

It was one of those Saturday night games football fans live for. And before I say more about the Saints, I want to extend my congratulations to the University of Sioux Falls Cougars, which put up a heck of a fight, after a heck of a season.

But with last night's win, Carroll held a perfect season. They were undefeated every step of the way. And every step of the way, Montanans watched with pride as they showed us what it takes to work as a team. And to win.

Carroll's Fighting Saints are no stranger to making football history. This isn't the first year they have returned to Montana with a national trophy.

What does it take?

It takes hard work. Strong leadership—especially under Coach Mike Van Diest—and old-fashioned Montana grit.

Most importantly, it takes teamwork and trust. Place kicker Tom Yarekmo missed two field goals. But Coach Van Diest trusted Yarekmo to try again—and he made the winning field goal.

Mr. President, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the team, the coaches and a whole lot of dedicated fans.

Their hard work and their victory is a warm reminder that hard work pays off.

We're already looking forward to next year.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

VOTE EXPLANATIONS

VOTE NO. 278

Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. President, had I been present on Saturday, December 18, I would have voted nay on the motion to invoke cloture on the Development, Relief, and Education for Alien Minors DREAM Act:

"While sympathetic to those who passionately support it, I cannot support the DREAM Act; as is, at this time.

"I strongly believe the DREAM Act should require the completion of a degree. As currently written, the legislation does not. Requiring the completion of a degree is exactly what the DREAM Act should be about, as it will help ensure that the young people who qualify have a real chance to fulfill the American dream and become the productive citizens they aspire to be.

"In fact, I have had sincere discussions with my fellow Senators and committee staff as to whether it would be possible to change the legislation to address my concerns. At this time, it is not.

"All that being said, I do believe, as most Americans do, that our immigration system is broken and must be fixed. During the next session of Congress, I sincerely hope to work with my Republican and Democratic colleagues to achieve true comprehensive immigration reform."

VOTE NO. 279

Mr. President, had I been present to vote on Saturday, December 18, I would

have voted nay on the repeal of the military's don't ask, don't tell policy:

"Over the past several days, I have spoken with many passionate West Virginians who hold different views on this policy. I greatly appreciate all of the feedback that my office has received.

"As I have said before, my primary concern with repeal of "Don't Ask, Don't Tell," DADT, stems from the Armed Services Committee testimony by two Service Chiefs, Army Chief of Staff General George Casey and Marine Corps Commandant General James Amos. Their issues are with the timing and the impact of the repeal's implementation on our front line combat troops during a time of war.

"While it may be little solace to those who disagreed with my earlier vote, over the last 9 days, I have had sincere discussions with my fellow Senators and other officials as to whether it would be possible to change the legislation to address my concerns over timing and implementation. With the legislative process nearing an end, it was simply not possible to alter the proposed DADT legislation.

"As such, while I believe the DADT policy will be repealed, and probably should be repealed in the near future, I cannot support a repeal of the policy at this time."

FEDERAL FUNDING

Mr. LEAHY, Mr. President, earlier this week, Republican Members who had pledged to support the fiscal year 2011 Omnibus appropriations bill changed their minds and chose instead to walk in lockstep with the House and Senate Republican leaders who believe that freezing spending at the fiscal year 2010 level is good politics.

On the face of it that approach has an appeal to it—no new spending. What a nice sound bite. It makes everything seem so simple.

But while one Senator of the minority party gleefully remarked on the Senate floor "we won," it is worth taking a minute to consider what a continuing resolution means—not for the Republican Party but for the American people.

That it is a short-sighted abdication of Congress's responsibility over Federal funding almost goes without saying. But in fact it is worse than that.

The Senators who profess to care about the security of this country but refuse to put their money where their mouth is, bear responsibility for the consequences.

Every American family—yours and mine—knows that in a year's time our budget priorities and the necessities of our families change from the year before. So do the budget priorities of a diverse country of more than 300 million people in a rapidly changing and dangerous world.

Those who celebrated after defeating the Omnibus—a bill that is supported by a majority of Senators—are implic-

itly promoting the myth that priorities and circumstances do not change from one year to the next.

They would substitute the mindlessness of a copy machine for the judgment that the American people pay their representatives to use in making these decisions.

A robo budget is a disservice to the American people, to our national security, and to this Nation's needs and interests here at home. Yet that is the option we are left with.

What is our job here? Is it to rubberstamp what we did last year, despite different circumstances and the passage of a year's time? I won't speak for the chairs of the other Appropriations subcommittees.

They know the consequences of a continuing resolution for the programs in their jurisdictions better than I.

