

We are not today. There is a Democratic President and there is a Democratic Senate and there is a Republican House. So if we want to make progress, we have to work together when we can form a consensus.

But if we want the privilege of being more than an ideological debating society and being actually a governing party, we have to re-earn the trust of the American people. We have to say: What are Republicans for? I am suggesting that when we say what we are for, we pick our goals—make it easier and cheaper to create private sector jobs, reduce spending closer to revenues, be tough and strategic on terror—and then we go step by step in that direction, and we take people with us and we gain their support.

I have mentioned on this floor before the example of the civil rights laws. Slavery was the greatest injustice in our country's history. It plagued us from the day of our country's founding. Our Founders punted on the subject, and then we tore ourselves apart in a war, and then we waited a century to do much about it. By any intellectual standard, by any moral standard, we should have fixed that all at once. But Lyndon Johnson, who was the majority leader at the time, knew better than to try to do that. In fact, he knew he could not do that. So starting in 1958 and then in 1964 and then in 1968 and then in 1975 were the major civil rights laws in the country. We went step by step to realize the promise of American life: that all men and women are created equal.

Now, it is easy to sit somewhere and say: Well, that went too slow, and a comprehensive approach toward civil rights would have been the right thing to do. It would have been the right thing to do, but it never would have happened.

There is one other problem with it: it would not have been accepted by the country. The civil rights laws of 1964 and 1968, during a time of Democratic majorities and a Democratic President, were written—where?—in the office of the Republican leader of the U.S. Senate, Everett Dirksen.

Now, why did President Johnson do that? Well, you can say he did not need the votes. He had huge majorities in the House and in the Senate. Well, it was a little more complicated than that because he had southern Democrats, and they were against it. So first he needed the votes to pass the bill. But the thing President Johnson understood so well was that he not only needed to pass the bill, he needed the country to accept it. And as controversial as the Civil Rights Act of 1968 was—the one written down the hall in the Republican leader's office by a Democratic President and a Democratic Congress—as controversial as it was, when it was over, Senator Russell of Georgia, for whom a building here is named, went to Georgia and said: I fought this for 30 years, but it is the law of the land, and we obey it. Lyndon

Johnson knew that going step by step in the right direction was the right way to get where our country had to go.

So we have some big challenges ahead of us, and some of them we will be able to do in a bipartisan way. I hope we can do that with No Child Left Behind. Let's fix it with four or five or six steps. Arne Duncan has some good ideas. They are very consistent with the ideas of a number of Democrats and a number of Republicans. That would be a start. The America Competes Act we should authorize at some point. That would be another step we could take. I think we have some steps on clean energy.

There are some areas where we will disagree. We are going to have some Republican ideas about making it easier and cheaper to create private sector jobs that our friends on the other side will honestly disagree with. We are having one of those disagreements this weekend because we believe it makes no sense to raise taxes on anybody in the middle of an economic downturn if your goal is to make it easier and cheaper to create private sector jobs, and they have a little different view. So we will have votes on that.

So we will have our differences of opinion. But if we want to be successful, we as a country—and if we as a party, the Republican Party, want to be successful in earning the trust of the American people to prove we are eligible, qualified, worthy of being a governing party after 2012, then we better set our clear goal: make it easier and cheaper to create private sector jobs and go step by step toward that goal, explaining carefully what we are doing, attracting independent voters, keeping independent voters, so that when we pass a law, the country accepts it, and then we move on ahead.

So that is what our discussion was about today, and it is an important discussion. It is not just some dusty, dry thing. Herbert Croly's book in 1909, "The Promise of American Life," is the manifesto for the progressive movement that has ascended in this country right now. And our idea of less from Washington and more of ourselves is an intellectual context for the antidote to that. It is for the resurgent movement in America that began with President Jefferson's yeoman farmer, with his distrust in the Federal Government and his skepticism of great big policy schemes imposed from Washington. That is the grand debate of the last century, and it is the one we are in the midst of today.

So I thank the Senate for giving me an opportunity to present my thoughts. I thank my colleagues who attended the Hudson Institute discussion today. And I especially urge my Republican colleagues to remember that if we want to re-earn the trust of the American people, we need to set the right goals and move in that direction, step by step. We will have to be a little patient to get there, but that is a good way to get where we want to go.

