

has been seeking employment for a long time. He said:

I have gone through a lot of health situations since being home—

Meaning since being home after losing his job.

constantly worrying will I get a job, is there going to be enough money, or when are my benefits going to be cutoff. . . . The worries are overpowering and devastating.

A lot of these letters we are getting speak in those terms. This isn't a mechanical thing or a question about a program or whether the Senate will do this or that; this is about whether Frank, in this instance, who lives in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, is going to be able to have enough money to provide for his family. So this is about worry and emotion and about real anxiety that people feel in the midst of the most horrific recession since the 1930s. This isn't some far off remote problem; this is real life for someone such as Frank. Then he goes on from there to say:

My ex-wife came home from work to advise me and our children that she will be losing her job on August 6, 2010, due to her company outsourcing [the work of that company] to India. She was employed there for 21 years. She carries our medical insurance and 80 percent of our income. We have a 12-year-old [child] with Cystic Fibrosis, which is a fatal disease, and this precious child will be without [health] insurance that pays for the very medicine that keeps her alive.

He goes on from there in his letter. I will end the quote with that line about his daughter with cystic fibrosis. So this isn't just about paying the light bill or paying the mortgage or making ends meet in a general way; this is about whether this family can provide health insurance for a 12-year-old with cystic fibrosis. That is what we are talking about, in many instances. We are talking about health care. When you lose your job, unfortunately, the direct impact isn't just on income; it is about whether you have health insurance. That is Frank's story in Pennsylvania.

I will give one more example because we are short on time.

Rachel, from Pennsylvania, writes to us in an e-mail. She says this:

I am writing for my husband.

Sometimes a person who loses a job is too embarrassed to write or doesn't want to express the feelings that are tearing them apart inside. They don't want to write down on paper the anxiety they are living with—the horror of not having enough to provide for your family. She is writing for her husband, saying he was laid off from his job as a GPS operator. She said the best way to take care of his family, he thought at that point, was to become an airman in the National Guard. He enlisted this year, and he entered the program for the Air National Guard. He excelled in the program, but he couldn't proceed to basic training because he needs dental work. Rachel and her husband, similar to so many others, have no health and dental insurance.

She says—and this is direct quotation from the letter:

I am doing everything I can, including working 2 jobs, to keep us above water, and we are drowning at a speed I never imagined. I bring home \$700 a month, which doesn't cover our rent, let alone car insurance, groceries, the electric bill, et cetera. We do not want to live extravagantly. We just want to live.

That is what Rachel says about her situation because of the loss of a job that her husband had to experience. He is becoming an airman in the National Guard to try to make ends meet. I could go on, but I will not because we don't have the time.

That is what this is about. This isn't a theoretical issue or some government program over here that none of us fully understands. This is about real lives, providing health insurance for families, making ends meet, and basic dignity that people feel robbed of because they lost their job, and some people in Washington don't want to lift a finger to help them. It doesn't take much to say aye when your name is called to vote for an extension of unemployment insurance. That is what the program is for. It is for emergencies, when people's lives are at risk—at least the life of their family to be able to make ends meet. That is what we are talking about. That is why I urge every Member of the Senate not to vote for your own political priorities but to vote for Frank and Rachel in Pennsylvania, who have written to us, and people similar to them all across this country. I think we are going to finally get an affirmative vote, but it is long overdue. With that, I yield the floor.

#### RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:30 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. BEGICH).

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### CERTIFICATE OF APPOINTMENT

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a certificate of appointment to fill the vacancy created by the death of the late Senator Robert C. Byrd of West Virginia. The certificate, the Chair is advised, is in the form suggested by the Senate.

If there be no objection, the reading of the certificate will be waived, and it will be printed in full in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the certificate was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA

Office of the Executive

Joe Manchin III

Governor

#### CERTIFICATE OF APPOINTMENT

To the President of the Senate of the United States:

This is to certify that, pursuant to the power vested in me by the Constitution of the United States and the laws of the State of West Virginia, I Joe Manchin III, the Governor of said State, do hereby appoint Carte Patrick Goodwin a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States until the vacancy therein caused by the death of Robert C. Byrd, is filled by election as provided by law.

Witness: His excellency our Governor Joe Manchin III, and our seal hereto affixed at Charleston, West Virginia this the Sixteenth day of July in the year of our Lord 2010.

By the Governor:

JOE MANCHIN III,

Governor.

NATALIE E. TENNANT,  
Secretary of State.

[State Seal Affixed]

#### ADMINISTRATION OF OATH OF OFFICE

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Senator-designate will now present himself to the desk, the Chair will administer the oath of office.

Mr. GOODWIN, escorted by Mr. ROCKEFELLER, advanced to the desk of the Vice President; the oath prescribed by law was administered to him by the Vice President; and he subscribed to the oath in the Official Oath Book.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Congratulations, Senator.

(Applause, Senators rising.)

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BEGICH). Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

#### AMERICAN JOBS AND CLOSING TAX LOOPHOLES ACT OF 2010

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the House message to accompany H.R. 4213, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

House message to accompany H.R. 4213, an act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend certain expiring provisions, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Reid motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate

to the bill, with Reid amendment No. 4425 (to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill), in the nature of a substitute.

Reid Amendment No. 4426 (to amendment No. 4425), to change the enactment date.

Reid motion to refer in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill to the Committee on Finance, with instructions, Reid amendment No. 4427, to provide for a study.

Reid amendment No. 4428 (to the instructions (amendment No. 4427) of the motion to refer), of a perfecting nature.

Reid amendment No. 4429 (to amendment No. 4428), of a perfecting nature.

**The PRESIDING OFFICER.** Under the previous order, the time until 2:30 will be equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees. That time has expired.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

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

The assistant editor of the Daily Digest read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 4213, the American Jobs and Closing Tax Loopholes Act, with a Reid amendment No. 4425.

Harry Reid, Max Baucus, Jack Reed, Edward E. Kaufman, John F. Kerry, Sheldon Whitehouse, Carl Levin, Roland W. Burris, Richard J. Durbin, Jeff Merkley, Benjamin L. Cardin, Christopher J. Dodd, John D. Rockefeller, IV, Barbara Boxer, Patty Murray, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Charles E. Schumer.

**The PRESIDING OFFICER.** By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 4213, the American Jobs and Closing Tax Loopholes Act, with a Reid amendment No. 4425, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 60, nays 40, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 209 Leg.]

#### YEAS—60

Akaka	Franken	Mikulski
Baucus	Gillibrand	Murray
Bayh	Goodwin	Nelson (FL)
Begich	Hagan	Pryor
Bennet	Harkin	Reed
Bingaman	Inouye	Reid
Boxer	Johnson	Rockefeller
Brown (OH)	Kaufman	Sanders
Burris	Kerry	Schumer
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Cardin	Kohl	Snowe
Carper	Landrieu	Specter
Casey	Lautenberg	Stabenow
Collins	Leahy	Tester
Conrad	Levin	Udall (CO)
Dodd	Lieberman	Udall (NM)
Dorgan	Lincoln	Warner
Durbin	McCaskill	Webb
Feingold	Menendez	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Merkley	Wyden

#### NAYS—40

Alexander	DeMint	McCain
Barrasso	Ensign	McConnell
Bennett	Enzi	Murkowski
Bond	Graham	Nelson (NE)
Brown (MA)	Grassley	Risch
Brownback	Gregg	Roberts
Bunning	Hatch	Sessions
Burr	Hutchison	Shelby
Chambliss	Inhofe	Thune
Coburn	Isakson	Vitter
Cochran	Johanns	Voinovich
Corker	Kyl	Wicker
Cornyn	LeMieux	
Crapo	Lugar	

**The PRESIDING OFFICER.** Upon the reconsideration of this vote, the yeas are 60, the nays are 40. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

Cloture having been invoked on the motion to concur with amendment in the House amendment, the motion to refer falls, as it is inconsistent with cloture.

The Senator from Vermont.

#### UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

**Mr. LEAHY.** Mr. President, I see the Republican leadership and the distinguished Senator from Tennessee on the floor. I would note that I am hopeful the Senate Republican leadership would take the opportunity to enter into a time agreement on 1 of the more than 20 judicial nominees who have been stalled from Senate consideration. I am referring to the nomination of Jane Stranch of Tennessee. Her nomination was reported by a bipartisan majority of the Senate Judiciary Committee last November, 8 months ago.

A native of Nashville, Mississippi, Ms. Stranch has practiced law in that community for 32 years, and has often appealed before the Sixth Circuit—the court to which she is now nominated. She has decades of experience in labor and employment law, an expertise she put to good use when she taught a class on labor law at Nashville's Belmont University. Ms. Stranch also has an active appellate practice, as well as significant experience with alternative forms of dispute resolution, such as mediation and arbitration. She is a leader in her community who dedicates significant time to pro bono work, civic matters, and her church. She also has impressive academic credentials, having earned both her J.D., Order of the Coif, and her B.A., summa cum laude and Phi Beta Kappa, from Vanderbilt University.

Since this nomination was reported last November, all Democratic Senators have been prepared to debate and vote on her nomination. I had given my friend, the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee, my assurance about that. I, myself, have spoken about this nomination a number of times because it is one of the oldest on the calendar.

