

**JUMPSTART OUR BUSINESS  
STARTUPS ACT**

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 3606, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3606) to increase American job creation and economic growth by improving access to the public capital markets for emerging growth companies.

Pending:

Reid (for Reed) amendment No. 1833, in the nature of a substitute.

Reid amendment No. 1834 (to amendment No. 1833), to change the enactment date.

Reid amendment No. 1835 (to amendment No. 1834), of a perfecting nature.

Reid (for Cantwell) amendment No. 1836 (to the language proposed to be stricken by amendment No. 1833), to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank of the United States.

Reid amendment No. 1837 (to amendment No. 1836), to change the enactment date.

Reid motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, with instructions, Reid amendment No. 1838, to change the enactment date.

**CLOTURE MOTION**

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

The legislative clerk 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 H.R. 3606, an Act to increase American job creation and economic growth by improving access to the public capital markets for emerging growth companies.

Harry Reid, Ben Nelson, Jon Tester, Charles E. Schumer, Joe Manchin III, Patty Murray, Mark R. Warner, Christopher A. Coons, Robert Menendez, Thomas R. Carper, Joseph I. Lieberman, Debbie Stabenow, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Tom Udall, Jim Webb, Barbara Boxer.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on H.R. 3606, an act to increase American job creation and economic growth by improving access to public capital markets for emerging growth companies, 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.

Mr. KYL. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FRANKEN). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 76, nays 22, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 53 Leg.]

**YEAS—76**

Alexander	Bennet	Brown (MA)
Ayotte	Bingaman	Burr
Barrasso	Blunt	Cantwell
Begich	Boozman	Carper

Casey	Johanns	Reid
Chambliss	Johnson (SD)	Risch
Coats	Johnson (WI)	Roberts
Coburn	Kerry	Rockefeller
Cochran	Klobuchar	Rubio
Collins	Kohl	Schumer
Coons	Kyl	Sessions
Corker	Lee	Shaheen
Cornyn	Lieberman	Shelby
DeMint	Lugar	Snowe
Durbin	Manchin	Stabenow
Enzi	McCain	Tester
Graham	McCaskill	Thune
Grassley	McConnell	Toomey
Hagan	Moran	Udall (CO)
Hatch	Murkowski	Udall (NM)
Heller	Murray	Vitter
Hoehn	Nelson (NE)	Warner
Hutchison	Nelson (FL)	Wicker
Inhofe	Paul	Wyden
Inouye	Portman	
Isakson	Pryor	

**NAYS—22**

Akaka	Franken	Merkley
Baucus	Gillibrand	Mikulski
Blumenthal	Harkin	Reed
Boxer	Landrieu	Sanders
Brown (OH)	Lautenberg	Webb
Cardin	Leahy	Whitehouse
Conrad	Levin	
Feinstein	Menendez	

**NOT VOTING—2**

Crapo	Kirk
-------	------

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 76, the nays are 22. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

Cloture having been invoked, the motion to commit falls as being inconsistent with cloture.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I raise a germaneness point of order against the pending Cantwell-Graham amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is well taken, and the amendment falls.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I raise a germaneness point of order against the Reed-Landrieu-Levin-Brown of Ohio substitute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is well taken and the amendment falls.

**AMENDMENT NO. 1884**

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 1884, offered by Senators MERKLEY, BENNET, and others.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:  
The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID], for Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. BENNET, and Mr. BROWN of Massachusetts, proposes an amendment numbered 1884.

(The amendment is printed in the RECORD of Monday, March 19, 2012, under "Text of Amendments.")

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.  
The yeas and nays were ordered.

**AMENDMENT NO. 1931 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1884**

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I call up the second-degree amendment, No. 1931, offered by Senator REED of Rhode Island.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:  
The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID], for Mr. REED, proposes an amendment numbered 1931 to amendment No. 1884.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end, add the following. "The Commission shall revise the definition of the term 'held of record' pursuant to section 12(g)(5) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 781(g)(5)) to include beneficial owners of such class of securities."

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the bill before this body had broad bipartisan support, bicameral in nature. The bill we are considering today is the IPO bill, of course. The bill passed the House by an overwhelming majority. President Obama supports it.

I want everybody to know that the bill is imperfect, and that perhaps is an understatement. What we are trying to do with amendments offered by Senators MERKLEY and REED is to improve this bill, which has a lot of problems. These two amendments would go a long way toward correcting those.

This is an important piece of legislation, and we are confident that it will improve innovators' access to capital and give startups the flexibility they need to hire and grow. But it is not perfect, I repeat. As with any other piece of legislation, there are ways we can improve it. On this bill, there are many ways we can improve it. I am sorry we cannot do more.

To that end, the Senate will consider two germane amendments to this IPO bill that will protect investors and prevent fraud.

The first amendment is sponsored by Senator MERKLEY and others. It deals with companies that raise capital online from small investors. This amendment will ensure that watchdogs are in place to protect the small investors and their money from fraudulent companies and abuse of the system.

People are lurking out there waiting for ways to cheat. I am sorry, but it is true. These are people who are either amoral or immoral, looking for opportunities to make money. I appreciate very much the work that a number of Senators have put into this amendment. It is an important amendment, and it is so important to improving this bill. You will hear much more this afternoon from the sponsors of the amendment about why it is so important.

The second amendment is sponsored by Senator REED of Rhode Island. All Senators have stature, but JACK REED, with his military background, his experience in the House, and his experience in the Senate, is a man we all look to for leadership. His amendment will ensure fair and honest disclosure by companies raising capital. It will stop businesses from gaming the system and avoiding oversight by hiding thousands—or maybe tens of thousands—of investors. This will stop when this amendment passes.

Democrats and Republicans agree that we need to pass the IPO bill and make it easier for American companies to raise capital, to grow operations, and to hire new workers, but we must do so in a way that balances the needs and rights of investors and prevents fraud and abuse.

These two amendments will accomplish that. These two amendments are not going to make the bill perfect, but it will be a lot better.

While the IPO measure before the Senate today is an important piece of legislation, experts agree its impact on job creation will be somewhat limited.

This legislation is something that is before this body. Yesterday, Senate Republicans blocked a bill that would create, in 1 year, as it did this year that we are in, 300,000 jobs. It is hard to comprehend, but people who sponsored the amendment voted against it. But this isn't anything new. I think it is such callous disregard for what is fair and right.

The Republican leader has been talking nonstop about how important it is for Congress to continue to create jobs. So I am disappointed—and that is an understatement—that yesterday Senate Republicans, led by my friend the Republican leader, rejected an opportunity to help American exporters grow and hire.

The Ex-Im Bank helps American exporters compete in a global economy, and it has always enjoyed broad, bipartisan support—until this Republican minority stepped in here. The last time it was offered, in 2006, a Republican offered it. It got unanimous consent to pass. This legislation has been going since the 1930s. It is backed by the National Association of Manufacturers, the Chamber of Commerce, the Business Roundtable, and labor unions. All my Republican friends can explain to the Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, and the Business Roundtable that not only did they kill this bill but they stopped the deficit from going down by \$1 billion, because the Ex-Im Bank bill reduces the deficit by \$1 billion. Of course, it had Republican cosponsors.

In fact, my Republican colleagues, including many who voted against this amendment yesterday, admitted they support the legislation. I had a number of Senators come to me saying, we like it. As I said yesterday in my remarks, they are voting against a bill they say they like. The Republican leader said a number of things yesterday, but he said he wanted to vote down this worthy proposal because he wants to pass it separately.

We understand what is going on here. The Republican-dominated House of Representatives wants to send over here a hollow shell of the Ex-Im Bank, and they would look to us and say that we now have an Ex-Im Bank bill. What they have come up with is so foolish, and that is a good description of it. Their offer is hollow. They want to appear to support the Ex-Im Bank and at the same time kill it.

Democrats actually do support the Ex-Im Bank, and we made that very clear to everybody and voted accordingly. We want it to become law.

House Republicans have shown no desire to even consider this important jobs measure—let alone pass it. The

only way to ensure the Ex-Im Bank can continue to help American companies grow and create jobs is for the Senate to attach it to this IPO bill, and that failed.

Yesterday, Senate Republicans had an opportunity to join with Democrats to create hundreds of thousands of jobs in this country over the next many years. They passed up that opportunity. Once again, they chose to pick an unnecessary fight instead. They want to fight over even things they agree with. How do you like that one? They love this bill, but they want to fight about it.

Our No. 1 priority is to create jobs, and we have shown that. It is obvious that the Republicans don't have their priorities straight. But this is something we have had to live with.

We are going to work with the minority to come up with a time to have a vote. The time expires around 6 o'clock tonight. Because of a number of things going on here today, I hope we can have a vote earlier than that. We will do our best to work with the Republican leader to try to come up with a vote. There will be three votes: Merkley, Reed, and final passage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized.

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I ask to speak for up to 10 minutes, with Senator MERKLEY following me.

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

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I rise to speak in strong support of the capital formation bill that we received cloture on a few minutes ago.

In a place where we too often get bogged down by politics, this legislation reflects a strong, bipartisan commitment to creating jobs by ensuring that small businesses have access to critical capital that they need. This legislation has tremendous potential to create jobs and spur economic growth and innovation. The key component to achieving all of these goals is ensuring that small businesses have access to the capital they need to grow their businesses and create jobs.

This legislation is a rare instance in Congress where both Chambers in both parties come together to focus on this Nation's most urgent priority, and that is jobs. The President has already expressed his support for it. So let's get this bill done and off to him for his signature.

Over the past few years, I have held 12 small business opportunity workshops all over the State of Montana. Without a doubt, access to capital is always one of the most critical issues that I hear from small business owners. Access to capital makes all the difference for a small business. If the money is there, so is the expansion; so is the capacity to do more research and development; so is the next great idea. Without capital, though, there is no growth, no risk-taking, and there are no jobs.

Montana is a State of entrepreneurs. It is a frontier State. It has a tradition

of self-reliance, which is clearly reflected in the entrepreneurs and the successful and innovative small businesses they have created and grown in this great State. They clearly reflect America's entrepreneurial spirit, which helps keep rural America strong and makes our economy the most innovative in the world.

Our small businesses in Montana vary from family farms, ranches, and one-man manufacturing shops, to innovative biotech companies and cutting-edge information analytics firms. Many of these newer firms have the opportunity to change the landscape when it comes to diversifying Montana's economy.

According to research from the Kauffman Foundation, nearly all net jobs created since 1980 have come from firms 5 years or younger. The role of startups in creating jobs and driving innovation has been well documented, but that ability to create jobs is limited if these firms do not have access to financing to scale and to grow their companies. So central to job creation is making sure investors and capital markets are accessible for startups.

Because of this potential for growth, we need to do all we can to empower these businesses with the tools they need to survive and thrive at every stage of their development. These young companies must be able to access the capital they need to bring innovative ideas and products to the marketplace.

Back in July I held the first of a series of hearings in the Banking Committee to examine the challenges and opportunities facing innovative small businesses as they try to access capital. A major take-away from the hearing was the need to ensure that capital markets remain within reach of startups at various stages of their development, particularly in the stages before they may be ready to go public.

A key recommendation offered at the hearing came from Rob Bargatze of Ligocyte Pharmaceuticals in Bozeman, MT. He said we should take a closer look at updating SEC regulation A to better enable small businesses to raise capital through these public offerings. The regulation A exemption was created in the Securities Act of 1933 to provide small companies with an opportunity to raise capital without being subject to full registration with the SEC.

Ligocyte is developing a new norovirus vaccine with the potential to prevent hospitalization and save significant health care costs—and to create those jobs of the future. Working through the FDA approval process is not easy. It requires years of hard work and tens of millions of dollars. It can be tough for any company to stick it out for that long or for that much money, but for a small firm in Bozeman, MT, it can be especially difficult. Access to capital to fund their clinical trials will be the determining factor in their ability to gain FDA approval.

Back in September, Senator TOOMEY and I introduced the Small Company Capital Formation Act to update regulation A by increasing the total amount of capital that can be raised through these offerings to \$50 million, while protecting new investors. Currently, the businesses can only raise \$5 million under regulation A—a limit that has not been updated in nearly 20 years and one that many view as too low to be a valuable tool in raising capital.

The bill maintains the most attractive elements of regulation A, including the ability for issuers to test the waters before registering with the SEC. It also preserves the nonrestricted status of securities sold through a reg A offering so that these securities can be resold to investors after the initial offering.

New investor protections include a requirement that issuers file an audited financial statement with the SEC—a requirement that has been included in the legislation that I introduced as well as the House bill before us today. The bill also directs the SEC to establish additional disclosure requirements and requires issuers to electronically file offering statements with the Commission.

Additionally, the bill subjects those offering or selling securities under regulation A to negligence-based liability under section 12(a)(2), and it includes disqualification provisions to prevent bad actors from making these offerings in a way that is consistent with Dodd-Frank.

From what I have heard said about the House version of regulation A, you would presume none of these investor protections are included. Let me clarify that the bill I introduced with Senator TOOMEY, S. 1544, is identical to the language included in the House bill, H.R. 3606, that is before us today.

The truth is that the substitute amendment that was voted on yesterday made very minor changes to this portion of the House bill, such as changing a “may” to a “shall” and adding a study by the SEC 5 years after implementation of these changes.

We should have been able to pass this bill by a voice vote here in the Senate since this bill has enjoyed strong bipartisan support in the Senate, with six bipartisan cosponsors. Regardless of that, I am pleased that this balanced bill also enjoyed a 420-to-1 vote in the House—420 for, 1 against. Imagine that—all but one voting Member of the House of Representatives agree on this bill.

I would also note the SEC’s recently released recommendation from its Forum on Small Business Capital Formation increasing the regulation A exemption to \$50 million was one of the top recommendations at this forum.

By the way, this is an idea which has been in the SEC’s Forum on Small Business Capital Formation recommendations almost every year since 1993, the year after the limit was last

raised to \$5 million. So the idea that this is some risky new idea is not correct. In fact, at a briefing with the SEC a few weeks ago, SEC lawyers suggested that there was absolutely nothing scary about S. 1544 and that they felt very comfortable with the existing investor protections included in that bill.

The bottom line is that I am thrilled we will finally have an opportunity to pass this legislation—hopefully very soon—and get it to the President’s desk.

What does this legislation mean for Montana entrepreneurs? Let me cite a few examples.

For Brett Baker, president and CEO of Microbion Corporation in Bozeman, lifting the cap on regulation A offerings will provide him with broader opportunities to raise capital. Instead of worrying about where the next phase of financing will come from, he can focus on discovery and research, working with the Department of Defense to use compounds Microbion discovered to treat antibiotic-resistant wounds. These changes will also allow a company such as Microbion to access capital at an earlier stage without diluting its earlier investors who believed in them from the earliest days of that company. And raising capital publicly through regulation A would also give folks in Bozeman who know about the company an opportunity to share in its success, something that is not possible now unless they are an accredited investor.

More broadly, this legislation is going to provide small businesses in Montana’s emerging data and biotech industries with new tools and options to access capital at different stages of development, and it will also provide necessary updates to existing regulations. For example, changes to the SEC’s 500 shareholder rule would ensure companies, such as investment brokerage D.A. Davidson in Great Falls, can continue to provide their employees with stock in the company without having to go through a costly and time-consuming registration process with the SEC. This Montana-grown company dates back over 75 years and has always believed in rewarding its employees so they can have a stake in the success of the firm, which now operates in 16 States. Without these changes, a company such as D.A. Davidson would be faced with the choice of costly public registration or potentially eliminating existing employee shareholders.

