

language that would allow 12 different ports to have studies completed in fiscal year 2011, if the Corps chose to engage in those studies. It was not a requirement, and it had no sums required in terms of what the Corps had to spend. It was purely discretionary. Unfortunately, our House colleagues did not accept that language.

My problem is that in fiscal year 2011, there is no mechanism as of yet to allow a scoping study to be done for the potential deepening of the Charleston harbor to accept supercargo ships coming through the Panama Canal in 2014. This harbor, along with others, has to be deepened to accept these new ships. The amount of money is \$40,000 on the Federal side to be matched by the State. People ask me: Why can't you come up with the money? Boeing, BMW, Michelin, the State of South Carolina?

I would do the \$40,000, but I can't. You cannot have a private entity take over a Federal Government responsibility. So this is one of those situations that is a catch-22. It is an anomaly in the law. The Vice President's office and Congressman CLYBURN, a lot of us, Congressman SCOTT, have been working diligently, with the assistance of the majority leader, to find a pathway forward within the current system. We are very close to finding a way to get this study done because it was a previously authorized program under current law.

I have put a hold on everything I could put a hold on.

Now I believe we are making progress. The majority leader has some needs, and I want to let him know I am willing to work with him and others to end the Senate well before we go out on Easter break. I thank him for the help he has given me to take care of a problem that no one could have anticipated. But it is a real problem for the people of South Carolina. I wish to let him know I appreciate the effort.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BEGICH). The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I say to my friend the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, I am aware of the 12 ports that need help. But out of the 12, there is none more needed—and we as a country would get such a bang for our buck—to do what is necessary than the port of Charleston. I first compliment the Senator from South Carolina for his proposed solution to a challenge facing the State. He is dogged in representing the State of South Carolina. This is an issue that is important to the people of his State. His solution would not in any way violate any of the rules we have in the Senate. It is something that would not be part of congressionally directed spending in the true sense of the word that has been not approved by people in recent years. I have been part of the Appropriations Committee since I first came to the Senate.

I love that committee. I know the good things it can do for our country

and has done for our country. This merit-based competitive port fund that has been suggested would not be limited to South Carolina, even though I think it is the most needy of the 12. This would not guarantee that the port study in Charleston would go forward but would provide the Corps the opportunity to move forward should they choose.

Mr. President, I not only have been a member of the Appropriations Committee, but for a long, long time—a long time—the Senator from New Mexico, Mr. Domenici, and I—that was our subcommittee, Energy and Water, and that is where this money comes from.

This is so necessary to be done. I understand the Corps' obligations. This is something we have to do. And even though my friend acknowledged this vote we just took care of the funding until the end of this year—but that is the end of this fiscal year. There are going to be other pieces of legislation to come to this floor. We could, at any time—any time—move forward on this. I thought we had a solution because of the anomaly we found ourselves in to work this out with the House of Representatives.

It is not often that I am a cheerleader for pieces of legislation that are suggested and moved forward by Republicans, but I was on this one. This is something that is merit-based and is fair. I am going to continue to do everything I can for my friend from South Carolina to see if before the end of this fiscal year we can get something done. It is important to him. It is important to our country because of the value that port has to our country.

Mr. GRAHAM. I thank the majority leader very much. It is appreciated on behalf of all of us in South Carolina. And I look forward to finding a solution for the country as a whole.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

SPECIALIST DENNIS "DANNY" POULIN

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to SPC Dennis "Danny" Poulin, a Rhode Islander who served in the Massachusetts National Guard.

On March 28, Specialist Poulin was a gunner in an MRAP when it rolled over in Kunar Province, Afghanistan. He was medically evacuated to Landstuhl Regional Medical Center in Germany, where, tragically, he died 2 days later but surrounded by his loving family. He was laid to rest today in Rhode Island.

Specialist Poulin grew up in Pawtucket, RI, and graduated in 2004 from Tolman High School. He joined the National Guard in 2008 and was promoted to specialist in May of 2010. As a member of the Massachusetts National Guard Headquarters Company, 1st Battalion, 181st Infantry Regiment, he deployed to Afghanistan in July 2010.

