

years, not only on the question of immigration, but then from the lessons of September 11, 2001, we realize there is another reason we must control our borders, so desperately necessary to the welfare and the protection of this country, the protection of the homeland. Because of those two main reasons, we will live to see another day, and we will pass an immigration law to bring us into order out of the chaos which is the current condition.

I commend the Senator from Colorado as he gave a personality profile of so many of these wonderful Senators here, and it is a Senate family. You get to know each other on a personal basis, and you see how on occasion a Senator will rise to an occasion. All of the people whom the Senator from Colorado mentioned certainly merit that distinction. But what the Senator from Colorado didn't do is he didn't talk about himself. The Senator from Colorado has done one of the most remarkable jobs of acclimating to the Senate within a short period of time and becoming so effective, and especially on an issue such as immigration, for which he has great passion and compassion.

So I wanted to add my little comments to all of those the Senator mentioned who have so wonderfully stood tall under very difficult circumstances. It is quite unusual when a subject will touch a nerve that will create such passion on both sides—passion that gets so heated that the sides won't talk to each other. We cannot make law like that because, as the Good Book says, you have to come and reason together. When the passion gets so hot that you cannot come and reason together, you cannot come together and build consensus, that is when the legislative process in a democracy breaks down.

These Senators, in the midst of all of that passion, stood tall, comporting themselves extremely well and serving in the best tradition of the U.S. Senate.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and 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. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON of Florida). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ETHICS AND LOBBYING REFORM

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we had a number of conversations this afternoon on the floor about ethics and lobbying reform. We are not going to move on that anymore today. We will renew our request tomorrow, until we get this done. I hope we can get it done. It is really important for the country.

Mr. President, I am reading now into the RECORD a statement that was issued today. I received it in my office, as all Senators did:

Statement on status of 9/11 Commission recommendations bill, dated June 28, 2007.

The 9/11 families are grateful to Congressional Leadership for taking the difficult step of removing a controversial labor provision from pending security legislation intended to implement the remaining 9/11 Commission recommendations.

I will read that again; I didn't do a very good job of it.

The 9/11 families are grateful to Congressional Leadership for taking the difficult step of removing a controversial labor provision from pending security legislation intended to implement the remaining 9/11 Commission recommendations. We recognize that this was a difficult decision for them, considering their party's longstanding dedication to the principles involved.

Passage of this bill is long overdue, particularly in light of bipartisan support at the bill's inception in both the House and Senate. The Democrats have taken an important step toward improving our national security by removing what the opposition identified as an impediment to the bill's passage.

Senate Republican leadership must, in turn, stop blocking the naming of conferees so that this critical legislation can move forward. Similarly, the Administration should cease its threats to veto legislation regarding the provisions that go to the heart of the 9/11 Commission recommendations.

Everyone must work together. The safety and security of our country is at stake.

This is signed by Carol Ashley, whose daughter Janice was lost in that terrorist attack of September 11; Rosemary Dillard, who is the widow of Eddie, who was killed in that terrorist attack; Beverly Eckert, who is the widow of Sean Rooney, who was killed in that attack; Mary Fetchet, the mother of Brad, who was killed in that terrorist attack; Carie Leming, whose daughter Judy was killed in that terrorist attack; and Abraham Scott, the widower of Janice, who was killed in that attack.

These are members of organizations that have been steadfast in making sure everything is done so that we don't have other terrorist attacks and that we implement the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission. Those organizations are Voices of September 11th, 9/11 Pentagon Families, and Families of September 11, which are organizations well known throughout the country.

Earlier this spring, the Director of National Intelligence, ADM Mike McConnell, told our Armed Services Committee in a public hearing that al-Qaida's franchise is growing and its leadership remains alive and well along the Afghanistan/Pakistan border and that any new attack on the United States "most likely would be planned and come out of the [al-Qaida] leadership in Pakistan." We think that is incredible. Almost 6 years after 9/11, we face the same threat we faced that day: Osama bin Laden and a determined extremist group intent on harming Americans. Unfortunately, it is painfully clear that much more can and must be done to protect America from terrorist attacks.

Three years ago, the bipartisan 9/11 Commission recommended ways to

strengthen our defense against terrorism. Unfortunately, the Bush administration and the Republican-controlled Congress failed to act on most of these recommendations. That is why one of the first bills passed in the House and the Senate at the start of this session of Congress would finally and fully implement the unanimous recommendations of the 9/11 Commission.

As my colleagues know, since we acted on a broad bipartisan basis, House and Senate Democrats and Republicans have worked tirelessly to resolve the differences over this bill and get it to the President's desk so it can be signed into law. However, twice this week, my Republican colleagues have objected to moving forward so we can complete action on this bill.

