

across State lines, and we can obviously do that as police departments are talking to each other more than they ever have through technology.

I spoke to police chiefs from across Ohio like my city of Lorain, OH. Cel Rivera, the chief there, said the blue alert system would be a critical resource to track down criminals and to protect law enforcement. It would be made possible with existing community-oriented policing services such as, the COPS Program funded by the Department of Justice.

I remember 15, 18 years ago when the COPS Program began with President Clinton and the Congress in the 1990s. It made such a difference in helping local communities, small towns, big cities, rural areas, suburbs, to be able to staff up in a better way with community police officers.

It is these types of Federal investments that are so critical for communities facing significant budget shortfalls. Too many communities are forced to make cutbacks in essential services reducing staff size and scaling back investments on safety equipment. These choices are difficult, and they are made with great reluctance. That is why Federal grants such as the staffing for adequate fire and emergency response, so-called SAFER grants, or the assistance for the firefighters grant are critical to help communities hire more firefighters as well as recruit and retain first responders. The omnibus bill we are considering now will provide much needed investments that will help communities do that.

While I fight for stronger investments, it is clear every little bit helps. Earlier this week the Chillicothe Fire Department received a funded grant through the AFG Program. It follows the SAFER grant that not only helped hire personnel, it saves lives. Fire Chief Steve Gallacher, whom I have spoken with prior to this, was off duty when he experienced a pulmonary embolism, a blood clot to the lung. Without a grant that kept his neighborhood firehouse open or without the medic who was hired because of the AFG grant, Chief Gallagher says he would have died.

These Federal investments literally helped to save Chief Gallacher's life. According to him, 40 percent of deaths among firefighters occur due to cardiac arrest. He wrote to me:

When I helped write the grant application, I knew that it would save lives. But I never imagined that one of those lives would be my own.

With reduced tax revenues, with the increased need of vital public services such as fire and police, it is critical we help our communities carry out the most basic and lifesaving duties. We can keep first responders and firefighters and officials on the job.

We can establish an alert system to warn us when criminals seek to harm law enforcement officials. These are bipartisan actions that can help communities across Ohio and throughout the Nation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWN of Ohio). The Senator from Florida.

RESOLVING ISSUES AND VOTING RIGHTS

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, at the late hour, as the Senate continues to try to do its work, there is word that maybe—as the Good Book says: “Come, let us reason together”—maybe there is some movement in bringing about some consensus-building so the people's work can be done and these issues that have kept us apart for so long can finally be resolved. Maybe they will be resolved only on a temporary basis. But at least we would be in a situation where we did not allow the tax cuts for Social Security payments that would be such—if those tax cuts did not continue, there would be an immediate amount more that people will have to pay out of their pocket. Maybe those will continue. It is certainly the right thing to do.

It is also the right thing to do to keep unemployment compensation going in a time of a recession, when so many people are out of work, and they do not have the opportunity to get work or only get what they can piece together, which is not enough to sustain their families. That is the right thing to do. Certainly passing the funding bills to keep the government going past midnight tonight is clearly the right thing to do, instead of extraneous issues holding us up, to having us all wound around the axle where we can't even fund the Government of the United States. So maybe some reasonable minds are coming together to start working out these issues. I certainly hope so.

In the meantime, what I wish to speak about is something that is even more pernicious and that is making it harder for our people to express their constitutional right of casting a vote. We have seen a pattern in 14 States, enacting new election laws that basically are a suppression of voter rights. One of those States that is glaringly, dubiously at the top of the list as being the most severe in cutting back on people's ability to vote and to know the vote they have cast is going to be counted as they intended it—and, in the first place, making it so they can register to vote—that very fundamental constitutional right for Americans is being threatened through these laws in the States, including my State, of suppressing the right to vote.

If we look at the similarities of the laws in the 14 States, we will see an obvious pattern. But in my State of Florida, we see the most severe assault on the rights of voters of all the 14 States. The present issue is joined in a court in the District of Columbia, a suit ironically brought by the State of Florida against the Department of Justice over the Voting Rights Act of 1965 and its

implementation. A part of that suit actually questions the constitutionality of the Voting Rights Act of 1965. That is a rather brazen attempt, but I think the courts will take care of that in short order.

