

alternative energy sources. I hope out of this tragedy that will be one of the outcomes and that it will be led vigorously. But that sense of outrage I don't see. I am going to try to express it in the next few moments.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington.

#### REMEMBERING SENATOR ROBERT C. BYRD

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I come to the floor this morning to pay my respects to a most amazing man who the Senate Chamber has lost, Senator ROBERT C. BYRD. It certainly is a sad day for the Senate, for all the people of West Virginia who loved this man so much, and for the entire country, as we mourn the loss of the Nation's longest serving Senator.

ROBERT C. BYRD was a historian, a poet, and he truly was a master of the Senate. We have heard a lot about this remarkable man. A lot of it bears repeating today. He was the longest serving Member in the history of this institution. He had courage. He had humility. He had intelligence. He had a vision that helped lead the Senate for many years. But he also showed us that one can change over time and admit their wrongs and move on and fight for what they believe is right.

His principled stands are what I will remember most about him. I was so proud, back in 2002, to stand with him and a total of 23 Senators who voted against the Iraq war. I will not forget how strong he was, reminding us that as a country we do not have to act out of fear. I was proud to stand with him many times since then, when he would knowingly wink at me and remind us of the 23 who stood tall in the Chamber that day.

His floor speeches were legendary. I remember so many times throughout my tenure with him as he railed on the floor about whatever passion he had at the moment, whether it was his little dog he would tell us a story about or some part of history he wanted to remind us of, always with a point at the end. I remember his compassion as he spoke, and his flailing arms. He always reminded us that we are human beings here. He had a true way with words, and he literally wrote the book on the Senate. Most importantly, he protected this institution from every attack.

To his very last days here he was weighing in on proposed changes to the filibuster rule, a rule he played a central part in reforming three decades ago.

But the true honor of serving with Senator BYRD came from his personal touch. I personally so remember my very first meeting many years ago with Senator BYRD. I came here as a brandnew Senator in 1993. I wanted to serve on the Appropriations Committee, the committee he chaired. It is a very powerful committee. It was a big ask for a freshman Senator coming

in. I was told that in order to get that seat, I would have to call him up and ask for a personal meeting. That was pretty intimidating, coming here brandnew and asking for a meeting with the chair of the entire Appropriations Committee.

He granted the meeting. I remember walking over to the Capitol to his office and not knowing what to expect. I couldn't have known what to expect because, when I walked in, I found this warm, wonderful, cordial human being. He regaled me with stories from his youth and talked about being a coal miner's son and the poverty he grew up in. He showed me his fiddle he was so proud of but that he played no more. He told me poetry he recited from memory. I remember sitting in his office and thinking: I can't believe I am sitting here with a part of history. Then, of course, he grilled me on my stance on the balanced budget amendment and the line item veto before he said: Yes, I would like you to serve on my committee.

I have been so proud to serve on that committee with him ever since. He taught me so much about protocol, about managing legislation, about the rules of the Senate, about respect. Yes, respect was what I think I learned from him most. He was a taskmaster. He believed passionately in the rules of the Senate, but he also believed in working together for the common good.

In the first year I was here, Senator Hatfield, Republican from Oregon, and Senator BYRD were the chair and ranking member on the Appropriations Committee. Senator BYRD called and asked me to come to lunch in his office with a small group of Senators, with Senator Hatfield and myself and several Democrats and Republicans. I was so honored to be asked, and I came over not knowing what to expect. Senator BYRD and Senator Hatfield, a Republican and Democrat, a chair and a ranking member of the most powerful committee, the Appropriations Committee, sat and talked to us about what they felt was being lost from the Senate and that, as new Members, it was our responsibility to return the Senate to. That was respect and listening to each other. They told us in words about how "one year I might be chair," said Senator BYRD, "but I know full well an election will change things and Senator Hatfield will become chair. So we better work together, and we better respect each other, as we put our bills together. Because you never know when you are going to be in the minority or the majority."

Their words were powerful. But even more powerful was sitting there listening to these two gentlemen, a Republican and Democrat, listen to each other, laugh together, have lunch together, and pass on a lesson to those following us about what we all need to be when we call ourselves United States Senators.

Senator BYRD earned many titles over the years: majority whip, major-

ity leader, chairman of the Appropriations Committee. But I know the title he cherished the most was husband. His love of his family trumped everything else.

I so remember one time my husband, who lives out in the State of Washington—as my colleagues know, I travel home every weekend to be with my family—one weekend my husband came out here to be with me. Why? Because it was our anniversary. I was going to be here voting so he traveled here from Washington State and came into the Capitol. As he was coming in, I met him. Senator BYRD happened to be leaving the Senate Chamber. He saw my husband and he welcomed him and said: What are you doing out here in the other Washington? My husband said: It is our anniversary. Senator BYRD said: Well, which anniversary is it?