For companies such as Rivertop Renewables in Missoula, this legislation will provide them with an onramp to going public if that is an option they choose to take one day. Rivertop has begun full-scale production of their groundbreaking green biochemical products used in commercial products such as dishwashing detergents and deicer. These changes will ensure that Rivertop will have multiple strategies at their disposal so they can go public

at a time that is right for them and take advantage of the public markets as they continue commercialization of their products.

For Lance Trebesch of ticketprinting.com and Ticket River, this legislation will enable him to grow his ticket printing, event management, and online ticket printing firm. Since 1997 this company has expanded its reach internationally, with over 25 employees in Bozeman and Harlowton, MT.

This bill will ensure that entrepreneurs across the State of Montana will have a whole new set of tools at their disposal so they can make smart decisions about their future to develop and expand their businesses. They will have more choices and better access to capital markets, which should also give them more leeway to create and innovate.

We have seen ecosystems of support for small businesses such as these as they spring up in virtually every county in Montana. Obviously, the success of these companies has implications for job creation and growth, but there are also tremendous opportunities for innovation.

It is not surprising that in Montana so many startups have located near universities in Missoula and Bozeman. In fact, many of these firms got their start with discoveries in the labs at Montana State and the University of Montana. With this legislation, the possibilities are endless for Montana and for entrepreneurs and innovators across Montana and this Nation.

Mr. President, I look forward to voting on this legislation and getting it to the President for his signature.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the remarks of Senator MERKLEY and Senator BENNET, I be recognized.

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

Mr. REED. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

AMENDMENT NO. 1884

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I rise to speak to amendment No. 1884. Specifically, this is the crowdfunding amendment. That might be a term that is new to many, so let me explain.

The Internet provides new opportunities for capital to reach small businesses and startup entrepreneurs, and what this crowdfunding amendment does is to say that when the crowd; that is, all of those who are surfing the Internet, goes to a funding portal on the Internet, a Web site, to support a company, to invest in a company, there is an orderly process that adequately facilitates this type of opportunity while providing fundamental investor protections. So this will be an effective instrument of capital formation because, indeed, if crowdfunding becomes a situation where inaccurate information is put forward, where there is no

accountability, where there are pump-and-dump schemes, then the reputation of crowdfunding will be deeply damaged and the opportunity for capital formation will be equally affected.

This follows on a model that is already on the Internet in some other contexts. For example, you can visit a Web site called kickstarter.com, and you as an individual can look at a host of concepts that are being put forward for social and artistic activities across this country. You can say: Yes, I want to help that artist build that sculpture or so on and so forth. They may say how much money they want to raise, and you would decide what you want to donate. That is a donation model. You also can go to Web sites such as prosper.com or kiva.com, and these are peer-to-peer lending Web sites. If you go to prosper.com, you will see a whole list of folks who are saying: Yes, I want to consolidate my credit cards, I would like to borrow X amount and I am offering an interest rate of such-and-such, and here is a little bit of background, and you can decide if you want to lend to that individual or not. That is peer-to-peer lending.

Well, what crowdfunding does is to create an equal opportunity for folks to invest in early-stage businesses, startup businesses, small businesses. Imagine, for example, you run into someone at a cafe who says: I have this new idea for a coffee shop called Starbucks. I am going to call it Starbucks. Would you like to help me launch this?

And you say: Well, another coffee shop—I don't know if the world needs another coffee shop.

Maybe you jump in and maybe you don't. Then years later, you say: Oh, I should have seized that opportunity.

Well, through a crowdfunding portal, you get to hear those stories. You get to read those stories being presented by folks from across the country about their efforts, and you can decide if you want to participate.

Now, crowdfunding is in the larger capital formation bill that comes to us from the House, but that particular formulation is deeply flawed, and I am going to walk through a series of differences between the House bill and the Senate bill for my colleagues so they can understand why we need to pass amendment 1884.

The first factor is that the House bill does not require someone listing themselves or asking for startup money to provide any financial information. Well, that is a huge mistake. If there is no information, there is nothing to guide, if you will, the wisdom of the crowd.

What we do in this Senate amendment is to create a simplified format. If you are seeking less than \$100,000, then your CEO simply certifies what the financials are for the company. If you are seeking from \$100,000 to \$500,000, then you need to have a CPA review the financial statements. If you are seeking more than \$500,000, then

you need to have audited financial statements. So, as the amount of money you are asking for increases, the degree to which you need to do due diligence financially and present the details increases as well.

There is certainly nothing that would prevent a particular Web site from establishing its own standards above and beyond these particular levels.

A second thing is it is critical there be accountability for the accuracy of the information. The House bill not only doesn't even require information, but they put out information and there is no accountability. Basically, it is an invitation to spin any story one likes.

What the Senate bill says is, in order for this capital market to work well one has to stand behind the accuracy of their information. It has basic liability accountability; that is, as a director or officer of this organization, they are standing behind the accuracy of what they put out. It has a due diligence protection so this is very balanced. It has a requirement that the information be relevant or germane to the conduct of the company. So that is another protection for the business itself. So it is balanced between the two. But this can give investors a basic belief that what is being set up are reasonable amounts of information proportional to the request and that the officers and directors are standing behind this information. That creates the foundation for an effective marketplace.

A third distinction between the House bill and our amendment No. 1884 is the House bill does not require companies to go through an intermediary. In other words, under the House bill, if someone wants to promote their company, they can simply put out an e-mail. An e-mail can say anything they want because they are not responsible for the accuracy, and they can send it to everyone in the world. They can proceed to put up popup ads that simply promote their company—again, with no accuracy required. But by creating an Internet intermediary and that intermediary has to register, we create a streamlined formulation so they have a funding portal registration much simpler than a broker dealer. But in doing so, they agree they are not going to take any position on the various investment opportunities they are listing. So you truly are the marketplace. They are not saying, by the way, that particular offering by that company is a sweet deal. They can't pump it; they can't favor it. So you are a neutral marketplace, again, enabling the investor to know they are getting straightforward information, not something that is spun.

Another distinction is the House bill has no aggregate caps. The result of that is that a person could lose their entire life savings in one fell swoop. The Senate bill puts on very reasonable proportional caps that say if one's income is \$40,000 or less, their cap is \$2,000; if they are between \$40,000 and

\$100,000, their cap is 5 percent of their annual income; if they are over \$100,000, it is 10 percent. So it allows for larger amounts of money from those who have much higher incomes but provides basic aggregate cap protections so we don't end up with folks who are on public services because they were swindled out of everything they had.

Another key distinction is that under the House bill one can list their offering and close their offering within a single day, which provides absolutely no feedback loop for any type of detected deception. Under the Senate bill, we create a 3-week period from one's listing to their closing. So one lists their idea. If enough people sign up to reach one's funding request level—say one has requested to raise \$600,000. If enough people sign up and they are investing \$100,000 here, \$1,000 there that one reaches their goal, as soon as the 21-day period expires, then they close. So that does give time for some sort of feedback loops regarding any sort of fraudulent activity.

Another distinction is that the House bill allows a company to pay promoters and not disclose it. That is called pumping. If one has ever seen the movie "Boiler Room," one can see a basic classic pump-and-dump scheme, where a roomful of folks on the phone are calling people, cold-calling them, and they are saying: Hey, I am calling because I am giving you this incredible investment opportunity and here is the story. They can say anything they want and they can talk people into buying that stock and then the stock is actually being purchased from the folks who own the boiler room. Then, as soon as they sell all the stock they have, they quit making phone calls, the value of the stock drops, and everybody who invested loses out. That is a classic boiler room. That is a classic pump and dump. The House bill allows paid promotion with no disclosure.

The Senate bill says if they are going to get on the blog's site within a Web site portal and say favorable things about a stock and if they are paid by the company to do it, they have to disclose that. They simply say: Hey, I am employed by such and such, but I want to bring to your attention some merits of this. But at least the public knows where they are coming from.

Another essential issue is the issue of dilution. Dilution is not a solution in this world; it is a problem. Those are folks who get in on the front end and think: I got in on this idea early. I am going to benefit from having made this effort, and find out later a bigger investor came in and the stock was diluted in a fashion in which they are basically written out of their share of the ownership. So the Senate bill directs the SEC to provide investor protections in this area.

These are key distinctions. These are the distinctions between a solid foundation for capital formation in this incredibly exciting new opportunity, new

market, and simply a path to predatory schemes that the House is providing. That is why I am encouraging my colleagues to support the amendment Senator BENNET, who will be speaking next, and I have put together and a number of our colleagues have joined us, including Senator LANDRIEU and Senator SCOTT BROWN. This is a credible foundation for an exciting idea.

Let me close with this notion; that is, that across America, Americans have \$17 trillion invested in their retirement accounts. If they were to put 1 percent of those funds into this type of crowdfunding startup, they would be providing \$170 billion of investment potential for small companies and startup companies. That is an incredibly powerful potential form of capital to put America forward. It is small businesses that create most of the jobs, and this capital formation idea will help in that. Let's get it done.

I certainly deeply appreciate the contributions of my colleague from Colorado, Senator BENNET, who will make his points.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I wish to recognize the Senator from Oregon, Mr. MERKLEY, for his leadership on this issue and for his willingness, when times got tough, to dig even deeper and make sure we get to the balanced approach that is reflected in this amendment. It is a bipartisan amendment, which around this place I think is worthy of all of us taking a moment to recognize, and it is an amendment the people who know most about crowdfunding support. I wish to read several paragraphs from some of those folks.

From Launcht, which is a crowdfunding platform, they note that our compromise:

[i]s important because, unlike previous bills, for the first time, we have a Senate bill with bipartisan sponsorship, a balance of state oversight and federal uniformity, industry standard investor protections, and workable funding caps.

From the National Small Business Association, we hear that our compromise:

[w]ould promote entrepreneurship, job creation and economic growth by making it much easier for small companies to raise capital and get new ideas off the ground. This legislation represents a reasonable effort to accommodate differing points of view and to move this important idea forward.

One prominent investor protection advocate wrote that:

[t]he CROWDFUND Act addresses this concern by providing significant regulatory relief to very small issuers without unreasonably compromising the investor protection provisions on which the federal securities laws are grounded and the long-term success of the U.S. securities markets has been based.

The Senator from Oregon did an excellent job of describing the provisions in this bill, so I am not going to go over that ground again. But I do wish

to talk for a moment before I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island about what it is we are trying to solve. Too often I think we don't ask ourselves what the nature of the problem is we are trying to solve before we actually set about solving it, and then—no surprise—we end up actually making matters worse.

In my townhalls the chief concern of the people who come is that median family income has continued to decline in this country. For the first time in this country's history, the middle class is earning less at the end of the decade than they were at the beginning of the decade. That has never happened before in the United States.

So person after person has come and said: MICHAEL, I have done what I was supposed to do. I kept working at my job. Nobody said I didn't do a good job. But my wage is actually less in real dollars today than it was at the beginning of the decade, but the cost of health insurance continues to go up, the cost of college. I have had at least half a dozen people say to me they cannot afford to send their kid to the best college they got into. I can't think of anything that is more of a waste of our productivity than that.

The essential problem we are facing in this economy is structural. Our gross domestic product, believe it or not, as we stand here, is higher than it was when we went into this recession, the worst recession since the Great Depression. Productivity is also way up. The efficiency with which we are driving that economic growth is way up because we have had to respond to competition from abroad. We can't take anything for granted anymore. We have employed technology to drive productivity from the cotton pickers in my wife's hometown to the largest Fortune 500 companies that we have, and we have 23 or 24 million people who are either unemployed or underemployed in this economy.

The economic output is back, but it has decoupled from wages and it has decoupled from job growth and that was true before we went into the worst recession. You see, the last period of economic growth in this country's history is the first time our economy grew and wages fell, that our economy grew and that we lost jobs. It was a decoupling of economic growth from wage growth and from job growth. There is something terribly wrong with that picture, and it is creating an enormous downward pressure on the middle class in this country.

There are a bunch of things we need to do, but there are two major things that I think we need to do; one is, we need to educate our people for the 21st century. The worst the unemployment rate ever got for people with a college degree in the worst recession since the Great Depression, the one we just went through, was 4.5 percent. That is a pretty good stress test, it seems to me, of the value of a college education in the 21st century. But as a country

today, if someone is a child living in poverty, their chances of getting a college degree are 9 in 100. If we don't change the way we educate people in this country, we will continue to see 91 of 100 children living in poverty constrained to the margin of our economy and the margin of this democracy. That is an important piece of work. We have a vital national interest in that, and we are not paying attention to it here.

But also we have to create the conditions in this country where we are driving innovation and driving job growth because the days of just expecting the largest companies in this country to create jobs are over. The jobs that went away in the 20th century, many of them are not coming back in the 21st century. It is about businesses that are started tomorrow and next week and the week after that and the month after that. In order to create those sorts of conditions, the amendment we have presented, this crowdfunding amendment, could unleash billions of dollars, as the Senator from Oregon said, of local investment, investment on Main Street—or on someone else's Main Street through the Internet—that could allow people with great innovative ideas for the first time to raise capital from our middle class and from other people who would like to participate in this kind of new business venture.

This is not all we need to do. There are many things we need to do, and I think there are things in this overall bill we need to fix. But this bipartisan amendment represents a real step forward. As we look to the future, it is the reason we need to do comprehensive tax reform in this Congress. It is the reason we need to fundamentally think differently in this Congress about our regulations. We should be asking ourselves the question: Are we more or less likely to be creating jobs in the United States with rising wages? I think we should put the politics of this aside because there isn't a person in this Chamber who doesn't want to do this. We start, though, with the recognition that we have structural issues we need to resolve.

I hope everybody who hasn't had the chance to get a look at the amendment will look at it. I hope people on both sides of the aisle will support this amendment. I am very pleased it is bipartisan, with Senator MERKLEY and Senator BROWN, and I look forward to voting on this amendment this afternoon.

I see the Senator from Rhode Island is here. I thank him for his leadership on this legislation, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I commend Senator MERKLEY and Senator BENNET for their extraordinary work, indeed, in collaboration I believe with our colleague Senator BROWN from Massachusetts to make significant improvements in the crowdfunding provisions

of the House bill. As Senator BENNET and Senator MERKLEY have indicated, this represents a potentially very productive way to raise capital, and they have provided protections that will ensure investors in this process are not disadvantaged, and I commend them for that.

It addresses one of the significant issues in the House bill but, frankly, not all the significant issues. There are some extremely glaring, I think, provisions in the House bill that we attempted to address in the Reed-Landrieu-Levin substitute. That substitute amendment, although it received a majority of votes, did not receive enough to achieve cloture to be the bill we are now considering. We are now considering the House bill.

I have an amendment to that House bill that addresses one of several difficulties with the House legislation. Investors, when they buy stock in public companies, expect routine disclosures. They expect to know on a quarterly basis, and in a very real sense on an annual basis, what is the company doing? What are the prospects of the company? All that goes hand in hand with the widely dispersed ownership of a public company. The House legislation would allow many companies with a substantial number of beneficial shareholders, the actual owners, the real owners of the stock, the ones who can vote the stock, the ones who get the dividends, the ones who vote on the proxies or directly for the leadership of the corporation—it would allow them to remain dark. This might be appropriate for some companies that have a relatively small base of real owners, but the way the House has drafted this legislation it could risk allowing a significant number of larger companies to go or remain dark.

The Securities Exchange Act of 1934 set up a system of public reporting. Beginning in 1964, the SEC required that companies with at least 500 holders of record—and at least \$10 million in assets, to follow the routine reporting requirements under the securities laws. The decision was made that at that point a company does have a size that is adequate and necessary so that they should be disclosing.