On Tuesday, a Republican Senator made it clear for the record that the Republicans objected to proceeding to conference because of a provision in the bill regarding TSA screeners, which had prompted the President to issue a veto threat on the bill.

Although the provision would improve efficiency, morale, and skills of TSA screeners, President Bush strenuously opposed it.

In an effort to demonstrate our commitment to completing this important legislation as quickly as possible, we informed our Republican colleagues we were prepared to address their objections and remove this provision during conference negotiations. But my Republican colleagues apparently decided to shift the goalposts.

Yesterday, when I asked for consent to proceed with the commitment that the TSA provision not be included in the conference, Senator LOTT objected on behalf of Senate Republicans. But this time he would not say why he objected. He just objected.

Once we made our intentions clear about their expressed concern, I certainly don't understand why my Republican colleagues continue to object to moving forward to complete action on this bill. Why do they keep shifting the goalposts? Of what are they afraid?

This strange behavior is not lost on the American people. Today, representatives of the 9/11 victims, their families, let their views be heard. I have read their statement into the RECORD. The American people expect us to finish this work as rapidly as possible.

There can be little doubt that America will be more secure when this bill is signed into law. That is why I believe we need to take the next procedural step as part of our regular order, which is to appoint conferees to finish these negotiations.

Therefore, Mr. President, I make the following unanimous consent request: That the homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 1 and that the Senate then proceed to its immediate consideration—I am sorry, whenever I see that H.R. 1, it confuses everybody; that is what we

did that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; that all after enacting clause be stricken and the text of S. 4, as passed in the Senate, on March 13, be inserted in lieu thereof; that the bill be read a third time, passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table; that the Senate insist on its amendment, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, and the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate, with the above occurring with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. COBURN. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oklahoma object?

Mr. COBURN. I object.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, does the Senator from Oklahoma wish to make a statement?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, I say to the majority leader, I do not mean to delay this bill. I am on that subcommittee. I worked hard on this bill. I agree with the majority leader that many of those recommendations need to go forward.

This bill spends \$12 billion over the next 3 years. We have worked tirelessly and worked hard. Mr. President, \$9 billion of that \$12 billion is grants. It is certainly not in the best interest of those most at risk, but I lost that fight. So I am willing to let that go. But the postgrant review process, which we asked for and were told would be in the bill before we went to conference, is not in it. Every time we ask about it, we get pushed back.

Until we look at how we are going to spend the money, until we can satisfy that, I don't believe we are ready to go to conference, and I also believe there are still some problems with ports in terms of solving those problems and some of the tier 1 issues we have.

My objection is not meant to be dilatory or anything else, other than to make the point that if we are going to spend \$9 billion in grants to carry these recommendations out—and that is a small portion of the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission, but it is the \$9 billion—and we refuse to have a postgrant auditing process where we look to see—because we know from what IGs have told us and the GAO, much of the money we have been spending post-9/11 has been wasted, and it hasn't gone to prevent the next terrorist act.

I have a personal interest as well. I have a daughter who lives in New York City. I want her protected. I don't want to do something that might stop that, but we have to do it in a way that makes us good stewards of the taxpayers' money.

That is my reason for objecting. It is not on behalf of the Republican leadership. It is on behalf of myself and my

staff in trying to get good value for our money.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I say through the Chair to my friend, I guess I will ask the question: Who have you talked to who said you can't have this postaudit program in the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma can answer the question of the majority leader.

Mr. COBURN. My staff has relayed to me, the Federal Financial Management Subcommittee minority staff, who have been working on this issue since we passed the bill, relayed to me before I came over that they still will not grant us that access in the bill.

Mr. REID. I will be happy to work with Senator LIEBERMAN. He is a person who has a reputation for being fair. He would be the chair of this conference, as far as I know.

I say to my friend, I will be happy to take a look at this issue—no guarantees. It sounds reasonable what the Senator is asking. I ask of the Senator, let us go to conference. If something comes back out of conference—I will personally look into this. I will talk with Senator LIEBERMAN about this issue. I don't know the bill that well because it has been through a committee of which I have no knowledge. But give us a chance. I don't know who the distinguished Republican leader will put on the conference. This is going to be a real conference, an open conference, where people will be able to, in a public meeting, say: I want to offer this amendment, and then the conference can either accept it or reject it.

I think the Senator from Oklahoma should give us a chance. This is an important issue. There are provisions that should be implemented—should have been implemented a long time ago.