Each generation of Americans is called upon to protect and sustain our

democracy. And there are no greater heroes than the men and women who have worn the uniform of this Nation and who have sacrificed for this country to keep it safe and to keep it free.

It is our duty to protect the freedom they sacrificed their lives for through our service, our citizenship. We must continue to keep their memories alive and honor their heroism.

Today, our thoughts are with Specialist Poulin's mother Doris, his father Richard, his sisters, Jennifer and Angelique, his longtime girlfriend Ashley and their son Nikolous, and all of his family, friends, and his comrades-in-arms. We join them in commemorating his sacrifice and honoring his example of selfless service, of love, and of courage that he has demonstrated to all of us.

Specialist Poulin is one among many Rhode Islanders who have proven their loyalty, their integrity, and their personal courage by giving the last full measure of their lives in service to their country in Afghanistan, in Iraq, and throughout the centuries. Today, we honor his memory and honor the memory of those who have served and those who have sacrificed.

Mr. President, with that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I am honored to join my senior Senator from Rhode Island, JACK REED, today on the floor of the U.S. Senate to honor the brave service of SPC Dennis C. Poulin, who died of injuries sustained while serving his country in Afghanistan.

Specialist Poulin, or "Danny," as he was known, had been assigned to the Kunar Provincial Reconstruction Team in Afghanistan. I have visited on several occasions the Kandahar Provincial Reconstruction Team, and I am well aware of the demands that are put on the security teams who allow the provincial reconstruction offices to do their vital work.

Danny's vehicle overturned while he was conducting a mounted combat patrol, causing severe injuries. Sadly, as a result of those injuries, he passed away on March 31, 2011, at Landstuhl Medical Center surrounded by his family.

Danny was born in Pawtucket, RI, where he lived for most of his life. After graduating from Tolman High School, he joined the Army National Guard and served with the Massachusetts National Guard's Alpha Company, 1st Battalion, 181st Infantry Regiment.

Specialist Poulin served with honor and distinction, receiving numerous awards and decorations, including the Army Commendation Medal, the Army Achievement Medal, the Good Conduct Medal, the Meritorious Unit Commendation Medal, the National Defense Service Medal, the Afghanistan Campaign Medal, the Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, the Army Service Ribbon, the Overseas Service Ribbon, the NATO Medal, and the Combat

Infantry Badge. We hope that upon review of this incident, he will be awarded his Nation's Purple Heart.

Danny will be remembered for his commitment to his family and unit. He was a devoted father, son, and brother, who loved his family very deeply. His fellow soldiers describe him as a hero and the kind of guy who always put others before himself.

As family and friends gather today in Rhode Island for his memorial service, I would like to join Senator REED in expressing my most sincere condolences for this terrible loss to his family and to our State. And on behalf of all Rhode Islanders, I want to thank Danny for his selfless service and his ultimate sacrifice.

Our hearts go out to his mother Doris, to his father Richard, to his sisters, Jennifer and Angelique, to his girlfriend Ashley, and especially to his 5-year-old son Nikolous, who will carry on his legacy and spirit.

We will never forget the sacrifice Danny and his family and friends have endured for our country, and my thoughts and prayers are with them during this difficult time.

Mr. President, I thank the Senate for its attention to these remarks, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—
S. 493

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 11 a.m., Tuesday, May 3, the Senate resume consideration of S. 493, the small business jobs bill; that no amendments, points of order, or motions be in order during the pendency of this agreement other than the amendments listed in this agreement and budget points of order and applicable motions to waive; that the pending amendments be set aside and Senator LANDRIEU or her designee be recognized to call up the following amendments: DeMint No. 300 to Paul No. 299; Carper No. 289, with a modification, which is at the desk; Pryor No. 278; Merkley No. 272; and Landrieu No. 234; that the DeMint second-degree amendment No. 300 be agreed to; that the time until 2:15 p.m. be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees; that at 2:15 p.m., the Senate proceed to votes in relation to the following amendments in the order listed below: Cornyn No. 186; Paul No. 199, as amended; Hutchison No. 197; Cardin No. 240; Snowe No. 253; Carper No. 289, as modified; Pryor No. 278; Merkley No. 272; and Landrieu No. 234; that there be no amendments in order to the amendments prior to the votes other than the DeMint second-degree amendment to the Paul amendment; that each amendment be subject to a 60-vote threshold; and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; further, that the Vitter amendment No. 178 and the Pryor amendment No. 229 be withdrawn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Maine.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I reserve the right to object, I have an additional amendment I would like to have considered on this list. I thought we had an agreement that there would be an even number of amendments offered on both sides, and now I understand that in the request that is put forward by the majority leader, there are five amendments on the Democratic side and four amendments on our side.