The issue that is motivating the House is this 500-person requirement. It was adopted, as I said, in 1964. There is a sense that the limit is probably too low. The House version is 2,000. We make no attempt to change the House limit of 2,000 now, the new limit. But what we want to be sure of is that the individuals who are being counted are not the record holders, they are the real owners, the beneficial owners. In fact, many companies are very astute and assiduous in assuring that these record holders fall beneath this 500 level.

There are many large companies, well-known companies, as I mentioned in my previously remarks, that have thousands of beneficial owners but still have, on their own records, less than

500 holders of record. The SEC defines record holders as “each person who is identified as the owner of such securities on records of the security holders maintained by or on behalf of the issuer.”

Holder of record is very direct. It is the shareholders who are recorded as such on the books of the company. This is where the term “beneficial owner” comes from. In such instances, the shares are held of record by a third party, usually a broker, on behalf of the shareholder. For example—and this is one of many examples—if you buy shares from Charles Schwab, that discount brokerage firm would likely serve as the record holder and you would be the beneficial owner. It is your money; you paid for it. It is your vote because you are a beneficial owner. It is your right to sell the shares. But as far as the company is concerned, the holder of record is the broker, Charles Schwab.

I think we have all been familiar and all received in the mail a big package of proxy materials from our broker. It is not, in many cases, directly from the company. It is from the Wells Fargo Advisors, it is from Schwab Advisors, et cetera, because they are on the records of the company as the ones who are the record holders. They distribute the material to beneficial owners.

The consequence is that for companies that may have a very few or relatively few record holders, they have thousands and thousands of beneficial owners. Those are the individuals who will lose out if the company decides, under the House bill, to suddenly go or remain dark, to avoid public reporting.

As I have indicated before, most investors today do so through intermediaries—through brokers, through others. As a result, they would not necessarily be counted as a record holder. Record holders—the brokers, the large entities—are increasingly purely passthroughs. They are agents with no economic interest in the company, no voting rights. Those are held by the beneficial owners. That is why I believe that beneficial ownership should be the test for whether companies have to report under the Securities Exchange Act. It should encompass those who have the power to sell and/or the power to vote the shares. They are the actual shareholders. They are the individuals who management is committed by fiduciary duties to work for. So I think it is appropriate that when we raise this level to 2,000 we also ensure that it is not simply record holders, it is the beneficial owners—the real owners, for want of another term.

There also could be, for example, two identical companies with identical numbers of beneficial owners but they might have different numbers of record holders because of the way the shares are held—in trust or by a broker, et cetera. And one company reporting and one not reporting does not seem to be to be a fair or efficient way to do business.

Companies already have to obtain numbers of beneficial owners from brokers and banks in order to know how many copies of annual reports and proxy materials they have to print, so every company knows about how many beneficial numbers they have. They have to provide the proxy material through the brokerage or bank to the beneficial owners, so they know very well—in fact, quite precisely—their beneficial ownership, their real shareholders.

But using record level as the trigger to remain private, to avoid public reporting, to me again is the wrong approach. My amendment would clarify the definition in this new shareholder threshold section of the underlying bill, and ensure that companies are not avoiding these public reporting requirements by using a threshold of 2,000 record holders if they have 2,000 or fewer beneficial owners. If this is a truly small business that has 1,500 individual shareholders, beneficial owners, and they want to remain dark—that seems to be something that we certainly would countenance, and with my language it would be possible to do so.

I think this approach makes it fair for everyone. It also doesn't frustrate the expectations of a person who buys a share of nationally known stock that is publicly reported and gets a 10-Q and every year the 10-K, and suddenly they don't get anything. They wonder what is going on at the company. Maybe the company merges with another company, creates a new company, and now has less than 2000 holders of record. I think that is not an approach we should countenance. I think transparency and accurate information are critical to the success of our capital markets, and I think this legislation will do that. Requiring quarterly reporting of firms with a large number of shareholders—real shareholders, beneficial shareholders—protects investors while at the same time improving overall market transparency and efficiency. From this information, those individual analysts and brokers who follow companies are able to determine their recommendations, are able to advise clients that you should buy this company, it is a good company.

When the company goes dark, that information source dries up and it is harder for individuals, brokers, investment advisors to give advice. I think this would not be helpful to the market. In fact, I think it might, ironically, impede capital formation, not facilitate capital formation.

There is one important point that has to be stressed, and that is my amendment does not affect the employee exemption in the underlying bill. The House bill has a blanket exemption for counting owners of the company for employees. We have reviewed this exemption in our legislation with eminent experts, including Prof. John Coates at Harvard Law School, and he concurs that employees would not be swept up into being

counted because they happen to receive compensation through stock in their company.

There are many companies—WaWa, Wegmans—that want to have active employee participation in the company through stock plans but are private companies and want to remain private. This should allow them to do so.

Again, my legislation makes no attempt to change the underlying House bill, which gives a very broad blanket exemption for employees, who are exempted from the shareholder threshold.

There is another aspect here, too, and that is ESOPs, employee stock option plans, because they do acquire stock on behalf of employees. We specifically asked Professor Coates, one of the preeminent experts in securities law, whether this would inadvertently trigger or inadvertently complicate the beneficial ownership rule. His opinion is that ESOPs typically count as one record holder and one beneficial owner because they do not pass through the votes or the right to direct sales. They do not have the characteristics which are typical of the beneficial owner: the right to vote and the right to sell the stock. They maintain those rights. They do not delegate those to the individual employees who might be part of the pool. So Professor Coates' view is that ESOPs also would be exempt from being counted, if you will, as more than one entity.

We have also reached out to the Securities and Exchange Commission and we have received some assurances, from talking to Meredith Cross of the SEC, that, given their rulemaking power, they have within the ambit of their power in implementing this legislation the ability to clarify any of these points. So that not just employees who receive stock through an employee plan, but an ESOP and other entities that hold stock—not on behalf of their investors but have the right as an entity such as a venture capital fund or a private equity fund—have the right at that fund level to vote and to direct the sale of the shares and receive the dividends—that they, too, would be counted as one entity.

Professor Coates, as I said, believes this will not affect the venture capital/private equity firm structures, which would typically count as one shareholder, whether of record or beneficially. The VC firm or PE firm does not pass through votes or the right to direct sales to its own investors, and the same might be said with mutual funds, pension funds, et cetera—the primary passthrough which would be counted as brokers and banks, who hold on behalf of beneficial owners.

What we have, I think, is legislation that recognizes the need to increase the number adopted in 1964, but also to recognize that the real owners of companies far exceed, in many cases, the holders or record, and that these real owners depend upon the routine reporting that is required under the Securities Exchange Act so they can be in-

formed, so they can follow their stock. Indeed, the analysts who look closely at these companies, who make recommendations to buy and sell, also need this type of information. For this reason I have proposed this amendment. I think it is something that improves the bill. It was included in our substitute which did not receive 60 votes to pass cloture but did receive the majority of votes in this body. I think it is something, again, that will improve this legislation. I would not hesitate to add that many more improvements are necessary, but certainly this would be an improvement.

I would note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. UDALL of New Mexico). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRASSO. 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. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to enter into a colloquy with my Republican colleagues for 30 minutes.

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

#### HEALTH CARE

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, on the Senate floor this morning Senator DURBIN called on Republican Members to offer to give up what he called their Federal health care. I heard his comments, and he makes an interesting argument. But, once again, Democrats in the Senate are ignoring history, as the Senator did today. They are ignoring the facts and ignoring the Democrats' record on this issue.

The truth is, Republicans in this body have already offered to give up their health insurance coverage. In fact, here is the rest of the story:

During the debate on the health care law—almost 2 years ago today—Republicans offered to forego their private coverage and instead enroll all Members of Congress in Medicaid, the government's safety-net program for low-income individuals. The Democrats in this body unanimously rejected this idea. Every Democrat voted no. This was on an amendment by former Senator LeMieux from Florida, an amendment that asked to enroll all Members of Congress in the Medicaid Program. Yet at least 50 percent of the newly covered individuals under the Democrats' new law are going to get coverage, and they will get their coverage through Medicaid.

So the President's solution for health care in this country is to put 50 percent of the newly covered individuals under Medicaid. Yet the Democratic Members of the Senate unanimously voted no. If Democrats believe Medicaid is good enough for the 24 million people they will soon force onto the rolls, my ques-

tion is, Why isn't it good enough for the Democratic Members of Congress?

So I am joined today by my colleagues on the Senate floor who continue to raise questions about the health care law and so many broken promises made by this President. I am fortunate to be joined by a senior member of the Senate Finance Committee, Senator GRASSLEY.

I would ask my colleague from Iowa, as a senior member of the Senate Finance Committee, who spent a lot of time studying and debating President Obama's health care law, my question to the Senator is, Do you think the President's promises match the reality?

Mr. GRASSLEY. I say to the Senator from Wyoming, definitely not, and Americans are seeing every day that is not the case. If I could respond a little bit more in length, I would go back to 1994 and point out a problem President Clinton had, and in turn that President Obama tried to avoid about 14 years later. It was in 1994 that the health care reform issue came before the Congress—promoted by President Clinton at that time—and it failed in large part because it fundamentally changed the health care coverage for nearly every American.

We know the bill that is now law has fundamentally changed, but President Obama, in 2009—and throughout his campaign in 2008—decided he would combat the failure of the Clinton administration on health care reform, and not being successful there, by repeating over and over to Americans: "If you like what you have, you can keep it." That is basically what we heard at least 47 different times while the bill on health care reform was being debated.

We heard that from the President himself. We probably heard it from Members of this Congress hundreds of times. While it may have been politically useful to make that promise to the American people, it remains a promise he cannot keep and he did not keep.

The fact is, millions of Americans are seeing changes in their existing health plans due to the health reform law. So, basically, when the President said, "if you like what you have, you can keep it," it is not turning out that way, and Americans are seeing it every day.

The administration's regulations governing so-called "grandfathered health plans" will force most firms—to give up their current health care programs, and that is happening fairly regularly. When those businesses lose their grandfathered status, they immediately become subject to costly new mandates and increased premiums that follow. So the economics of health care costs and health care insurance dictate that people are not going to be able to keep what they have, as the President promised.

Families in 17 States no longer have access to child-only plans as a result of

the health care law. So if you were a voter in 2008, and the President said to you “if you like what you have, you can keep it,” and you wanted only health insurance for your children, you cannot do that today in these 17 States. It is not known how many families who lost coverage for their children because of the law have been able to find an affordable replacement.

Medicare Advantage covers about 20 percent of the senior citizens of America. There is a study that shows the Medicare Advantage enrollment is going to be cut in half. The choices available to seniors are going to be reduced by two-thirds. Then there is the open question about Americans who receive their health care through large employers. The CBO recently released a report that constructed a scenario where as many as 20 million Americans could lose their employer coverage.

While I acknowledge that the Congressional Budget Office report provided the number that I just mentioned as only one possible scenario, there are many who believe that is very plausible given the incentives in the health care law created for large businesses.

So I say to the Senator from Wyoming, 47 times—just while we were debating it; I don’t know how many times during the campaign—this President said, “If you like what you have, you can keep it.” It is a promise that was not kept.

Mr. BARRASSO. Well, I say to my colleague from Iowa, it is interesting that we take a look at this and so many promises that reflect one specific promise, “if you like what you have, you can keep it.”

I practiced orthopedic surgery for 25 years, taking care of families in Wyoming. Many of those families included family members who were on Medicare, the program for our seniors. Senator GRASSLEY has made some reference in his earlier comments about seniors, people who are on Medicare, people who are having a harder time finding a doctor. This health care law clearly had an impact on seniors as well.

So I would ask my colleague from Iowa, are there specific things the Senator has been hearing as he travels around the State and visits with folks at home in terms of perhaps promises made specifically to seniors and those broken promises related to Medicare?

Mr. GRASSLEY. That is not only a promise that has been broken, that is a promise that is very easy to quantify because, on July 29, 2009, during the consideration of this health care reform law, the President said:

Medicare is a government program. But don’t worry: I’m not going to touch it.

So let’s take a look at the health care law and see if that promise was kept. The health care law made significant cuts in Medicare programs. This is what we can quantify in dollars and cents.

On April 22, 2010, the Chief Actuary of Medicare analyzed the law and found that it would cut Medicare by \$575 bil-

lion over 10 years. The President said, about Medicare, as I told you, “I’m not going to touch it.” But the President has touched it in a big way: \$575 billion out of Medicare.

Medicare is on a path to go broke by 2021; \$575 billion is not going to guarantee Medicare for everybody in the future. We have to reform and change Medicare if that promise is going to be kept. We all want to do that, but the President has made that more difficult.

The Congressional Budget Office wrote that over \$500 billion in Medicare reductions “would not enhance the ability of the government to pay for future Medicare benefits.” You know what the President said during the debate on this bill: “I’m not going to touch it.” But he has touched it in a big way.

The Chief Actuary had this to say about the Medicare reductions:

Providers—

Meaning hospitals and doctors—

Providers for whom Medicare constitutes a substantive portion of their business could find it difficult to remain profitable and, absent legislative intervention, might end their participation in the program.

So not only touching 500-and-some billion dollars, but also touching it in a way of limiting access for senior citizens of America when the President said, “I’m not going to touch it,” he misled the American people.

The CM Actuary said, in essence, these cuts could drive providers from the Medicare Program. I have a hard time understanding how these massive cuts to Medicare count as somehow: I’m not going to touch Medicare.

On the other hand, the biggest problem facing Medicare in the near term is a physicians payment update problem that we constantly have to address and could have been addressed in the health care reform bill. You know what. It was not addressed. Of course nothing was done about it. Perhaps that is what the President meant when he said about Medicare, I say to the Senator from Wyoming, “I’m not going to touch it.”

Mr. BARRASSO. That clearly points out to the people around the country what they know, and if they are on Medicare that it is that much more challenging for them to even find a doctor because of the \$500 billion of cuts to Medicare—and not to save Medicare, not to strengthen Medicare, but to start a whole new government program for other people. So those are several of the promises the President made.

We just heard from my colleague from Iowa, “if you like what you have, you can keep it.” We know that promise has been broken, and now the promises by the President—I will protect Medicare—which is clearly not the case, as the American people have seen, which is why this health care law is even more unpopular today than it was when it was passed.

But thinking back to the time it was passed, the Senator from Missouri Mr.

BLUNT, who is joining us on the floor, was very actively involved in the debate and the discussions in pointing out the concerns people in his home State had with regard to the health care law and the objections he heard. My recollection is that there was even an issue on the ballot about the health care law and mandates and related issues.

So I ask my friend and colleague from Missouri if there are comments he would like to add to help with this discussion of the broken promises of the Obama health care law.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I thank the doctor for his leadership on this issue during the debate on the health care law itself and right up to now, the second anniversary of it being signed into law. Certainly Missouri voters were the first voters who went to the polling place and registered their views on this. As I recall, 72 percent said they did not want to be a part of it. The famous comment made on the other side of the building by the Speaker—we will know what is in the bill once we pass it—has proven to be very true and not very positive from the point of view of that bill.

The Senator from Wyoming and Senator GRASSLEY have talked about the promises made already—the promise not to touch Medicare, the promise that if you like what you have, you can keep it—surely nobody can say that with a straight face anymore—and the promise during the campaign that there wouldn’t be a mandate.