But the very issue, as brought in this new Florida elections law, does a number of things to cut back on the rights of voters. In the first place, the League of Women Voters, which has been registering voters for years, has stopped its registration of voters because of the new law. Why? Because the old law on the books for decades said that once an organization such as the League of Women Voters registered the new voters, they had 10 days to turn that in to the respective supervisors of elections in the 67 counties. The new elections law amended that to 48 hours, and they attached to that the possibility of a fine that could go up to \$1,000 per person on the person doing the registration if they did not turn in the names in 48 hours. Of course, we had the two cases of two civics teachers in two different parts of the State who, being good teachers, in their government class were registering their students to vote and did not meet the 48-hour deadline and the State of Florida is looking at the possibility of fining these teachers. That is the height of hypocrisy. That is the height of an assault on the right of people to vote by impeding their ability to register to vote.

The intended result is there. The League of Women Voters is just one organization. There are many. But it shows what has happened; that all the registrations that would occur of people being encouraged to participate in the political system is not being done and will not be done until this issue is settled in the courts, and that is probably going to be late summer. So for the period of over 1 year, since the passing of this new law in Florida, voters will not be registered by organizations such as the League of Women Voters. That is a sad commentary, but in fact that is what has happened. That is what has happened in the State of Florida.

But that is not all. Let me tell my colleagues what else the law does. My colleagues remember how college students got so active for the first time in a Presidential election. When the Presiding Officer and I were coming up in college, we were taught that public service was one of the highest callings a person could have. We were also taught that to be a participant in our democracy was a civic responsibility. But over the intervening years, after the Vietnam war, after a number of other circumstances, young people got turned off to politics and government. Then we saw them in this past Presidential election becoming energized once again. They went down in the cities where they went to school and they registered in great numbers. Then, on election day, they turned out in great numbers. Do my colleagues know what the State of Florida did in passing the

new elections law? They changed the law which said that when a college student goes down there on election day to vote and they bring out their identification to show they are who they say they are and they compare their driver's license identification and address to the voting registration in the college town, if that driver's license, which likely shows their parents' address, if it is in a different county, they will not give them a ballot. They will give them a provisional ballot. As a result, we saw in the last Presidential election in Florida half the provisional ballots cast were not counted.

This is a blatant attempt to cut out a certain element or to make it more difficult, all under the guise that they are trying to weed out fraud. We haven't had a lot of voter fraud in our State of Florida, and I daresay we would find the same in the other 13 States that enacted these very repressive laws.

But that is not all. The law goes on further to restrict voters' rights by cutting back on the number of days of early voting. Why did we have early voting? In our State, we went through the trauma of the Presidential election of 2000, when there was so much confusion about whether the ballot was intended to be this way, and people were confused with the way the ballot was constructed. It went on and on and on. We know the high drama that ended in the Supreme Court of Bush v. Gore. Because of that trauma, many State legislatures decided to try to make it easier to vote. One way to vote so there was less confusion was to allow what other States have done, which is to let part of the voting occur before election day—early voting. Then a person can take their time going in. People don't have to be confined to voting within a 12-hour period from 7 o'clock in the morning until 7 o'clock at night, with the long lines and perhaps inclement weather, with a pouring down rainstorm or snowstorm, to inhibit people's ability to exercise their right to vote.

So legislatures across this country started enacting early voting. In Florida, that early voting period was 2 weeks. The 2 weeks went all the way up through the Sunday before the Tuesday election. Lo and behold, in the last Presidential election, because of early voting, 40 percent of the electorate of Florida voted before election day.

You certainly know the supervisors of election liked that because then on the election day, from 7 a.m. to 7 p.m., there was 60 percent of the vote—not 100 percent of the vote—and, therefore, it was much more manageable, even

though there was an extremely high turnout because it was in a Presidential election.

Well, by constricting, as the Florida law did, from 14 days to 8 days, they are limiting that ability. They cut it back. Instead of the Sunday before the Tuesday election, the last day of the eighth day will be the Saturday before the Tuesday election.

On the basis of the experience of the last decade, guess who voted in record numbers on the Sunday before the Tuesday election after church. Certain minority groups, in record numbers. Therefore, it is again an attempt at suppressing that particular vote.

Why cannot we use walking-around common sense that would say we want to help people, to facilitate people, to make it easier for them to cast their vote, make it easier for them to register to vote; and then, once they have cast that vote, to do it in a manner where they know exactly what they are doing, lessen the amount of mistakes, and have the security of mind of knowing that the vote was going to be counted as they intended it? Yet we see laws have been passed in a number of States to the contrary.