Rob said to him: It is our thirty-second. Senator BYRD paused and nodded, and he said: That is a good start.

He had been married for 67 years. He was going home to be with his wife. That is a moment I will cherish, because it sets in perspective all that I know about Senator BYRD. He taught by example. He taught by words. He knew humor and how to use it. But most of all, he had respect for every one of us here.

He was a gentleman. He certainly was tough. But he treated everyone with dignity and respect. Everyone here on this floor has been molded by his presence. We have learned so much from him, and he will be missed.

But I know for certain his work and his passion and his spirit will never be gone from this Senate he loved so much, and I know as I walk on this Senate floor, I will try and remember, as he taught me so well, respect of others above all.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, how much time is remaining in morning business on our side?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is 9½ minutes remaining.

Mr. DURBIN. Thank you very much.

Madam President, yesterday I joined Senator MURRAY and others in giving my tribute to Senator BYRD, and I will not repeat my remarks. But I look forward to other Members coming to the floor with their own memories and reminiscences of this great man who served this Nation and the State of West Virginia so honorably for so long and the fact that I was honored to serve with him for 14 years in the Senate.

#### UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I know an issue that was always important to ROBERT BYRD was the working men and women of West Virginia. If there was one thing that innervated him and inspired him, it was the memory of his youth and growing up in the

most impoverished circumstances where he could not attend college and had to go to work straight out of high school. It was not until many years later that he completed college and law degrees as a Member of the Congress. It was an extraordinary feat to be able to achieve that.

I think of him when I think of the bill we considered last week because it was a bill that tried to help struggling families across America in the midst of this recession. We tried to extend unemployment benefits for those who are out of work across America. The estimates range from 8 million to 14 million Americans—people who had a job and are now out of a job through no fault of their own. There are an estimated five unemployed people for every available job. So it is not a situation, which some have said, where there is a lack of effort on their part. It is a very hard thing to find a job.

I have visited unemployment offices in Chicago, in Springfield, and all over my State and met with these people, many of whom are desperate. They put out their resumes online in an effort to try to get an opportunity for a job and just cannot get any response whatsoever. They spend day after weary day going through the want ads and going through the Internet postings in the hope of finding something.

What we have tried to do is to say to families in this distress: We are going to give you a helping hand so you can survive. That was a major part of this bill. We were going to extend unemployment benefits across America for an additional 6 months, until the end of the year. I wish I could say the economy was turning around more quickly, and it is not necessary, but I think we know better. We know many families without these unemployment benefits just cannot make it.

We had a vote last week on unemployment benefits for unemployed Americans, out of work through no fault of their own, and could not get a single Republican to vote for it—not one. Not one Republican would vote for cloture so we could move to passage of that bill.

There were many things in the bill, but that one hit home this weekend when a friend of mine, a woman whom I have known for a number of years now, called me. I respect her so much. I met her at a drug rehab facility far away from my home in a corner of our State. She had been addicted to crack, but for the last 8 years she has been drug-free. She is a single mom, and she has three children living in her home. One of her daughters has a little boy who is 4 months old.

She called me over the weekend and said: I can't find a job. I keep looking, and I can't find a job. Now they are going to cut off the utilities to my home.

That is the reality of what a vote on the Senate floor means in the real world. I wonder sometimes how some of my colleagues can consistently decide

they are not going to vote to support these American families. I struggle to understand how we can be spending billions of dollars in an effort to rebuild Afghanistan, to try to put these people back on their feet and give them a future, and turn our backs on our own. That is what happened.

This bill had many provisions in it, but that one hit home. There was another one. There was a provision in this bill to send money to the States to help them pay for Medicaid. Medicaid is health insurance for poor and unemployed people. Of course, there are more demands for Medicaid because so many people are out of work. The States are struggling to provide the medical assistance these families need, and many of us believed it was only fair that we in Washington try to help these States through these difficult times by sending this money back to the States.

Not a single Republican—not one—would vote to help us help the Governors in States that are struggling to pay these medical bills for the unemployed and poor in their State. It just strikes me that we have an obligation to our own—to our American family—and that obligation is being ignored by those who vote against it.

During the course of the day and this week Senators from the Republican side of the aisle are likely to come to the floor and ask that specific provisions in that bill pass. They do not want to help the unemployed, they do not want to help provide medical care for the poor and unemployed, but they have tax provisions they want to pass. Some of them I agree with; some of them are very important and valuable to us. But it seems to me only fair that if we are going to consider these provisions, we consider the whole bill.

