

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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I would finally say that this legislation, under any circumstances, is not relevant or germane to the underlying bill. That is very clear. This legislation that now has to be considered by the Senate has not had a hearing. Sure, we have had hearings on regulatory reform. We have had hearings on the environment also. But when you bring up a piece of legislation that is new, we deserve to know what it is about.

These other amendments, we know what they are about. Hers is too detailed and complicated. It is not germane or relevant. It has had no hearings. I am stunned by the new standard suggested by my friend from Maine: Democrats have more amendments than Republicans; therefore, we should consider an amendment that is not germane, irrelevant, and has never had a hearing.

So I am disappointed my friend from Maine is killing this legislation. We have spent enough time on this legislation, and it is really too bad. The chairman of the committee doesn't support it. The chairman of the Small Business Committee does not support this legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I heard the majority leader's comments, and I appreciate them. It is not about the evenness of the amendments, but that was the agreement. That was the understanding before I arrived on the floor. My staff worked in concert with the staff of the Small Business Committee chair, Senator LANDRIEU from Louisiana, so that was the agreement. So that agreement obviously changed sometime in the last hour.

Getting beyond that point, though, in talking about hearings, when I look at the list of amendments that are going to be voted on and put forward in the majority leader's unanimous consent agreement, many of these amendments have not had specific hearings. But everybody in the small business community, every small business in America, understands the value of regulatory reform. It is a very straightforward piece of legislation.

Many of these issues have been addressed in hearings. Last fall we had a small business jobs bill, part of which was a \$30 billion lending facility, and, believe me, there were serious problems with that lending facility. But that was not the subject of one Senate hearing, and I just want to understand, to garner clarity with respect to the standards that are now being established.

This issue is very important. Regulatory reform is absolutely crucial and central to small business job creation, not to mention survival. You don't have to take too many Main Street tours to figure out what is happening on Main Street. They are struggling to

survive. Last year alone there were \$26 billion in additional regulatory costs that was imposed on small businesses across this country as a result of new regulations—\$26 billion. But what is the total cost of regulations in America? It is \$1.7 trillion.

So is there any question in terms of the urgency and the imperative of addressing this issue? It is very central to the underlying legislation. It is about small businesses. It is about regulation and the hardships and the costs that are associated with it, and it is disproportionate to the small business community. It is disproportionate. They pay more than \$10,000 per employee, more than the large companies because they don't have the number of employees to be able to fill out the forms and do all that is required that is associated with the complexities and the costs of complying with those regulations.

So that is the issue. We had a \$30 billion lending facility as part and parcel of a piece of legislation that was voted on and became law. There are issues with it today and it was not subject to even one Senate hearing.

So what I am saying is it was my understanding that we had an agreement. That is what I understood, that we were going to have an even number of amendments on both sides to be offered and that my amendment was going to be included and brought up for a vote. If Members of the Senate don't want to vote for the amendment, they don't have to vote for the amendment. It is just saying: Please allow us to have a vote on this specific amendment just like the others that are in the majority leader's unanimous consent request. That is all I am asking.

We have had this bill pending for the last month, and I wanted to bring it up, but, unfortunately, for a lot of reasons, we are where we are today. That doesn't mean to say that we should not have the opportunity to vote on this particular amendment that had been prepared to go more than a month ago to be considered on the floor of the Senate. But, in any event, I regret we are in this position tonight. Hopefully, we can work through this during the course of the recess so that we have the opportunity to vote on this amendment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the longer the Senator from Maine talks, the more reason there is not to bring that up in the status that it is in now.

She is absolutely right. The issue she talks about in the Wall Street reform bill was brought in at a time when there hadn't been hearings, and it has created a furor around the country. Now there are people on all sides of the issue trying to change that. That is why we need to hold hearings. She is absolutely right. The more she talks, the more reason there is not to do this amendment.

For her to suggest that regulatory reform is something she is all-knowing about—and she hasn't said that, but that is the implicit statement she is making—I understand regulation reform. It is a burden, and we have to change it.

