

billion added to it that did not have anything to do with the war, didn't have anything to do with priorities in this country, didn't have anything to do with that other than adding things on because it was outside the budget so they could spend more inside the budget.

I am in my fourth year in the Senate. One of the things we have done ever since I have been here is try to root out waste, fraud, and abuse. There is no question right now that in the Federal budget—almost \$3 trillion—over \$300 billion right now that is in the appropriated programs and in the mandatory programs is lost to fraud, waste, and abuse. So we are going to be bringing a bill to the floor for \$120 or \$107 billion, plus probably another \$10 or \$15 billion that the porkers will add to it and oink all the way, and nobody is going to offer anything to offset it out of the fraud, waste, and abuse—the waste we have because we are not paying attention to the running of the Government. We hear this big debate about earmarks, the prerogative to make sure that we point to things. The fact is, the way you point out things is to do oversight on the waste, fraud, and abuse.

If you think this is not accurate, let me give you a list of where the waste is. There is \$90 billion worth of fraud in Medicare right now, and there is \$10 billion that we pay that we inherently pay wrongly. So that comes to over \$100 billion in Medicare alone that should not be going out the door. We are not doing a thing about it. Nobody is going to offer an amendment. It will not even be judged as in order with the rules, to get rid of the fraud in Medicare. Medicaid is same thing—\$30 billion in fraud, \$15 billion in overpayments for people that we just made a mistake in paying. No, there is not going to be anything offered during the supplemental to fix that, so right there you have \$125, \$130 billion that would pay—just in fixing Medicare and Medicaid fraud.

There will not be a rule that will allow us to vote on that. There will not be a way for us to do it because that is hard work, and we do not want to do the hard work.

Social Security disability fraud, \$2.5 billion; the governmentwide overpayments, improper payments, overpayments for other things, \$15 billion. These are not my numbers, these are documented numbers by either the GAO, the Congressional Budget Office or the IGs; \$8 billion that the Defense Department pays out for bonuses for companies that did not earn the bonus or performance awards.

There is not going to be anything in this to fix that. It is not even going to be made in order. And \$4 billion that we are being defrauded on a crop insurance modernization program, where we allow for crop insurance a higher rate of return than any other casualty or insurance company could earn.

No bid contracts, \$5 billion. U.N. contributions that are purely waste, that

get defrauded and wasted, \$2 billion. We buy \$64 billion worth of IT projects a year, and at least 20 percent of it is wasted. That is another \$12.8 billion.

Nobody is going to fix that on this. No, we are going to borrow the money from our children. So I raise the issue that we are going to pass a supplemental, and the games are going to be played on it like they are every year. People are going to add things that are not a priority; they are going to add them in—they are not in the budget—knowing they are going to go straight to the debt. Is it in our interest for us to consider, as we do the supplemental, what we are spending right now per American family on different things?

Let me spend a minute to outline that every American family is paying \$8,668 for Medicare and Social Security every year; every American family is paying over \$5,000 a year to defend this country; we are spending \$3,752 for antipoverty programs every year; we are spending \$2,000 a family for interest on the national debt, which is going to be higher next year because we are going to borrow all the supplemental and add that to our debt.

Federal employee retirement benefits cost every family in this country \$1,000 a year—\$1,000 a year for every family. Veterans' benefits, \$750 per family; health research and regulations, \$692; education, \$578; highway mass transit, \$455; unemployment benefits, \$320; international affairs, \$300.

We have a deficit that is going to be \$800 billion this year. While Congress sits on its heels and has debates about legislating or not legislating, we are going to continue the same bad habits of not holding agencies accountable, not being transparent about what we are doing, and we are going to say we funded the war, but we are not going to make any of the hard choices about it.

When this bill comes to the floor, it is going to have \$17 to \$20 billion that does not have anything to do with the war but has everything to do with political directives outside the budget so we can spend more money.

Washington does not need a raise, it needs a cut. It is time for us to pay for the war by getting rid of the waste, fraud, and abuse in this Federal Government. Unfortunately, there is not the character or the courage in either the House or the Senate to take on that fight because it might impact political careers.