I know the senior Senator from Tennessee has expressed his frustration to me about the fact that this nomination has not been voted on in the last 8

months. So I went to him last week and said I was going to make a unanimous consent request for a time agreement to consider her nomination. The Senator asked me if I would wait until today, which I was glad to do. We have waited 8 months already.

I, in no way, fault the senior Senator from Tennessee. He has been very clear to me he is ready to vote whenever this nomination comes forward. So seeing the Republican leader on the floor, I will now propound a unanimous consent request. I ask unanimous consent, as if in executive session, at a time to be determined by the majority leader, following consultation with the Republican leader, the Senate proceed to executive session and consider Calendar No. 552, the nomination of Jane B. Stranch, of Tennessee, to be a judge on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit; there be 3 hours of debate with respect to the nomination, with the time equally divided and controlled between the chairman and ranking member of the Judiciary Committee, myself and Senator SESSIONS, or our designees; that upon the use or yielding back of time, the Senate proceed to vote on the confirmation of the nomination; that upon confirmation, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; any statements related to the nomination be printed in the RECORD; the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; the Senate then resume legislative session.

**The PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection?

**Mr. ALEXANDER.** Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I thank the Senator from Vermont, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, for his request. Jane Stranch is a well-qualified nominee.

It has long been my position, without going into the history in this body, that a President's judicial nominees deserve an up-or-down vote. She is President Obama's longest pending circuit court nominee yet to be confirmed. She was nominated last August. The committee reported her in November. She has my support, that of Senator CORKER.

I know it is difficult, with the amount of matters we have on the Senate floor, to schedule anything, including a circuit judge.

But it would be my hope that the Republican leader and the majority leader could, before long, set a time certain for an up-or-down vote on Jane Stranch, the President's nominee for the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals. I thank the Senator from Vermont for his request. I will not object.

**The PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mrs. GILLIBRAND). The Republican leader.

**Mr. MCCONNELL.** Reserving the right to object, I know my good friend from Tennessee is interested in this nomination. There were, however, some no-votes on the nominee in committee. We will be running the traps on our side and seeing if we can work out

both the debate time and a time to take up this nominee in the not too distant future. But for the short term, I must object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I am terribly disappointed. With this objection, Senate Republicans have further ratcheted up the obstruction and partisanship that has become commonplace this Congress with regard to judicial nominees. I had honestly hoped that working with the respected senior Senator from Tennessee, we would be able to obtain a standard time agreement. I am not asking any Republican Senator to vote for the nominee, but simply to vote. I am not asking Republican Senators to vote before they have had a chance to debate the nomination, only to agree to a reasonable time for debate. If they do not think 3 hours reasonable, I wish they would indicate what time they think they need for such a debate. During the past 2 years, their demands for time have gone unused in debates on the nominations. Often, hours will be demanded in opposition without any of it being used for that purpose. If it were just a matter of the number, I would hope we could have worked that out and reached an agreement. Instead, this objection is like the Republican leader's objection last week to the request from the Senator from North Carolina to consider two nominees from that State to the Fourth Circuit. They were both reported by the Judiciary Committee last January, more than 6 months ago. One was reported by a vote of 18 to 1 and the other by a vote of 19 to 0; they are supported by both home State Senators, one a Republican and one a Democrat. Still the Republican leadership refuses to allow the Senate to consider them.

I was disappointed to see my friend from Kentucky object last week. He did not speak about the nominees, or to their unquestioned qualifications, including their backgrounds in military service. It seemed as if his justification was along the lines of tit-for-tat. That is most unfortunate. I note that when I became chairman of the Judiciary Committee midway through President Bush's first tumultuous year in office, I worked very hard to make sure Senate Democrats did not perpetuate the judge wars as tit-for-tat. In fact, we did not. Despite that fact that Senate Republicans pocket filibustered more than 60 of President Clinton's judicial nominations and refused to proceed on them, including one of the nominees from North Carolina now pending before us, again, during the 17 months I chaired the committee during President Bush's first 2 years in office, the Senate proceeded to confirm 100 of his judicial nominees. By contrast, during these first 2 years of President Obama's term, Senate Republicans have allowed only 36 Federal circuit and district court nominees to be considered by the Senate, 100 to 36.

Ironically, the history of the Sixth Circuit and our efforts to turn away from the destructive practices that Republicans had followed during the Clinton years is detailed in my July 29, 2002, Senate statement in support of another Tennessee nominee, Judge Julia Gibbons. As chairman, I proceeded to a confirmation hearing for Judge Gibbons in April 2002; it was the first hearing for a Sixth Circuit nominee in 5 years. Despite the well-qualified nominees of President Clinton, the Republican majority did not consider them. Republicans refused to consider the nominations of Judge Helene White, an experienced State court judge; Kathleen McCree Lewis, an accomplished attorney and the daughter of former Solicitor General of the United States and former Sixth Circuit Judge Wade McCree; and Kent Markus, a law professor and former Justice Department official who had the support of his Republican home State Senator. This was the partisan record Senate Democrats overcame when in the Senate majority. Republicans' pocket filibusters of President Clinton's nominees resulted in numerous Sixth Circuit vacancies. By proceeding with President Bush's nominations of Judge Julia Gibbons of Tennessee and then his nomination of Judge John Rogers of Kentucky, to the Sixth Circuit in 2002, the Democratic Senate majority did not engage in a tit-for-tat but acted to break the logjam the Republican obstruction had created.

When I resumed the chairmanship of the Judiciary Committee in 2008, we were able to fill the last remaining vacancies on the Sixth Circuit when we confirmed President Bush's nominations of Judge Helene White and Judge Ray Kethledge of Michigan to the Sixth Circuit. Judge White had been one of President Clinton's nominations in 1997 who was pocket filibustered after having waited in vain for a hearing for more than 1,450 days. During the Bush years the Sixth Circuit went from half vacant to full.

With respect to Senate Republican leadership's current practice of holding, delaying and obstructing Senate consideration of judicial nominees reported favorably by the Judiciary Committee, this is a tactic they reserve for nominees of Democratic Presidents. Indeed, when President Bush was in the White House, Senate Republicans took the position that it was unconstitutional and wholly inappropriate not to vote on nominees approved by the Senate Judiciary Committee. With a Democratic President, they have reverted to their secret holds that resulted in pocket filibusters during the Clinton years. Last year, Senate Republicans successfully stalled all but a dozen Federal circuit and district court nominees. That was the lowest total for judges confirmed in more than 50 years. They have continued that practice despite the fact that judicial vacancies continue to hover around 100, with more than 40 declared judicial emergencies.

No one should be confused: The current obstruction and stalling by Senate Republicans is unprecedented. There is no systematic counterpart by Senate Democrats. In fact, during the first 2 years of the Bush administration, the 100 judges confirmed were considered by the Senate an average of 25 days from being reported by the Judiciary Committee. The average time for confirmed circuit court nominees was 26 days. The average time for the 36 Federal circuit and district and circuit court judges confirmed since President Obama took office is 82 days and the average time for circuit nominees is 126 days.

Overall judicial vacancies were reduced during the Bush years from almost 10 percent to less than 4 percent. Federal judicial vacancies are now over 10 percent. During the Bush years, the Federal circuit court vacancies were reduced from a high of 32 down to single digits. That progress has not continued with President Obama. Instead, Republican obstruction is putting that progress at risk. During the Bush years, we reduced vacancies on nine circuits. Since then, vacancies on six circuits have risen. I note that during the Clinton years, Republican obstruction succeeded in virtually doubling Federal circuit vacancies.

I trust that the Republican leader remembers how I treated and Senate Democrats treated judicial nominees from Kentucky. During the 17 months I chaired the Judiciary Committee during President Bush's first 2 years, we proceeded to consider and confirm Judge John Rogers of Kentucky to the Sixth Circuit by voice vote before the end of the session in 2002, having already confirmed Judge Danny Reeves and Judge Karen Caldwell to the Eastern District of Kentucky, and of course, Judge David Bunning to the Eastern District of Kentucky by voice vote, as well. During the more than 4 years that Republicans were in the majority during the Bush Presidency, one other judge for the Eastern District of Kentucky was confirmed, Judge Gregory Van Tatenhove, a former aide to the senior Senator from Kentucky. The year I resumed the Judiciary Committee chairmanship, we proceeded to confirm Judge Amul Thapar to the Eastern District of Kentucky. Nominees the Republican leader supported for his home State's vacancies were very well treated.

I am confident the senior Senator from Tennessee remembers how fairly we treated judicial nominees from his State. I was chair when we broke a longstanding logjam on the Sixth Circuit by confirming Judge Julia Gibbons of Tennessee in July 2002. During the first 2 years of the Bush administration we worked to see the Senate also confirm Samuel Mays, Jr., as a judge for the Western District of Tennessee and Judge Thomas Phillips as a judge for the Eastern District of Tennessee. When I resumed the chairmanship in 2008, we also facilitated the Senate confirmation of Judge Stanley Anderson

to be a judge for the Western District of Tennessee. During the intervening years three other nominees were considered and confirmed to be Eastern District of Tennessee judges, Judge Thomas Vartan, Judge Ronnie Greet and Judge Harry Mattice, Jr. In addition Judge J. Daniel Breen was confirmed to be a judge in the Western District of Tennessee.

