

couple of years. In Bethesda, not very far from here, River Road, a major thoroughfare, became a river because of a water main break. In Dundalk, MD, right outside of downtown Baltimore, thousands of basements were flooded as a result of a water main break. In Baltimore County, just a few weeks ago, we had a water main break that denied residential homeowners water service for many days. This is happening all over. In the city of Baltimore, 95 percent of their water mains are over 65 years old and have not been inspected. We need to pay attention to these issues.

If I had to mention the single most important challenge we face, it is in our energy policies. We all understand that, the impact it has on our environment, but we should also acknowledge that doing the energy policy right will be good for our national security. We spend \$1 billion a day on imported oil. That compromises our national security.

For the sake of our national security, we need to develop a self-sustained energy policy on renewable energy sources. For the sake of our economy, we need to do that. We developed the technology for solar power and wind power. Yet we are not capitalizing on the jobs here in America. Jobs are our most important goal. A sound energy policy will allow us to create more jobs here in America.

But today, on Earth Day, I want to talk about the environment. A sound energy policy means we can become a world leader and bring this world into some sense on what is happening on global climate change, on the indiscriminate release of greenhouse gas emissions by the burning of fossil fuels and nitrogen and carbon into the air. We know we can do better on that.

So on this Earth Day, let's rededicate ourselves to develop an energy policy that will be not only good for our security and our economy but good for our environment. Addressing the failing health of our world is not just in the hands of our political leaders alone. Each of us can make a difference by changing the way we live and move about the Earth. Our history shows us that bold and courageous actions by all of us to tackle our environmental challenges make us stronger, more vibrant, and a healthier nation. That should be our message on this Earth Day.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST— EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I had informed my colleague from Louisiana that I would come to the floor to once again ask unanimous consent on an issue he has been holding or blocking, and it is the issue of the promotion of General Walsh, a distinguished American soldier who has served his country for 30 years and served in wartime, who

has been approved to have a promotion to the rank of major general by the Senate Armed Services Committee, and that committee approved that promotion unanimously, the committee headed by Senators CARL LEVIN and JOHN MCCAIN. Both strongly support the promotion of General Walsh. That support was given and the notice of promotion was voted on by the Armed Services Committee in September of last year.

This soldier's career has been put on hold by the hold of one Senator, the Senator from Louisiana. I informed him that I would speak on the floor on this, so I am not being impolite. I normally would not speak of another person solely on the floor of the Senate. Yet the Senator from Louisiana is the one who has exhibited the hold to prevent the promotion of this soldier.

I know this soldier. That is not why I am on the floor. I know General Walsh. He commands the Mississippi Valley Division of the Corps of Engineers and does a great job, in my judgment. But, again, his career has been stalled by the actions of one Senator.

That Senator indicates there are certain demands he has of the Corps of Engineers and unless they are met, he will not allow this soldier to be promoted. The point is, this soldier executes; this soldier is not making policy in the Corps of Engineers, and he cannot do what the Senator from Louisiana demands he do. The Corps of Engineers does not have the legal authority to do what the Senator from Louisiana demands he do.

I have put in the RECORD the two letters the Senator from Louisiana has given to the Corps of Engineers making certain demands. I have put in the RECORD the response from the Corps of Engineers.

I believe 2 days ago when we had this discussion that my colleague from Louisiana indicated the corps had missed 14 deadlines or deadlines on 14 reports and he was not happy with the Corps of Engineers. I went back and found out what that was about. Let me just say that 10 of those 14 reports dealt with the Louisiana coastal area. All of those reports were authorized in WRDA 2007. Prior to initiating the studies, the corps was required by other law that exists to execute a feasibility cost-sharing agreement with the State of Louisiana. To cost share the study would result in the feasibility report. At the State of Louisiana's request, the corps did not execute this agreement until June of 2009. I can describe the other four as well.

But to come to the floor and suggest that somehow the Corps of Engineers is slothful and indolent, or at least slothful, for missing a deadline on reports, 10 of which they missed because the State of Louisiana requested they be delayed—I don't know, it seems to me that this may not be on the level.