So as you listen to the debate when we come up with the supplemental, we need to fund our troops, there is no question about it, but we should not be funding our troops on the backs of our children. We should be funding our troops on the backs of us, and we ought to be doing that every time.

So I am going to do all in my power to try to offer amendments to offset the funds in this war supplemental. I know the rules will prohibit me from doing many of them. But I am not going to stop talking. I am not going to stop talking about the \$350 billion

that goes down the drain and steals the future and opportunity from our children.

That is exactly what we are going to be doing. And we are going to be smiling all the way through and patting ourselves on the back that we funded the war. But we did it on the backs of those who do not have the same opportunities we were given. We are going to steal those opportunities from the next two generations.

It is time for Congress to start doing its job. That means tough, rigorous oversight and staying within the budget guidelines and spending the money like it was ours, not like we had an unending credit card that never comes due.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maryland.

#### FAIR PAY RESTORATION ACT

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, thank you very much. I too wish to speak as in morning business.

All over America today, people are celebrating Earth Day. But we, the women of the Senate, have another day we are commemorating, it is called Pay Equity Day. That means women should get paid equal pay for equal or comparable work.

You are going see the women of the Senate dressed in red today. We are going to be on the Senate floor, we are going to be in our committees, and we are going to be doing our job. But we wear the color red with solidarity for women all over who say: We are red in the face because of the way women have been treated in terms of our pay.

Right now, in the year 2008, women still make less money per hour than men for the same or comparable job. If that was not hard enough about the business practices, we actually have a Supreme Court that agreed with discrimination.

So today we come to the floor with legislation that has been developed, on a bipartisan basis, to reverse a Supreme Court decision called the Ledbetter decision.

You have to hear this. Last May, the Supreme Court made an outrageous decision that said women cannot get equal pay for equal work if they do not do it within the first 180 days that a discrimination occurs. The decision was sexist, it was biased, and it did not understand the reality of women's lives or the reality of the workplace.

Their decision was a step backward for women, and it hit women right in the pocketbook. It violates the American concept of fairness and justice and equal treatment under the law.

Let me tell you about Lilly Ledbetter, who brought the case to the Supreme Court. I met her in the HELP Committee—the Health, Education, Labor Committee—when we were listening to the testimony about it. I listened to her story. This is a woman

now who is beyond middle-age, who has worked 19 years for the Goodyear Corporation.

Systematically, she was underpaid from the day she walked in that door. Not only did she get less pay for the work that she did, but she did not get comparable raises when the men got theirs.

What does that mean? Not only did she have less earnings in her work, though she worked as hard, received excellent ratings, and was promoted, but it also now will show up in her pension; she will get less Social Security and she will get less pension. So remember, when discrimination begins, it is compounded over a lifetime.

Now, Lilly Ledbetter is a real American. She fought the system on her own time and with great risk. She fought the discrimination and took it to the Equal Opportunity Commission, took it to the courts, and then took it all the way up to the Supreme Court. Along the way, she had to raise her own money to do this, while the big corporate interests at Goodyear had fat-cat, billable-hours lawyers against her.

She faced sexual harassment in the workplace because she dared to speak up and speak out. Well, Lilly Ledbetter would not give up. If she was the only case in America, it would be wrong, but this is a persistent pattern in the workplace. And also it has now been approved by the Supreme Court.

The Supreme Court said: Someone cannot sue their employer over unequal pay if that person does not file suit within 180 days after the pay was established.

Once again, the Supreme Court does not get it. How many women know the salary of their coworkers, especially in the first 6 months on the job? The reality of the workplace is that often people are forbidden to talk about their salaries. What if you were hired at an equal rate with your male counterpart, but he gets a raise every few months and you do not? The Supreme Court decision was outrageous. It was so bad that Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg, God bless her, God bless Justice Ruth, she stood up and actually spoke from the bench to read her dissenting opinion.

That is unprecedented. Usually, they file it and let it go into the history books. But Justice Ginsburg wanted to put the world and this Congress on notice that we better act. Justice Ginsburg said in her dissenting opinion:

In our view, the court does not comprehend or is indifferent to the insidious way in which women can be victims of pay discrimination.