So as they are making unanimous consent requests to pick out the piece they like in the bill, I will be making a unanimous consent request to pass the bill in its entirety—not just the tax provisions that help families but also help businesses and corporations, but also to make sure we help those who need a helping hand.

I often wonder why the Republicans would oppose helping the unemployed. Traditionally, it has been a bipartisan issue. We have said if a disaster hits some part of our country, we will rally behind that part of our country. It has happened in Illinois. I have come to the floor of the Senate and the House when we have faced a natural disaster, whether it was a flood or a tornado or whatever it happened to be. Colleagues of mine from far-flung places across the United States have said: We will be there to help you because tomorrow may be a day when we need help too. We pitch in together to help one another. Yet when it comes to this bill to help those who are unemployed across America, they resist it. I try to get into the bill to try to understand why the Republicans oppose helping those who have lost their jobs through no

fault of their own, why the Republicans oppose basic health care for people who are in the most dire circumstances.

It turns out that some of it has to do with the tax policy that is in this bill. You see, one of the things we are doing is closing the loophole that allows American businesses to ship jobs overseas. Yes, there are rewards in America's Tax Code for corporations that decide to close down their plants in Galesburg, IL, or in the State of New Hampshire, and move them overseas. It makes no sense. Why would we create tax incentives, financial incentives for American corporations to shut down in the United States and build overseas?

This bill closes those loopholes, and I can tell you, some of the biggest corporations in America are angry about it. They want to have a helping hand to move good-paying jobs overseas. Well, they are not going to get a helping hand from this Senator and a lot of others. Yet there are some on the other side of the aisle who happen to agree with that position.

This bill also has tax incentives to help small businesses. For goodness' sake, if we will ever get out of that recession, it will be because small businesses get back on their feet and hire more people. This is a good bill which the Republicans refuse to support. I do not know how we can go home for the Fourth of July weekend, take a week off afterwards, and ignore the obvious: that while we are at home with our families, other families will be asking themselves basic questions about whether they will have their gas or electricity cut off in their homes.

That is the reality of what we are facing.

I take a look at the estimated number of people who will lose their unemployment compensation because of this vote by the Republicans against extending unemployment compensation, and throughout the month of June it will mean some 80,000 people in my State of Illinois will be losing this kind of help. It is also a fact in States such as California, 255,000 people; Florida, 115,000 unemployed will have their benefits cut off; 40,000 in Indiana; 107,000 in Pennsylvania; 95,000 in New York; 65,000 in Texas; 33,000 in Wisconsin. The numbers are huge in these States. Yet the Republicans refuse to give us one vote in support of moving this forward—this bill to help those who are out of work and create a better environment to create jobs in America.

I often wonder if this is part of some campaign strategy to try to slow down the economic recovery in the hopes that it has some political advantage, but that is a very cynical analysis and I believe most Senators on both sides of the aisle pray that our recovery comes sooner rather than later.

But we need their votes to show it. We need for them to step up and give us the support on the Senate floor to pass this jobs bill, a bill which they defeated last week, without a single Republican supporting it—not one.

Well, many of them have said publicly they want to have another chance to vote on some parts of it, and I am open to the suggestion. But when I look at this bill in its entirety—the tax cuts, the help to small businesses, the closing of these tax loopholes, the help to the States—I think all of these things are an important and timely package of things we need to do across America.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority's time has expired.

Mr. DURBIN. Then I yield the floor.

Since I see no Republican seeking time in morning business, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 3 additional minutes, and to extend the same 3 minutes on the Republican side, if they care to use it.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### PROTECTING THE GREAT LAKES

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, one of the greatest assets in my part of the world would be Lake Michigan. If you ask the people of Chicago: What do you think is the greatest thing about the city of Chicago, in a recent survey they overwhelmingly responded it is Lake Michigan because it is so beautiful, and we are fortunate to be near it and take advantage of it, using beaches and being out on boats, and mainly looking out the window at this magnificent lake, which I get a chance to do when I go up to the city.

So when the issue of the future of Lake Michigan and the question about whether it is going to be the victim of invasive species comes up, we take it seriously. I do not know how many years ago some people decided a very wise thing to do would be to import into the United States a fish called the Asian carp. So they brought in this Asian carp—and I believe it was in the State of Arkansas, though I do not want to pick on them; I think this is true—and they were going to raise these carp for some reason, and there was some flooding and the carp ended up in the Mississippi River. Now they are all over the Mississippi River and those tributaries leading to it.

Well, if we follow the Mississippi River north from Arkansas and make a right-hand turn north of St. Louis and head up the Illinois River, we are on our way up Lake Michigan. That is the route the Asian carp have been following.

Well, they are all over the Illinois River on their way up to Lake Michigan. These are fish which grow to enormous sizes and suck up everything in sight on which other fish would live. So they are an invasive species that is a danger to other species of fish, and there has been a great fear for a long time they would reach Lake Michigan and change its future as a fishery.