I recognize that the Senator has a daughter in New York. I have listened to my colleague, the senior Senator from New York, on more than one occasion about what the people of New York went through, we all went through. America through long-lens glasses watched what happened on 9/11. These people in New York, widows and widowers—and I read their names into the Record—have a better feeling about these issues and we need to get this done.

I commit to my friend, the junior Senator from Oklahoma, that I will personally take a look at this issue. I know how thoughtful he is and how he feels about the money that is spent by the American taxpayers. I will make every effort to make sure the Senator from Oklahoma is treated fairly. Even though he is not a member of the conference, I will arrange it, if he is not on the conference committee, he can come and talk to the conferees. I will do whatever I can to help alleviate any of the concerns he has.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, first, I thank Majority Leader REID for trying to move this bill forward.

Second, I say to my friend from Oklahoma, I have tremendous respect for my friend from Oklahoma. I regard him truly as a friend. We traveled to China together. He is a gentleman, and I don't think anybody doubts the sincerity of his conviction and his desire to save and not waste money.

Similar to Senator REID, I am not familiar with the particulars of this provision the Senator wishes to put into the bill, but it seems reasonable. I have to tell my friend from Oklahoma, I don't want to see money wasted. I can tell him that in New York City, we are not wasting the money. In fact, the taxpayers of New York, the city where his one daughter and two of mine reside, as well as my wife and my parents and most of my family, we in New York don't like to see the money wasted. We think too much of it is spread all over the place.

I will tell him this: That the money that goes to New York is not wasted, No. 1. No. 2, there are areas that affect the whole country that will be held up. Port security—God forbid a nuclear weapon is smuggled into this country and exploded, God forbid. The more we delay on port security, the worse off we will be. Rail security, truck security, and cyber security are all part of this bill.

Similar to Senator REID, it seems to me the proposal the Senator from Oklahoma is making sounds good. Why not have review? Money wasted on this vital area—it is akin to money from the DOD wasted because it is our defense, even though it is our homeland defense as opposed to our military defense—hurts all of us.

But I can tell him this: I have known Senator REID a long time. The Senator from Oklahoma has known him a little less longer than I. When he makes a commitment to be serious about this issue and to look at it carefully and to give a colleague, such as the Senator from Oklahoma, a bird's-eye view of what happens in the conference and the ability to push and make changes, he is sincere. He is not trying to put one over and push this aside.

Also, I am not on the committee, but I will join my colleague from Oklahoma in wanting a review process. I would like to speak with Chairman LIEBERMAN and other members of the committee as to why they didn't put this in. I don't know the reason for that. But I can assure him, as somebody who is involved in many parts of the Homeland Security bill because of the city and State from which I come, I will work with him because I hate seeing the money wasted. I hate it.

In New York City, we are spending money. New York City taxpayers and New York State taxpayers are spending money because we don't think there is enough. I will give one example.

I live in Brooklyn. There is the Brooklyn Bridge. Intelligence reports

targeted the Brooklyn Bridge several years ago, and they know how they would try to blow up the bridge, which is by the two towers, the cables. It is a suspension bridge, the first one ever built. Every day there are two police officers at each end of the bridge. That is four police officers 7 days a week, 24 hours a day. We can't do it part time if terrorists are going to go after this bridge. So that is 20 police officers per week. It is five shifts to do it 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. That money is coming out of the pockets not of my friend from Nevada or my friend from Oklahoma but the daughter of the Senator from Oklahoma, my family, me, city residents. It is not fair.

This bill, in terms of helping deal with some of those issues, is important. In making our homeland secure, it is important.

So I make a plea to my friend from Oklahoma—and he is my friend and I think every bit of his intentions are honorable, as they almost always are—to let this bill go forward, to take the majority leader's word that he will look at this issue himself carefully and make sure the Senator from Oklahoma has the ability to look at it carefully because this bill has been delayed long enough and the heartfelt pleas of the people who Senator REID mentioned—I know most of them personally, I know about their losses, I know their families a little bit—are for real, as are the pleas of everybody else who is involved.

So I ask my colleague to consider lifting his objection and letting us move forward. There will be plenty of time to object if the conference committee doesn't treat him fairly. He can slow this place down and slow the bill down at that point and have the same effect as doing it now, and we might be able to move forward with the legislation.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, if I might be recognized, I say to my colleague for New York, I have been working on this for 6 months. This isn't new. They knew this was coming. These are commitments that were made that were not kept. This is not a reflection on Senator LIEBERMAN. This is a staff-driven problem. The only leverage I have to get staff to do what they are supposed to be doing is this.