She encouraged the Congress to fix it, and we will fix it. We will. Unfortunately, wage discrimination exists. Woman now earn 77 percent for every dollar our male counterpart makes. Women of color even get paid less. African-American women get paid 68 cents for every dollar a White man makes. That is almost a 40-percent difference.

The Supreme Court decision will make it almost impossible for women workers to close this wage gap and to get the remedy they deserve, and what they should get, under our doctrine of fairness, is equal pay for equal or comparable work.

From the bench, Justice Ginsburg did call on the Congress for action. She said, "Correct the mistake."

Well, when Justice Ruth speaks, and by the way, do we not miss our Justice Sandra Day O'Connor? Justice Alito wrote the primary assenting opinion. They told us the Court made a mistake and the Congress could fix it. Well, fix it we will. We will be soon voting on the legislative process in the bill itself to right this wrong. We will be voting on legislation that will correct this mistake.

This legislation was authored by our great Galahad in the Senate, Senator KENNEDY. He did it in consultation with we, the women in the Senate: Senator CLINTON, myself, Senator SNOWE, women on both sides of the aisle. He reached out to us. We reached out to the best legal thinking.

This bill will amend title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. This bill will amend the Civil Rights Act of 1964, so the statute of limitations for an employee to file a wage discrimination suit runs from the date of the actual payment of the discriminatory wage, not from the hiring. So every time you get a paycheck, it will be an act of discrimination, which will reset the clock so you can file your case.

That means employees can sue employers based on each discriminating paycheck, and it does not limit the time a worker can get the remedy she deserves. This bill is about fairness, justice, and respect. Is it not time, is it not time? When we think about Lilly Ledbetter and all those wonderful women similar to her, a woman who worked for 19 years, she was not exactly sure when the disparity developed, she could not quite get to all that.

A jury found they had discriminated against her. They awarded her \$400,000 in backpay. The Supreme Court took it away from her. Well, today, we are going to give it back to her. We are going to make sure she and her guts and her grit, in standing up for herself, has stood up for all women.

We who are the women of the Senate stand up as well, I believe also with the very good men who work with us. Men of quality never fear women who seek equality. We are doing that today. We believe in this country all people are created equal. We need to make sure it is in the Federal law books and in your personal checkbook.

All people are created equal in the Federal lawbook and in your personal checkbook. People should be judged by their skills, their competence, and by the job they do. Once you get that job because of your skills and talent, you should get equal pay for equal or comparable work.

Lilly Ledbetter was an honest and hard-working person for 19 years. She is entitled to every cent she worked for. Because Lilly Ledbetter stood up, we rise with her. We are going to correct the Supreme Court decision. We are going to pass this reform legislation that is called the Fair Pay Restoration Act. We ask the Presiding Officer to join with us today. For all of us who wear red, this is going to be a great victory.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TESTER). The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I come to join my colleague from Maryland, the distinguished Senator MIKULSKI, who has always fought for women's rights because she knows that is what will make our country strong. I serve on the Health, Education, and Labor Committee with the Senator from Maryland. We saw Lilly Ledbetter come before our committee to speak about her experience in a factory where she was not given fair pay. Over time it went all the way to the Supreme Court, where she lost her right in her own lifetime to ever be compensated for the pay she lost because she wasn't treated fairly. She came before our committee, and she was such a woman of dignity and courage, not speaking for herself—anything we do on the floor won't help her personally—but speaking for all women who will come behind her for decades, to make sure they have the right to get equal pay when they are performing an equal job.

I thank Senator MIKULSKI for her leadership and urge our colleagues tomorrow to vote with us so we can go to the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act and once and for all assure that our daughters and future generations will have access to equal pay.

This Senate has a very proud history of working across the aisle to pass civil rights laws. Those historic laws ensure that all people have equal rights, regardless of race, religion, gender, or national origin. I am proud that they ensure that my daughter now has the right to work in the same jobs and achieve the same success as my son. But even though women are doing the same jobs as men and working as hard every day, they still are not equal on one important day. That is payday. On payday, women will take home 77 cents for every dollar paid to their male coworkers. That pay gap is even wider for African-American and Latino women. African-American women earn 67 cents on the dollar and Latino women earn 56 cents for every dollar a white man makes. I know some people out there say: That can't be true. It is true.