There did come a time in the 108th Congress when President Bush and Senate Republicans were intent on packing the courts with ideologues and the Republican Chairman of the Judiciary Committee violated the rules and practices of the committee in support of this effort. They forced filibusters of 10 nominees, 6 of which were ultimately confirmed.

I have not done what the Republican chairman did. I have respected and protected the rights of the minority. President Obama has not made nominations opposed by home State Senators but has instead reached out and worked with home State Senators from both parties. He has by and large nominated well-qualified moderates.

I have tried to ratchet up the co-operation between parties and branches in my role as chairman. It is disappointing to see the Senate Republican leadership take the opposite approach. They are holding up consideration of nominees reported unanimously from the Judiciary Committee for weeks and months for no reason. Just last week, after a needless 3-month delay, the Senate confirmed a judge for the Northern District of Illinois unanimously. That is more evidence of the pattern of stall and obstruct. Earlier this year the majority leader had to file cloture to get to a vote on the nomination of Judge Barbara Keenan of Virginia to the Fourth Circuit. When the vote was held, she was confirmed unanimously.

Republicans' sense of injury is misplaced in my view. Moreover, the disproportionateness of their response disservices the American people and our Federal justice system.

Jane Stranch of Tennessee is just one example of the harm they are causing. Judge James Wynn of North Carolina is another example, as is Judge Albert Diaz, also of North Carolina. The list includes the 21 judicial nominees currently stalled by Republican objection from final Senate consideration but also many of the 36 who were needlessly delayed. What is being perpetuated is a shame.

I thank the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee for his efforts in moving this forward. I am obviously disappointed, but I am not disappointed in the actions of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee. He did work very hard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR PAUL COVERDELL

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, about 10 years ago, one of our dear friends, the Senator from Georgia, Paul

Coverdell, was unexpectedly taken from us. He became ill and passed away. Here we are 10 years later, and we wish to commemorate his life and service. His good friends, the Senators from Georgia, Mr. CHAMBLISS and Mr. ISAKSON, are both here. We all want to say a few words about our departed friend Paul Coverdell.

Paul was a patriot. I admired him a great deal. Nobody worked harder than Paul Coverdell, and nobody wanted less credit for it. We were talking on the floor a few moments ago. Senator Lott, who was the Republican leader at the time, used to call him Mikey. What he meant by that was some character we believe was in a commercial named Mikey who always got the job done and didn't care where the credit ended up. That is exactly how Paul was. No matter how tough the task, no matter how thankless the job, Paul was ready to pitch in with good humor and credible persistence and see it through to completion.

He had a distinguished career in the private sector before he entered public life. He spent a long time toiling in the Georgia State Senate before he came here. In fact, he used to joke that he knew all too well what it was like to be an underdog because he spent 15 years representing all five Republicans in the Georgia State Senate against 51 Democrats. That gives one a certain humility, shall I say.

Paul's deep understanding of the power of freedom is well known, and his efforts to promote and spread freedom are a big part of his legacy. As Director of the Peace Corps in the late 1980s, Paul sent the first Peace Corps volunteers into Eastern Europe to work with nations about to experience freedom for the very first time.

In a speech he delivered shortly before his death, Paul said:

I believe that in the 20th century, America has helped plant the seeds of democracy and freedom around the world. I hope that when the stories are written at the end of this new century, it is said of this nation that we tended to liberty, nurtured it around the world, and sustained freedom and prosperity here in this Hemisphere.

That was Paul shortly before his death.

He served in this Chamber for nearly a decade, and those of us who served alongside him know he never, ever sought the spotlight. He was a decent hard-working guy who was dedicated to his wife Nancy, the people of Georgia, the American people, and to promoting what he called the three pillars of freedom: economic liberty, security for persons and property, and a well-educated citizenry. Paul often said that an uneducated mind can never truly be free. It is an idea he shared with the men who founded our Nation. As Washington put it in his first annual address to Congress:

Knowledge is, in every country, the surest basis of public happiness.

As with all the lessons Paul liked to share, he delivered it with a smile.

Paul is deeply missed by all of us in this room, but his contributions are lasting. Ten years after his sudden passing, we continue to learn from the life and example of Paul Coverdell.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Madam President, I rise, like my leader from Kentucky, to celebrate the life of Paul Douglas Coverdell. I thank the leader for his kind comments about a very personal friend to both Senator ISAKSON and me as well as to the leader.

Paul Coverdell served in this body from 1993 until his untimely death on July 18, 2000. Paul was a longtime politician in our State, having first run for office in 1968. He lost the first election and then was elected to the State senate in 1970. He rose to the rank of minority leader in the Georgia State Senate and had a successful career there. He then decided to run for Congress and lost his first race for the House of Representatives.

Paul did something that is so Coverdell-like in the summer of 1978. He was then the chairman of the Georgia Republican Party. He was on vacation in Maine. He knew, obviously, of the soon-to-be Vice President, George H.W. Bush, but he didn't know him and he wanted to get to know him. So he walked up to his house in Kennebunkport—didn't have to worry about the Secret Service back then—and knocked on his front door. President Bush came to the front door. He introduced himself. They became fast friends after that.

When President Bush was elected, Paul Coverdell was very involved in his campaign. He wrote him a simple note. He said: If I can help you, I would like to. Well, the President took that to heart and appointed Paul to be the Director of the Peace Corps. Anything Paul undertook, he put his whole heart and soul into. When he became Director of the Peace Corps, he did exactly that. He also was a very good thinker. He created what was called World Wise Schools within the Peace Corps. Those schools all of a sudden cropped up all around the world under the sponsorship of Peace Corps volunteers and all under Paul's leadership. Paul led the first Peace Corps volunteers into Eastern Europe after the fall of the wall.

I will never forget going to the Peace Corps building as a Member of the House after Paul's death when the Peace Corps building was named after Paul. To hear the many tributes of volunteers who had served for so long under Paul and the personal stories they had about the involvement of their leader and their affection for their leader was truly humbling and moving.

When Paul was elected to the Senate in 1992, he actually had to be elected four times that year. He was in a primary which he won after a runoff. He then came in second in the general election in November, but because of the rules being what they are in Georgia, as I experienced myself in 2008,

Paul was in a runoff with the incumbent because an independent third-party candidate got enough votes so that the incumbent did not get 50 percent plus one. Paul then won, after coming in second, the runoff election and, thus, his fourth election in 1992.

In 1998, he became the first Georgia Republican to ever be reelected to the Senate. He was such a class guy here that he was respected and admired by folks on both sides of the aisle. I went back and looked at some of the comments Republicans and Democrats made on the floor of the Senate after Paul's death. It truly was, again, a very moving experience to read those comments.

He created what is called the Coverdell ESA, or the Coverdell education savings accounts—they are really education IRAs—to allow families to set aside money on a tax-free basis to educate their children. Paul loved education. It was very near and dear to him. He was very proud of being able to establish those IRAs for future leaders of the country.

A quick story about Paul. He was a very unique individual. He never wore anything but a dark suit, never wore anything but a long-sleeve white shirt. I remember one day I had an event down in the very southern part of my congressional district, down at the Okefenokee Swamp. It was in July or August, I don't remember which, but I do remember it was extremely hot. The humidity in south Georgia on a June or July or August day is extremely high. We were all there, and some other Members of Congress who were there were in shorts and golf shirts. Whatever we could put on to stay cool or somewhat cool, that is what we had on. Paul showed up. As always, Paul had on a dark suit and a white shirt. We finally did get him to take his tie and coat off because we were going to ride out into the swamp. I used to kid Paul about that really until the time of his death.

The leader is right, Senator Lott had a term for Paul Coverdell. He called him Mikey because anytime Trent needed to get something done, he would go to Mikey. Paul just had a way of making sure that whatever the challenge was, it got done and got done in a very efficient way.

The photograph I cherish most of all my political photographs is a black-and-white photo. It is a picture of Paul and myself sitting in his office at one of our weekly meetings that took place while I was in the House and he was in the Senate, the two of us just sitting there talking. The expression on Paul's face is so classic Coverdell. It always makes me feel good and is a great reminder of Paul.

Paul's wife Nancy has always been a dear friend. She was such a great asset to him. She has chaired my military academy appointment committee in all of my years in the Senate. She is a wonderful lady. Again, we have some very fond conversations together about Paul from time to time.

Paul Coverdell was not just a great Georgian; he was a great American. He certainly loved our State and our country as much as anybody who has ever served in this body. It is a sad day but yet a very good day from the standpoint of having the opportunity to remember the strong and positive leadership of Senator Paul Coverdell.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. ISAKSON. Madam President, I am honored and privileged to join Leader MCCONNELL and Senator CHAMBLISS to take a few minutes to talk about one of my great friends, Paul Coverdell, and his lovely wife Nancy. MITCH MCCONNELL has done some great recollections of Paul's service in the Senate. Senator CHAMBLISS told some great stories of his relationship with Senator Coverdell. I wish to share some of mine to certify and document that everything they have said is absolutely correct.