But as chairman of the Department of State and Foreign Operations Subcommittee, I can say unequivocally that freezing spending for global security programs—as we are about to do—will shortchange the American people—this generation and future generations, compromise the security of this country, and cost the lives of countless people in the world's poorest countries.

Contrary to what some of our friends in the minority seem not to fully appreciate, the United States is a global power. We have vital interests around the world, from the Korean Peninsula to Mexico, that are important to the lives and livelihoods of every American.

We are involved in two wars, with over 150,000 troops deployed in harm's way—wars that will not be won by military force alone.

Our economy is tied to the economies of countries far and wide. Our security depends on what happens thousands of miles from our shores, as much as it does at our borders.

Americans are traveling, working, studying and living in every country on Earth. We have diplomats and military personnel stationed on every continent.

Our environment, the health of our citizens, the security of our borders, and relations with our allies as well as our adversaries, are not static. Time does not stand still. It marches on, either with us or without us.

What the other party is saying is that while China and our other competitors aggressively expand their influence, the United States will pull back. While other countries become global markets, we will freeze our export promotion programs.

While international terrorism, transnational crime and corruption threaten American businesses and fragile democracies, including in our own hemisphere, we will retrench.

That is the vision of the minority. It is myopic. It is self-defeating. It pretends to help solve the deficit, when in fact it will have virtually no impact on the deficit. But it will weaken our influence around the world.

In contrast, the Omnibus appropriations bill that was abandoned 3 nights ago would have cut spending below the President's budget request by some \$29 billion, as our Republican friends insisted just a few short months ago. Then they moved the goal posts.

And 3 nights ago they walked off the playing field altogether, when those who said they would support it changed their minds—or had their minds changed for them.

The Omnibus would have cut the budget for the Department of State and Foreign Operations by \$3.2 billion below the President's request.

The funding for the Department of State and Foreign Operations, which represents 1 percent of the Federal budget—1 percent—is a far cry from what we should be allocating to protect America's interests.

Fifty years from now I suspect our grandchildren or great-grandchildren will look back and wonder why we were so penny wise and pound foolish, when so much was at stake.

But if one asks which would be better for our national security, a continuing resolution or the Omnibus; or which would be better for protecting America's interests in the global economy; or which would be better for strengthening our alliances and improving our image around the world? There is no comparison.

Let me cite a few examples.

The Omnibus would have funded global health programs, including vaccines and nutrition for children, maternal health, and programs to prevent or treat infectious diseases like HIV/AIDS, West Nile, the Asian Flu, and drug-resistant tuberculosis.

These and as yet unknown viruses can become raging pandemics overnight. They can spread across the globe to our shores with the ease of an airplane flight.

The other party may not want to talk about cutting these programs. But when there is an outbreak of a deadly disease like the Asian flu that could endanger the lives of millions of Americans, we can predict they will demand to know what the State Department is doing about it.

It won't matter that they just cut the budget for disease surveillance and prevention.

At a time when there are more than 7,000 new HIV infections each day, a continuing resolution will reduce the U.S. contribution to the Global HIV/AIDS fund by \$75 million. That will almost certainly cause other donors to reduce their contributions too. Millions of people who need drugs to stay alive, won't get them.

The Pakistan Counterinsurgency Capability Fund, which is a cornerstone of our partnership with the Pakistani Armed Forces in fighting al-Qaida, will be cut by \$300 million in a continuing resolution. It makes no sense.

A continuing resolution will cut funding by more than \$700 million for agriculture and food security pro-

grams, small business development, clean water, energy, basic education, trade capacity, and other priorities of both Democrats and Republicans, as well as of American businesses, universities, and other organizations that implement these programs.

There are thousands of American diplomats stationed in almost every country of the world, assisting American citizens and businesses, defending our interests and our security. They risk their lives in countries where Americans are targeted, and many have lost their lives in the line of duty.

A continuing resolution will provide half a billion dollars less than the Omnibus would have for the State Department's overseas operations, including for Afghanistan and Pakistan, requiring cuts to personnel, information technology, and public diplomacy programs that counter extremist propaganda and other misinformation about the United States.

How, in the world, does that make sense? Will anyone advocating this recklessness come forward to explain it to the American people? Apparently not. Better to declare "we won," and hope the public never finds out that they lost.

A continuing resolution will cut funding for U.S. Embassy security, construction, and maintenance programs, delaying the completion of new facilities to replace the most vulnerable embassies in some of the most dangerous locations.

Security costs money, but the minority will cut these programs. Any delay in the completion of these facilities will extend the risks to American diplomats, consular officers, and other personnel overseas.

A continuing resolution will cut funding for educational and cultural exchange programs—programs that Republicans have claimed to strongly support. That means thousands fewer participants in exchange programs, including those from Muslim-majority countries and Muslim communities worldwide, and a corresponding retreat for our national security interests.