Four years ago this was the big division of the two principal candidates for the nomination on that side. Senator Obama’s view was that there would be no mandate, that there was no need for a mandate. In fact, at one point he said that having a mandate would be like solving homelessness by mandating that everybody buy a house. Now, that is not my quote, that is President Obama’s quote when he was Senator Obama—having a mandate on health care would be like solving the housing problem by saying we are going to require that everybody buy a house.

This plan does not work. It doesn’t come together. The parts of the plan that were supposed to pay for the plan are one by one being discarded.

Remember the so-called CLASS Act, the long-term care act, which technically, I guess, would have produced some money because it collected money the first 10 years; the first 10 years, we are counting the money and we are not allowed to spend any of it for the first 10 years. So, sure, that would be a net income to the Federal Government. We are not spending and money is coming in. But even the Secretary of Health and Human Services said what many of us said at the time, which is that this plan won’t work, so we are not even going to collect the money because we know there is no way this particular structure will do what it is supposed to do.

It is just one broken promise after another, it is just one set of provisions



after another, and the more the American people look at it, the more they realize this just doesn't add up. Not only does it not add up financially, it doesn't add up to better health care.

We are going to see lots of people—the Congressional Budget Office recently estimated that I think 20 million people who get insurance now at work would lose that insurance at work once this goes into effect, and that was not a calculation in the original bill. Everybody was at least calculating that anybody who has insurance now would keep what their employer would continue to pay for. Well, for 20 million of them, apparently, that is not going to be the case.

I yield to the Senator from Wyoming on that topic of just what employers are going to have to decide to do once they are faced with this new mandated policy that covers not only what they think they can afford but whatever some government official decides is the perfect policy for all Americans. Now, imagine that—the perfect policy for all Americans. One-size-fits-all almost always means that one size doesn't fit anybody. And these employers, it is now understood, are in many cases just going to take the option that they will pay the penalty that is less than they are paying now for insurance or they are going to have to require their employees to go get their insurance in a subsidized exchange. That means taxpayers will be helping buy insurance for people who today have insurance through their employers at the rate of at least 20 million, and I think that number will be a lot higher than that.

Mr. BARRASSO. Well, it does seem that way to me, to the point that now, 2 years out, Senator COBURN and I put together a report on what we are finding. It is a checkup on the Federal health law, and the title is "Warning: Side Effects." That is because there are huge side effects from this health care law. The four that we have written out on the prescription pad, as we see it, on the prescription pad handed out by President Obama, No. 1 is fewer choices; No. 2, we have higher taxes; No. 3, more government; and No. 4 is less innovation. That is what the American people are seeing as the side effects of this health care law. People don't want few choices, they want more choices. People don't want higher taxes, they want lower taxes. They don't want more government, they want less government. They don't want less innovation, they want more innovation. That is what the American people asked for.

There was a reason to do health care reform—because people wanted the care they need from a doctor they want at a cost they can afford. I know that is what my colleague from Iowa sees when he goes home every weekend and talks to people in his home communities.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, if I could add one thing at this point, we don't really know how bad this law is

yet. I am going to add something to what Senator BLUNT said when he quoted the Speaker of the House saying that we don't really know what is in this bill and we are going to have to pass it to find out what is in it. That is what she had to say to get a majority vote even within her own party to get it through the House of Representatives. But, in a sense, she is right. One could understand every letter of this law, but it has 1,693 delegations of authority for the Secretary to write regulations, and until they are written, we aren't really going to know what is in it. We remember the accountable care organization rules that came out. Six pages out of 2,700 in the bill dealt with accountable care organizations, but the first regulations that were written were 350 pages long. So we really won't know how bad this legislation is maybe for a few years down the road, and hopefully we never get that far down the road.

Mr. BARRASSO. My understanding of the accountable care organization component is that the very health programs the accountable care organizations were modeled after, the ones the President held up as the models across the country—one was in Utah, one was Geisinger in Pennsylvania, and I believe the Mayo Clinic may have been a third—once those 350 pages of regulations came out, the programs the President said were the models we want to follow, they all said: We can't comply with these regulations. They are too stringent. They are too confining. They will not work in our program.

So if it is not going to work in the places where the President said they are doing it well, to me that means they are not going to work anywhere in Wyoming and very likely not anywhere in Iowa or anywhere in Missouri as we try to make sure patients get the care they need from the doctor they want at a cost they can afford.

That is why I continue to look at this health care law and go home every weekend and talk to people, and I continue to hear that this bill is bad for patients, bad for providers—the nurses and the doctors who take care of the patients—and bad for taxpayers.

When we take a look at Medicare—and Senator BLUNT made a comment about Medicare and some of the changes—who is going to make these decisions? It looks to me as though, from reading through this law, it is about 15 unelected bureaucrats with this so-called Independent Payment Advisory Board who will decide what hospitals will get paid for providing various services. So in small communities, the hospital may say: Well, we can no longer offer that service. I have heard my colleagues talk about the specific loss of the ability of hospitals to even stay profitable with some of the cuts, from taking \$500 billion away from Medicare, again, not to save and strengthen Medicare but to start a whole new government program for others.

Those are the things we are dealing with and why, at townhall meeting after townhall meeting, people continue to tell me they want this repealed and they want it replaced with patient-centered health care—not government-centered, not insurance company-centered, but patient-centered health care. That is what people are asking for, and they get tired of all these broken promises the President has made.

I remember the President said he was going to bring down the price of premiums by \$2,500 per family per year. What family wouldn't want that? The whole purpose of the health care law initially was to get the costs of health care under control. This didn't do it.

If I go to a townhall meeting, as I did not too long ago in Wyoming, and say: How many of you under the new health care law are finding that you are paying more for health insurance, not the \$2,500 less a year the President promised, but how many are paying more, every hand goes up. Then we ask the question: How many of you believe the quality and the availability of your own care is going to go down as a result of this health care law, and every hand goes up. I know that in the Show Me State of Missouri, that is not what people want. They don't want to pay more and get less. I don't know if my colleague has been hearing things similar to that at home.

Mr. BLUNT. I think that is what we are all hearing. Whether you are for this bill or not, my guess is that you are hearing that if you are asking that question.

Another of the President's promises was that an average family, if this health care plan went into effect, would pay \$2,500 less, as the doctor just said, per year. In fact, since he became President, insurance premiums have risen by \$2,213 a year—not a \$2,500 cut but a \$2,213 increase, according to the Kaiser Family Foundation. The survey says that in 2008, for employer-provided insurance, the average family premium was \$12,860. Last year it was \$15,073. These are incredible increases for families, coupled with the bad energy policies and other policies that put families into a condition they would hope not to be in and we hope for them not to be in. So you have increased costs to families, increased costs to the system.

That is the other thing the President said. Another broken promise was that this health care bill would control costs. Recently, according to the Medicare Actuary—the person who calculates these costs—the estimate was that national health spending would go up at least \$311 billion over 10 years under this plan. Now, that is not cost control; that is \$311 billion, almost one-third of \$1 trillion in increases.

Payment reductions to hospitals—the Senator from Wyoming mentioned this board that will make these decisions. I am not sure there will be

enough people on that board who understand rural hospitals and understand why it is critical that rural hospitals that are critical-care hospitals continue to have different arrangements with the government than others do for the government-provided health care, such as Medicare and Medicaid. And if they understand that, there may not be enough people on the board who understand the unique needs of urban hospitals that have a heavily uninsured population.

How is this 15-member board going to be better than the 500 Members who serve people in Washington now, trying to look at specifics and then be accountable? To whom is this board accountable? What decision do they make that somebody can challenge in a meaningful way, in a way that they would be really concerned about?

So it doesn't control costs as the President said it would. It doesn't reduce insurance costs as the President said it would. I think it will wind up with maybe even more people uninsured as long as the penalty paid is less than the premiums paid, particularly for young workers who are outside the system today. Under the President's plan, we eliminate the advantage they have for being young and healthy by saying: No, you can't really classify groups, whereas if a person gets life insurance, that person will certainly pay more if they are 75 than if they are 27. They are just going to pay less. It is the same way today for health insurance as well because it is clear that the likelihood of a person using that plan at 26 is different than it is at 62. So all of these things just don't add up, and people are beginning to figure that they don't add up.

I thought Senator GRASSLEY made a very good point about even when we passed the bill, we wouldn't know all of the costs of this bill until it actually goes into effect. I am very much in support of his view that we never want to let this get so far down the road where we would know how much it would really cost or all the rules and regulations we would really have because it will head health care in a direction where we might not be able to reverse course and get to a health care system that is really focused on patients and health care providers rather than government bureaucrats deciding what is the best health care for everybody. I want my doctor to decide. I want to be part of that discussion. I do not want some government bureaucrat deciding what procedure is the only procedure that is acceptable for me.

Mr. BARRASSO. It is interesting—because I know the Senator goes home, as I do, very often to talk to many of the small business owners in the State of Missouri, as I do in Wyoming, and as Senator GRASSLEY does in Iowa—one of the promises the President made is, he said 4 million small businesses may be eligible for tax credits. Well, it turns out that the key word there by the President is “may”—may be eligible.

Even the fact that the White House has sent out postcards to all these small business—the IRS spent over \$1 million of taxpayers' money to send out millions of postcards promoting the tax credit—the Treasury Department's inspector general recently testified that “the volume of credit claims has been lower than expected”—as a matter of fact, only 7 percent of the 4 million firms the administration claimed.

Why? Well, because of the complexity and the whole way the system was set up, the President was able to talk big and deliver very small. That is why so many people are very unhappy with the claims in the health care law because they know these promises have been broken.

With regard to NANCY PELOSI's famous quote—that first you have to pass it before you get to find out what is in it—that is why I come to the floor every week with a doctor's second opinion because it does seem just about every week we do learn some new unintended consequence, something new about the health care law and another reason why Americans are unhappy with it, why it remains as unpopular, if not more unpopular, today as when it was passed, and why so many people believe the Supreme Court should find this bill unconstitutional, for the reasons that do have Americans at home in an uproar, and very unhappy that the government can come into their homes and mandate that they buy a government-approved product and pay for it or pay a fine. Nothing like this has happened before, and people are, frankly, offended.

We do not know what the Supreme Court is going to do, but I know what this body ought to do. This body ought to vote to repeal and replace this broken health care law and get a health care law in place which is what the American people wanted, which is, the care they need, from the doctor they want, at a price they can afford.

We have not seen that yet. But that is why we are here on the second anniversary of the President's health care law, to continue to point out the flaws of this legislation. Quite interestingly, when you take a look at some of the national poll numbers, for people who have talked to a health care provider—whether that be a nurse, a doctor, a physician's assistant, a physical therapist, a nurse practitioner, no matter who—they are even less supportive of it than the general public.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, this Friday the Nation observes an anniversary that most Americans would prefer to see removed from its calendar. I am talking about the second anniversary of the passage of the President's health care law. Rather than celebrate this day, it is one that citizens and taxpayers have come to rue and regret. The process by which Obamacare became law was an affront to republican principles of democratic self-government. The substance of this law is an

historic threat to the liberties our Constitution was designed to secure.

A decent respect for the opinions of the American people cautioned against passing this law on a purely partisan basis. Yet in spite of the clear opposition of the American people to this massive expansion of government power, and to its historic spending and tax increases, the President and his congressional allies were determined to jam this bill through the Congress.

The architects of this strategy, if not the party loyalists who carried it out against the wishes of their constituents, sleep easy at night having done so, because they knew that this was a once-in-a-generation opportunity, the crowning achievement of the liberal bureaucratic state. A takeover of the Nation's health care sector and its top-down regulation by Washington had eluded Democrats for over 70 years.

The economic downturn of 2008 changed that. With the election of President Obama and significant majorities in the Congress, the left was not going to, in the words of the President's Chief of Staff, “let a crisis go to waste.” What this strategy meant in practice was that Democrats would advance a radical liberal agenda whether the American people supported it or not. That is the anniversary we are observing this week, and it is a dark spot on our Nation's history, in my opinion.

The Obamacare episode showed a fundamental disrespect for the opinions and constitutional common sense of the American people. Faced with growing unrest and real concerns about the impact of this law on families, the economy, and access to health care, the law's proponents assumed that the American people were too dumb to get it; that once Obamacare became law, the American people would come to love it, as well as the benefactors who gave it to them. That is what they thought. As Speaker PELOSI explained: We have to pass the bill so you can find out what is in it.

The great liberal conceit was on full display in the process that led to this bill becoming law. We know better than you, they said. We can plan one-sixth of the American economy, and you will eventually come to like it.

Well, as we all know, the American people had something else in mind. They reminded Congress and the President that in this country the people are sovereign. They stood up as free men and women rejecting Obamacare before it became law and refused to embrace it afterwards. And as their understanding of the law has deepened, they have remained constant in their commitment to full repeal. According to a Rasmussen poll this week, over half of Americans support the full repeal of Obamacare.

Next week, the Supreme Court will hear oral argument on the constitutionality of this misguided law. In arriving at their decision later this year, they will consider Obamacare through the prism of past precedents and the

Constitution's original historic meaning. But the Justices of the Supreme Court are not the only ones evaluating the constitutionality of this law. The American people and citizens of this Nation have their own obligation to consider whether this law comports with our Constitution and principles of limited government, and on that the verdict is already in. According to a recent Gallup poll, 72 percent of American adults, including 56 percent of self-professed Democrats, believe that the law's individual mandate is unconstitutional.

The average American who opposes this law on constitutional grounds might not be a law professor or an appellate advocate, but those citizens and taxpayers understand our Constitution was designed to guarantee liberty and that it did so, in part, by limiting the powers of the Federal Government and maintaining the sovereign powers of the States.

They know the unconstitutionality of ObamaCare runs far deeper than the onerous individual mandate. The law is, at its core, a violation of our most deeply held constitutional principles.

It undermines personal liberty and puts more power in the hands of the Federal Government. In the interest of advancing what the left views as a constitutional right to health care, they undermine actual constitutional rights to life, liberty, and property.

The law's mandate for abortion-inducing drugs undermines sacred rights of personal conscience and religious liberty.

Its expansion of Medicaid fundamentally transforms the relationship of the States to the Federal Government, undercutting the ability of those sovereign communities to make basic decisions about the welfare of their citizens by crowding out spending for police, infrastructure, and education.

The American people might not have submitted complex legal briefs in the Supreme Court litigation, but their conclusions about ObamaCare possess a unique and powerful wisdom. The people of Utah and the rest of this country understand the very DNA of ObamaCare—a commitment to more government control, the empowering of an already unaccountable administrative state, and an assault on free markets—is unconstitutional.

This was not what President Obama promised the American people. The President couched this government takeover of the Nation's health care sector as a modest reform designed to reduce costs.

When he spoke before a joint session of Congress in September of 2009 to push for his plan, the President promised it would "slow the growth of health care costs for our families, our businesses, and our government."

The President swung and missed on all three. According to the President's own Actuary at CMS, national health expenditures would increase by \$311 billion over the law's first 10 years. This

comes as no surprise to the American people. The President's health care law promised all sorts of new free care. But we all know, contrary to the repeated assertions of President Obama and his administration, nothing in life is free.

The bill will eventually come due for all this so-called "free care," and it is taxpayers who will pay that bill.

According to the Congressional Budget Office, "Rising costs for health care will push Federal spending up considerably as a percentage of GDP."

This is not what the President and his allies promised. We were promised lower costs. What we got were higher costs, more Federal spending on health care and, with it, more taxes and more debt.

When fully implemented, ObamaCare authorizes \$2.6 trillion in new Federal spending over 10 years. It will increase premiums by \$2,100 for families forced by ObamaCare to purchase their own insurance. Its Medicaid expansions will impose \$118 billion in new costs on the States.