We have been through a number of procedures here. We can remember during the Clinton administration when Al Gore was in charge of reducing regulations, and we did a lot of that. It was good, but we didn't do enough. I worked with a Republican Senator by the name of Nichols from Oklahoma. We changed the law drastically, and it has been used in this Congress and the last Congress on several occasions to get rid of bad regulations that an administration promulgates. We now have the ability to do that.

Is there more we can do? Yes. But to march into this, as suggested by my friend from Maine, would cause people to make a decision on legislation that has not been adequately reviewed. That is why, I repeat, the more she talks about what needs to be done around here, the more reason there is not to do her legislation.

As far as an agreement, I had no agreement with anybody. This consent agreement was drafted just a short time ago. I have never suggested to the Senator from Maine—we have never had a conversation about this until during the last votes.

I moved to proceed to this bill more than a month ago—more than a month ago. There comes a time when we have to move the bill or move to something else.

During our next work period, we have some big, important things to do. We are going to have to deal with the PATRIOT Act. We have other things that are extremely important. We cannot spend more time on this legislation. It is unfair to our country, and it is unfair to the small business community that badly wants this legislation to go forward so they can do things, as I repeat, such as invent more electric toothbrush-type items.

There comes a time when we have to make a decision as to whether people are just stalling this legislation or trying to send some political message saying: Look, I was able to offer an amendment; I want to do regulation reform, when there is no chance in the world that the Senators have adequate information upon which to vote.

So I am very disappointed that very likely this legislation will be killed as a result of my friend, the former chairman of this committee, and certainly—I hope she understands how important this underlying legislation is and how her legislation has nothing to do with what is in keeping with the germaneness or relevancy to this legislation.

I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

TRIBUTE TO REBECCA EYSTER

Mr. REID. Mr. President, today, after more than 20 years of service to the U.S. Senate and the U.S. House of Representatives, Rebecca Eyster will retire. Rebecca is one of the official reporters of the debates and proceedings in this Chamber. She is one of the many dedicated employees who are essential to the daily operations of the Senate.

For more than 12 years, Rebecca has been part of the team that produces a verbatim transcript of all of the Senate floor proceedings. Before that, Rebecca spent 8 years in the House of Representatives in a similar capacity. These jobs can be very demanding. When speeches and votes go late into the night, our dedicated reporters like Rebecca are always here. They produce a historical record about some of the most important legislative debates in our Nation's history.

I am proud to have worked with Rebecca and appreciate her important contributions to the Senate. I know I speak for the Senate family as we wish you the best in your future endeavors.

SCHOOL SAFETY PATROL LIFESAVING AWARD RECIPIENTS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I rise today to show my appreciation for the actions of seven young Americans who make up this year's School Safety Patrol Lifesaving Award recipients as chosen by the American Automobile Association. In 1920, the American Automobile Association, AAA, began the School Safety Patrol Program in hopes of promoting traffic safety amongst school children. The AAA School Safety Patrol Program has been awarding its highest honor, the Lifesaving Award, to those patrollers who have acted to save the life of another since 1949. This year, seven heroic school safety patrollers are receiving this award, and it is my honor to recognize their courageous actions.

On February 2, 2011, Paul Hardin, a fifth grader at Canterbury Woods Elementary School in Annadale, VA, averted a possible tragedy by preventing an adult female pedestrian from stepping out into oncoming traffic. When the pedestrian approached the crosswalk, Paul verbally warned her to stop. She ignored Paul's warning and continued walking into the crosswalk at which time Paul stepped off the sidewalk and grasped the woman's arm to prevent her from crossing. An approaching car was within 5 feet of the crosswalk. Paul put the safety of a parent before his own in his heroic effort to prevent a dangerous situation.

Marisha Little and Sierra Walters, safety patrollers at Ranson Elementary School in Ranson, WV, worked together to save the life of a kindergarten student who wandered away

from the school heading toward a major road crossing. This life saving incident that occurred on January 18, 2011, was the first of two that Marisha Little took part in at Ranson Elementary. The patrollers remembered seeing the student walking alone away from the school and became worried when they no longer had him in sight. After alerting her safety patrol advisor, Sierra left her post to find him. Sierra found him and brought him back to the post where she instructed him to stand behind Marisha. Shortly after, he darted into the street in the path of an oncoming car when he saw his aunt approaching the school area. Marisha jumped into action, grabbed him and pulled him back to the sidewalk. Their keen awareness and quick thinking brought him back to school and prevented him from being hit by the car.