Let me make one final point. When a natural disaster hit Louisiana and New Orleans, I was one of those who cared a

lot about reaching out to say: You are not alone. And it was not just me; it was all of my colleagues. But I chair the subcommittee that provides the majority of the funding for this. We provided all of the funding for the Corps of Engineers. The fact is, we have put—listen to this—\$14 billion—\$14 billion—into New Orleans and Louisiana. I am proud of having done it. It is what we ought to do as a country. But I must say that it wears out the welcome a bit for someone to come to the floor to disparage the Corps of Engineers and the efforts of the Corps of Engineers. That \$14 billion—much of that runs through the Corps of Engineers, and I wonder where that city and that State would be without the Corps of Engineers to be engaged with them in these battles.

So let me say to my colleague from Louisiana that demands being made of the Corps of Engineers that the corps cannot possibly comply with because the law will not allow them to comply are demands that are never going to be met. To hold up the career of one distinguished soldier who has served in wartime because the corps cannot meet demands required by the Senator from Louisiana is unfair. It is always and will always be a disservice to uniformed soldiers anywhere to hold hostage promotions of soldiers in order to get demands that cannot possibly be satisfied.

So I am going to once again ask unanimous consent that the nomination that has existed on this calendar since September of last year to promote a distinguished soldier who has a distinguished record—I am going to ask once again that, at long last, perhaps my colleague will relent and allow the promotion to proceed and allow this soldier's career to continue.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to Executive Calendar No. 526, the nomination of BG Michael J. Walsh; that the nomination be confirmed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, any statements related to the nomination be printed in the RECORD, and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, as my colleague knows, I object. Let me say why I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, may I proceed?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized.

Mr. VITTER. Let me explain why I object, as I have explained very openly, very clearly every step of the way. Michael Walsh is one of the top nine officers of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. He is part of the key leadership.

Senator DORGAN is a fierce, active, vocal defender of that bureaucracy, but before he continues and plunges into

that fierce and vocal defense, I suggest he step back for just a minute and truly think about and understand what he is defending. Before he accepts every suggestion, every argument of the Corps of Engineers' bureaucracy, I suggest he step back and look at the history of the corps and look at the source he is accepting as gospel truth.

Senator DORGAN mentioned Hurricane Katrina, called it a great natural disaster. It was a great natural disaster, a horrible natural disaster. It was also a horrible manmade disaster because if we want to talk about the greatest damage—not the only damage but the greatest damage—inflicted upon the country from Hurricane Katrina—the flooding of the city of New Orleans—that was manmade by the Corps of Engineers.

That was due directly to the design flaws of the outfall canals in New Orleans by the Corps of Engineers. The Corps of Engineers has admitted this, and we have laid that out in congressional testimony since Katrina. The problem is, no one in that bureaucracy has ever been held accountable for that. I don't want to focus on looking back. The even greater problem is looking forward because that bureaucracy has not fundamentally changed.

I challenge my distinguished colleague, Senator DORGAN, to spend half as much time working with others to change the truly broken bureaucracy of the Corps of Engineers, spend half as much time as he has spent as a fierce, active, and vocal defender of that broken bureaucracy.

I am fighting for that change. I will continue to fight for that change. I will use every tool available to me as a Senator to do so. For instance, in the last WRDA bill, I worked very hard to craft language to include in the bill the Louisiana Water Resources Council, an outside peer review body, to bring outside, independent expertise and analysis to work with the corps on key projects following Hurricane Katrina. That was included in the 2007 WRDA bill. It passed into law. Do my colleagues know what the corps did to implement that? Nothing. Do they know how they acted to move that forward, an absolute, clear, statutory authorization from Congress? They did nothing. They said they are not going to do it.

Finally, I got them to change their tune. Finally, they are committed to beginning to move forward 3 years later, but I had to get their attention through this scenario.