I see the distinguished Senator from the University of Arkansas on the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

ARLINGTON NATIONAL CEMETERY

Mrs. MCCASKILL. Mr. President, back in July of this year, the subcommittee I chair on contracting oversight held a hearing about heart-breaking incompetence at Arlington National Cemetery.

Because of a series of management errors, bungling, neglect, the contracts that were supposed to be executed to make sure we were keeping track of America's heroes in our most sacred place in this country—we discovered that, in fact, the officials at Arlington National Cemetery were not sure who was buried where.

The reaction I have had to that hearing has been so reassuring because as I travel around Missouri, person after person comes up to me, so many veterans, saying: Thank you for getting on top of this disaster at Arlington National Cemetery.

Since that hearing, when it was very clear there was no direct line of authority in terms of managing Arlington National Cemetery—that they had no problem issuing multiple contracts for millions of dollars and getting absolutely nothing for it, an acknowledgment that they did not have a system that was adequately keeping track of the location of burial for potentially thousands of America's finest—we have continued to stay on top of this and have realized that more and more problems continue to arise.

This morning, it was reported nationally that they now found a grave site that has eight different urns buried—eight different urns—cremated remains buried in one location with a tombstone that said "Unknown." And, of course, they have been able to identify some of those remains—gratefully, they have—and they are contacting those families.

But as a result of the hearing, I filed legislation, along with Senator BROWN, who is with me on that committee as the ranking member of that committee. Together, we filed a bill, with a number of cosponsors, setting up some basic oversight of Arlington going forward—basic but very important—making sure we have review of contract management, making sure we have compliance with an Army directive, making sure we have a report on the grave site discrepancies that have arisen, so we can be assured that every family in America who looks upon Arlington as the last resting place for

their family member can be assured that when they go to visit their loved one, they are indeed visiting their loved one. So we filed this bill, S. 3860. After we found out about these additional problems that have arisen, I now feel a sense of urgency about this.

I know my colleagues on the other side have said we are not doing any other legislation except making sure we get a tax cut for millionaires. I am hoping they will make an exception to the rule because if we do not provide adequate oversight right now, when will we? Is there a subject more important than our oversight and making sure those we should honor the most are, in fact, being treated with the kind of dignity and respect they deserve rather than just being thrown in a gravesite that says "Unknown"?

So I am going to make a motion tomorrow—we will be in session tomorrow—for unanimous consent to pass this legislation. I know I am being impatient. We are supposed to let these things sit on the calendar for months and months, and we are to hope that nobody puts a secret hold on it, and we are to get frustrated not knowing who has a hold on it or why. We have 38 members of the judiciary who have been sitting on the calendar who came out of committee unanimously. But, no, we can't take those up. We can't do anything until we do unpaid tax cuts for millionaires.

I am hoping my Republican colleagues will give the millionaires a rest tomorrow. I am hoping they will get off the case of helping the millionaires and the billionaires so we can unanimously pass this bill. That is the best we can do right now to make sure our loved ones—because they are all of our loved ones. We love the men and women who are buried at Arlington National Cemetery, from John F. Kennedy to the soldiers none of us has ever met. We love these Americans, and we need to do everything we can to make sure there is proper oversight of what is going on at Arlington National Cemetery.

So, tomorrow, I am hoping we get an exception to the edict that we got from our friends on the Republican side of the aisle. I am hoping they will allow this bill to go through by unanimous consent because, I will tell my colleagues, I am not comfortable going home for my Christmas holidays with my family until I am sure we have done everything we can for the families who lost loved ones who reached a final resting place on this Earth at Arlington National Cemetery.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The Senator from Illinois.

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

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

REMEMBERING RON SANTO

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, last night, Chicago and America lost a hero. Ron Santo was a Chicago Cubs legend and an inspiration to anyone who has ever faced a tough, uphill battle in life.

During his 15-year career with the Cubs, Ron Santo batted .277 with 342 home runs and 1,331 RBIs. He was a nine-time All Star and a five-time National League Gold Glove winner. In each of four seasons, he batted .300, drove in 100 runs, and led the league in walks.

What the public didn't know for most of his career is that he lived every day with a life-threatening illness.