A continuing resolution will cut hundreds of millions of dollars for clean technology and other programs to reduce global warming. Whatever one may think about climate change, 95 percent of new births are occurring in the world's poorest countries, where the demand for energy is exploding. The environmental consequences of this exponential growth in energy consumption are staggering, and we ignore it at our peril.

There are dozens of other examples, but the point is simple. The other party may think this is good politics at home, but it represents a dereliction of duty.

It will have no appreciable impact on the deficit. In fact, over time, it is just as likely to cost the taxpayers more. But most important, the Omnibus, while billions of dollars below the President's budget request, would have at least enabled us to not lose ground.

We would have at least been able to respond to new threats as they develop.

We would have at least been able to continue the effort started by former Secretary of State Colin Powell, and strongly supported by Secretary of Defense Gates, to build the diplomatic corps we need.

We would have at least been able to compete in new and emerging export markets. We would have at least been able to maintain programs with Mexico and Pakistan, transfer responsibility in Iraq from the Department of Defense to the Department of State, support public diplomacy and exchange programs with countries where large majorities have hostile and distorted opinions of the United States, and continue initiatives that are strongly supported by both Democrats and Republicans.

That is the choice. It is not theatrical; it has very real consequences. It should not be a political or partisan choice.

Senator GREGG and I worked hand in hand to write our portion of the Omnibus within the allocation we were given, an allocation that was \$3.2 billion below the President's budget request.

I am not among those who believe the Congress should hand over our responsibility for the budget to an unelected, unaccountable bureaucracy, but there were no earmarks in our portion of the Omnibus. That has been the practice of our subcommittee for many years.

The minority has elevated hypocrisy to a new level over the issue of earmarks. There are earmarks I have felt were a waste of money. Many of them were Republican earmarks. Other earmarks, by both parties, have been enormously beneficial to the people of our States.

Less than 1 percent of the Omnibus appropriations bill consisted of earmarks—many of them requested by Republicans. Many of them would have improved the lives of their constituents.

But to score cheap political points those same Republicans who took credit for earmarks, now want the American people to believe that eliminating a few billion dollars in earmarks will fix the deficit.

And so they would hand to the administration total discretion to earmark every dollar of the budget. There will come a time, I predict, when they will regret having done so.

I want to thank the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Senator INOUE, for the herculean efforts he made this year—first to get 12 individual appropriations bills reported by the Committee, and then to try to get the Omnibus passed.

He did everything humanly possible, right up to the bitter end. But when those who had pledged their support walked away, there was nothing more he could have done. As he has said, this is no way to run a government.

I also want to thank Senator GREGG, who is retiring this year, for the many

years he has served on the Appropriations Committee, and as ranking member of the Department of State and Foreign Operations Subcommittee.

It has been a pleasure working with him. He cares about these programs, he supports the people who serve in our embassies, he understands what is at stake for our country, he asks important questions, and he insists on accountability for the use of funds.

Contrary to what some might think or guess, there were not many times when Senator GREGG, a conservative Republican Senator, and I, a liberal Democratic Senator, disagreed over the need to find the funds to support these programs. We will miss him greatly.

One year ago, 37 Senators—Democrats and Republicans—wrote to the chairman and ranking member of the Appropriations Committee urging full funding of the President's budget request for the Department of State and Foreign Operations. The funding in the Omnibus was \$3.2 billion below that amount.

Rather than voting for a sound bite, Senators should consider the consequences. The consequences are unmistakable.

A continuing resolution says whatever was OK last year is OK this year. I understand that is where we are. Even though a majority of the Senate would support the Omnibus, the minority party has made it impossible to pass anything without 60 votes.

It is no way to govern, and when it involves issues of national security, it is foolhardy.

TRIBUTES TO RETIRING SENATORS

ARLEN SPECTER

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise to speak today to recognize the departure of my good friend, the senior Senator from Pennsylvania. Senator ARLEN SPECTER has been present here in the Senate through some of its most contentious times. He and I have worked side-by-side—sometimes in agreement, other times in opposition—for many years. His presence will be sorely missed.

ARLEN is the son of immigrant parents. He was born in Wichita, KS, in 1930 to Lillie Shannin and Harry Specter. Harry served in World War I in the U.S. infantry, just a few years after migrating to the U.S. from Russia. While in combat in France, ARLEN's father was seriously wounded. Yet a few years later, the Federal Government, strapped for funds, broke its promise to pay World War I veterans a bonus. This, of course, led to a veterans march on Washington and a tragic encounter between the U.S. Army and the protesting veterans. It also led, indirectly, to Senator SPECTER's career in public service as he has been fond of saying that he came to Washington to get his father's bonus and that he would run for reelection until he got it.