It will increase spending on prescription drugs, physician and clinical services, and hospital spending. It will increase the deficit by \$701 billion over its first 10 years.

How does the President propose to pay for this? Here is how: He will pay for it by selling more Treasurys to China. He will pay for it by increasing taxes and penalties by over \$500 billion, and American workers will ultimately pay for it with 800,000 fewer jobs than would have otherwise existed.

This is not the story the President or the Democrats in Congress responsible for this law want the American people to hear. So they will attempt to spin their way out of it.

In a memo obtained by the press last week, the advocates of ObamaCare laid out their strategy to sell the merits of this misguided law prior to oral arguments at the Supreme Court.

This week was designed to lay out all the great things provided by ObamaCare. But, naturally, that memo mentions absolutely none of the costs. It doesn't mention the cost of these benefits for Federal taxpayers. It doesn't mention the costs for employers and workers. It doesn't mention that the law could lead to as many as 20 million Americans losing employer-sponsored health benefits by 2019. It doesn't mention the impact the \$½ trillion in tax increases and penalties will have on the economy, and it doesn't mention the harm this law does to our Constitution and its principles of republicanism, personal liberty, and limited government.

I wish I could say I was surprised, but I am not. ObamaCare is merely the capstone to a generations-long liberal project that has attempted to convince citizens that they can have their cake and eat it too. They can have all the benefits of an ever-expanding welfare state, and nobody—or only the very rich—would have to pay for it. ObamaCare exploded this myth. It is

the culmination of generations of government expansion, and it shows once and for all that we are all going to be paying for the liberal welfare state.

Taxing Warren Buffet is not going to cut it. All American families will pay for this \$2.6 trillion spending law one way or the other. After centralizing control of the Nation's health care system in Washington, DC, and putting health care decisions into the hands of government bureaucrats, we will all pay for it through higher taxes, less opportunity, and diminished access to care.

Our children are going to have to pay for it, as a nation conceived in liberty is increasingly burdened by an unsustainable national indebtedness; that is, unless the American people get the final word on this. They certainly should.

I believe in the American people. I know what my fellow Utahans think about the President's health care law. No less than legislators or Justices, they take the Constitution seriously. They know this law is unconstitutional. They know what it does to free markets and to free men and women. They know that if this law is constitutional, then there are effectively no limits on what the Federal Government can do. They know this law has to go. I look forward to showing it the door.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has used 30 minutes.

Mr. BARRASSO. Thank you very much, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. BROWN of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I enjoyed the preceding presentation by the Senators dealing with issues surrounding health care. I think it is a very relevant discussion we need to all pay attention to.

AMENDMENT NO. 1884

I want to talk on two issues today. I will start first with the crowdfunding amendment that has been offered by Senators BENNET, MERKLEY, and me—something we have been working on in a truly bipartisan manner, as it should be done here, and as I do many of my actions.

For those of you who may be listening either up in the gallery or on television, crowdfunding is an opportunity for individuals to invest money upwards of \$1,000, upwards of \$1 million total—so \$1,000 per person, totaling \$1 million—not dealing with a lot of the traditional SEC filings that are in place and a lot of the other problems in which only very wealthy people in years past have been able to participate in these types of offerings.

For example, right now, if I had a good idea, and I wanted some of my friends to invest in it, and then we go and start marketing, we could not do that. That is illegal. One of the President's objectives in his jobs speech was to talk about these new opportunities, and crowdfunding is one of them. He

supports it. The House has done a similar crowdfunding bill. We are actually taking this crowdfunding opportunity and putting a little bit more safeguard in it.

I think our bill is different—well, I know our bill is different than the House bill in that the House bill does not require that you actually are a legal business or even some kind of incorporated legal forum before you try to issue stock. That bothers me somewhat in that you could have somebody in their living room taking people's money and issuing stock with no check and balance, and I think that is important.

It also does not require that you offer securities through an intermediary. You could put up your own Twitter site: Buy shares is my great idea. Come on and buy shares.

All the experts agree that we would need to require an intermediary, say, like an eBay, where the crowd can help identify the good and bad players, the way that eBay uses identified bad sellers on their site.

But also, as I said, it allows investments to take place that cannot be done right now, and allows those entities, those groups, to take that money and either use it as the investment seed money to create those new ideas and new jobs—as we know, startup businesses are the entities that are actually looking to create jobs at this point—and/or use that money as seed money to go to a more traditional lender and say: Hey, we have a great idea and we also have some money to back it up, and we would ask you to sign on with us.

I am hopeful the amendment comes up. I understand it is. I am looking forward to having that very important vote. I would appreciate, obviously, the Presiding Officer and everyone else giving strong consideration to that.

REAUTHORIZATION OF THE VIOLENCE AGAINST  
WOMEN ACT

Mr. President, I wish to shift gears for a minute and talk about the Violence Against Women Act. As we know—you may not know—Jessica Pripstein of Easthampton, Lisa Stilkey of Douglas, Belinda Torres of Worcester, Kristin Broderick of Haverill, Patricia Frois of Marshfield, Edinalva Viera of Brighton, Milka Rivera of Lawrence, Nazish Noorani of East Boston, Casey Taylor of Winthrop, Alessa Castellon of Roslindale, Lauren Astley of Wayland, Michael Trusty of Edgartown, Janice Santos of Worcester, Beth Spartichino of Easton, Son Tran of Lowell, Jettie Lincoln of Plymouth, David Walton of Tauton, Elaine McCall of Wakefield, Jennifer Freudenthal of Webster, Brian Bergeron of Malden, Lancelot Reid of Dorchester, Joel Echols of Springfield, Maria Avelina Palaguachi-Cela of Brockton, Troy Burston of Medford, Joseph Scott of Worcester, and Aderito Cardoso of Brockton—are constituents of mine who have been killed by their husbands, wives, partners, girlfriends,

or boyfriends in domestic violence incidents in 2011 and 2012 alone, and it is only March of this year.

It is unacceptable. The loss of those lives is tragic. But in addition to the people who have lost their lives, the lives of the victims' children, families, and friends have been destroyed. I know because I was a victim of domestic violence. As a child, I watched as my mother was beaten by abusive stepfathers. I did what I could to protect my mom and my sister, but as a young boy there was only so much I could do.

I remember vividly being a 6-year-old boy going to protect my mom and getting beaten on until the police came. It is something that still lives with me, and I try to use that experience and knowledge to help in many different ways.

When I was growing up, quite frankly, there were not the resources that are available to victims today. I wish my mother had known back then that she was not alone. I wish she could have used one of the fantastic support providers that now exist in Massachusetts today. Since being elected to the Senate, I have been moved by the organizations in my State that are stepping to the plate—and continuously step to the plate each and every day—to provide support to victims of domestic violence.

Quite frankly, as a government, we have made tremendous progress in helping victims get their lives back in order—not only the victims themselves but the family members of those victims.

The Violence Against Women Act was first signed into law in 1994, as you know, and made a bold statement that we would redouble our efforts to support law enforcement efforts to crack down on offenders and assist those working in our communities to provide assistance to victims seeking a new life away from the violence they had been subjected to.

In each reauthorization we have improved upon the previous bill and made it stronger and made stronger commitments to those who have been abused. Now is not the time—let me repeat: now is not the time—to take our foot off the gas and avoid dealing with this problem.

The landmark Violence Against Women Act must be reauthorized this year. I am incredibly proud to have co-sponsored this reauthorization when it first came to my attention. I believe it makes critical commitments against this horrific problem.

Historically, VAWA has been a bipartisan effort, where both parties locked arms in support of our enforcement and victims against perpetrators of domestic violence. It was a glimmer of hope for an otherwise contentious and overly partisan atmosphere. I have to tell you—this is not the first time I have said this—but there is no Democratic bill that is going to pass, there is no Republican bill that is going to pass, for those listening. It needs to be a bi-

partisan, bicameral bill that the President will sign.

I have been deeply troubled to see that this year's reauthorization has become, once again, partisan. There is no reason for it. There is no excuse for it. We just did the Hire a Hero veterans bill, we did the 3-percent withholding, we are doing the insider trading, we did the highway bill. There is no reason we cannot do the VAWA bill on a completely nonpartisan basis.

I am on the floor today to call on my colleagues to band together and pass this reauthorization and send a very strong signal to Americans that the Senate—yes, the Senate—stands united in recognizing victims from across the country, to give them the help they need and, obviously, deserve.

In Massachusetts, VAWA is supported by law enforcement and many service providers that are on the front lines in assisting domestic violence victims. I know. Previously, as an attorney, I dealt with family law matters. I know of the yeoman's work these entities do.

On Friday, I will be visiting Voices Against Violence in Framingham, MA. They receive VAWA funding to support direct services to victims and survivors of sexual assault and ensure that a trained rape crisis counselor is available after hours and on weekends.

The YMCA in central Massachusetts in Worcester uses those funds for a proactive program that has service providers working very closely with law enforcement to provide information to domestic violence victims and advocate on their behalf—at a time when, quite frankly, these folks need advocates.

Because of VAWA, REACH Beyond Abuse in Waltham has supported many cutting-edge prevention efforts with teens and the placement of advocates in police departments as a symbiotic, a give-and-take relationship in those departments.

The Jeanne Geiger Crisis Center in Newburyport, where my dad lives, used VAWA funds to establish a high-risk homicide prevention project and was recently recognized by the White House for their work.

I could go on and on and on about the tremendous involvement and great organizations not only in my State but throughout this country that are making a difference in the lives of victims. We need to stand as a body and not get into party rhetoric, and declare to women across America that they are not alone in this fight. We need to do everything in our power to help the millions of women like my mom who were once in this situation and are now survivors. And we need to help them become survivors, not victims. So I call upon my colleagues to join me in sending a very strong bipartisan vote and get this done.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARDIN). Will the Senator withhold his request?

Mr. BROWN of Massachusetts. Yes. I am sorry. I did not see the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts for his remarks in support of the Violence Against Women Act. I believe the bill will be before us shortly. We will count on Senator BROWN's vote. So we look forward to that.

TRIBUTES TO SENATOR BARBARA MIKULSKI

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to a public servant, a social worker, and a tenacious advocate for vulnerable Americans. I rise today to honor a trailblazer and a mentor for me and countless others. I rise today to honor an outstanding U.S. Senator from Maryland and the dean of the Senate women, my friend BARBARA MIKULSKI.

I am privileged to have represented California in this body for almost 20 years. When I first ran for the Senate, back in 1992, I received a call from BARBARA MIKULSKI, personally urging me on and reaching out to provide encouragement.

I have relied on her advice, her friendship, and the Mikulski brand of candor ever since. As a matter of fact, one of my fondest evenings was a three-onion martini right down the street.

It is hard to believe, but when Senator MIKULSKI took office in 1987, there was only one other woman in this body, Senator Nancy Kassebaum, later Nancy Kassebaum Baker, the great Republican Senator from Kansas. Increasing the number of women in the Senate has been painfully slow. In 1991, the ranks of women in this body rose to three, then later to seven after the 1992 election. Today we have 17 women in this body and 76 in the House. As Senator MIKULSKI reflected in the Washington Post last year:

Women were so rare even holding statewide political office [back then] . . . I was greeted with a lot of skepticism from my male colleagues. Was I going to go the celebrity route or the Senate route? I had to work very hard.

And she has. BARBARA has worked very hard to become an outstanding legislator and a trailblazing public official. Let me list a few of her firsts. She was the first female Democrat to serve in both Chambers of Congress—that in itself is impressive—the first female Democrat to be elected to the Senate without succeeding her husband or her father; the first woman to chair a Senate appropriations subcommittee; the first woman to serve a quarter century in the Senate; and the first woman elevated to a Senate leadership position.

She is the only current Member of Congress in the National Women's Hall of Fame. And she is not done yet. Just last week, BARB achieved another historic first. According to the Senate Historical Office, she reached 12,858 days of service, becoming the longest serving female Member of Congress in our Nation's history.

Senator MIKULSKI was born and raised in Baltimore. Determined to make a difference in her community—and you know that well, Mr. President—and guided by her Catholic belief and a belief in social justice, she became a social worker, helping at-risk children and educating seniors about Medicare. She once said, "I feel that I am my brother's keeper and my sister's keeper." Social work evolved into community activism when BARB successfully organized communities against a plan to build a highway through Baltimore's Fells Point neighborhood.

Shortly thereafter, in 1971, she was elected to the Baltimore City Council where she served 5 years. That was about the time I was elected to the Board of Supervisors in 1970 in San Francisco. In 1976, she ran for Congress and won, representing Maryland's 3rd District for a decade. She was then elected to the Senate and has won reelection in 1992, 1998, 2004 and 2010 by large majorities.

As I said, BARB is an accomplished legislator. She is also one of the very best. She cares passionately about quality education and ensuring every student has access to higher education. She is a fighter for stem cell research to cure our most tragic and debilitating diseases. She is a tireless advocate for the National Institutes of Health. And she is a leader on women's health, writing law requiring Federal standards for mammograms, and a fearless proponent of breast and cervical cancer screenings and treatment for uninsured women.

We serve together on the Intelligence Committee. She asks some of the most prescient questions. I have seen her commitment to the FBI, to fighting terrorism, and also to cybersecurity where she headed a task force for our committee that has resulted in the cybersecurity legislation newly pending.

Finally, she has led the way to strengthen pay equity for women. The Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Restoration Act is the law of the land today because of BARBARA MIKULSKI's effort. As BARB said when we passed the bill:

I believe that people should be judged solely by their individual skills, competence, unique talent and nothing else in the workplace. Once you get a job because of your skill and talent, you better get equal pay for equal work.

Or, in a manner that best captures BARB's candor, she said, "Women of America, square your shoulders, put on your lipstick, suit up, and let's close that wage gap once and for all." To me, that is classic BARBARA MIKULSKI.

Let me close with a story. Every so often at BARBARA's leadership, the Senate women get together for dinner. There is no agenda or staff, just Republican women, Democratic women, and a lot of lively conversation. We talk about our families, we talk about the workplace, we talk about the world, and, of course, we even talk, to some extent, about this place. Sometimes we enjoy Senator MIKULSKI's world-fa-

mous crab cakes, the best you will ever taste, and second only to the Dungeness crab of the west coast, I might add. If you have not, make sure you try the recipe on her Web site. We talk about our families and the way we can work together. It is a throwback to the civility of the Senate. These dinners are when BARB really stands out as the dean of Senate women.

Women in this country have always had to fight for the most basic of rights. I think young women forget that it was not until 1920 that we were able to vote in this country, and it was only because women fought for it. BARB will be the first to say her milestones are symbols of how far she has come. But she will also show us how much farther women have to go.

Today we take it for granted that a woman can be Secretary of State—we have had two—or Speaker of the House—we have had one or a candidate for President. Not quite yet. Oh, no, I take that back. We have had one. And one day soon, a woman will sit in the Oval Office of this great country. When she does, she will owe a great deal to BARBARA MIKULSKI.

But on this day, let the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of this Senate reflect and forever record that Senator BARBARA MIKULSKI is the longest serving woman in the history of the United States Congress, and this country is forever better because of it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I came here to talk on another matter, but I wish to take a few minutes to talk about my friend BARBARA MIKULSKI. We have served a long time together. When she came to this body, I think I may have been chairman of what was then called the Labor and Human Resources Committee, now the Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee.

From the day she got on that committee, she made a difference in every way, not just for women but for every single American in this country. I have a tremendous amount of profound respect for Senator MIKULSKI and what she has been able to accomplish.