I rise on Equal Pay Day to recognize that we still have a lot of work to do to ensure fairness in society. Tomorrow is the day the Senate can go on record saying we in this country are going to stand behind the women and men and their children who rely on them to bring home a paycheck.

The pay gap that exists is true regardless of skill or education. It is so deeply engrained in society that many jobs dominated by women pay less than jobs dominated by men, even when the work they do is almost exactly the same. In my State of Washington, a woman with a college degree earns about \$20,000 less than a man with the same education. According to a study by the American Association of University Women, the difference in pay starts as soon as that woman enters the workforce. That study found that within a year after graduating from college, a woman will already earn less than her male classmates in nearly every major. So that is a problem when one starts out. It is also a lifelong problem, because by the end of her career, a female worker will have lost an average of \$250,000 in earnings.

It is just as important to make it clear that the pay gap is a problem for everyone. This disparity hurts millions of families. In almost 10 million households, mothers are the only breadwinners, and in many cases those women are also supporting parents and extended family members. In far too many of those households women have to struggle to pay for rent or heat or food or gas, especially today as prices are rising. Think of how much better off families would be if a woman were paid a wage equal to men, especially as the economic downturn grows worse and expenses rise.

If women and men made an equal wage, single working women would have 17 percent more income each and every year. Ensuring they earn a fair paycheck could cut the poverty rate in half. Wage disparity follows those women into retirement. Women today are twice as likely to live in poverty over the age of 65. Women are more dependent upon Social Security for a greater percentage of their retirement income. All of us are staring down the looming Social Security crisis. Think how much better off we would be if women could save a little more for retirement and contribute more to Social Security.

My colleagues and I should not have to be here talking about this today. I should not have to come to the floor in the year 2008 to make a case for equal pay. Not only is it a no-brainer, but fairness and equality are fundamental American values. We are not asking for special treatment. We are here because, despite all the work done to ensure equal rights, women haven't achieved equality. We are here because we run the risk that pay discrimination laws are growing weaker, not stronger, if we don't act.

As Senator MIKULSKI discussed, the Supreme Court last May took a big step backward with its decision on *Ledbetter v. Goodyear*. That decision went against Congress's intent and 40 years of EEOC practice. It made it almost impossible for workers who suffer pay discrimination to now seek justice.

Today on Equal Pay Day, we urge our colleagues to support legislation that

would reverse that decision and ensure workers have a fair shot at fighting discrimination. The *Ledbetter* decision requires many workers to file a claim within 180 days after their employer discriminates against them, but it does not recognize that in many cases workers don't even know they have been discriminated against for years. It may take them much longer than 180 days to gather the proof. Frankly, for women in the workplace to be aggressive in finding out how much other people get paid in order to even file a case is very difficult. This sounds an awful lot like the Supreme Court is asking our workers to be mindreaders. That is unfair. It is not what Congress intended when we created that law in the first place.

The *Ledbetter Fair Pay Act* will allow workers to file a claim within 180 days of any discriminatory paycheck. It gives workers the ability to discover the facts and to challenge ongoing discrimination. Although the *Ledbetter* case involved gender discrimination, the decision applies to all kinds of discrimination, including religion, race, age, disability, and national origin.

Our Nation was founded on the principle that all of its citizens are created equal. We think they ought to be equal on payday as well. As a mother and grandmother, I want my children to live in a country where my daughter can earn as much as my son. Now is the time to ensure that that can be true by strengthening our pay discrimination laws. Now is the time to ensure the Senate's history of civil rights cannot be eroded.

Tomorrow is an important day for women and men. I urge my colleagues to vote with us to consider the *Fair Pay Act*.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mrs. McCASKILL. Mr. President, I also rise to talk about Lilly *Ledbetter* and some practical realities regarding this issue. I had the honor of representing a number of people on discrimination cases during the time I practiced law in Kansas City. I represented people on age discrimination, race discrimination, and gender discrimination. I am familiar with the law before *Ledbetter*. The thing about this decision that is hardest for me is how impractical it is. When I was a single mom with three small kids in a job with a lot of responsibility and long hours, I had to be very practical in the way I lived my life. Working women across this country are very practical people. They have to prioritize. They make multitasking a way of life.