I apologize to the Senator and to his constituents. If my colleagues fix it over the break, when we come back, I would not have any objection.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. COBURN. Yes, I yield.

Mr. SCHUMER. Is that the Senator's only objection?

Mr. COBURN. That is the only objection I have.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I say to Senator COBURN, I received a note. This is from Senator LIEBERMAN's staff:

We have worked very close with Senator COBURN's staff—in particular his sub-committee staff director—Katie French. Coburn's provisions were included in S. 4. The House negotiators opposed them and

after long negotiations Katie signed off on our final agreement.

Beth worked on this and will send more information in a moment.

It appears they have worked this out.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, I have no knowledge, I say to the majority leader, that has been worked out. The last memo I have from my staff director is that it has not. If that is the case, again, I will live up to my word that I promised the majority leader and senior Senator from New York that you would not have an objection from me—

Mr. REID. If this is the case, tomorrow in the Senator's absence, can we go ahead with this bill?

Mr. COBURN. If that is the case, then I don't have a basis for objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I was not able to be here yesterday for all of the votes on motions to table amendments to S. 1639. Had I been here, I would have voted against tabling the amendments filed by Senator DODD and Senator MENENDEZ.

TRIBUTE TO BARBARA WHITNEY CARR

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, Chicagoans take our green spaces very seriously. In fact, if you look at the great seal of the city of Chicago, you will see, written in Latin, the city's motto: *Urbs in Horto*—City in a Garden.

So it seems only natural that Chicago is home to one of America's most popular and spectacular gardens: the Chicago Botanic Garden.

The Botanic Garden is one of the brightest jewels in Chicago's crown of great cultural and educational institutions.

Since its opening in 1972, the Chicago Botanic Garden has provided a 385-acre island of beauty and tranquility just outside of one of America's biggest and busiest cities.

Today, it is the second-most visited public garden in the country, drawing appreciative visitors from throughout the Chicago area and around the globe.

Part of what makes the Chicago Botanic Garden so extraordinary is the dedication, vision and inexhaustible energy of the woman who has served as its president for the last 12 years, Barbara Whitney Carr.

With a great sense of gratitude—and a touch of sadness I would like to wish Barbara Carr well as she prepares to step down from the Botanic Garden and begin a new chapter in her life. More importantly, I want to thank her for all she has done to make the Chicago Botanic Garden a beautiful oasis, a popular tourist attraction, and an important teaching tool.

Like Daniel Burnham, the legendary planner who redesigned Chicago after

the Great Fire of 1871, Barbara Carr "make(s) no little plans."

She joined the Botanic Garden as president and CEO in 1995 and immediately set to work developing and carrying out a 10-year, \$100 million improvement plan.

Her plan included renovation and construction of eight gardens, as well as the restoration of close to 6 miles of Lake Michigan shoreline.

Under her direction, the Chicago Botanic Garden has expanded its collection to include more than 2 million plants.

While it is undeniably beautiful, the Chicago Botanic Garden prides itself on being more than just a pretty garden. Under Barbara Carr's leadership, the garden has truly become a living museum and classroom. Students from the Chicago Public Schools attend programs at the garden in which they learn about the science of plants and the importance preserving biodiversity.

And you don't even have to visit the Botanic Garden to learn from it. Working with the University of Illinois at Chicago, the garden created an online, searchable database of plant species that can help even the most inexperienced gardener. It is called *eplants.org*. If you have a garden you might want to bookmark that site. It is a good one.

A few years ago, Barbara Carr realized that in Chicago—one of the greenest cities in the country—there weren't a lot of advanced degree programs in horticulture and botany, and she quickly set about to fill that gap. She initiated the creation of an Academic Affairs Program at the Botanic Garden and teamed with Northwestern University, the Illinois Institute of Technology, and the University of Illinois to develop several outstanding academic programs.

In recent years the garden has become the site of cutting edge research in the fields of botany and environmental conservation.

In recent years the garden has become the site of cutting edge research in the fields of botany and environmental conservation. It is home to an impressive seed repository called the Seeds of Success program, part of a global initiative to collect and store native seeds in order to preserve plant biodiversity.

Over the years, both Barbara and the garden have received many accolades. The garden was recognized for its educational programs and community outreach projects with the National Award for Museum and Library Service in 2004. This prestigious honor is the highest award bestowed upon a museum. Earlier this year, the American Public Garden Association presented Barbara with the 2007 Award of Merit, the organization's highest honor.

Before joining the Botanic Garden, Barbara Carr earned a degree from Denison University in Ohio. She spent nearly 20 years at the Lincoln Park Zoological Society, serving as its executive director and president.