Ron Santo hid his diagnosis from the public for 10 years. He said he didn't want anybody to feel sorry for him. He didn't want to be held to a different standard. He wanted to be judged the same way every other ballplayer is judged—by the numbers. By that standard, Ron Santo earned his spot among the greats.

We can't know how much better he might have been if he hadn't suffered from diabetes, in an era that suppressed the long ball or maybe for a team that, God bless them, never once saw postseason action, but it doesn't matter. Simply put, Ron was the best third baseman in Cubs history and maybe in the game.

The last decade in Ron's life brought challenges that would have sidelined many others. In 2001, Ron lost the lower portions of both legs to diabetes. He earlier survived a bout of cancer and endured more than two dozen surgeries. In his later years he walked on prosthetic legs that slowed his gait but not his dedication to the Cubs or his work for the Juvenile Diabetes Research Foundation where he served on the board of directors.

On October 3, as he had for the last 32 years, he hosted the annual Ron Santo Walk to Cure Diabetes in Chicago to raise awareness and funding for research into a cure.

Baseball may one day see a third baseman with the playing skills of Ron Santo, but it is hard to imagine that we will ever again see a ballplayer with greater love or loyalty for a city, its team, and its fans.

His broadcast partner, Pat Hughes, was quoted this morning saying: "Ron Santo absolutely loved the Cubs. The Cubs have lost their biggest fan."

But Ron Santo's love affair with the Cubs started at an early age. Born in Seattle, he watched the Game of the Week on TV and remembers a game from Wrigley Field with Ernie Banks. He said there was something about that ballpark and the Cubs fans.

When it came time to sign up, this great prospective ballplayer was offered a lot of money by a lot of clubs, but he wanted to be a Chicago Cub. He could have made a lot more money at the end of his career as well by leaving Chicago. Instead, in 1974, Ron Santo became the first player to invoke his

privilege under the league's "5-and-10 rule," declining a trade to the California Angels because he wanted to finish his career in Chicago. That kind of dedication to a team and its fans is something you hardly ever see anymore. It is something I remember fondly from my youth, and I will bet the Presiding Officer does too.

Since 1990, Ron Santo lived out his love for the Cubs as commentator in the booth, providing color commentary on WGN Radio Cubs broadcasts. Sports Illustrated writer Rick Reilly described Ron's commentary this way. He said Ron Santo "loves them Cubs like the Pooh Bear loves honey. He does not call a game, he lives it. He cheers so much that it sounds like his play-by-play partner Pat Hughes is broadcasting from Murphy's Bar."

In the words of broadcaster Pat Hughes, he "never had a better partner."

Ron Santo's boisterous 7th inning stretch renditions of "Take Me Out to the Ball Game" at Wrigley Field, a tradition that he carried on after the passing of Cubs legend Harry Caray, could make anyone smile—maybe even a White Sox fan.

One other thing that I always thought was interesting. They used to joke about it. I was fortunate to be invited to go up to the broadcast booth at Wrigley Field. What a treat for a baseball fan to be up there with Ron Santo and Pat Hughes and to do an inning. I mean, if there is any psychic reward with this great job, it is that. I would study up on all the stats and all the ballplayers' names and what happened in the preceding week and think about who is coming and I would be all loaded up, and here is Ron Santo.

At this point it is instinctive. He is announcing a game and talking to people and getting ready for the next commercial and all of these things are going on, and they were kidding him constantly. There was one ongoing joke that I never knew the origin of, and it wasn't until they started writing these articles about his life that it finally came out. It seems that there was an incident that occurred on opening day in the year 2003. Ron Santo, for all his great qualities, didn't believe that an expensive toupee was necessarily worth the money. So he wore a toupee that clearly was a bargain. His toupee caught fire in the Shea Stadium press box in New York on opening day 2003 after he got too close to an overhead space heater. They kidded him about that for the next 6 years. What a good-natured man he was, to take that kidding and to just go on and say: Let's get back to the game—typical of a great fellow with a great sense of humor who doesn't take himself too seriously.

Ron Santo was considered for entry into Major League Baseball's Hall of Fame an astonishing 19 times. The last time was 2008. Sadly—wrongly, in my view—he never made it to Coopers-town. But he took that disappointment