at high tide, leaving only a small embankment between the ocean and homes. At the current retreat rate, the shoreline could reach homes within the year. A high-tide storm event in Imperial Beach could affect 3,000 homes within 3 blocks of the coast. Already these homes have experienced flooding and structural damage and the soil is highly erosive and receding—the problem in Imperial Beach is now, and we cannot wait years to address it.

The problem is that the beach is no longer the recipient of sand from its natural sources. First, there is a lack of sediment transfer from the Tijuana River because of three dams, two on the American side and one on the Mexican side, which have stopped the historical flow of sediment to the shoreline. Second, the Army Corps-built jetty that protects San Diego harbor also disrupts the flow of sand.

Yesterday, Senator COBURN stated that he believes the replenishment of this beach is a State responsibility. As we all know, all of these projects are cost-shared with the State or localities involved. The State of California already has \$4.2 million on the table for this project as soon as it is authorized. So the State's commitment is there.

The residents and local government are also doing their fair share to shoulder the costs. The Army Corps of Engineers has determined that every dollar spent avoiding storm damage through beach nourishment will save taxpayers close to \$2.00. The total net benefit this project provides due to annual costs from structural damage due to erosion, wave attack, or inundation costs, utility relocation costs, land loss, cleanup costs and other items related to the loss of sand will be at least \$1.8 million.

There are hundreds of very important projects authorized in this bill, and many States have multiple projects. This amendment would set the dangerous precedent of requiring vital projects to wait until other projects in the same State are completed. Not only does this have the potential to increase Federal costs if we have to respond to disasters that could have been prevented, but it removes our discretion to evaluate projects independently, regardless of where they are located.

Senator COBURN has now decided that securing levees in my State is a high priority. It certainly is. However, I do not agree with him that homes and families behind river levees are more important than homes and families behind an ocean beach. I hope that my colleagues will join with us to oppose this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, to make sure everybody understands, this is not an amendment that eliminates this project. As I complimented the Senator from California and the Senator from

Oklahoma yesterday, the idea behind this amendment is to make priorities.

What do we know? We know the Corps has a \$58 billion backlog right now. That is 27½ years of work at the way the Corps is funded now. All this amendment says is, if you are in a family and you need a new roof, and you want to build a swimming pool, probably most American families are going to put the roof on before they build the swimming pool.

Sacramento has 1.8 million people. It is the largest city in this country at risk for flood damage. The canals and levees up there need to be reworked. All this amendment says is before we restore beaches—by the way, let me give a little background. The last time there was any flood damage at Imperial Beach was 1988. The total damage was \$500,000 in 1988.

What we do know is, when you restore the sand, one winter storm will wipe it all out. That is why this is a 50-year project. This is planned to restore sand after sand after sand after sand for the next 50 years. It may be the right thing to do, but in terms of making a choice about priorities, wouldn't we think that before we restore sand that is going to be washed away by the next winter storm, maybe we ought to ensure ourselves that the people in Sacramento are safe. So this does not eliminate this project.

I also go back to the history on this project. What is the Corps' No. 1 way of fixing this project? It is not to continue to pump sand onto the beach. It is to have an extended growing out until the beach redevelops and replenishes itself, which was proposed and never finalized before they completed the environmental impact statement on it. That is the way to restore the sand to the beach in a natural way.

So what we have is we are going to take a low-priority item—very high-priority item for some of the people of Imperial Beach, CA, not all of them—we were submitted a letter yesterday by a large group of people who oppose this—and we are going to say that is as important in terms of authorization as fixing the levee system in Sacramento. It is not.

All this amendment says is before you start spending money on restoring sand that is going to be washed away by the next winter storm, you ought to fix the levees where you have 1.8 million people at real risk for flood. It is the largest city in the United States at risk. It has a greater risk of flood than New Orleans. It has an 85-year risk compared to a 250-year risk in New Orleans.

By this amendment, we are not saying do not do this. We are saying, let's add some priorities. Let's fix what is wrong in a major levee system first. Let's have, in this bill, that we are going to choose a priority rather than to send all this to the Corps, which is 27 years behind right now on their projects—will be another 7½ to 8 years after this bill passes—and say, on the

way of priorities, the priority that ought to go first is fixing the levee system in Sacramento. It is not to degrade that this is not needed. I am not saying it is not needed. I am saying, with limited funds, we ought to have a priority.

Many people will argue they will make that decision at the Appropriations Committee. The authorizing bill right now is on the floor. I support many of the projects in this bill. But I think a case can be made, and the American people would demand, we cannot quit ducking priorities. It is easy to say to do everything, as the Senator from California said yesterday. The only problem with that is, we cannot do everything. We cannot do everything, so we have to make a choice. We ought to do those things that will protect the most people, solve the biggest problems first, and then work to the smaller problems.

In 1988 was the last time we ever had any storm damage at Imperial Beach, CA. It was in the midst of storm damage that was less than \$500,000. We are going to be talking about in excess of \$20 million for this beach at the same time we have levees that need to be reworked and reaffirmed in Sacramento.

This amendment is common sense. Let's do what is most important first, and when we have done that, then go do this. Let's do not do them both at the same time, quite frankly, because it will never happen at the same time, because we only have \$2 billion a year for the Corps now and there are hundreds of projects in this country that should be done before this project.

With that, Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, there has been some misinformation. The last flooding and very bad winter storm was in 2004, and we have all that documented—in the hundreds of thousands of dollars—in this area. I understand Senator COBURN wants to substitute his opinion for the opinion of the Corps, but I want to go through, with my colleagues who might be listening to this debate, how many steps this project has already been through, as have all the projects we have agreed to fund.

So the WRDA bill is 7 years in the making.