Let me mention one thing. Back in the early 1990s, she and I worked together on what was called the FDA Revitalization Act. That act was a very important one, because we had the FDA spread out all over the Greater Washington, DC, area, probably 30, 35 different offices, some of which were in converted chicken coops. It was ridiculous to have these top scientists in anything but a centralized location with top computerization and all of the other scientific instruments they need to do this work for the American people. I have to say that BARBARA MIKULSKI played a pivotal role in helping to

develop that tremendous facility. I want you to know that I do not think it would have been developed without her effort and her dogged work to make sure that we now have a centralized—and it still needs improvement but centralized FDA campus that literally is saving the lives of millions of people and making the lives of millions of people better.

I could go on and on. But I have a lot of respect for my distinguished colleague from Maryland. I would feel badly if I did not get up and tell people how much I do respect her. She believes in what she does. She loves this body, most of the time, I think. And she cares for her fellow Senators. We care for her. I want her to know that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I rise to join my colleagues in honoring our friend and colleague who is often regarded as the dean of the women in the Senate, BARBARA MIKULSKI.

Earlier this week Senator MIKULSKI added to her already long list of accomplishments the distinction of being the longest serving female Member of Congress in the history of the United States of America.

Senator MIKULSKI's life is a story of the American dream. Raised in a working-class immigrant family in the east Baltimore neighborhood of Highlandtown, Senator MIKULSKI learned at a young age about the struggles of working families and ethnic Americans and the value of paying it forward.

She helped at her father's grocery store, which opened early in the morning so that steelworkers could buy lunch before their morning shift. She delivered food to seniors and families when parts of her neighborhood were set on fire after the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King. At one point she even rode on the top of a tank to deliver the groceries.

Senator MIKULSKI's roots helped shape her role today as a mentor, fighter, and true public servant. She worked as a social worker for Catholic Charities, helping at-risk children and counseling seniors on Medicare. She had her start in politics as a community organizer and social worker.

In 1970—one side of BARBARA MIKULSKI her colleagues have certainly seen is her dogged determination—she organized Marylanders to stop a 16-lane highway project that would have threatened Fells Point and another neighborhood in Baltimore. She got the job done. Many people say that work helped to save Fells Point and the Inner Harbor, two of the showcase areas in the great city of Baltimore. She gave a speech at Catholic University to a Catholic conference on the ethnic American. It caught the attention not only of people in Baltimore but far beyond its reach as she talked about her family story and the story of millions just like her.

One year later, she ran for and won a seat on the Baltimore City Council—

the first step in her now 41-year career in public service.

Over the course of the Senate's 223-year history, there have only been 38 female Members; the first, Rebecca Latimer Felton, of Georgia, was appointed for political reasons to fill a vacancy, and she served only a single day in 1922.

Senator MIKULSKI has so many firsts in her story of public service. She was the first woman elected to the Senate in her own right—the first—and not because of a husband or father or someone who served before her in higher office. She was the first woman Democrat to serve in both Chambers of Congress—the first. Last year, she was inducted into the National Women's Hall of Fame for her trailblazing political career, including, with this recognition today, becoming the longest serving woman Senator in the history of our Nation.

Given her years of experience, it is no wonder other Members of Congress have turned to her for guidance, men and women alike.

I can recall so many meetings of our Democratic caucus when, after a long debate involving many people saying many things, BARBARA MIKULSKI would stand and, in a few terse words, get it right. At the end of the day people would say: That is what we ought to do. She has this insight based on her life experience and her ability to try to peel through the layers of the political onion and get to the heart of the issue.

Following the election of a number of esteemed women into the Senate, a lot of reporters deemed 1992 as “The Year of the Woman.” Senator MIKULSKI's response was so typical and so right. This is what she said:

Calling 1992 the “year of the woman” makes it sound like the “year of the caribou,” or the “year of asparagus.” We are not a fad, a fancy, or a year.

That was typical BARBARA. Senator MIKULSKI rises above and beyond all that. From her first days in the Senate in 1987, she has fought an uphill battle to address the most important issues of national importance.

First and foremost for her is her family, next is her great State of Maryland. She is a fearless advocate, and I know the Presiding Officer knows that better than most as her colleague from that great State.

She has supported educational initiatives, veterans causes, interstate commerce, access to health care and women's health and fair pay.

The Chair knows the answer to this question, but some of those listening to the debate might not. What was the first bill that the newly elected President Barack Obama signed in the White House with a public ceremony? It was a bill BARBARA MIKULSKI pushed hard for, the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Restoration Act, so women going to work all over the United States—not just in the Senate—would get a fair shake when it comes to the compensation for the jobs they did. It was Presi-

dent Obama's first bill. When he signed it, the very first pen he handed over to Senator BARBARA MIKULSKI. I was there and I saw it.

Championed by Senator MIKULSKI, the long-awaited and much needed bill clarifies time limits for workers to file unemployment discrimination lawsuits, making it easier for people to get the pay they deserve regardless of race, age or gender.

I wish to start here—but I don't know where I would end—to talk about the important issues she has worked for. Let me talk about health care for a minute. When we set out to pass this historic affordable health care act, BARBARA was assigned the job to make sure it connected with the families and workers across America in a very real way, to make sure that at the end of the day we weren't talking to ourselves or engaged in political gibberish but passing a law that could literally change a life for the better. She led that effort and made invaluable contributions to the substance of that bill.

We knew those provisions would be important and that they would work because we knew where BARBARA MIKULSKI came from and we knew where her political heart resides. While it is a milestone to celebrate Senator MIKULSKI's distinction as the longest serving woman in the Congress, there is a much greater cause for celebration; Senator MIKULSKI's decades of service to this Nation is an admirable feat for any man or woman.

I extend my congratulations to my colleague and friend Senator MIKULSKI for this milestone. Thank you for what you have done for the Senate, for the State of Maryland, and for our great Nation.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant editor of the Daily Digest 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.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the hour of 2:30 having arrived, it is my honor and my pleasure to rise to honor a patriot, a pioneer, and now the longest serving woman in the Congress of the United States ever, and that is the senior Senator from Maryland BARBARA MIKULSKI.

BARBARA and I served together in the House, and we came to the Senate together in 1986. I remember that day so well, when we had our first appearance in the Senate as new Senators. It was quite a moving event for me. But one of the events I remember about that day is the presentation of Senator MIKULSKI.

We all said a word or two, and everything we said will be long forgotten. But what BARBARA MIKULSKI said, in the way she has of saying things, will not be forgotten.

Here is this woman who is not even as tall as my wife, who is 5 feet tall, but she said, "I slam-dunked Linda Chavez," her opponent. That said it all.

That was the beginning of my working closely with this good woman. She has been a friend, an inspiration to me in so many different ways in the time we have served together. When we got on the Environment and Public Works Committee, she was here, and I was here. She was always ahead of me in seniority because of her longer service in the House. On the Appropriations Committee, for more than two decades, I was here, she was here. She was always one ahead of me.

BARBARA was the first Democratic woman elected to the Senate in her own right. Last year, she surpassed the legendary Margaret Chase Smith of Maine as the longest serving woman in the history of the Senate. On Saturday, she officially surpassed Congresswoman Edith Nourse Rogers of Massachusetts, who, by the way, served in the House from 1925 to 1960 as the longest serving woman in the history of the Congress.

Senator MIKULSKI's service—and the service of many female Members of Congress—has paved the way for girls of today to know they can become Senators, they can become professional basketball players, and they can be engineers and doctors. The sky is the place they need to go, and that is where they believe they can go because of the work that has been done by BARBARA MIKULSKI.

When I came to the Senate with her, she was the only woman who served in the Senate as a Democrat. There was one other Republican at the time. Now, since then, Mr. President, I have watched very closely on this side of the aisle. Now we have 12 Democrats, and if the elections turn out the way I hope they do—and I am cautiously optimistic they will—we will have 17 women who are Democrats in the Senate.

She has been truly a trailblazer. We recognize BARBARA's achievements today and her outstanding record as a tireless advocate for the State of Maryland. She grew up in the Highlandtown neighborhood of east Baltimore. She learned the value of hard work by working in and watching her dad, especially, open that family grocery store and work from early in the morning until night. He sold lunch to steelworkers and other people who came by that little grocery store.

In high school she was educated by the nuns at the Institute of Notre Dame. She credits the nuns with instilling in her faith and a thirst for justice. She went on to study at Mount Saint Agnes College, which is now part of Loyola College in Maryland. She earned her master's degree in social work from the University of Maryland.

BARBARA was a social worker and has always been proud of the fact that she has been a social worker. She was employed by Catholic Charities and the

City of Baltimore's Department of Social Services. I can imagine what a dynamo she was—and she still is. There is no work harder than being a social worker. The problems one sees and has to deal with are extremely difficult.

During her years as a social worker, she was a powerful voice for children and seniors in need of an advocate. BARBARA MIKULSKI then and now is an advocate. It was there the spark for service and activism was lit, but it was a plan to build a 16-lane highway that fanned the flames that had been lit by her activism.

The highway would have gutted historic Fells Point, a neighborhood that she believed should have been protected. It would have uprooted homeowners in a majority African-American neighborhood. She organized the residents of Fells Point and Baltimore's Inner Harbor and stopped the construction of that highway.

That is a testament to the power of democracy that she believes in with all her soul. Looking back on that triumph, Senator MIKULSKI said:

I got into politics fighting a highway. In other countries, they take dissidents and put them in jail. In the United States of America, because of the First Amendment, they put you in the United States Senate. God bless America.

She has always been an advocate for the disenfranchised and disadvantaged in this country, but she has also been an advocate for dissidents in other countries, of whom she has spoken so eloquently on so many occasions. Her family was Polish. She has heard all the Polish jokes, and she has withstood a little of the "barbs" when neighborhoods were different than they are now. But she took special pleasure and was so proud of her heritage.

BARBARA took a special interest in the plight of Polish people oppressed under communism. We know in 1980 the people of Poland started a fledgling little group called Solidarity—a movement to engage in nonviolent resistance against communism and in support of social change.

Senator MIKULSKI and I had the wonderful pleasure of traveling under the guidance of a trip led by John Glenn—a world famous man then and now. It was a wonderful trip for a couple of new Senators. The Iron Curtain was down, and it was down hard, but we went to Poland on a codel. I can remember we had the opportunity to meet with members of the Solidarity movement. We met in secret with them, in a secret location, and Senator Glenn talked, Senator Stevens, then a senior member of the Senate at the time spoke, and I said I would like to hear from Senator MIKULSKI.

Now, Mr. President, I am not articulate enough to explain the presentation she made extemporaneously, but this powerful woman stood and talked about her heritage and her religion and what that meant to the people of America and what it should mean to the people of Poland. It was truly—and

I have told her this personally over the years on several occasions to remind her—one of the most heart-warming, stirring speeches I have ever been present to listen to. She spoke to the people assembled there—there weren't many of them—as a fellow activist. She spoke as an American of Polish descent and a fellow Catholic. She spoke as one of them. When that presentation was completed, everyone knew she was one of them.

It took almost a decade for the Solidarity movement to strike victory in Poland, and I know Senator MIKULSKI's speech was not the reason, but I guarantee you it was one of the reasons they had the audacity and the courage to proceed as they did.

Remember, Poland was an interesting country. It was the only country behind the Iron Curtain where the Communists could not destroy their educational system, and that was because of the strength of the Catholic Church in Poland at that time. Solidarity's victory in Poland inspired a stream of peaceful anti-Communist revolutions that eventually caused the fall of communism entirely all over Eastern Europe.

BARBARA's Polish ancestry and the Polish community in which she grew up in Baltimore were very important to her, but I never knew it until that moment in Warsaw with those few members of Solidarity who were assembled to honor us.

Her great-grandmother had come here from Poland with just a few pennies in her pocket—literally—but she had a dream of a better life for her and her family. This is what BARBARA MIKULSKI said about her great-grandmother.

She didn't even have the right to vote, and in this great country of ours, in three generations, I joined the United States Senate.

It was a remarkable feat for her. But, more importantly, it was a confirmation of the American dream. For BARBARA, what began as community activism, a fight against a highway, grew into a successful career in public service.

I just want to add a side note, Mr. President, and talk about something very personal to me. When Senator David Pryor got sick, he was the Democratic conference secretary in the Senate. That opened up a spot in the Senate leadership. That was something I thought would be interesting to me. It was known who was interested in filling that spot, and I knew BARBARA was interested.

I went to BARBARA and said: BARBARA, if you want it, it is yours. Two years later, Wendell Ford decided he was going to retire. He was the whip. I can still remember that morning walking from the Hart Building over to the Russell Building, in that long walkway there, and I saw BARBARA MIKULSKI. I didn't say a word to her.

She said: I want to talk to you. She said: You supported me when I wanted to be the conference secretary. You

want to be the whip, I am supporting you. But for BARBARA MIKULSKI, I would not have had that leadership position. Once the Democratic caucus knew BARBARA MIKULSKI supported me, it was all over. I won. And I won because she came to me, as she did that morning.

So, Mr. President, my respect, admiration, and love for this woman is difficult for me to describe, but it is there. BARBARA MIKULSKI ran for Congress and won after serving on the city council of Baltimore for 5 years. She represented Maryland's Third District for 10 years before winning the seat in the Senate she now holds.

Again, I appreciate all she has done for me—so many different things she has done for me. As a very able member of the Appropriations Committee and somebody who loves this institution, I am in awe of the legislative record of this amazing woman.

She has been a dedicated representative not only for the State of Maryland but the State of Nevada. One thing she did for me—and there have been a lot of them—when we were new Senators and she was on one of the subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee concerning veterans benefits and affairs, as a favor to me she traveled to Reno, NV, to look at an old veterans hospital. She went through it and said: This is not the way a veterans hospital should be, and I, BARBARA MIKULSKI, am going to change it. And she did.

Through the appropriations process we renovated and improved that hospital so it was one of the better hospitals at the time. So I am grateful for this good woman, an advocate for parity for women on everything from salary to health care access. But for BARBARA MIKULSKI the National Institutes of Health would not have a center for women. She got a little upset when she learned they had done a study of the effect of aspirin on people's hearts and she realized they had tested 10,000 people and they were all men.

I had a situation that arose in Nevada about at the same time where three women came to me who had something called interstitial cystitis, a devastating, debilitating, painful disease that is described as running slivers of glass up and down your bladder. It was said to be a psychosomatic disease. These women had nowhere to go. I talked to BARBARA MIKULSKI about this, and now 40 percent of these women have medicine that takes away their symptoms totally.

I could go on here a long time, as everyone can see. But I do it because I congratulate BARBARA on this milestone, which is so important to me and the Senate, and to tell her how much Nevada appreciates her. It is not just for Maryland. She has done things for the entire country.

I wish her well for years to come.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader is recognized.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, it is my honor to be here this afternoon to

extend, on behalf of the Republican Conference of the U.S. Senate, our respect and admiration for the senior Senator from Maryland on achieving this important milestone.

I am sure she would be the first to tell you that becoming the longest serving woman in the Congress wasn't easy. A life in public service is filled with many highs and lows. But BARBARA is nothing if not both tough and resilient.

BARBARA would point to her upbringing as the daughter of a Baltimore grocer, where she learned firsthand how hard work, honesty, and determination can lead to a successful and rewarding life. She later learned, while fighting a freeway that would have destroyed several Baltimore communities, including her own, that if you fought hard enough for something you believed in, you too can make a difference. So if you knew BARBARA back then, it wouldn't surprise you we are honoring her today.