I met Paul Coverdell in 1972, 2 years after he was elected to the Georgia State Senate as the fifth Republican to serve there. I was running for the Georgia House of Representatives. Although I lost in 1974, I won in 1976. A few years later, I became the leader of the Republicans in the Georgia House of Representatives, and Paul was the senate leader. The senate had their caucus elections every January after elections. I always loved the senate election. They had five caucus officers and five Republican Senators. So instead of having an election, they drew straws. They drew straws and they drew Paul Coverdell, to which he was forever reelected as leader of Republicans in the Georgia State Senate.

Paul was the most organized guy I have ever known and was the most goal-oriented guy I have ever known.

His goal—when we were outnumbered 10 to 1 in the senate, Democrat to Republican, and 8 to 1, Democrat to Republican, in the house—he dreamed of the day when we were in the majority. As the Republican leader of the house, he would summon me, by kind invitation, on every Monday morning, to the Buckhead Waffle House or the Buckhead IHOP where we would have coffee and talk about how one day we were going to be the majority party in Georgia.

Now, I am an optimist. I was a salesman all my life. I believed we could get there too. But Paul had a step-by-step plan—a plan that in 1976 seemed tantamount to impossible but a plan that was realized with his election to the Senate in 1992, a congressional majority for Republicans in Georgia in 1994 and, ultimately, the first Republican Governor in the history of our State Post-Reconstruction, in 2002.

Paul meticulously was a partisan, but he was, above that, an American. Paul Coverdell was also a man of ideas. Folks have talked about the Coverdell education savings accounts, which he authored in the Senate and are now law. But I remember, in Georgia, in the

1970s and 1980s, when he championed the mandatory seatbelt law. Believe me, in a State such as Georgia where you have a lot of pickup trucks and a lot of rural communities, wearing a seatbelt was not the most popular thing in the world. But Paul knew it was good for saving lives. He knew it was good for lowering insurance rates because he was an insurance man. He fought against a majority that did not want it, but he prevailed and he won, and today many lives have been saved because of the efforts of Paul Coverdell in the Georgia Legislature.

Senator CHAMBLISS told his story of Paul in his dark suit and his red tie and his white shirt. I want to tell mine.

Back in 1982, I was on the beach at Jekyll Island, GA, following a joint house Republican-senate Republican conference. The late Haskew Brantley—then a Georgia State senator—and I were on the beach under an umbrella enjoying the beautiful coast of Georgia on our great island, Jekyll Island. In the distance we could see this figure coming toward us that looked from a distance as having on a suit, walking on the beach with his shoes in his hand and his pant legs rolled up. The closer he got, the more Haskew and I realized: That is Paul Coverdell.

Paul came in his red tie, his buttoned-down white shirt, his dark pin-striped suit but with his shoes in his hand. He sat in the sand with us, talked, got up, walked back to the parking lot, and drove to Atlanta. In fact, I am not sure I ever saw Paul when he did not have on the dark suit, the red tie, and the white shirt.

He was always dressed to the nines, and he was always ready for whatever challenge came. His wife Nancy, who is a beautiful lady I saw just a few weeks ago on the coast of Georgia, actually had her real estate license in my company. So not only did I know Paul, but I knew Nancy, and for 35 years they were as close of friends as I have ever had. But for 35 years they served Georgia day in and day out in whatever capacity they could to make it a better State.

I think it is a great tribute to tell this story: When Paul was elected to the Georgia State Senate as the fifth Republican in history in 1970, for somebody to think a Republican majority could ever have taken place, they would have laughed. But shortly after Paul's death, the legislative office building where every member of the Georgia House and Senate in downtown Atlanta has an office was named the Paul D. Coverdell Legislative Office Building. He went from the bottom in terms of numbers, and he went to the top, but he climbed it one step at a time; he climbed it one commitment at a time, and he never lost sight of the fact that he was an American first and a Republican second but always committed to the values of Georgia and the values and the conservative principles we shared.

So on this day, just 10 years after his passing, we rise to pay tribute to a great American, a great Member of the Senate, and a leader who made it possible for people such as Senator CHAMBLISS and myself to follow in his footsteps and one day, ultimately, serve in the greatest deliberative body in the world, the U.S. Senate.

I pay tribute to Paul Coverdell and his legacy and his beautiful wife Nancy.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

Mr. MERKLEY. Thank you, Madam President.

#### OIL INDEPENDENCE

Madam President, today I come to this Chamber to speak about oil independence for a stronger America. Many folks across America are continuously talking about the downside of our addiction to overseas oil. Today I am going to be presenting a plan embodying a bill with that name: Oil Independence for a Stronger America.

One of the big issues of our dependence on foreign oil is national security. We send \$1 billion a day overseas to governments that often don't share our core American values; governments in the Middle East, in Nigeria, in Venezuela. Sometimes those dollars end up directly in the hands of terrorists. As some national security analysts have noted, in our current wars we are sometimes funding both sides of the battle, and that is not a good place to be.

In addition, to maintain our access to that overseas oil, we have to maintain a significant national security military force. Some analysts have estimated the cost of that additional security, that additional access to guarantee oil for America, has a value or a cost of up to \$5 per gallon. So those aren't dollars we pay at the pump, but we certainly pay them in terms of our national security overhead.

In addition to national security, our addiction to overseas oil is terrible for our economy. We are sending \$1 billion a day overseas. Two years ago, when the cost of a barrel of oil surged upwards, we were sending \$2 billion a day overseas. It will be that again. It will go higher, because the world's demand for oil is only increasing. As the economies of Asia, and particularly the economy of China, are growing, the demand for oil is growing as well, and with it we will be paying more.

Take that \$1 billion a day. That is \$3 for every man, woman, and child in

America. I have a family of four: \$12 a day for my family. A significant sum, hundreds of dollars a month for my family, goes overseas. When those dollars go overseas, they create jobs overseas instead of creating jobs here in America. Try to picture the difference between spending \$1 billion a day overseas and spending \$1 billion a day on red, white, and blue American-made energy. That is the difference between families who have jobs, a stronger economy, or a weaker economy.

Oil addiction makes us weaker as a nation. Oil independence makes us stronger as a nation. Isn't it time to choose strength over weakness?

I wish to take a look at the numbers demonstrating the challenge before us. The estimate for the amount of oil we will be importing as a nation 20 years from now is between 6 million to 7 million barrels per day, as indicated by this column. If we were to put together a plan that would reduce our consumption of oil by more than 6 million to 7 million barrels per day, then we would have a plan that equates to independence from oil so that we would be able to eliminate the requirement, the need to import oil from overseas.

The good news is that the tools are at hand to have such a strategy. What we have lacked is the will, the political will to move forward; the will to say, yes, we are going to have a plan and we are going to stay on that plan over the course of time, the two decades necessary to implement it.

So what are the major strategies through which we can end our addiction to overseas oil? The first strategy I wish to talk about is changing the consumption of gasoline in passenger vehicles. Right now we have a number of hybrid cars that consume a lot less oil. We have coming on the market next year the Nissan LEAF, the Chevrolet Volt. We have the Tesla sedan. We are going to have numerous options for customers in America to be able to satisfy their domestic transportation needs in ways that consume vastly less gasoline, and that means less overseas oil. So the question is whether we promote adoption of these strategies. There is a tremendous amount to gain by promoting adoption of these strategies.

I wish to thank Senator BYRON DORGAN and Senator LAMAR ALEXANDER who partnered with me, the three of us together, on the Electric Vehicle Deployment Act. This is an act that will take a half dozen or so communities across this country and create deployment communities to test drive, if you will; building the infrastructure necessary for electric vehicles in partnership with the deployment of electric vehicles, because the two have to work together. From what we learn from those deployment communities, we can develop an accelerated strategy to shift to electricity from gasoline across this Nation. The potential savings are 3.2 million barrels per day.

The second strategy is to have more efficient freight transportation. There

is a lot to be gained in this area as well—up to 2 million barrels of oil per day. We have a group out in Oregon, a nonprofit called Cascade Sierra. Cascade Sierra works in partnership with the trucking community to make sure there is a one-stop shop to acquire different technologies designed to increase the efficiency of trucks. They deploy airfoils to make the trucks go down the highway more efficiently. They provide the technology for automatic tire inflation which makes a huge difference in mileage over time. Cascade Sierra makes available different types of generators so that a truck, instead of running its large diesel engine to provide electricity when it is stopped, can instead run a small generator. Now they are working to help develop charging stations where the trucks can actually plug in to power up their electric infrastructure on the truck rather than running their diesel engine.

There are many ways to increase efficiency on trucks as well as increasing efficiency by shifting a percentage of our freight transportation from trucks to barges and rail. Rail and barges are incredibly efficient. I am constantly amazed at the statistic of how far you can take a ton of freight with one gallon of diesel. For all of my colleagues who may be wondering: Well, how far can you go? Can you go 50 miles? Can you take a ton of freight 50 miles with one gallon? Well, no, it is higher than that. Is it 100 miles? No, it is over 400 miles, a ton of freight, with one gallon on rail or by barge. Significant savings are available in that area.