Mr. President, will you tell me when I have 1 minute remaining because I want to yield that minute to Senator INHOFE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are at 1:10 now.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, 1:10 remaining? I thought I had 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senator INHOFE used a minute of that.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we be given an additional 3 minutes, and the same for Senator COBURN, if he wishes to respond.

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

Mrs. BOXER. I am going to take 2 minutes, and then we will see if Senator COBURN wants to respond, and then we will give the last minute to Senator INHOFE.

There is a lot of misinformation about the flooding here. There is also the implication that this is not an important project, when I have already pointed out how many businesses are at risk, how many residences.

This project has gone through so many steps. First, the local people said: We want to step forward and pay toward solving this problem. Then, the Corps said: You are right. Let's do a cost-benefit study and see if it makes sense for Federal dollars to go into the mix. Well, it came back: Absolutely. Then they said: What is the best type of project? Should we build walls? What should we do? No. They said: The best type of project is to utilize the sand as a natural barrier to these floods.

What we are desperately trying to do is complete this project because we are very concerned we could have even a worse problem than we had in 2004.

As much as I respect my colleague, I feel his judgment is not something I can accept. I cannot look in the eyes of the people who have been fighting for this project since 2003 and say to them they do not deserve to get any attention paid to their problem until Sacramento is taken care of.

I have to say to my friend, in going after this project the way he is, it seems to me he is picking one project out of a hat, which is extremely disturbing.

Mr. President, I know there are those who need to go over to the White House, so I will stop my discussion. I think I have enough information in the RECORD to have colleagues join with me.

I say, if Senator COBURN has anything to add at this time, I will reserve the minute for Senator INHOFE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, I am not going after the project. The project stays. I think the Senator from California misses the point. This beach had restoration done by the city last year. It washed away. The sand they put up there will wash away. It is a temporary fix to a long-term program. That is why they have a 50-year authorization for restoring this beach, because it is going to continue to wash away because they are not fixing it in the way the Corps originally recommended it be fixed.

It is not about picking on this project. It is about, again, shouldn't we have priorities? Isn't it more important to fix Sacramento and the levee system there than this particular project, which has been repaired of late by the city with their own funds? I am not saying we should eliminate it; I am saying we should not do this until we have done the other things that are higher priority on the Corps' list,

which No. 1 in my mind, besides what we need to do in Louisiana, is to restore the levee system in Sacramento.

With that, Mr. President, I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, is the Senator yielding back time?

All right. In deference to some other things that are going on right now, I will go ahead and yield back my time at this moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 1090.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN), the Senator from Ohio, (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. OBAMA), and the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER), are necessarily absent.

Mr. LOTT. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Kansas (Mr. BROWNBACK), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. DEMINT), the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. DOLE), the Senator South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), and the Senator from Arizona, (Mr. MCCAIN).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. DEMINT) would have voted "yea" and the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. DOLE) would have voted "nay."

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

The result was announced—yeas 12, nays 77, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 163 Leg.]

YEAS—12

Bunning	Ensign	Lugar
Burr	Feingold	Sessions
Chambliss	Gregg	Smith
Coburn	Lott	Sununu

NAYS—77

Akaka	Crapo	Levin
Alexander	Dodd	Lieberman
Allard	Domenici	Lincoln
Baucus	Dorgan	Martinez
Bayh	Durbin	McCaskill
Bennett	Enzi	McConnell
Bingaman	Feinstein	Menendez
Bond	Grassley	Mikulski
Boxer	Hagel	Murkowski
Byrd	Harkin	Murray
Cantwell	Hatch	Nelson (FL)
Cardin	Hutchison	Nelson (NE)
Carper	Inhofe	Pryor
Casey	Inouye	Reed
Clinton	Kennedy	Reid
Cochran	Kerry	Roberts
Coleman	Klobuchar	Salazar
Collins	Kohl	Sanders
Conrad	Kyl	Schumer
Corker	Landrieu	Shelby
Cornyn	Lautenberg	Snowe
Craig	Leahy	Specter

Stabenow
Stevens
Tester
Thomas

Thune
Vitter
Voinovich
Warner

Webb
Whitehouse
Wyden

NOT VOTING—11

Biden	Dole	McCain
Brown	Graham	Obama
Brownback	Isakson	Rockefeller
DeMint	Johnson	

The amendment (No. 1090) was rejected.

Mrs. BOXER. 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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I thank my colleagues for that overwhelming vote. I view it as a vote that basically says this bill is a good bill. Let's not tinker with this bill unless there is pretty quick agreement on both sides that it is the right kind of amendment. This wasn't the right kind of amendment. We appreciate this vote.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 2:15 p.m. today, Senator CARDIN be recognized to call up amendment No. 1072; that once the amendment is reported by number, there be 5 minutes under the control of Senator CARDIN, and that upon the use or yielding back of time, the amendment be withdrawn; that the Senate then resume consideration of the Coburn amendment No. 1089, and there be 2 minutes of debate prior to a vote in relation to the amendment; that upon disposition of the Coburn amendment No. 1089, the Senate consider the Feingold amendment No. 1086, and there be 5 minutes of debate prior to a vote in relation to the amendment, with all debate time equally divided and controlled in the usual form; that prior to a vote in relation to the amendments covered in this agreement, no intervening amendments be in order.

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

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following Members be recognized to speak as in morning business: Senators DODD, INOUYE, ALEXANDER, and LEVIN and that after that the Senate stand in recess.

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

Mrs. BOXER. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

100TH BIRTHDAY OF FORMER SENATOR THOMAS DODD

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I am speaking today, as I have for the past 26 years, at the desk my father used during his 12 years as a Member of the Senate, from 1959 to 1971. I would like to think that this surface still bears some of the marks he might have made in an idle moment. As he did almost 50 years ago, I too have etched my name in this desk drawer.