Unfortunately, that is not the only item on which they have ignored mandates from Congress and ignored pressing needs all around the country, including my part of the country. I tried to pinpoint specific items where they were not living up to their mandate or to Congress's direction. I could have listed dozens. Instead, I focused on nine specific items. I worked closely with the corps, had several meetings discussing those items in an abundance of trying to work with them toward reso-

lution. After that, I focused on three of the nine, rather than all nine. I laid out why they did have the authority to move forward in some positive way on all that. I am going to continue to do so until we get real, positive change at the corps and real, positive progress on these important issues.

The Senator's main argument, apparently spoon-fed by the corps, is that the corps has no authority to do anything in these areas, no authorization language from Congress. That is flat wrong. Again, before the distinguished Senator simply accepts every little e-mail, every little memo the corps feeds him, perhaps he should consider the source of that information. If the corps was always right, New Orleans would have never flooded. If everything the corps said was good and true and gospel, we would never have had those billions of dollars of damage in terms of the catastrophic flooding of New Orleans caused solely by breaches in canals which were design flaws of the Corps of Engineers.

Let me go through a few specifics and explain—I have done this with the corps over and over—the authority they do have. One of my top concerns—

Mr. DORGAN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. VITTER. I will yield when I am through. One of my top concerns is the critical outfall canals in New Orleans. It was the breaches in those canals that led to 80 percent of the catastrophic flooding of New Orleans. It was those breaches that were caused by design flaws of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. All I am asking under this category is that the corps do a risk/cost analysis of the different options they have identified in terms of fixing the outfall canals.

The reason I am concerned about the path they are moving down, which is their option 1, is that I truly believe it is much less safe and much less robust than their identified option 2. It is not only I who believes that. It is the corps who admits it. In the corps' report to Congress, which we mandated, the corps itself said: Option 2—that is the option they are rejecting—is generally more technically advantageous and may be more effective operationally over option 1 because it would have greater reliability and further reduces the risk of flooding.

In addition, Chris Accardo, the corps' chief of operations in New Orleans, said he is in favor of option 2 over option 1, absolutely.

In light of that, all I am asking, with the rest of the Louisiana delegation, with all the affected communities in southeast Louisiana, is that the corps perform a risk/cost analysis comparing these different options before they forge ahead building the option they themselves admit is less safe, less dependable.

It is also important to note that the corps clearly has authorization from Congress to do this study. General Van Antwerp, in my office, clearly said

they do. They have authorization. They have authority. They can do the study. They are not going to do it. Why don't we compare these options, the relative risk and the relative cost, before the Corps of Engineers plunges ahead to build the option they themselves say is less secure and less safe?

The second key issue I have focused on in my letters to the corps is the mandated AGMAC project, including the buildup of protection banks in Vermilion Parish to give that parish greater protection from storm surge. They were devastated during Hurricane Rita, in particular, and also in significant events since then. Again, the corps has authority to do this project. This project is in the WRDA bill. The corps says: We have busted our spending limits. We have explained to them various ways they can solve that problem by using O&M funds, exactly as they have used O&M funds for bank buildup in the MRGO project. We have given them another route, to use the CWPPRA program in conjunction with the WRDA-mandated project. The corps' response has been pretty simple. Its response has been: No, we don't want to do it.

Third and finally, the other big concern I have highlighted and the most obvious case of the Corps of Engineers ignoring the mandate of Congress, not having authorization, actively ignoring the mandate of Congress, is the critical Morganza to the gulf flood protection project. That project was initiated in 1992, 18 years ago. Senator DORGAN, the distinguished Senator from North Dakota, wants to say that the corps has no authority in this area. This project was included in three different water resources bills, once, then twice, and then a third time. Every step of the way, the corps has come up with excuses why they cannot move forward. Under their present plan, they are re-studying the project, and that restudy is due in December 2012. There is one little problem with that. That will be after the next water resources bill, which we hope to pass in 2011. All the people of LaFourche and Terrebonne Parishes who are going without adequate protection, who are in danger every additional hurricane season, having missed three WRDA trains because of the foot-dragging of the corps, now under the corps' present plan, they will miss a fourth.

We wish to talk about authorization from Congress. Is specific, full construction authorization in three WRDA bills not good enough? If that is not good enough, I don't know how to meet the corps' criteria.