I look at this decision from a practical standpoint. Here is what sticks in my craw. They are acting as if when you get a paycheck, immediately some switch is turned on in your head that says: My paycheck is discriminatory.

There is no way women in the workplace can look at their paycheck and immediately determine they have been

discriminated against. They don't know what everybody else is making. If you are going to say that someone only has 180 days to file a complaint on discrimination from the date the decision is made to make that complaint, what you are saying is that everybody in the workplace, whether they are an elderly person, whether they are a minority, whether they are a woman, they are going to have to turn into a detective every time they get a paycheck. They are going to have to run around and interview their colleagues as to how much money they are making to make sure their paycheck is fair. That is dumb. That is just dumb.

First, you are not even supposed to talk about your paycheck in the workplace. In many places of employment, the boss says it is against policy to discuss with other people what their salary is or what your pay is. So what we are saying to the women and to the older workforce and to members of minorities is: Now you have to figure out what is in the head of your employer. And by the way, you have 6 months.

If I were an employer in America, I would say: Hey, talk about hurting productivity.

Instead, doesn't it make sense that we should be able to show a pattern of discrimination that is reflected in a series of paychecks? Of course, it does. Who has the best knowledge as to whether someone is being discriminated against? I will guarantee you, it is not the person receiving the check. I think about the cases I represented and what kind of incredibly high bar it would have been for each one of those individuals to figure out in 180 days whether their paycheck was fair.

It is funny how people around this place talk about activist judges. I have a feeling that when we debate this issue today and tomorrow, and as this vote occurs, we won't hear a word from the other side about activist judges. This was, in fact, a Supreme Court decision that radically changed the law as we knew it, as it has been practiced in this country, as it has, in fact, been embraced by this country. This Court, by the narrowest of margins, said 5 to 4 that they were going to upset all that law and make it very difficult for people in the workplace to have their day in the bright sunshine of justice.

I am tempted to call it an activist judiciary. They are out of control. We have to do something about the judiciary. Instead, what we need to do is what we have always done in our history. We have to correct it. By the way, that decision spoke to us in terms of asking us, in the dissent, to take the steps necessary to put the law back where it was before that fateful day last summer when the Supreme Court said to the people who have been discriminated against: We are going to make it really hard for you to hold your employer accountable.

This is not a twilight zone of liability for companies. This is a situation where all the damages that someone

can receive is just 2 years, regardless of how long the discrimination has gone on. Mr. President, 180 days is a very short period of time in terms of filing a complaint—much shorter than any other statute of limitations that is out there for any wrong anyone suffers in our country.

I think people need to remember how Lilly found out about this. The jury found in her favor. The EEOC found in her favor. The law was in her favor—until the Supreme Court overturned it.

How did she find out she was being discriminated against? She had been there all these years. She had started out on an even keel with the colleagues who were men. Someone slipped her an anonymous note. There is not a tote board somewhere she could have checked. Someone slipped her an anonymous note in the workplace and said: Hey, do you realize what is happening to you? You need to start asking some questions about what is happening to your pay.

This is not just about women. This is also about the older workforce. By the way, with the economy the way it is right now, under this administration, people are having to work longer. People who used to think they could retire at 62—forget about that—they are working into their late sixties, into their seventies. In fact, we have many Members in this body who are working hard every day who are well beyond their early seventies who are contributing on a daily basis to this place. Should those people be discriminated against because they are older? Should they have to figure out in 180 days that a younger colleague is making a bigger paycheck?

What about the minorities in this country? This is not just about women. This is about discrimination. We need to send a very clear signal to the rest of the country that we understand we have to fix this and we have to fix it quickly.

This is not a bunch of whining over something that is not important. That 22 cents in Missouri that a woman makes less than a man is important. It is important to pay for the gas. It is important to pay for the daycare. It is important in order to make the bills come out even.