It is my hope—it is the hope of a lot of people across this country, who care about one of the most fundamental rights of being a citizen of the United States of America: the right to vote; a right, a constitutional right that casts us in contrast to a lot of other countries on the face of planet Earth—it is my hope, as the court deliberates and renders its judgment, the Constitution of the United States will be upheld.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I previously filed committee allocations and budgetary aggregates pursuant to section 106 of the Budget Control Act of 2011. Today, I am further adjusting some of those levels, specifically the allocation to the Committee on Appropriations for fiscal year 2012 and the budgetary aggregates for fiscal year 2012.

Section 101 of the Budget Control Act allows for various adjustments to the statutory limits on discretionary spending, while section 106(d) allows the Chairman of the Budget Committee to make revisions to allocations, aggregates, and levels consistent with those adjustments. The Senate will soon be considering the conference report to accompany H.R. 2055, the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2012, as well as H.R. 3672, the Disaster Relief Appropriations Act, 2012. I previously made adjustments pursuant to the Budget Control Act to the allocation to the Committee on Appropriations and

to the spending aggregates for items contained in H.R. 2055 and H.R. 3672, including funding designated for overseas contingency operations, disaster relief, emergencies, and program integrity. I am now revising those prior adjustments to reflect the final amounts contained in the two pieces of legislation. When compared to my previous adjustments, the combined effect of H.R. 2055 and H.R. 3672 is to increase budget authority by \$2.302 billion and lower outlays by \$0.286 billion in 2012.

With these revisions, I have now made adjustments to budget authority in 2012 pursuant to the Budget Control Act of \$137.48 billion. That total breaks down as follows: \$126.544 billion for overseas contingency operations, \$10.453 billion for disaster relief, and \$0.483 billion for program integrity initiatives.

I ask unanimous consent that the following tables detailing the changes to the allocation to the Committee on Appropriations and the budgetary aggregates be printed in the RECORD.

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

BUDGETARY AGGREGATES

(Pursuant to section 106(b)(1)(C) of the Budget Control Act of 2011 and section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974)

\$s in millions	2011	2012
Current Spending Aggregates:		
Budget Authority	3,070,885	2,983,398
Outlays	3,161,974	3,047,189
Adjustments:		
Budget Authority	0	2,302
Outlays	0	-286
Revised Spending Aggregates:		
Budget Authority	3,070,885	2,985,700
Outlays	3,161,974	3,046,903

FURTHER REVISIONS TO THE BUDGET AUTHORITY AND OUTLAY ALLOCATIONS TO THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

(Pursuant to section 106 of the Budget Control Act of 2011 and section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974)

\$s in millions	Current Allocation/ Limit	Adjustment	Revised Allocation/ Limit
Fiscal Year 2011:			
General Purpose Discretionary Budget Authority	1,211,141	0	1,211,141
General Purpose Discretionary Outlays	1,391,055	0	1,391,055
Fiscal Year 2012:			
Security Discretionary Budget Authority	814,744	2,200	816,944
Nonsecurity Discretionary Budget Authority	363,434	102	363,536
General Purpose Discretionary Outlays	1,327,925	-286	1,327,639
Memorandum: Cumulative Adjustments, Fiscal Year 2012:			
Security Discretionary Budget Authority	n/a	132,944	n/a
Nonsecurity Discretionary Budget Authority	n/a	4,536	n/a
General Purpose Discretionary Outlays	n/a	65,639	n/a

DETAIL ON ADJUSTMENTS TO FISCAL YEAR 2012 ALLOCATIONS TO COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

(Pursuant to Section 106 of the Budget Control Act of 2011)

\$s in billions	Program Integrity	Disaster Relief	Emergency	Overseas Contingency Operations	Total
Combined adjustments for H.R. 2055 and H.R. 3672:					
Budget Authority	-0.410	2.712	0.000	0.000	2.302
Outlays	-0.359	0.213	0.007	-0.147	-0.286
Memorandum 1: Breakdown of Above Adjustments by Category:					
Security Budget Authority	0.000	2.200	0.000	0.000	2.200
Nonsecurity Budget Authority	-0.410	0.512	0.000	0.000	0.102

DETAIL ON ADJUSTMENTS TO FISCAL YEAR 2012 ALLOCATIONS TO COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS—Continued
(Pursuant to Section 106 of the Budget Control Act of 2011)

\$s in billions	Program Integ- rity	Disaster Relief	Emergency	Overseas Con- tingency Oper- ations	Total
General Purpose Outlays	-0.359	0.213	0.007	-0.147	-0.286
Memorandum 2: Cumulative Adjustments (Includes Previously Filed Adjustments):					
Budget Authority	0.483	10.453	0.000	126.544	137.480
Outlays	0.415	1.803	0.000	63.421	65.639

RECESS SUBJECT TO THE CALL OF THE CHAIR

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate recess subject to the call of the Chair.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:18 p.m., recessed subject to the call of the Chair and reassembled at 8:14 p.m. when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. CASEY).