The third section is smart metropolitan transportation options. Portland, OR, is a city that is working very hard to provide options to its citizens on how they commute back and forth to work. We have light rail not too dissimilar from what we have here in Washington, DC. Back home in Oregon, we also are building streetcars, and streetcars create a whole infrastructure around efficient electric transportation for neighborhoods. Then we are working on other strategies, including bike lanes, and so forth, that create a network of options for effective noncar transportation. Those types of strategies can do an enormous amount in reducing the amount of fuel we consume, not to mention reducing the congestion and, therefore, improving the quality of life for Americans throughout metropolitan areas. Potential savings: 1.7 million barrels of oil per day.

The fourth area is in alternative fuels. There have been natural gas forklifts since I was a little kid. Compressed natural gas is an effective fuel. Through recent developments in drilling technology, we have discovered we can produce a lot more natural gas in our Nation, which means a lot more potential to power up trucks with natural gas rather than diesel. So that is a technology that will have a big impact.

A second area is advanced biofuels. Certainly I wish to see the forests of



Oregon generating some advanced cellulosic ethanol for our truck fleet and to do so in a fashion which is environmentally sustainable so the power of plants, if you will, can be a significant factor in strengthening our domestic energy economy and creating more jobs here in America and reducing our oil imports from overseas.

The fifth area is energy-efficient homes and buildings. In this case, the savings are more modest: 200,000 barrels of oil per day. They are more modest because most buildings are not heated by heating oil. But we should pay attention to those buildings that are heated by heating oil, because the savings, when you increase the energy characteristics of a building, are substantial. So that merits attention.

If one combines these strategies, we are looking at savings of well over 8 million barrels per day, as compared to the estimate for imports 20 years from now of 6 million to 7 million barrels per day. So it is unquestionable that we can end our oil addiction if we have the political will, if we have the determination to sustain a plan through every 4-year cycle over 20 years.

Here in America, we tend to oscillate back and forth as Presidencies change, and that is why this bill, the Oil Independence for Stronger America Act, calls for a National Energy Security Council that will sustain the attention to the national plan as Presidents come and go, as Members of Congress come and go.

There should be little question in any of our minds that America will be stronger as an oil-independent nation rather than an oil-addicted nation. There should be little question that creating jobs here, buying American-made energy at \$1 billion a day is far preferable to sending billions of dollars a day overseas, where they are no longer in our retail stores and are no longer creating jobs.

Certainly, many of these strategies will have a very positive influence on creating cleaner air and having American leadership and stewardship of our planet. So numerous positive factors go together. I want to be sure to thank my original cosponsors of the bill. Senator TOM CARPER has done terrific work on CAFE and CLEAN TEA, which involves metropolitan transportation options. TOM UDALL brought insights on freight, rail, natural gas, and biofuels. Senator MICHAEL BENNET has a comprehensive understanding of energy issues that is of real value in the Senate Chamber.

I will conclude with this: Let's choose a stronger oil-independent America over a weaker oil-addicted America.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KAUFMAN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 10 minutes as in morning business.

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

HUGO BOSS

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. President, last April a German clothing company, Hugo Boss, announced it was planning to close down its only North American manufacturing plant located in Brooklyn, OH, outside of Cleveland. Hugo Boss told us they were going to expand their American sales force but shut down all U.S. production. Despite the Cleveland plant being profitable—a plant that had been in existence for decades and decades prior to Hugo Boss purchasing it—Hugo Boss planned to move its Cleveland production to the country of Turkey.

I recognize Hugo Boss's desire to expand their sales force by eliminating production in the United States and shipping it to Turkey—a sad but all too common story in our Nation today—but it was a devastating announcement for the workers and for the community in Brooklyn, OH. Cleveland has a long and storied history of manufacturing clothes and apparel, in addition to chemicals and steel and autos and so much else. In Brooklyn, a suburb of Cleveland, a factory is a source of pride and economic prosperity. Yet despite the shock and disappointment of the announcement, the community rallied behind the workers.

In the ensuing months, Governor Strickland and I met Hugo Boss executives and workers. I talked to the Hugo Boss people in Germany by phone. I went to the plant and talked to workers, heard their stories—often workers who had been there 10, 20, 30 years, husbands and wives working together at the plant making no more than \$15 an hour. So these were not jobs that paid a lot of money or made a lot of people rich, but they were jobs that gave particularly immigrant workers a real opportunity in this country to work. They had decent health benefits, and they made a wage that they could at least make a go of it.

Earlier this year, in February, when I traveled to meet with some of those 400 workers, I began to hear these stories. As I said, the workers make no more than \$15 an hour, and many make less than that. They are paid decent benefits but barely enough to keep these working families in the middle class. These workers did everything they could to keep this plant profitable. Their work meant everything to the community.

When the decision to close the factory was made, Joe Costigan, Sue Brown, Mark Milko, and Dallas Sells—all of Workers United—fought tirelessly on behalf of these workers. Mayor Richard Balbier rallied the community to help keep the plant open, recognizing a healthy manufacturing

sector means a healthy and prosperous community. In the meantime, management, workers, elected officials, and community leaders all continued to work together to find a way to keep the factory open.

Exactly a year later, in April 2010, an agreement was made that would keep workers in their jobs and would sustain that community's economy. These workers agreed to absorb wage cuts. Many of them went from \$12 or \$13 an hour down to \$10 or \$11 an hour.

Yesterday, we celebrated what happens when we work together to save a plant and a community. Yesterday, Governor Strickland and I joined 200 workers and Hugo Boss executives to celebrate the first suit off the line of this restarted manufacturing plant. Wanda Navarro and Sheila McVay were among those who spoke. Sheila McVay introduced the Governor, and Ms. Navarro introduced me. But before they did so, they spoke eloquently of what being back to work means. I am proud to have stood by Wanda and Sheila and those who fought for the classic American success story.

I wear a suit. The suit I have on today was union made in Cleveland, OH, by these workers. One of these workers came up to me as I was standing there and she pointed to the vest pocket of the suit, saying: I make those vest pockets; I probably sewed that one. It makes me proud to have worked with Workers United and Hugo Boss to ensure that a premier global company continues to invest in this town, in this State, in American manufacturing.

Yesterday marked a new chapter for this company's global competitiveness and for our community's economic prosperity. But that celebration yesterday must be viewed in the context of what is happening all too often in our country. The closing of a plant too often means moving it offshore. It looks like a good deal for the company's quarterly financial statement. That is initially what Hugo Boss thought when they were going to close this plant—a profitable plant—and move to it Turkey: manufacture more clothes, sell more clothes in Turkey, increase their U.S. sales force, and sell more of them back into the United States. We know that story can be told again and again, when U.S. trade law, U.S. tax laws, and companies think about the next quarter more than they do the next year or the next decade and outsource those jobs, then sell the products back into the United States.

As an example, I was meeting with someone today who is working to push the Commerce Department to simply enforce U.S. trade law and enforce or stop some of the currency manipulation by the People's Republic of China. He told me that only 10 years ago we had 19 million manufacturing jobs in the United States. Today, we are down to about 11 million. Yet China has some 100 million people working in manufacturing.

For the last two decades, manufacturing has steadily declined, as financial services expanded. The Presiding Officer from Delaware has worked on and has talked about this. He understands this in terms of what has happened with manufacturing versus what has happened with financial services. Only 30 years ago, manufacturing made up more than a quarter of our Nation's GDP, our Nation's gross domestic product. Financial services was only 11 percent of our gross domestic product. Today, those numbers are almost reversed, where manufacturing is only about half of what it was as a percentage of GDP and financial services is double what it was. Look where that brought us as a nation. Look what happened to our jobs. Look what happened to the middle class.

People at Hugo Boss and these other companies make things. People in this country who make things can provide a middle-class lifestyle for their loved ones and their families. If we stop relying on manufacturing as something that is important to us as a nation—not everything but something important to us as a nation—we will see the middle class continue to atrophy and decline.

We need a national manufacturing strategy that ensures that trade agreements and tax laws come down on the side of workers and communities, not encourages investors to go overseas, make things in China and then send them back to the United States. We need a national manufacturing strategy that once again invests in American workers and incentivizes companies to promote manufacturing innovation. We need a national manufacturing strategy that recognizes manufacturing has been and always will be a ticket to the middle class for millions of Americans. That is what manufacturing means to workers at the Hugo Boss plant in Brooklyn, OH, a suburb of Cleveland. That is what it means to workers in communities in Toledo and Dayton and Cincinnati and Lima and Mansfield, OH, and that is what it means to the middle class all over this great country.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, what is our parliamentary position?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are in a period postcloture.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

#### NASA AUTHORIZATION

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, I wish to compliment a lot of Senators on both sides of the aisle for the extraordinary bipartisanship—no, the extraordinary nonpartisanship that occurred in coming together unanimously to pass the NASA authorization bill out of the full Commerce Committee last week.

The budget for NASA was about to be blown apart by centrifugal force—having different elements, different interests all going off in different directions. Everybody seemed to have their own agenda. Geographical circumstances came into it as to whose States were being affected. The companies were at war with each other. There was a lack of cooperation that was going on between the legislative branch and the executive branch. All I can say is hallelujah, it all came together, and we passed the NASA bill out of the Commerce Committee last week unanimously, with all the Senators who spoke singing its praises.