ARLEN attended college at both the University of Oklahoma and the Uni-

versity of Pennsylvania, graduating from the latter in 1951. He served in the Air Force during the Korean war as an officer in the Office of Special Investigations. In 1953, he married Joan Levy, with whom he has raised two sons and four grandchildren. In 1956, he graduated from Yale law school and entered into private practice.

Senator SPECTER's career in public service began in 1959 when he became an assistant district attorney in Philadelphia. In 1963, he was appointed to serve as assistant counsel on the Warren Commission, investigating the assassination of President John F. Kennedy. Two years later, he was elected to serve as the district attorney for the city of Philadelphia, a position he held for 8 years. After another brief stint in the private sector, ARLEN was elected to the Senate in 1980 and has been the longest serving Senator in Pennsylvania's history.

ARLEN has had his hand in a number of high-profile efforts here in the Senate. However, I will always remember him for his role in some of the most contentious Supreme Court confirmation fights in our Nation's history. He and I both served on the Judiciary Committee during the confirmation hearings for Judge Robert Bork, which were, at the time, the most contentious in our Nation's history. In the end, ARLEN and I reached different conclusions as to whether Judge Bork should have been confirmed. I still think ARLEN was wrong to oppose Judge Bork, but, I have never doubted that his decision to do so was sincere.

ARLEN and I once again found ourselves at the center of a Supreme Court fight during the nomination hearings for Justice Clarence Thomas. During those hearings, Senator SPECTER had the daunting task of questioning Ms. Anita Hill for the Republican side. I was and continue to be impressed with the manner in which he handled that responsibility. Those were difficult, sensitive issues. None of us wanted to disrespect Ms. Hill, but we believed it was important to ensure that the truth be examined and brought to light, and I've always thought that ARLEN handled the matter with the necessary professionalism and respect.

In the years that followed the Thomas hearings, a number of people expressed their displeasure for the way I treated Ms. Hill during those hearings. I was always quick to remind them that it was ARLEN who questioned her, not me. I was the one who questioned Justice Thomas. But, in the end, I think the historical memory of that time has tied the two of us together.

Senator SPECTER has a reputation for being a fighter. And, having been on both sides of the debate with ARLEN, I have to concur with that assessment. His was among the sharpest minds we have known here in the Senate and I am grateful for the privilege I've had to serve alongside him.

I want to wish ARLEN and his family the best of luck.

SAM BROWNBACK

Mr. President, I rise today to speak in honor of my good friend, the senior Senator from Kansas. Senator SAM BROWNBACK has been a devoted public servant and a friend to all of us here in the Senate. And, at the end of this session, he will be moving on to bigger and better things. I will miss him dearly.

Senator BROWNBACK was born in Parker, KS, in 1956. He was raised on a farm—a farm on which his parents still live to this day. SAM was leader in all aspects of his life before coming to the Senate. In high school, he was the State president of the Future Farmers of America. While attending college at Kansas State University, he was student body president. And, he was president of his class when he attended law school at the University of Kansas.

After law school, SAM went to work as an attorney in Manhattan, KS. In 1986, he was the youngest person ever appointed to serve as the Kansas Secretary of Agriculture. In 1990, he went to work in the White House of President George H.W. Bush as a White House fellow. After another stint as Kansas's Secretary of Agriculture, SAM was elected to the House of Representatives as part of the 1994 Republican revolution. And, in 1996, he was elected to replace the former Senate majority leader, and my good friend, Senator Bob Dole. The people of Kansas have kept him here ever since.

Looking over his career in public service, it is clear that SAM BROWNBACK is Kansas man in every sense. The voters of Kansas have recognized this more than anyone else. That is why they have elected him three times to serve in the Senate. And, of course, that is why he is currently the State's Governor-elect.

Throughout his time in the Senate, SAM has been a tireless advocate for the rights of those who have no voice, whether it is the rights of the unborn, the rights of refugees, or the rights of the victims of human trafficking. I believe this is due, in no small part, to SAM's religious faith. For as long as I have known him, SAM has never been afraid to speak publicly about his religious convictions and his belief that those convictions required action on his part. As a religious man myself, I have always admired that part of Senator BROWNBACK's personality and found his openness refreshing.

Over the years, SAM and I have typically found ourselves in agreement on most issues. We have worked together on numerous occasions. While I regret that we won't be working together any more after this session, I want to congratulate him once again on his recent victory in the Kansas gubernatorial election. I am confident that he will be an effective and popular governor for the people of the State he loves so much.

KIT BOND

Mr. President, I rise today to speak in honor of my good friend Senator KIT