MAKING FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2012

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.J. Res. 94, which is a 24-hour continuing resolution, which was just received from the House and is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the joint resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 94) making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2012, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be read three times and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, there be no intervening action or debate, and any statements related to this matter be printed in the RECORD.

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

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 94) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. REID. 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 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.

TRIBUTE TO WILSON "BILL" LIVINGOOD

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I rise to recognize the extraordinary work of

the Honorable Wilson "Bill" Livingood, who served with distinction for 17 years as the House of Representatives Sergeant at Arms, protecting and serving Members, staff and visitors to the Capitol complex.

Mr. Livingood, the House Chief Law Enforcement Officer, served with great merit in his capacity as Sergeant at Arms and as a member and biennial Chairman of the United States Capitol Police Board, shepherding monumental security enhancements post September 11, 2001.

Mr. Livingood was sworn in on January 4, 1995, for the 104th Congress, making him the third longest-serving House Sergeant at Arms in United States history. Prior to 1995, Mr. Livingood was the Senior Advisor to the Director of the U.S. Secret Service, from 1989 to 1995, serving for 33 years as a special agent with the Secret Service.

Born on October 1, 1936, in Philadelphia, Mr. Livingood received a Bachelor of Science degree in Police Administration from Michigan State University. His public service began at an early age, as he served as Michigan State University's student body president in 1959. A veteran of the U.S. Navy, he was appointed as a Special Agent at the Secret Service's Dallas Field Office in 1961 and held supervisory assignments at headquarters and on several protective divisions to include the Presidential Protective Division.

In 1969, Mr. Livingood was promoted to Assistant to the Special Agent in Charge of the Presidential Protection Division. Five years later, he was promoted to Assistant Special Agent in Charge of the Office of Protective Forces. Mr. Livingood was named Special Agent in Charge of the Houston Field Office in 1982 until his appointment as Deputy Assistant Director, Office of Training in 1986. From 1988 to 1995, he served as the Senior Advisor to three Directors.

Mr. President, Mr. Livingood is known best around the world for his introduction of the President of the United States at the State of the Union address, and he is the 36th person to hold the Sergeant at Arms office since the House of Representatives first met in New York City in 1789.

Mr. Livingood served during critical, historical and tragic events that include the fatal shootings of two United States Capitol Police officers, the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001 and the anthrax attacks the following month in 2001.

Mr. President, during his tenure, Mr. Livingood has served with great resolu-

tion, balancing security needs while maintaining open access to the "People's House."

Mr. President, I congratulate Mr. Livingood on his well-earned retirement.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I wish to explain my absence from rollcall votes 230 and 231 on Thursday, December 15, 2011.

I was unable to vote yesterday because I was back in Atchison, KS, paying my respects to slain police sergeant David Enzbrenner. Officer Enzbrenner was a veteran of the Atchison Police Department but, more important, he was a loving dad and a caring husband. Although I returned to Washington today to continue the important work being done in the Senate, my thoughts and prayers continue to be with Officer Enzbrenner's family and the Atchison community.

WELCOMING HOME U.S. TROOPS

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I rise to welcome home 53 of the men and women of the Headquarters Element of the storied 25th Infantry Division, also known as Tropic Lightning, who will be returning to Schofield Barracks in Hawaii from their deployment to Iraq this Sunday, in time to join their loved ones for the holidays. I would like to recognize the entire 25th Infantry Division for their service in Iraq and Afghanistan over the past decade. I would also like to pay my respects and give my deepest condolences to the families of the 236 members of the 25th Infantry Division who made the ultimate sacrifice while serving in Iraq and Afghanistan, defending the American values and freedoms we enjoy.

Although I cannot be there in person, I send my warmest aloha and heartfelt gratitude to these soldiers and their families for their many sacrifices and dutiful service to our country.

Since its activation on October 1, 1941, the 25th Infantry Division has played a significant role in every major conflict we have had. In that tradition of outstanding service, the 6 major elements of the 25th Infantry Division—the division headquarters, the 4 brigade combat teams, and the combat aviation brigade—have made a total of 19 combat deployments since 2004. Thirteen of these deployments were to Iraq and another six were to Afghanistan. In addition, three separate Tropic Lightning battalion-sized aviation task forces have deployed to Iraq.