In Missouri, the figure is that women earn 78 cents for every \$1 earned by men. The median annual income for a man with a college degree in Missouri, from the years 2004 to 2006, was \$59,000. For a woman with the same amount of education, it was \$46,000. The American Association of University Women did that study in the State of Missouri.

We need to unite behind this legislation. This is not going to be onerous for employers out there. It is fair. It is just fair. It is what we pledge allegiance to every day in this room: equal justice for all. Let's make sure we fix this. Let's make sure we move and pass this bill and send it to the President. I will tell you what, if this President has the nerve to veto this bill, I know a lot

of women in America who are going to wake up and get busy before November.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I would like to be recognized, if I could. I ask to speak in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator withhold the suggestion?

Mrs. McCASKILL. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

#### VETERANS' BENEFITS ENHANCEMENT ACT

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, this morning on the floor of the Senate is a bill entitled the Veterans' Benefits Enhancement Act of 2007. Nine months ago, this bill came out of committee, and this bill is now on the floor and to be considered.

Back in November of last year, I asked for permission to bring this bill up for consideration in the Senate and have amendments. It is the orderly process of the Senate, a deliberative process: a debate—and one might expect that is what we do around here. But, sadly, at that point the Republican minority objected to bringing up the Veterans' Benefits Enhancement Act, even though it had passed out of the committee with an overwhelmingly positive vote.

What is included in this bill? A long list of important changes in the law, changes which will give to our veterans, especially those returning now disabled from combat, benefits they absolutely need: housing, education.

In addition, there is a provision in here which I support—was happy to join as a cosponsor—related to Filipino World War II veterans. I think it is long overdue that the U.S. Senate recognize the contribution made by so many Filipinos in World War II to the success of our war effort. They fought so gallantly and courageously and stood by our troops at a moment we desperately needed their help. Those who are not students of history may have forgotten or never read that our fight in the Philippines was a bitter, long, and tragic battle that ended well but only after great sacrifice by the Filipino people, by the Filipino soldiers, and by our American soldiers.

This provision in the bill related to veterans:

would deem certain service before July 1, 1946, in the organized military forces of the Philippines and the Philippine Scouts as active military service for purposes of eligibility for veterans benefits.

[It] would provide that the children of deceased or totally-disabled service-connected Filipino veterans who qualify for educational benefits would be paid at the same rate and under the same conditions as the children of other veterans.

Mr. President, this is long overdue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Time for morning business is expired.

#### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 10 minutes on the bill.

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

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, would the clerk report the motion to proceed to the bill at this point, or should I proceed?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is appropriate to close morning business and then report the motion to proceed.

Morning business is closed.

#### VETERANS' BENEFITS ENHANCEMENT ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume the motion to proceed to S. 1315, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A motion to proceed to the bill (S. 1315) to amend title 38, United States Code, to enhance life insurance benefits for disabled veterans, and for other purposes.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I see Senator KLOBUCHAR on the floor. I think she was coming to speak in morning business, and I may have used the minute or two that was remaining for her. I wish to address the motion to proceed to the bill that is pending, but since she is on the floor, I would like to give her a chance to speak at this moment before I do. So I ask—if it meets with the approval of the Senator from North Carolina—unanimous consent that the Senator from Minnesota be recognized for—

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Five minutes.

Mr. DURBIN. Five minutes, and that following her remarks, I be recognized for 10 minutes to speak on the pending motion to proceed.

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I do not plan on objecting, if the 5 minutes is to come out of the majority's time for the debate—which the time is split between now and 12 o'clock between the majority and minority—if Senator KLOBUCHAR's time comes out of the majority's time, fine.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, it is my understanding Senator AKAKA wants to speak for up to 10 minutes. So I am trying to figure out—we have 38 minutes remaining before the vote, so that would allow 19 minutes per side. If Senator AKAKA needs 10 minutes, I would ask for 4 minutes and yield 5 minutes to Senator KLOBUCHAR, if that meets with the Senator's approval.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I say to my colleague from Illinois, thank you very much. I appreciate the time. If I go less than 5 minutes, I will give you back the rest of the time.