Last year, when Senator MIKULSKI became the longest serving female Senator, she said she never saw herself as a historical figure. To me, BARBARA said, history is powdered wigs and Jane Addams and Abigail Adams, both pioneers in their own right.

However, BARBARA is a pioneer. She is only the second woman to be elected to both the Senate and the House. When first elected in 1986, she was only the 16th woman to serve. Today, in Congress, there are 76 women in the House and 17 in the Senate. As dean of the Senate women, she served as a role model and a mentor to many of these women. To put this in perspective: When she first arrived in the Senate, there weren't any natural mentors to teach her the ways of the Senate. At the time, even the Senate gym was off limits. A lot has changed since then, and BARBARA had a lot to do with it.

Later, as more women were elected to the Senate, BARBARA worked with them to help them understand the Senate and how best to be an effective Senator, both here and back home. She wanted to give back.

Most importantly, regardless of party or issue, BARBARA would push her female colleagues in the Senate to think differently, encouraging them to think of themselves as a force—a force of good and, oft times, a force for change. I know many are grateful not only for BARBARA's leadership and courage but for her willingness to take the time to share her experiences with them. I don't want to just be a first, BARBARA once said. I want to be the first of many.

In 35 years, nearly 13,000 days as a Member of Congress, BARBARA has been a champion of the space program, science research, welfare reform, major transportation, homeland security, and environmental issues in Maryland.

I wish to recognize BARBARA not only for the tremendous accomplishment as the longest serving female in the history of the United States in Congress

but also for all of her many accomplishments in the House and the Senate. As she once said herself, it is not how long you serve, but it is how well you serve.

I wish to recognize BARBARA for the pioneering model she has been to so many women in her distinguished career.

Congratulations, Senator MIKULSKI.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. STABENOW). The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Madam President, Senator MCCONNELL and I have tentatively worked out something so we will have votes tomorrow, not today. That being the case, we are not under a crunch for time here today.

We have a number of Senators here who wish to say something regarding Senator MIKULSKI, and I wish to set up an orderly time to do that. So I ask that Senator MIKULSKI be recognized. Following that, we have Senator CARDIN to be recognized for 10 minutes; Senator BOXER, 10 minutes. Senator KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON has been here since before anybody else. So following Senator BOXER, I ask that she be recognized. And Senator GILLIBRAND?

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. At the conclusion of my colleagues' remarks, 3 minutes.

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

The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I know there are a lot of us who want to pay our tribute and respect to the senior Senator from Maryland, Senator MIKULSKI. I want to make sure everybody has their opportunity. Are we operating under a consent order?

Mr. REID. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The consent order to this point has Senator CARDIN, followed by Senator BOXER, and then Senator HUTCHISON. Senator KERRY is asking to be recognized.

Mr. KERRY. I believe he included my name for 10 minutes at the same time. Madam President, I believe Senator REID included my name in that list for 10 minutes—I ask unanimous consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. Senator KERRY will be added, and a complete list will be put together.

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I am glad we could get that straight.

Let me first thank all of our colleagues who are here to pay honor to the senior Senator from Maryland, Senator MIKULSKI.

This is March Madness in basketball. Sweet 16 is starting. We are very proud in Maryland of our Lady Terps. They are in the Sweet 16. But I want you to know that we are all getting our fantasy teams, and I want Senator MIKULSKI on my fantasy basketball team because she is a true leader, she understands the importance of working together, and she is a winner.

We are proud of her roots in Maryland. She is the great-granddaughter of Polish immigrants who owned a bakery. She began her public service in



high school, where she helped deliver groceries to seniors who were locked in their apartments and she helped the homebound seniors get the food they needed. She went to the University of Maryland School of Social Work because she wanted to be a social worker. She wanted to help other people. She knew that she was good at that and she could make a difference in people's lives. She worked for Catholic Charities and dealt with children at risk and helping seniors with Medicare.

As you have heard from several of my colleagues already, she gained her reputation by taking on a highway that was scheduled to be built that would have gone through Canton and Fells Point, disrupting a neighborhood in Baltimore. This was a 16-lane highway. It was considered to be a done deal; it was going to happen. The powers that be said we are going to have a highway coming through downtown Baltimore. The powers to be did not know BARBARA MIKULSKI. That highway never happened. Senator MIKULSKI stopped that highway from being built.

She then went on to serve in the Baltimore City Council with great distinction. Then in 1976 she was elected to the Congress for the Third Congressional District, a seat that was vacated by our esteemed colleague Paul Sarbanes, who then came into the Senate, and BARBARA MIKULSKI followed in the great tradition of Senator Paul Sarbanes. In 1986, when Senator "Mac" Mathias's seat became vacant, Senator BARBARA MIKULSKI was elected to the Senate.

She has many firsts: The first female Democrat elected in her own right to serve the United States Senate. At the time she was elected to the Senate, she was only one of two female Senators. Today, we have 17 female Senators in the Senate in large part because of Senator BARBARA MIKULSKI. I know the Presiding Officer was part of that expansion. You will hear how Senator MIKULSKI was not only a role model and an inspiration but an incredible help to get more women elected to the Senate.

Last year we joined in this body to celebrate Senator MIKULSKI becoming the longest serving woman in the history of the Senate, surpassing Margaret Chase Smith from the State of Maine. Then on this past Saturday, on St. Patrick's Day, she became the longest serving woman in the history of the Congress, replacing Edith Nourse Rogers from Massachusetts who served, as the majority leader pointed out, from 1925 to 1960.

Marylanders understand longevity records. We are very proud of Cal Ripken and the record he held in baseball. Senator MIKULSKI's, like Cal Ripken's, legacy is what she has done in office to make a difference, not the length of her service. She is a fierce and effective advocate for so many causes. We have heard about her accomplishments in education and health care, what she has done to advance sensible health care to improve quality for

the people of this country. That was her mission in the Affordable Care Act, to make sure that we had the delivery systems in place that would deliver quality health care, and Senator MIKULSKI's leadership was critical in that regard.

She has been a leader in women's health care issues. I will never forget her reminder to all of us in the caucus: Don't forget women's health care issues when you bring that bill to the floor. And we didn't. We put that in under Senator MIKULSKI's leadership. We talked about breast cancer and cervical cancer screenings. Senator MIKULSKI has been in the leadership on all those issues.

We in Maryland are proud to be where the National Institutes of Health is headquartered. Its growth in large measure has been the result of Senator BARBARA MIKULSKI. We are proud of HOPE VI and housing. Senator MIKULSKI has been in the forefront of that program, making it possible for many people in our community to have decent, affordable, and safe housing.

Senator MIKULSKI has been critically important to America's space program. I have been with her many times at Goddard and seen firsthand the results of her advocacy and what it has meant. The Hubble space telescope is another legacy of which Senator MIKULSKI can be rightly proud.

We in Maryland are also proud to house NSA, the National Security Agency, with its new mission with the cyber command located in Maryland. Senator MIKULSKI, as Senator FEINSTEIN pointed out, has been one of the real leaders on national security issues. We can't issue press releases on this. She is a member of the intelligence committee. She works behind closed doors to keep us safe. But we all know that she is one of the key leaders in this Nation on national security issues.

We know about pay equity and the Lilly Ledbetter law, the first bill signed by President Obama. It was Senator MIKULSKI's leadership that got that bill to the President's desk, recognizing that we are still not where we need to be on gender pay equity in America.

In our region, the Chesapeake Bay is center to our way of life and our economy. Senator MIKULSKI has been one of the real champions on water quality and the Chesapeake Bay. She understands the respect for State and local government, that we have to work together as a team. I know the Governor of Maryland, Governor O'Malley, would agree with me that there is no better friend to the people of Maryland working with the State than Senator BARBARA MIKULSKI, getting the Federal Government on the same page as the State and local governments to get things done for the people of Maryland. That is true with what she has been able to do for all of us working across the Nation.

I think the Baltimore Sun put it best when it said:

There is nobody more feisty, more willing to take on big business, big government, or anyone when it is time to look out for the interests of her constituents.

I think all of us would agree.

On a personal note, I thank Senator MIKULSKI for her friendship. I thank her for being my buddy and my adviser. Whether she is with Presidents or Kings or the patrons at Jimmy's Restaurant in Fells Point, you get the same common sense, the same down-to-earth person—you get Senator BARB. We are so proud of her.

Thank you, Senator BARB, for what you have done to make this Nation a better place to live. Thank you for being such a role model for young people, especially young women, to get involved, to make a difference. Thank you on behalf of my two granddaughters. Their future is much brighter, their opportunities are much greater because of you, Senator BARB.

Congratulations. Your colleagues here want to express our love and respect and admiration for your incredible service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MERKLEY). The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, what an incredible milestone Senator MIKULSKI has reached. The words of her colleagues and the love they feel for her are coming through. It is a wonderful thing for me to be part of this tribute. I don't know how many Senators would have the Governor of their State here—Your Honor; and the former distinguished, incredible Senator Paul Sarbanes is here. That in itself, Senator MIKULSKI, is testimony to your status among all of us.

So many of us are here in the Senate because BARBARA MIKULSKI knocked down the barriers one by one—the first Democratic woman ever elected to the Senate in her own right, the first woman to serve in both Chambers, the longest serving woman in the Senate. Now she has made history once again. This past Saturday, after 12,858 distinguished days of service, no other woman in history has served in Congress longer than Senator MIKULSKI—ever.

Some trailblazers make history, and they are content to stand proudly alone. "Aren't I great? I did it." But not Senator MIKULSKI. She always made clear that she was honored to be the first Democratic woman, but she never wanted to be the last.

I will never forget her saying:

Some women stare out the window waiting for Prince Charming. I stare out the window waiting for more women Senators.

Well, 17 women, Republicans and Democrats, now serve in the Senate. I know all of us have stories to tell about how Senator MIKULSKI helped us along the way, reaching out to mentor us, encourage us, lead us and organize our regular meetings filled with folders and pens and pencils, and organizing dinners. She and Senator HUTCHISON teamed up. We are so fortunate to have

them working together. We get together now and then. Just in the heat of debate, we sit down and break bread together.

When I considered running for the Senate in 1992, Senator MIKULSKI was the very first person I went to see, after my husband. I was conflicted. I had a good House seat. I was told I could hold it for as long as I wanted, and I was not sure I should give it up for the Senate. I was considered a long shot. Senator MIKULSKI told me the following: "If you run, and I want you to run," she said, "it will be the toughest thing you will ever do and the best thing you will ever do." And she was right.

Those of us of a certain age have probably seen the play or the movie "A Man For All Seasons." Today we celebrate a woman who is truly a Senator for all seasons. Some Members have passion, others have policy skills, some are brilliant negotiators, others great advocates for the least among us, some are very serious students of history, and others are flatout hilarious. But I do not think our country has ever seen so many incredible traits combined in one Senator. Whatever the issue, she will address it. Whatever the problem, she will solve it. Whatever the wrong, she will fix it. Whatever the need, she will meet it. Whenever and wherever people without a voice need a champion with a keen mind, a sharp wit, and an unparalleled ability to speak from the heart and get things done, BARBARA MIKULSKI is there. A lot of us have been there with her, and we have watched her and we love it and we marvel at her. And she does it with a sense of humor that is unparalleled. Anyone who has ever listened to a speech or interview with Senator MIKULSKI has heard her utter these incredible quips, which I fondly called "Mikulski-isms."

She has called us women into battle by asking us to go "earring to earring" with our opponents. She has challenged us to square our shoulders, suit up, put our lipstick on, and fight. She has said often that women do not want to talk about gender but an agenda that helps America's families.

When asked by Glamour Magazine how she felt about being named Glamour's Woman of the Year along with singer Madonna, Senator MIKULSKI replied, "She's got her assets, I have mine, and we both make the best of what God has given us."

When asked about the different perspective women bring, she often says, "Women, we are not so much about macro issues but, rather, the macaroni and cheese issues." Who else could say that better?

When discussing the challenges women face in politics with a group of female parliamentarians from around the world, this is what BARBARA MIKULSKI explained to them when they asked about what is it like and is it tough. She said:

Let's put it this way. In an election, if you are married, you are neglecting him; if you

are single, you couldn't get him; if you are divorced, you couldn't keep him; and if you are widowed, you killed him.

Then there was one of my favorite Mikulski moments. This is a treasured moment. The women of the House still hadn't managed to integrate the House gym, so we were relegated to this tiny room with old-fashioned, hooded hair dryers and hardly any room to move. But there were very few of us, and we decided to make the most of it by having an aerobics class. Of course, coming from California, I organized it.

In came Geraldine Ferraro, Barbara Kennelly, OLYMPIA SNOWE, BARBARA MIKULSKI, and me. Our instructor started the class by asking us to stretch our arms way up, and we do.

Groans.

"Put your hands on your hips."

More groans.

Now she says, "Bend from the waist."

Suddenly, a voice bellows from the back of the room: "If I had a waist, I wouldn't be here."

We all turned around to see Senator MIKULSKI, and we just cracked up. Needless to say, that was the end of the aerobics class.

As funny as she can be, I can't think of anyone more resilient than BARBARA MIKULSKI. I remember when she was mugged a few years back, one evening outside her home in Baltimore. A man pushed her to the ground and grabbed her purse. It was terrifying—for the mugger. He had no idea whom he was dealing with. At 4 feet 11, Senator MIKULSKI fought back and defended herself, just like she defends the people she represents, just like she defends women and families, just like she defends equal pay and equal rights and civil rights and the health care of our citizens and the dignity of our seniors.

The truth is, the Senate used to be a very lonely place for women, but Senator MIKULSKI changed that. From the day she was first sworn in, she has carried the challenges, the hopes, and the dreams of millions of women with her. BARBARA MIKULSKI has inspired generations of young women everywhere. She has given them the confidence that they can do it, too, because even as we celebrate this incredible milestone, I know Senator MIKULSKI's greatest hope is that a young girl growing up today will be inspired to follow in her footsteps and one day to break her record. When that happens, it will be because BARBARA MIKULSKI—our dean, our cherished leader, our Senator for all seasons—opened the doors of the Senate wide enough to let the women of America walk in.

Thank you, BARBARA MIKULSKI.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I am pleased to stand and add my experiences with and admiration for Senator BARBARA MIKULSKI. It is fitting that she is now the longest serving woman in the U.S. Congress.

When I first got here—I was elected in 1993—BARBARA MIKULSKI, as the

dean of the women in the Senate, had a workshop the previous year for the newly elected Democratic women Senators. When I arrived in 1993, she expanded it to include all new women Senators, and her sort of opening comment was, civility starts with us.

Surely, she has carried through as the dean of the women of the Senate to ensure that all the new women get their bearings in the Senate, that they get the advice of the ones who have been here before. It has been a huge help and really a fun opportunity for us to get to know each other on a personal level as we have our women Senators' dinners.

From this came a book Senator MIKULSKI and I worked on together. The genesis of the book—which became "Nine and Counting," the nine women Senators who were here in the year 2000—came from a meeting called by Senator MIKULSKI to meet with the women of Northern Ireland, along with the women of Ireland, when there was so much strife in that country. BARBARA MIKULSKI called all of the women Senators together, our nine, to give encouragement and advice to the women who were trying to bring the people of Ireland and Northern Ireland together so that there could be a peaceful conclusion to the conflicts in Northern Ireland. From that, as we were sharing our stories to show the women of Northern Ireland how much they could do, from our experiences and our overcoming of obstacles, BARBARA MIKULSKI and I sat down and said:

You know, I think we have a book here. If each of the nine women Senators could write a chapter about our obstacles and our beginnings in politics and help encourage other young women and girls to aspire to and be able to succeed in politics, then we ought to do it.