So I joined with Republican Congresswoman JUDY BIGGERT, and we started pouring in millions of dollars 10

years ago to stop this fish. This fish is insidious. It just grows by leaps and bounds and attacks people. Hard to imagine, isn't it? Boaters going down the Illinois River will see these fish jumping out of the river at the boaters. It is a danger. I have seen videos, and I know it is.

This is an aggressive species of fish that can destroy Lake Michigan. So Congresswoman BIGGERT and I built electronic fences that create an electrical shock at points in the river to stop the fish from moving toward Lake Michigan. We have done that twice. We now think we have to do it more. There is a real concern not only in Chicago and Illinois but around Lake Michigan, the surrounding States, about how successful this effort is going to be.

Last week, we continued to fish and look for these Asian carp, and we found one in Lake Calumet, just miles from Lake Michigan. From my point of view, that was a wake-up call. Somehow a fish had reached the other side of the electronic barrier. I do not know if it was dumped in Lake Calumet—we are doing some studies to find out—or whether it migrated there.

Regardless, what I am doing with Senator DEBBIE STABENOW of the State of Michigan is introducing legislation today calling on the Army Corps of Engineers to take a serious, comprehensive look at ways to avoid any contamination of Lake Michigan from this fish.

These studies usually take forever. Senator STABENOW and I are encouraging the corps to move on them very quickly.

Secondly, I have written to the White House and have spoken with the President's Chief of Staff about appointing a coordinator who will try to bring together all the Federal agencies that are dealing with this invasive species, the State and local efforts, and coordinating them to be more effective and focus on stopping this fish moving forward.

We are trying to also increase the amount of money being spent to build fences and more electronic barriers to stop these fish from their migration toward Lake Michigan.

This is critical for us to do for the future of Lake Michigan and the Great Lakes. It is something we have worked on for years. We will continue to work on it. We take it very seriously.

I thank Senator STABENOW for joining me in that effort, and I encourage all the Senators from the Great Lakes area, if they would consider it, to join us as cosponsors.

Madam President, I see the Senator from Missouri has taken the floor on the Republican side. I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Missouri.

### CLEAN ENERGY

Mr. BOND. Madam President, today Members of the Senate will go to the White House to meet with President

Obama on energy legislation. There is general agreement among Republicans that we need to do more to promote clean energy and reduce our dependence on foreign energy sources. We also need real reform of our oilspill protection laws and agencies.

However, today I talk about where we disagree, and that is on the Democratic proposal to impose a national energy tax related to carbon emissions.

The President will try to convince Senators and the public to impose a national energy tax. Of course, he will use fancy terms such as "pricing carbon." But if it walks like a duck, quacks like a duck, then it is a duck, and this duck is an energy tax.

One form the Democratic national energy tax will take is a tax on gasoline, diesel, and jet fuel. Senator HUTCHISON and I just released a new report documenting the size of the gas tax in the Kerry-Lieberman cap-and-trade bill. My colleagues can find it on our office Web sites.

The Kerry-Lieberman cap-and-trade bill includes a \$3.4 trillion gas tax—with a "t." That is an average of \$90 billion a year.

The number is so large because Americans consume a lot of fuel—over 200 billion gallons a year. Putting a price on the carbon in this fuel, as Democrats and President Obama want to do, will impose a massive new tax increase on the American people. You don't have to take my word for it. Anyone can add up the cost of this new gas tax. We used all publicly available government information, such as the fuel consumption data from the U.S. Energy Information Agency and carbon pricing estimates from the Environmental Protection Agency. The rest is just simple addition and multiplication—multiplication and multiplication—combining how much fuel we will use with the carbon tax rate they propose.

The \$3.4 trillion figure is based on EPA's estimates of future carbon prices. By law, as proposed by Kerry-Lieberman, the gas tax could be as high as \$7.6 trillion if carbon prices hit the price ceilings in this bill.

Kerry-Lieberman's \$3.4 trillion total gas tax will include a \$1.9 trillion gasoline tax on families, workers, and small businesses, a \$1.1 trillion diesel tax on farmers, truckers, and businesses, and a \$425 billion jet fuel tax on airline passengers.

Of course, politicians do not want to admit they support a new multitrillion-dollar gas tax. They use code words such as "pricing carbon" or "requiring the purchase of allowances."

They also try to take advantage of the current disasters, such as the gulf oilspill, to impose a new gasoline tax. I say we should be punishing BP, not the American people, with a new gas tax. A gas tax will not stop the oil from leaking, it will not clean up the oil that has been spilled, and it will not do anything to restore the environment in the coastal areas where that oil will hit.