If those three particular concerns are not enough, we can expand the list. In an attempt to work with the corps, in an attempt to find resolution, I have narrowed the list. I have tried to compromise. I have offered to meet with them. I am offering to meet with them again, as I have done consistently throughout the process. But if narrowing the list is going to be held

against me, we can expand the list. How about the final report of the Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration effort, a comprehensive analysis mandated in Public Law, an emergency appropriations bill after Hurricane Katrina? It was due in December 2007. It is not finished. It is not delayed because of the State of Louisiana. It is delayed because of the corps.

I know Senator DORGAN is anxious for a promotion of the corps leadership. I have to say, I am anxious for this critical report that was due in December 2007. We haven't seen it.

Is that not good enough? How about the Louisiana Water Resources Council I talked about? That was mandated in the 2007 WRDA bill. The corps has not produced it yet. It wasn't just authorized; it was mandated. It is not up and running. Senator DORGAN is anxious for a promotion for the pristine corps leadership. I am anxious for that.

How about the establishment of a Coastal Louisiana Ecosystem Protection and Restoration Task Force? That was mandated in the 2007 WRDA. We haven't seen that yet. The integration team under that task force was a separate team mandated in the 2007 WRDA, 3 years ago. Nowhere to be seen. That is not being held up by the State. That is the corps. Clear authorization, clear mandate, nowhere to be seen.

How about a comprehensive plan for protecting and preserving the Louisiana coast? That was due in November 2008. That was mandated in the 2007 WRDA. It is not being held up by the State, but it is nowhere to be seen. Senator DORGAN is anxious for promotion for the pristine corps leadership. I am anxious for this important work to protect Louisiana citizens.

That is not the whole list. How about the Mississippi River Gulf Outlet Ecosystem Restoration Plan? That was due in May of 2008. We haven't seen it. It has not been submitted. It is a corps report, not a State of Louisiana report. Nowhere to be seen.

How about section 707 of the WRDA? That actually mandates that the State can get credit from one project and it can be transferred to another project. It is in clear language. The corps says they are not going to do it. You want clear authorization? We have it. The corps is ignoring it.

How about section 7006 in the same 2007 WRDA. That requires that five construction reports be submitted to Congress to move forward with key projects authorized in that WRDA, five critical projects. They are authorized in the WRDA bill. They can't move forward until those construction reports are submitted by the corps.

We have not seen the first thing of any of those five reports. The State is not holding them up. We are waiting on the corps. The distinguished Senator is anxious about a promotion for the pristine corps leadership. Well, great. I am anxious to see that mandated report.

We can go on and on. The point is—
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator's time has expired.

The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, my colleague from Louisiana describes me as anxious. I will tell you what I am anxious about. I am anxious to have a Member of this Senate stop using a U.S. soldier and the promotion of a soldier as a pawn to meet certain demands. I am anxious never to see that happen again.

We are talking about a soldier who has served in wartime, has served 30 years, who, 6 months ago, was supposed to have been promoted by a unanimous vote of the Armed Services Committee under the leadership of CARL LEVIN and JOHN MCCAIN. Six months later, that soldier's career is on hold because of one Senator.

I wish to say this. I think it was Will Rogers who said: It is not what he says that bothers me. It is what he says he knows for sure that just ain't so. I have just heard the most unbelievable amount of fiction on this floor. Let me describe some of it. My colleague has just gone through a tortured lesson in the most unbelievable interpretation of the authority and the law with respect to the Corps of Engineers.

I said when I started today that we have put \$14 billion into New Orleans and Louisiana. I have been proud to be a part of that as chairman of the subcommittee on Appropriations that actually funds these issues—\$14 billion. But I will say to my colleague, my colleague is fast wearing out his welcome with me and I expect the Corps of Engineers with this kind of behavior.

I do not normally do this personally, but I tell you what, when a soldier serves his country and then my colleague says to that soldier: I am not going to allow you to be promoted until the Corps of Engineers does what I demand, when, in fact, the Corps of Engineers cannot legally do what he demands, then I say that is using a soldier's promotion as a pawn, and I think that is unbelievably awful to do.