I am going to outline it in just a minute, but let me make note of another fact. We had unprecedented cooperation between the authorizers; that is, the authorizing committee, and the appropriators. As we speak, the Appropriations Subcommittee on Commerce, State, Justice, which includes the NASA appropriations—are preparing the markup. We will find out the result tomorrow afternoon. But I can tell you the cooperation was extensive and so was the communication, the likes of which we have not seen around here this year, particularly in this year when there is so much gridlock and we have so much difficulty getting anything done. That has not been the case with the NASA bill.

There are a host of Senators, they all know who they are, to whom this Senator wants to express his appreciation for their coming together. As the Good Book says: "Come, let us reason together," and it happened. As I said at the time we passed it, I think it was a near miracle, but I believe in miracles. Indeed, it happened.

Let me tell you what is in the bill. A good part of what the President requested is there. That is why we had the verbal and the written support of the President of this consensus that developed, which we passed. We had the President's recommendations on the top line of the spending for NASA, about \$19 billion for this next fiscal year starting in October.

The President recommended the extension of the International Space Station to 2020, which was originally supposed to expire in 2015, which was absolutely ridiculous. We are just now getting it built and it is about a \$100 billion investment. The President wants to start a commercial rocket industry, already under contract with NASA—two companies, SpaceX and Orbital Sciences—to deliver cargo to the International Space Station. Those contracts are already underway and the

testing is beginning. We put in the President's recommendation on that commercial cargo in this bill, which was a recommendation for \$300 million.

We agreed with the President to start the process of human-rating commercial rockets for the purpose of being, in effect, a taxi service to and from the International Space Station. Human rating of a rocket is no small measure, because when you strap in to a rocket, there has to be all kinds of redundancies in order to protect human life. Safety is one of our major watchwords. That was authorized as well—at a different level from what the President had originally recommended and over 6 years as opposed to 5 years that the President had recommended, but nevertheless it gets the project started.

The main thing we did differently from the President's recommendation is this. When the President came to the Kennedy Space Center a few months ago and said he wanted to develop a new heavy-lift rocket that will ultimately take us out into the cosmos, the President set the goal—and I gave him great credit for this because you have to have a goal when you are developing cutting-edge technology—he set that goal of going to Mars by a flexible path. The first way station he pointed to, with a date 2025, is an asteroid. He said he wanted that heavy-lift rocket to start to be developed by 2015. That is a 5-year wait. Our committee did not want to wait that long. We want to get started now. In the authorization bill, in a congressional committee, we cannot design a rocket. But we can set policy guidelines to the executive branch of government and to the agency, in this case NASA, as to using shuttle-derived technology and building on that, making it, in the parlance of the space community, evolvable, and that is what we did in the authorization bill. We want to start it now instead of waiting until 2011.

We also did another thing differently. Although the White House was contemplating this, by them embracing the consensus that we built, now they have supported it; that is, to fly an extra flight of the space shuttle. This is not a space shuttle that we have to go out and build the parts for. It is a space shuttle, a stack with the external tank and the two solid boosters as well as the orbiter we already have and ready to be on the pad as a rescue shuttle for the remaining two flights, one of which will come this November, the other next February. We wish to fly that third flight. It is likely to be the orbiter Atlantis. That would come a year from now, probably next June.

There is a lot more stuff to take up to the space station. There is a lot more equipment, supplies, and, interestingly and importantly, there is a lot of stuff up there that you need the big volume of that cargo bay of the orbiter to be able to bring back to Earth. That third flight will supply that.



We continue the President's recommendations on all the other parts of NASA—on the science part, on the aeronautics part, and on the acceleration of research and development for new technologies. We continue that. We focus some of that development of technologies in our authorization bill toward the building, the designing, and ultimately the flying of this heavy-lift vehicle, complete with a crew compartment, which more than likely will be in the form of what we thought of in the old days as the capsule.

Therefore, at the beginning of the new fiscal year, which comes this October, assuming that we have the authorization in place—if that is the decision of the Appropriations Committee as well, and we can get that appropriation passed and signed into law by the President—then, come October 1, they will start on the development of that new heavy-lift vehicle.

This has been met with wide consensus. The research and development on new technologies will continue. They will be more focused and directed. They will be more immediate. The capability of having the commercial rockets be human rated, to be the trip to and from the space station, will be there, and it will start immediately.

All this dissonance and argument and criticism, it all came together and it passed unanimously. I await very expectantly and very hopefully for the Appropriations Committee—they are acting as we speak—on seeing the results of their work.

Let me say in conclusion, I could name a dozen Senators. They all know who they are. I have said it in press conferences, and so forth, singing their high praises. Somewhere down the line, if this Chamber is still in gridlock on so many other issues that we have and if we get to the point we are not able to pass appropriations bills and if we, in fact, have to go back in order to fund the government starting October 1 on what is called a continuing resolution, which usually is a continuance of the previous year's funding—hopefully, we will have passed by the Senate Appropriations Committee their bill that is very similar to the authorization bill I have just described. In that case, if we are in gridlock, it would be my hope, it would be the hope of some dozen of us Senators that we would be able, then, to take that Appropriations Committee bill, passed by the Senate Appropriations Committee, if we have to go to a continuing resolution, and put that NASA appropriations bill in the continuing resolution.

The alternative would be disaster. It would be appropriating on the basis of last year's bill that would completely blow apart the consensus I have just described. It would have the manned space program dead in its tracks by the funding at last year's levels without the policy direction.

But, despite gridlock, I am an optimist. I believe what I have laid out is the mere expression of support of so

many of our Senators on both sides of the aisle so that when it comes to this little \$19 billion agency, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the agency that carries the hopes and dreams of a lot of Americans, it is my hope that under those circumstances, as we get on into the fall, that that is how we can fund NASA with an appropriations bill, if we cannot pass the overall CJS appropriations bill in its entirety.

I come as someone who 2 weeks ago didn't know where in the world we were going or how we were going to get the votes. But Senators came together, and I, for one, this Senator, hope for the sake of all those young people out there whose hearts beat a little bit faster when they see that rocket as it climbs into the heavens, who had the dreams of understanding what is out there in that universe that we are exploring—for the sake of all those young people, for the sake of this country and its technological prowess, for the sake of this country and its people, for the technological spin-offs that come out of the research and development of the space program that absolutely pervades our everyday life to make our quality of life better, for the sake of the future of this country, that we stay on the cutting edge, inspiring our young people into math and science and technology and engineering so we can stay as the leader in this global marketplace, because we have the ingenuity, the creativity, the inventive-ness.

A lot of that inspiration comes out of our space program, both manned and unmanned. It is our destiny as a people to explore. It is our heritage as a people that we have explored. We have always had a frontier. When we developed this country, we expanded westward on the frontier. Now that frontier is upward. We can do no less than to continue the quest.

I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HAGAN). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant editor of the Daily Digest proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, after months of obstruction, we have overcome a shameful effort by the Republican minority to block the extension of emergency unemployment benefits.

Because of the obstructionism of those on the other side of the aisle, more than 2 and a half million unemployed Americans have seen their benefits terminated in recent weeks—49 days ago, to be exact. They are among the nearly 6.8 million Americans who have been out of work for more than half a year. That is the highest number of long-term unemployed we have had since we started keeping track in 1948. Again, this is the highest number of

long-term unemployment we have had since 1948.

In recent weeks, I have come to the Senate floor several times to share the heartbreaking letters and e-mails I have received from long-term unemployed workers in Iowa. These families are struggling to survive. These Iowans are trying their hardest, doing everything they can to find any kind of work. But the jobs just aren't there.

Officially, there are five job seekers for every new job opening. Unofficially, and more accurately, there are more than eight job seekers for every opening. Here on the chart, it says that when you include the discouraged workers who aren't counted in the official numbers, unemployment has gone up to 26 million. Yet there are 3.2 million job openings. So there is between five and eight unemployed workers for every job opening.

I say to those desperate families in Iowa and across America that we have listened to you, we have heard you, and we have been fighting desperately over the last 49 days here to get an extension of unemployment insurance benefits. Every time we have tried it, we have been obstructed by the minority, the Republicans. So thanks, today, to the first vote cast by the new Senator from West Virginia, Mr. CARTE GOODWIN—by the way, I might say to Senator GOODWIN, who was just sworn in at about 2 p.m. and then cast his first vote, he can be rightfully proud of the first vote he cast in the Senate—to help lift up people who, in many cases, have lost all hope, to make sure families get the necessary wherewithal to put food on the table and keep their families together. Thanks to the first vote of the new Senator from West Virginia, today we were able to get cloture and stop the filibuster.

I also thank the two Republicans—Senator SNOWE and Senator COLLINS—who also voted with us today to make sure we were able to get this extension into law.

Just remember, on three occasions this summer Republican Senators pulled out the stops to filibuster and kill efforts to extend unemployment benefits. During that time, we heard a rising chorus on talk radio and even from some Senators. They said that extending unemployment benefits would be a bad idea because, in so many words, people are lazy, and they are just relying on their benefits instead of looking for work.

As the distinguished minority whip, the Senator from Arizona, Mr. KYL, put it:

... continuing to pay people unemployment compensation is a disincentive for them to seek new work.