I would like to ask consent, because I thought my amendment—Snowe amendment No. 299—would also be included in the agreement. So I am asking unanimous consent that the order be modified to include Snowe amendment No. 299.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the leader modify?

The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I object to my friend's request with the following explanation: We have worked very hard to get this bill done. This is a committee of which the Senator from Maine was chairman. She is now the ranking member. This legislation—underline this—is extremely important. It has done in the past wonderful things for our country. This innovation that this bill allows to go forward has created things such as the electric toothbrush and many other things. It is a good piece of legislation.

The legislation of my friend from Maine is not relevant or germane to this legislation. What is going to happen—if she objects to the request I have offered, this bill will not go forward. And that is too bad. We have worked all week long—in fact, some into last week—trying to get these amendments cleared and agreed to.

The sad part about her amendment is that we cannot get agreement not only from our side but on her side. Without going into detail who they are, people do not want to do this amendment because it has no direct relevance to this legislation.

In addition to that, Mr. President, her legislation has not had a hearing. It is something that is a big bill not only in content but in pages, and it should have a hearing. Senators should know what they are voting on in more detail. The other amendments we have gone through have been perused very closely and people understand what is in them and people can vote intelligently on those.

Now, my first inclination is to say: Well, let's go ahead and do it and try to defeat it, but that is not the way we should do legislation.

So I am terribly disappointed that the Senator from Maine, the former chairman of this committee, recognizing the importance of this legislation, is going to cause this legislation to fail, and we very likely will not have time to bring it up again. Now, if that is what my friend wants on her legislative conscience, that is fine. But I

think it really should not be there. For someone who understands this legislation as well as she does, it is wrong to stand in the way of our completing it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the original request?

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, further reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I appreciate the comments that have been made by the majority leader. But to the contrary, this is very relevant to the underlying legislation. It is about regulatory reform. And if you were to ask the small business community exactly what is their major priority in the U.S. Congress, it would be regulatory reform. Undeniably, it is one of the most onerous burdens placed on small businesses today, and our economic well-being. We have had numerous hearings within our committee that touch on the issue of regulatory reform, and my legislation would reform the process to ensure that small businesses are free to compete and to create jobs.

What could be more important at a time when we are struggling to create jobs in our economy, where we need to create millions of jobs if we are ever going to turn around this serious unemployment rate that is plaguing our Nation today and critically affecting the personal financial well-being of all Americans?

So, Mr. President, I am surprised with the standard proposed now about hearings. We have had numerous hearings touching on the subject. The question is that we never addressed the issue in the U.S. Senate. As I look through the number of amendments that are going to be offered to vote on in the majority leader's unanimous consent request, many of these amendments have not had hearings either, they have not been the subject of very specific hearings.

The point is, everyone has had the opportunity and would have the opportunity to review this legislation and debate it amply, and would be able to explore these issues. My legislation has drawn the broad support of the small business community nationwide. They reviewed the legislation. They understand the implications. They understand the benefits if we do regulatory reform, and they understand the consequences if we do not.

So I am just surprised that there is a new standard here because we have passed numerous pieces of legislation on the floor of the Senate that may not be subject to a specific hearing, but have been touched upon in numerous hearings on various subjects. The same is true of the amendment that had been included in the majority leader's unanimous consent agreement.

So I will have to object at this time to the underlying consent agreement since I am unable to have a vote on my amendment. Hopefully, we can review this upon return from the recess so we can go forward with these votes.