I wish to say this. My colleague described—in fact, he said I was using information the corps feeds me. He went into a whole series of pieces of language, suggesting we have all swallowed the minnow somehow.

Let me say this. On the first item my colleague raised, he forgot to make one important point. He said: I demand they do this. That is the first issue of his letter to the Corps of Engineers—the outfall canals and pump to the river. I demand they do this, he said. Well, they cannot do that, actually. What he is proposing, by the way, for his State and his city is to spend more money for less flood protection. That is what he is proposing.

The corps will not do it, and I will tell you why. He knows why, but he

would not tell the rest of the folks here. But we actually had a vote on that in the Senate Appropriations Committee. Guess how that vote came out. The majority of the Democrats and the Republicans on the Appropriations Committee said: We do not intend to spend more money for less flood control protection. We do not intend to do that. We voted no. It is just one little piece of information my colleague left out on the floor of the Senate. Convenient perhaps, but, nonetheless, he left it out.

I am not going to go through this. We have the majority leader and the minority leader on the floor. But I offered, as a courtesy, to tell the Senator from Louisiana when I was coming to the floor today. He did not extend the same courtesy to me when I asked him to yield so I could make a point about the vote, so I will not be extending that courtesy in the future.

I am going to come to the floor again on a unanimous consent request saying: Let's have one person in this Senate stop using the promotion of a dedicated, decorated, American soldier as a pawn in order to meet demands that the Corps of Engineers cannot meet. My colleague seems to think somehow that the Corps of Engineers is something, an organization without merit. I will say this to him: There are plenty of things wrong with, I suppose, every government agency and every government organization.

But I will say this. If you know much about the Corps of Engineers, you are not going to want to be in a big flood fight without them as a partner. Oh, they have made mistakes, I tell you. But nobody has had more floods than we have had in North Dakota, I expect, over a long period of time, and I wish to see the corps as a partner in the flood fight because they are good. They know what they are doing.

Yes, they have made mistakes. But when my colleague comes to the floor of the Senate and says there are 14 reports, the Corps of Engineers blew it—14 reports—they cannot meet any deadlines, he does not tell the rest of the story. I went and checked on those 14 reports. Let me describe 10 of them. I will not describe the other four because it would take some time. But for 10 of the reports the deadline was not met on, it was because the reports required there be the execution of a feasibility cost-sharing agreement with the State of Louisiana, and at the request of the State of Louisiana, the corps did not execute the agreement until June of 2009.

So my colleague criticizes the Corps of Engineers, calls them a bunch of elitists. He says they miss all these deadlines. Well, at least on 10 of the deadlines the State of Louisiana asked them not to proceed with respect to that agreement until June of 2009. That is fundamentally unfair—fundamentally unfair.

With respect to Morganza to the gulf—and I could go through a whole

list of things to demonstrate that—as much as my colleague would like for the corps to have complete authority and funding to do everything he would like and then for them to say: Yes, absolutely, whatever you like, we are willing to do—as much as he would like that, he is flat out dead wrong when he says they have the authority to do these things.

I put the demands in the RECORD, two letters from my colleague. They are in the RECORD and I have read and will read—but I will not do it now because my colleagues are here and waiting to speak.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, will my friend yield for a unanimous consent request and then the Senator will maintain the floor?

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I will be happy to yield without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. REID. I will say to my friend, we have 99 other holds, but this one, I will have to acknowledge, is a little egregious. One of our finest military people is being held up for this. There are ways we can move around this, and we will do it as quickly as we can with cloture.

I appreciate my friend yielding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the majority leader is recognized.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 30 additional seconds.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we have to get this done. OK.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

RESTORING AMERICAN FINANCIAL STABILITY ACT OF 2010—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 3 p.m., Monday, April 26, the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 349, S. 3217, a bill to promote the financial stability of the United States by improving accountability and transparency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader.

Mr. McCONNELL. Reserving the right to object, and I will object, here we go again. The majority leader is once again moving to a bill, even while bipartisan discussions on the content of the bill are still underway.