Marisha Little and Talyn Underwood were credited with the second life saving incident at Ranson Elementary School in the same month. On January 31, 2011, they prevented a second grade student from being struck by a moving vehicle. The student was horsing around, talking to his friends while running backwards into oncoming traffic. Marisha and Talyn noticed that the vehicle driver closest to the student was looking in the other direction. Marisha and Talyn screamed loudly to alert the student at the same time working their way toward him. Talyn reached him first and pulled him by his jacket from the direct path of the moving car. Both students were very quick to respond and didn't think about their own safety in their effort to save their fellow student.

Kamryn Mendell is a safety patroller at the Fox Chapel Elementary School in Germantown, MD. On September 28, 2010, during morning patrol duties, Kamryn immediately reacted when she realized that a first grade student was beginning to walk into the pathway of a school bus that was turning into the school's bus loop. Kamryn and her partner were holding back students from crossing when Kamryn's partner had to step away to remove a cone to allow the bus to enter the loop. Kamryn kept the children from crossing with one hand and reached out to grab the first grader who was now 4 to 5 feet in front of the bus. The bus driver didn't see him and continued driving into the loop. Kamryn's fast thinking and immediate actions averted a certain life threatening injury.

Evan Siegel, a safety patroller at Salmon Creek Elementary School in Vancouver, WA, saved a 7-year-old girl from being hit by an oncoming car. On a December morning in 2010, Evan noticed a car approaching the intersection. It was driven by a teenager who was texting and totally unaware that the little girl had entered the crosswalk without permission. Evan reacted quickly by putting his crosswalk stick in front of her and pulling her to safety. At the time the car was 10 feet away from her and the driver was not

slowing down. Evan's courage and quick actions are to thank for keeping this young girl safe.

Jake Vowell, a fifth grader at George B. Carpenter Elementary School in Park Ridge, IL, is credited with saving the life of a 6-year-old student on February 2, 2010. He was on morning patrol duty, when two cars failed to stop at the stop sign when Jake noticed a young girl attempting to cross the street. He bravely went out into the street and pulled her back to safety. His dedication and awareness put him in a position to save this young girl from harm.

These seven heroic young leaders demonstrate courage, awareness, and a commitment to safety. Moreover, these traits are what the AAA School Safety Patrol Program embodies as an institution. Patrollers exemplify the kind of services that are needed so that young people safely navigate traffic hazards to and from school. I applaud their commitment to improving our community.

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

SPECIALIST BRENT M. MAHER

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, it is with deep sadness that I address my colleagues today. A hero from my home State, SPC Brent M. Maher of Honey Creek, IA, was killed in action on Monday, April 11, 2011 in the Paktya Province of Afghanistan. He was 31 years old. Specialist Maher was the gunner on a "Cougar" mine-resistant ambush protected vehicle, MRAP, that was struck by an improvised explosive device.

Specialist Maher served in the Iowa Army National Guard, Company B, 1st Battalion, 168th Infantry, 2nd Brigade Combat Team, 34th Infantry Division, out of Shenandoah, IA. Specialist Maher has been posthumously promoted to sergeant. Prior to his service in the Iowa National Guard, Specialist Maher served over 7 years in the U.S. Navy. In all, Specialist Maher dedicated 11 years of his life to serving and protecting our Nation. Words simply cannot express the debt we owe to Specialist Maher and all of the other servicemembers fighting for our Nation.

My thoughts and prayers are with Brent Maher's family and friends, including his wife Brenna and his three children, as well as his mother Cheryl and everyone else who will be grieving his loss.

Specialist Maher truly loved his job in the U.S. military. He was proud of the difference that he was making in the lives of the Afghan people. It is because of individuals like specialist Maher and his loving and supportive family that America is the nation it is today. At times like these, I think that it is important that we pause and remember the lives of those lost in order that we can enjoy our way of life. As we go about our lives as free people, we ought to bear in mind the sacrifices made by Specialist Maher and others in our Armed Forces.