I believe that is woefully out of touch with the reality of trying to survive on unemployment benefits. Let's look at the facts. While the numbers vary from State to State, the average weekly unemployment benefit nationwide is only about \$300 a week. As this chart shows, \$300 a week in UI benefits adds up to

about \$15,000 a year. That is the average. The poverty line for a family of four is \$22,000 a year. So is the Senator from Arizona saying someone who is getting \$15,000 a year—a family of four—would rather get that than find a job and make well over \$22,000 a year, which would be the poverty line? Would they rather exist on \$15,000 a year than, say, \$45,000 a year or \$55,000 or \$60,000 a year?

It is incredible to think that someone would say that when there is one job for five to eight people out there looking. To say that somehow by giving them \$15,000 a year—\$300 a week—that will keep them from going to work is preposterous.

This line of argument is not just absurd and factually wrong, it is shameful. It is shameful to say that about hard-working Americans, who, through no fault of their own, are out of a job. I keep saying every time I come to the Senate floor that we all have jobs here. Every time I come here and look around, I see fellow Senators and staff—we all have jobs. We are not worried about tomorrow. Think about your own family. What if you were out of work and have been out of work for a year and you are out there looking for work, and for every job there are eight other people out there looking for that job? You have to put yourself in the shoes of those kinds of families.

It is shameful to say somehow that by giving people unemployment benefits, they are not going to go back to work because of that—I have more faith in the American people. The American people want to work. In fact, the figures show that we are still the most productive Nation on Earth. Does that somehow point to lazy Americans? No. Given the opportunity, Americans can outwork anybody anywhere in the world—if there is only a job.

To say that somehow giving unemployment benefits encourages people to be lazy flies in the face of the facts about hard-working Americans—how hard they work and how productive American workers are. Well, there is little question that the long-term unemployed would like nothing more than to pull themselves up by the bootstraps. But this economy right now is very short on bootstraps.

Our Republican colleagues have trotted out another justification for stopping extending unemployment benefits. They say that extending the benefits will add to the deficit. They argue that we should cut off some of the most desperate people in our economy. We should take away their last meager lifeline out of a concern for the deficit.

Yet these very same Senators today are demanding that the 2001 and 2003 tax breaks for the wealthiest 1 percent of Americans be extended for another 10 years. Let me repeat that. These same Senators on the Republican side who are arguing that we can't extend the unemployment benefits because it would add to the deficit are some of the same Senators who are saying these

tax breaks President George Bush and a Republican Congress gave to the wealthiest 1 percent of Americans in 2001 and 2003 should be extended for another 10 years. And they are saying the cost of those tax breaks should not be offset, they should simply be added to the deficit.

So let's be clear about what our Republican friends are saying. They are saying the roughly \$33 billion cost of extending unemployment benefits for some of the most desperate workers in our society is unacceptable if it adds to the deficit, but extending tax breaks for the most fortunate and privileged Americans, which would cost a whopping \$670 billion over the next decade, well, we can just add that to the deficit. So, again, \$33 billion to help people who are out of work, who are desperate, to help them feed their children, stay in their homes, pay their mortgages, keep their families together, that \$33 billion we can't spend because it adds to the deficit; however, we can extend these tax breaks that cost \$670 billion for another 10 years. Oh, yes, we can add that to the deficit. That is what my Republican friends are saying. Well, this is breathtaking. It is breathtaking to hear this line of argument. It is nothing more than a return to the Bush years when the President, with a Republican majority here, dragged us into trillion dollar wars and turned major surpluses into historic deficits—historic deficits. Well, today, finally, the Senate said: No, we are not going to go any further on this. We drew the line. We had our vote. Shortly, we will vote on passage of the bill—49 days too late.

Imagine, if you will, that you are one of those persons and you have a family. Maybe you have an illness in the family. Maybe you have a child who is sick or a child with a disability or maybe some other unfortunate things have happened to you. Maybe you have been out of work and you lost your unemployment benefits 49 days ago. What have you done for those 49 days? Think about it. Think about what you would do. Well, I am sorry. I apologize to all those Americans, on behalf of the Senate, that we didn't pass this 49 days ago. But the Republican minority would not let us do it because of a filibuster—because of a filibuster—which requires 60 votes. We didn't have 60 votes until today. So I am sorry people had to wait 49 days, but the unemployment extension we will pass today will be retroactive, so it will fill in those last 49 days. I hope and trust that many of the bills that piled up on those kitchen tables—maybe the mortgage payment that wasn't made or maybe the mortgage company is calling all the time and hounding you about it, maybe you have had to go out and get one of those awful payday loans with high interest rates to tide you over—I hope that will soon get taken care of, that you will get your unemployment benefits and be able to pay those off. These will be extended until the end of

November. So we can now say to the people who are unemployed: You will get your unemployment benefits until the end of November. And I hope the programs we are working on will turn this economy around.

Tomorrow, the President will sign into law the financial reform bill we passed here last week. This is going to go a long way toward reassuring the markets that we are going to have openness and transparency and that we are going to now deal openly and forthrightly with our financial institutions and demand of them that they deal openly and forthrightly with the American people. I am hopeful the economy will turn around, but the economists say things are still kind of dicey. Well, if that is the case, our obligation is to make sure we have a safety net, and the biggest safety net of all is unemployment insurance benefits.

I am sorry we had to wait 49 days because of Republican intransigence and their raising the filibuster on this, but we finally got it done today, and pretty soon those checks will be going out to our American families. I just hope we don't have to keep extending it. I hope the economy turns around. But if it doesn't—if it doesn't—I say to my Republican friends right now, as we go into next year, these tax breaks they want to extend for the wealthiest 1 percent, I am sorry, that is going to have to take a backseat to the people who are unemployed in this country. We need to make sure we do everything possible to get them jobs, to get them back to work, and to make sure they get the unemployment benefits they need until such time as those jobs do return.

Madam President, with that, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll. The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. UDALL of Colorado). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CARDIN. I ask unanimous consent I be permitted to speak as in morning business.

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

IRAN

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I rise today to express my deep concerns over Iran's nuclear ambitions and to applaud new and tougher U.S. sanctions recently passed by Congress.

With both of the sanctions imposed in U.N. Resolution 1929, and the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act becoming law, we are finally poised to inflict real damage to Iran's nuclear program. But only a strong, unified, and forceful implementation of a sanctions regime will stop Iran from continuing on its current dangerous path.

While Iran still clings to the myth that its recent Turkish-Brazilian compromise proposal is an antidote to the global and U.S. sanctions, we must not waste time pretending this is a sign they are halting their nuclear program. Under this proposal, Iran would ship only half of its low enriched uranium out of the country for further enrichment while continuing to violate a multitude of U.N. Security Council resolutions. The international community cannot afford to be fooled by Tehran into slowing the implementation of the sanctions and this is precisely why we should step up pressure on the regime.

Make no mistake: Iran wants to become a world nuclear power, with the ability to threaten Israel, the United States, and the global community.

Containing a nuclear Iran would be virtually impossible and this growing threat looms large in all international diplomacy. If they acquired this capability, it would be an unequivocal "game changer" in the Middle East and, indeed, throughout the world. An undeniable threat to Israel and the United States, a nuclear Iran cannot become a reality. We therefore must do all in our power to prevent Iran from acquiring nuclear capabilities.

I am heartened to see the administration embrace both tough global, but more importantly, stringent Congressional sanctions. The enactment of powerful and effective economic sanctions against Iran—and the foreign companies that do business with Tehran—will go a long way in further isolating this rogue nation.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, millions of Americans all across the country, and hundreds of thousands in my State, have lost their jobs. To soften the blow of those job losses, we seek to extend the emergency unemployment insurance benefits that many of these Americans receive. Since the beginning of this crisis, we have extended these benefits several times, but more recently, a Republican filibuster has kept us from doing so.

I hope we will finally clear the way to extend these benefits today, because the failure to do so has been deeply wrong. It has done great harm to millions of American families. Already coping with an economy that is not yet creating the jobs they need, these families must also cope with the fact that because of a Republican filibuster, Congress has failed to provide the help they need.

The arguments offered in opposition to this extension aren't just a matter of differing opinions. They are fictions. And based on these fictions, the opponents seek not just to block an extension of unemployment benefits for millions of jobless Americans, but to stop us from even holding a vote.

Some opponents tell us they oppose this extension because jobless benefits encourage workers to stay on unemployment instead of seeking work. In fact, the Bureau of Labor Statistics reported just last week that in May of

this year, there were about 3.2 million job openings in the United States. There were at the same time roughly 15 million unemployed Americans. With nearly five jobless workers for every job opening, desire to work on the part of the American people is definitely not the problem. Instead of disparaging the work ethic of Americans, these members should help us get desperately needed aid to workers who lack not the desire to work, but the opportunity.

These opponents also tell us they oppose this extension because it will add to the deficit. This is an odd position to take after having supported proposals, such as the Bush tax cuts, that added far more to the deficit than this legislation would add. To account for this clear contradiction, they say that they do not believe those tax cuts added to the deficit. The Republican leader was quoted last week as saying, "There's no evidence whatsoever that the Bush tax cuts actually diminished revenue." He went on to say that this is "the view of virtually every Republican."