Just about an hour ago, the majority leader said:

I'm not going to waste any more time of the American people while they come up with some agreement.

Well, I do not think bipartisanship is a waste of time. I do not think a bill with the legitimacy of a bipartisan agreement is a waste of time.

Is it a waste of time to ensure that the taxpayers never again bail out Wall Street firms? Is it a waste of time to

ensure that the bill before us does not drive jobs overseas or dry up lending to small businesses? Is it too much to ask, should an agreement be reached, that we take the time to make sure every Member of the Senate and our constituents can actually read the bill and understand the details?

This bill potentially affects every small bank and lending institution in our country. It has serious implications for jobs and the availability of credit to spur economic growth. It has important consequences for the taxpayers, if done incorrectly.

I think Americans expect more of us. I think they expect us to take the time to do it right. I would add, my impression was that serious discussions were going on. I think they should continue. Therefore, Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Thank you, Mr. President. Here we go again. This is a bill that has been out here for a month—weeks. I think people even reading slowly would have a chance to work their way through that in a month. This Kabuki dance we have been involved in for months now—my friend, and he is my friend, the ranking member of that committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama, worked with the chairman of the committee for weeks and weeks—weeks going into months—trying to come up with a deal we could move forward on. That was no longer possible. No negotiations went on. My friend from Alabama said that is enough.

Then we get the Senator from Tennessee coming in and spending weeks with my friend, the chairman of the Banking Committee, Senator DODD. That fell through.

We are moving to this bill because we need transparency, we need accountability, we need someone to respond to Wall Street because they have not responded to us.

This game is apparent to the American people. My friends on the other side of the aisle are betting on failure again, as they did with health care, as they have done on everything this year. They did not get—health care was not Obama's Waterloo. Maybe they want this to be his Waterloo, but it is not going to be. We are going to move forward on this piece of legislation because the American people demand it.

I have said publicly on many occasions, we need to get on this bill. Remember, we are not finalizing the bill. We are asking for the simple task we used to do easily: move to the bill. I am only asking permission to get on the bill—to get on the bill—and then start offering amendments. I am not asking everybody to approve the bill as it is written. All I am asking for is we move to the bill.

If there is an agreement reached between the ranking member and the chairman of the committee, it is easy to take care of that. There would be a

substitute amendment. They would agree to it and probably it would be accepted pretty easily. So to think this is some way to bail out Wall Street firms is an absolute joke. Read the bill.

So in light of the objection, I now move to proceed. I am moving to proceed. It takes me 2 days. It takes the Senate 2 days for this to ripen. We are going to have a vote Monday. We should be on the bill today offering amendments, having opening statements on the bill. Those who think it is good, say something good about it. Those who think it needs to be improved, improve it. But, no, we are going to waste the next 4 days getting on the bill.

CLOTURE MOTION

So in light of the objection, I now move to proceed to Calendar No. 349, S. 3217, and I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 349, S. 3217, the Restoring American Financial Stability Act of 2010:

Harry Reid, Christopher J. Dodd, Byron L. Dorgan, Mark Udall, Roland W. Burris, Daniel K. Inouye, Sherrod Brown, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Mark Begich, Patrick J. Leahy, Tom Udall, Patty Murray, Tom Harkin, Richard J. Durbin, Frank R. Lautenberg, Benjamin L. Cardin, Bill Nelson, Jack Reed.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, just so the American public knows this also, if there is an agreement reached between Senators DODD and SHELBY and anyone objected to that agreement, I would have to start all over with a bill because it would be a new bill and we would have the same games being played. So if they can come to an agreement, more power to them. They will work this out as an amendment to the bill or a substitute.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed occur at 5 p.m., Monday—I will drag the vote; some people wanted it earlier, some wanted it later, and we will not close the vote until at least a quarter to 6—so that will be on Monday, April 26, at 5 p.m., and with the mandatory quorum being waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I would only add, briefly, that Senator DODD and Senator SHELBY are on the floor. I would encourage them to continue to do what they have been doing, which is to try to reach an agreement.