Tax cuts decrease tax revenue. This is not debatable. The entire economic team from President Bush's White House will tell you so. Alan Viard, former chief economist of President Bush's Council of Economic Advisers, has said, "Federal revenue is lower today than it would have been without the tax cuts. There's really no dispute among economists about that." And according to the Congressional Budget Office, roughly half the increase in our deficits since 2001 is due to those tax cuts. By contrast, the unemployment extension would barely move the needle on our debt.

And what is the consequence of making these inaccurate arguments? It is millions of Americans dealing with tragedy on top of tragedy. Not only have they lost the jobs that provided a decent living for themselves and their families, but the benefits that could help them keep food on the table and help clothe their children are held up by politicians who fail to see that their justifications are fictional.

It is deeply frustrating and sad that so many of our colleagues do not see the need to help these families. It is disappointing that they justify their obstruction with clearly false arguments. And it is outrageous that they would oppose even our ability vote on this measure.

Michigan families who need us to act should not have to wait 1 more day for the help they need. Voting to approve this cloture motion is the only justifiable course.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I rise today to thank my colleagues for voting to extend the emergency unemployment compensation program through November 30, 2010. This vote is long overdue. While we have been debating the issue, families across the country dealing with long-term unemployment have been suffering. While we have

been arguing about this extension, they have been struggling to survive. I am pleased that this body has finally taken action to ease the burden they face.

Extension of the emergency unemployment compensation program provides additional weeks of unemployment benefits to out-of-work Americans once regular State unemployment benefits have been exhausted. The number of weeks of benefit is determined by a State's unemployment rate.

The legislation also extends full Federal funding of the extended benefits program. This program provides 13 to 20 weeks of benefits to unemployed workers who have exhausted regular and emergency unemployment compensation benefits in States with threshold unemployment rates.

Thanks in part to some of the actions of this Congress, including the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, we are beginning to see some upturn in what is considered the most severe economic recession this Nation has experienced since the Great Depression. The recovery, though, is not a quick and easy process.

Even though job loss has slowed, unemployment remains high at 9.5 percent. This translates into 14.6 million unemployed Americans. Further, an unprecedented number of Americans have been without jobs for more than 6 months. The average length of unemployment is now stretching to 35 weeks. To put it simply, there are more job seekers than jobs available. For every job, there are five applicants.

Americans want to work and are willing to work but until the job market improves, many rely on unemployment compensation to support themselves and their families. That is why the passage of the extension of emergency unemployment insurance benefits is so crucial; many unemployed Americans quite literally can't survive without this support.

More than 19,000 Marylanders have lost their benefits due to the delay in passing the legislation. The average benefit in Maryland is \$312 a week. This isn't "money in the bank." It is food on the table. It is gas in the car. It is medicine and other necessities.

Unemployment checks contribute to the local economy as they are spent almost immediately on basic goods. For Maryland, the delay in passing the legislation dealt a 6 million dollar blow to the State's economy each week. Nationally, 2.5 million Americans have lost their benefits, costing the economy approximately \$775 million a week.

Again, I thank my colleagues for standing up for American workers and families. Workers like 57-year-old Cynthia Allen of Baltimore County, MD. Cynthia was laid off from her data management position in January 2009. Outsourcing has made it difficult to find another job in that field. So, here she is, 19 months later, savings expended, credit cards maxed, and unemployment benefits exhausted. Until

this point, throughout her work history she had never drawn unemployment. Still, Cynthia perseveres. She continues her job search and she hopes something will open up for her soon. Our thoughts go out to Cynthia and to the millions of Americans who are struggling to survive in these difficult times.

It is time to finish the job of extending these desperately needed benefits to people like Cynthia Allen.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

#### REMEMBERING SENATOR ROBERT C. BYRD

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to our dear departed friend and colleague, Senator Robert Byrd of West Virginia. I have been deeply moved by the words of remembrance we have heard here in the Senate this week and I am honored to have been here today as Senator Byrd has lied in repose on the Senate floor. It is a fitting tribute to the man who, over the course of an astounding tenure of 52 years, came to embody the Senate, its traditions, and its rules.

Robert Byrd was born in North Wilkesboro, NC, in 1917. He was valedictorian of Mark Twain High School and, through the course of his life, attended four separate colleges in West Virginia as well as the American University College of Law. In the early days of his career, he was, at one time or another, a grocery clerk, a butcher, and a shipyard welder before beginning his political career in 1946, when he was elected to the West Virginia House of Delegates. After 5 years in the West Virginia Legislature, he was elected to the House of Representatives in 1952, beginning what would be the longest tenure in the history of the U.S. Congress.

Senator Byrd came to the Senate in 1959. He served right up until his death on June 28 of this year. During his time on the Senate, he was known for his skills as a parliamentarian and his knowledge of Senate rules and procedure. He put these abilities to great use, serving in the Democratic leadership—as either the whip or the leader—for nearly two decades. Senator Byrd's

ability to use the parliamentary rules to his advantage is legendary. Indeed, I can think of few others who had such a great understanding of what can be an arduous and difficult set of rules and procedures.

His knowledge of the traditions and history of the Senate were also quite noteworthy. In 1989, the bicentennial anniversary of our cherished Constitution, Senator Byrd published a four-volume series on Senate history, which is a definitive work in describing and outlining the storied traditions of this great Chamber. Senator Byrd's love of this body was known to all. He expressed his love for the Senate at every opportunity and much of his time was spent trying to preserve those rules and traditions he held dear.

Mr. President, this Chamber has suffered a great loss. But, my sadness is tempered by the thought that Senator Byrd is now reunited with his wife Erma, to whom he was married for nearly 70 years. I want to express my sincerest condolences to Senator Byrd's family.

Mr. BUNNING. Mr. President, today I want to speak on the loss of the great statesman, orator, and author, Senator Robert Byrd. Senator Byrd served the State of West Virginia and this great Nation in the Senate for over 50 years. It has been an honor to serve and craft legislation with Senator Byrd to protect and promote the values of our two States, which share a common border and economy. He represented his State well.

Following my election to the Senate, Senator Byrd offered me valuable advice and direction on the operations and rules of the U.S. Senate. Upon learning of his passing, my wife Mary and I were deeply saddened by the news.

Starting from humble beginnings, Senator Byrd was a great example of the virtue of hard work and determination. After losing his mother during the influenza epidemic of 1918, Senator Byrd was sent to live with his aunt and uncle in the coal-mining region of southern West Virginia. With a combination of his strong work ethic and quest for knowledge, Senator Byrd graduated as valedictorian of his high school class. Despite his stellar academic achievements, Senator Byrd was unable to attend college following his high school commencement due to financial constraints.

At the age of 19, Senator Byrd married his high school sweetheart and lifetime soulmate Erma Ora James. In an effort to support his growing family, Senator Byrd took jobs, which included working as a gas station attendant and butcher, to put his family first.

After serving in the West Virginia House of Delegates and Senate, Senator Byrd was first elected to the U.S. House of Representatives and began serving in 1953. Unable to stop his quest for knowledge, Senator Byrd began attending night classes at the American University's Washington College of

Law where he received his degree a decade later.

Senator Byrd's love for this country and the Senate itself could be seen in many ways such as the copy of the U.S. Constitution tucked away in his jacket pocket and his vast knowledge of the rules of the Senate. As he said to many of us, "he who knows the rules will rule."

He believed, as I do, in the power of the Senate. He understood that the Senate should not be beholden to the executive branch, but must remain separate and equal to provide the necessary checks. As he stated, "We must never, ever, tear down the only wall—the necessary fence—this Nation has against the excesses of the Executive Branch and the resultant haste and tyranny of the majority."

Even in his frustration of the current political climate and through his remaining days, Senator Byrd continued to fight for the protection of the rules of the Senate and the rights of the minority, because as he wrote, "I know what it is to be Majority Leader, and wake up on a Wednesday morning in November, and find yourself a Minority Leader."

I extend my thoughts and prayers to his surviving children, grandchildren, and great-grandchildren. During this time of difficulty, there is strength in knowing Senator Byrd has once again been reunited with his sweetheart and the son he missed dearly.

#### CYPRUS

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I rise today to draw the attention of my colleagues to the legacy of the July 20, 1974, invasion of Cyprus by Turkey and its ongoing occupation of that island nation. Thirty-six years later, the human dimension of the conflict and the artificial division of the country is evident in many areas. As Chairman of the Helsinki Commission, I am particularly mindful of the violations of human rights stemming from the occupation. I have walked along the U.N.-monitored buffer zone that cuts through the capital city of Nicosia. A visitor to Cyprus need not look far to discover the scars left by the artificial division of a capital and a country.

A year ago this week, the Helsinki Commission held a public briefing, "Cyprus' Religious Cultural Heritage in Peril," to draw attention to this aspect of the legacy of the events of 1974. Experts at that briefing documented the scope of the destruction of sites in the north, including Orthodox churches, chapels and monasteries as well as those of other Christian communities. According to Archbishop Chrysostomos II, leader of the Church of Cyprus, over 500 religious sites in the area have been seriously damaged or destroyed. Subsequent to the briefing that Church of Cyprus filed a formal case with the European Court of Human Rights regarding its religious sites and other property in the north. A report prepared by