So we worked with a publisher. We got together and decided how we would lay it out. We then decided as a group that we would give all of the proceeds to the Girl Scouts of America because almost each of us had been a Girl Scout at one point.

From so from that we put a book out, which is still being sold here in the Senate bookshop called "Nine and Counting." It has given a lot of money to the Girl Scouts of America, to a leadership fund so that they can continue to create girls who will be leaders in our country. But that started with the meeting BARBARA put together for those of us who could maybe give advice and help these women of Northern Ireland.

When I came into the Senate in 1993, the first thing I wanted to do was give equal treatment to women who work at home in their ability to save for retirement as those who workout outside the home. I had the experience, as a single working woman, of putting aside some money for my IRA, and then when I married my husband Ray, I found out I could put aside only \$250 in an IRA. I said: Wait a minute. Why would someone working inside the home—a woman

who is probably going to need retirement security more than any of us—not be able to save for her own retirement security if she is a married woman? So I authored the Homemaker IRA, and of course I wanted to have a Democrat lead because we had a Democratic Congress. So I asked Senator MIKULSKI, and she said she would absolutely sign on—as she always does—when it is something that is going to benefit women. So it became the Hutchison-Mikulski bill. I said to BARBARA: I want this bill to pass. I don't care if my name is first. I would love to put your name first if you think that will help us get it through. She said: Absolutely not. I would not take your name off that bill for anything because it was your idea. There are not very many people in this body who would make that gesture and also put her weight behind the passage of the bill.

Of all the things I have done and that we have done together, BARBARA, and of all the things that bill is going to affect the most people in our country because now we have the Homemaker IRA that passed in 1996 that allows women—whether they are married and working at home or outside the home and single or married—they will be able to set aside the same amount. Fortunately, that amount has grown, and so it is not \$2,000, but it can be \$2,500 or \$3,000 or \$5,000, depending on their age. It is a wonderful thing we were able to do together.

Senator MIKULSKI and I also worked on behalf of Afghan women. When we started hearing the atrocities that were happening to the women of Afghanistan that were brought back by great women's organizations, such as Vital Voices, that told stories of not only unequal treatment of women in Afghanistan but inhumane treatment of women in Afghanistan. Senator MIKULSKI, Senator Clinton, and I introduced the Afghan Women and Children Relief Act, which was signed into law in December of 2001, which authorized funding for women in Afghanistan and Afghan refugee women. Political participation was supported for Afghan women, and we followed up with appropriations. I have to say our Republican President, President Bush, and our Democratic President, President Obama, have always said American money will go into Afghanistan or Iraq or anywhere else to support equally the education of girls and boys; that we would support women where they are not being treated as equals on a human rights basis. So our Presidents have stood and, of course, our bipartisanship in Congress has done the right thing. Again, Senator MIKULSKI is a leader in that area.

I cannot think of a stronger supporter in this Senate than BARBARA MIKULSKI in the area of NASA. I wish to say Senator BILL NELSON also has been such a strong supporter, as well as Senator LAMAR ALEXANDER, but Senator MIKULSKI and I now are the—she is the chairman and I am the ranking Repub-

lican on the committee that is appropriating for NASA. We are also fortunate to have Chairman JAY ROCKEFELLER on the authorizing and oversight committee for NASA. He, too, has been such a strong leader in assuring that we continue America's pre-eminence in space.

When the rubber hits the road in appropriations, Senator MIKULSKI has been there to say: We are going to have the science in the Hubble telescope, which has given us so much information, as well as the James Webb telescope. Now, of course, we have the human space flight issues and BARBARA MIKULSKI has been right there saying, of course we are going to utilize the International Space Station, of course we are going to keep America's priorities in space because it has done so much for our economy and our jobs and our technology and our health care improvements, but it has also been a national security issue that BARBARA MIKULSKI recognizes, first and foremost.

I cannot match a lot of the stories about BARBARA MIKULSKI and her personality, but I can tell you I took BARBARA MIKULSKI to tour the Johnson Space Center in 2001, and we did a wonderful event at Baylor College of Medicine to talk about the research that is being done in the biomedical sciences and on the space station. I thought, I am going to bring BARBARA where we can show her a little bit of Texas.

We know Texas has a lot of personality and sometimes we are thought to have a little too much fun, but I will tell you what, BARBARA is one of us. I brought her to the Houston rodeo. During the month of the Houston rodeo, everybody is "Go Texas," and everybody dresses Texan, which means cowboy, and we have a great time. So I took BARBARA MIKULSKI into the steer auction, where just this past Saturday a steer was sold for \$460,000.

It is a grand champion steer, I might say. All of that money goes for scholarships for our young people to go to college.

BARBARA came into the steer auction, and she looked around. There were 2,000 people at the breakfast before all these people are going to go and bid on the steers so we can fund scholarships. We were all dressed appropriately for Texas, and she reached over to my ear and she whispered: Now, KAY, if we were here on Monday morning and we went to a chamber of commerce meeting, do these people look like this? I love to tell that story in Houston because it gets huge laughs. She won over everybody in Houston. They adored her from the beginning. She put on her cowboy hat, she rode in the grand entry on a buckboard and she became an honorary Texan in our hearts. So BARBARA MIKULSKI knows how to win over others.

Let me mention one of my early experiences when I first came into the Senate. There was an effort to have health care reform. A program was put forward and this particular program

had some things that were good, but one of the things in it was that no health insurance coverage would be required for women to have mammograms if they were 40 or below. I will tell you something, the biggest eruption in the Senate was BARBARA MIKULSKI saying: Are you kidding? I will not let this go by me in the Senate. We are not going to say that a woman who is 40 or under is not going to be eligible for insurance coverage for a mammogram. It is not going to happen. BARBARA MIKULSKI took the lead, and I am going to tell you, the first thing that came out of that plan was that provision, and it will never be in a plan as long as BARBARA MIKULSKI is in the Senate. So I am just going to tell anybody who is looking at health care reform, take a little advice, don't mess with BARBARA MIKULSKI because we are going to have mammograms.

Not only that, BARBARA MIKULSKI came forward in the next month and passed unanimously in the Senate a mammogram standards bill. During this process she learned that there were varying degrees of standards of mammography. She was going to make sure there were standards that every clinic would have, that every piece of equipment would have and she led the effort. It is law today.

I will end with yet another accomplishment; that is, single-sex education in public schools. Senator Jack Danforth of Missouri started looking at the issue and said: We need to allow our public schools to offer single-sex education—meaning girl schools and boy schools—because so many of us have seen that we have to adapt education for the needs of each individual child to the best of our ability. We know there are so many wonderful private schools for boys and girls, but we could hardly have a public school that would be single sex in this country in the 1990s.

So Jack Danforth started the effort, and when he left the Senate, I picked it up. The more I looked at it, the more I saw the benefits to boys and to girls—particularly in the middle and high school grades—were palpable. Senators Clinton, BARBARA MIKULSKI, SUSAN COLLINS, the three of them, had gone to an all-girls school. I had not, but they knew the benefits firsthand of single-sex education. BARBARA was the product of single-sex education, having gone to a parochial school.

I first introduced the amendment in 1998, but it was in 2001—when the four of us came together—that we actually got the bill passed through an amendment and that amendment then not only made public single-sex education an option and legal, it also made it eligible for Federal funding grants similar to all our public schools.

I wish to say it has been one of the joys of my time in the Senate to work with Senator BARBARA MIKULSKI, and I think this 4-foot-11-inch mighty-might has 10 times the impact. She has made an impact on Congress and an impact

on America because she is relentless, she is reasonable, she understands an issue, and she understands the importance of listening as well as talking. She is effective and she is respected. If there is anyone in the Senate who doesn't like her, respect her, and work well with her, I have not met them. When one is the longest serving woman in the Senate and Congress, they have worked with a lot of people. She is unanimously so well regarded, I have never met an enemy of hers.

I will close by saying the people who know her best love her most, and I cannot think of a finer thing to say about any person.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, first of all, I wish to say what a pleasure it is to welcome Senator Sarbanes back. I had the pleasure of sitting beside him on the Foreign Relations Committee for 24 years. We miss his judgment and wisdom. We could use it these days.

I wish to welcome Governor O'Malley. I can't think of a time, when people have stood up to laud a fellow Senator, that a Governor of their State is sitting and listening. All of the comments to this moment and beyond will undoubtedly echo the remarkable affection that everybody has for BARBARA MIKULSKI and particularly the high regard in which she is held.

This is a very special celebration for the longest serving woman in the history of the Congress, 12,862 days today and counting. In that time—I recall when I first came here there was one woman serving, and that was Senator Nancy Kassebaum—it is fair to say BARBARA MIKULSKI has been one of the pivotal forces in creating and assembling what I would call a true “band of sisters”—the women with whom she has served in the Senate, each of whom makes extraordinary contributions to this institution.

We have heard from other colleagues that her career is filled with milestones, and it is. She is the first Democratic woman to serve in both Houses of Congress. She is the first Democratic woman elected to Senate leadership. She is the first woman elected to statewide office in Maryland. These are just a few.

When BARBARA came to the Senate in 1986 after 10 years in the House of Representatives, women were still, as she describes it—these are her words—“a bit of a novelty” in the Senate. Indeed, then, it was only BARBARA and Senator Nancy Kassebaum. But now BARBARA says:

We're not viewed as novelties. We're not viewed as celebrities. We're viewed as U.S. Senators.

One of the reasons for that is that BARBARA MIKULSKI has demonstrated a seriousness of purpose, an ability to legislate, and an ability to make friends and bring people together that has defined her role as the dean of the women in the Senate.

Some of her women colleagues in the Senate call her Dean. Others call her Coach BARB. But no matter what they call her, she has brought them together in this bipartisan sisterhood, as we just heard from the Senator from Texas. She holds workshops and serves as a mentor to all newcomers and organizes regular monthly dinners. They don't always agree on everything, but the dinners are what some of them have called a “zone of civility,” which is something the Senate could use a little more of these days. Again, it is BARBARA MIKULSKI's example that helps point us in that direction.

But for all of her firsts, I would say to my colleagues that BARBARA MIKULSKI's career has never been about gender as much as it has been about agenda. I have had the privilege of working with her enough on different issues of being what she calls one of her Galahads. I have seen her laser focus on what is right, on her conscience, on her gut, on her sense of what the people of Maryland want, and what she thinks is her duty as a Senator. That is why I wanted her on the Speaker's platform in 2004 in Boston at the convention, and she delivered just the right message in her forceful and commanding way. She stood up there and declared:

When women seek power, we don't seek it for ourselves; we seek it to make a difference in the lives of other people.

There is no arguing, as we heard from a number of colleagues, about what an extraordinary difference BARBARA MIKULSKI has made in the lives of other people, not just Marylanders but all Americans. She has been an extraordinary advocate for the Goddard Space Center, for the Wallops Flight Facility, and for Johns Hopkins Applied Science Lab in Maryland, as well as the Port of Baltimore and Chesapeake Bay cleanup efforts.

For decades, she proudly worked beside my colleague of 26 years Ted Kennedy. She loved Ted Kennedy and Ted Kennedy loved her. Together, on the Health Committee, they worked to make universal health care a reality. Her role when Senator Kennedy was sick was an extraordinary role of picking up that baton and helping to bring it across the finish line.

Along the way she became a leader on women's health, fighting for equality in health research and making sure women get the quality of care they deserve. She was one of the chief sponsors of Medicaid financing of mammograms and Pap smears.

Personally, I will never forget how BARBARA reacted when the National Institutes of Health said it would not include women in trials of aspirin as a preventive for heart attacks because “their hormones present too many biological variables.” BARBARA fired back: “My hormones rage because of comments like that.”

Her proudest accomplishment, she says, is the Spousal Anti-Impoverishment Act, which helps to keep seniors from going bankrupt while paying for a

spouse's nursing home care. But throughout her career, BARBARA MIKULSKI has fought to strengthen the safety net for children, for seniors, and for anyone who needed somebody to stand for them or push open a door for them.

That fight started in east Baltimore where her Polish immigrant grandparents ran a bakery and her father a grocery store. She says she often watched her father open the doors to his grocery store for local steelworkers so they could buy their lunches before the morning shift. She got it in her head at that time that she would rather be opening doors for others on the inside than knocking on doors from the outside.

So no surprise, after college she got a job as a social worker helping at-risk children and educating seniors about Medicare. She got involved in politics by organizing community groups to stop a highway from going through the Highlandtown neighborhood where she grew up. Let me tell my colleagues, nobody had ever seen anything like her. At one rally, she jumped up on a table and cried:

The British couldn't take Fells Point, the termites couldn't take Fells Point, and goddamn if we'll let the State Roads Commission take Fells Point.

As they say on ESPN, the crowd went nuts, and the roads commission never knew what hit them. And I assure my colleagues, that was a nonprofane use of our Lord's name.

Again, no surprise, that led to her election to the Baltimore City Council. I think that explains a lot about just how good a politician she is—how well she knows the street. I think every one of her colleagues, all of us, are in awe of BARBARA's ability to focus on the street emotion, on the simplicity of an argument, and to be able to sum it up in a razor-like comment that just cuts to the quick and makes the rest of us who search around for the words seem pretty inept in the process. Whether it is at Camden Yards, Fells Point, the Eastern Shore, the Washington suburbs, or up along the Mason Dixon Line, BARBARA has her finger on the political pulse of Marylanders. She understands their concerns, shares their aspirations, and sums up their hopes and their dreams in a few short sentences that nobody else can parallel.

If anyone expected BARBARA MIKULSKI to accept being just a novelty or a celebrity in Congress, they obviously had no understanding of her deep roots as an immigrant, being an American, and the values she learned about hard work in her family.

If anyone expects her to slow down just because she is now the longest serving woman in the history of Congress, they don't know BARBARA MIKULSKI. A couple of years ago, BARBARA and I talked—I think it was at one of our retreats—about how similar Maryland and Massachusetts are in certain ways, especially their rural and fishing histories which we actually both have.

She told me she wasn't much of a fisherman, but she liked to hunt. The only problem she cited was the recoil of the rifle given that she stands 4 feet 11 inches tall.

Well, it is clear from the record, clear from the comments of all of her colleagues, and clear from this extraordinary longest serving record in the Congress and all that she has accomplished that she stands as one of the tallest Senators and packs a punch way beyond her 4 feet 11 inches.

We are proud to have her as a colleague, and we are in awe of her ability to galvanize action, which is what this institution should be all about.

Mr. LEVIN. When you read over the long list of Senator BARBARA MIKULSKI's accomplishments, one word keeps coming up, "first." First woman to be elected to the Senate from Maryland, first woman of her party to serve in both the House of Representatives and in the Senate, first woman to serve in the Senate leadership. Today we gather to honor Senator MIKULSKI, who in addition to her many firsts, now stands as the longest serving woman in the history of the Congress.

Senator MIKULSKI began her service in Congress in 1976, and in all her time here since, she has championed the causes dearest to her—causes dear to the needs of her constituents and to our Nation's most vulnerable citizens.

As chairwoman of the Children and Families Subcommittee, Senator MIKULSKI has been a determined champion of the young, the old, and the sick. She has fought for access to higher education for every child because she believes ours is a nation where every young boy and girl should have the chance to reach his or her true potential. She has fought for secure pensions for seniors because she believes ours is a nation where, after a lifetime of work, every person should have the chance to enjoy their retirement. And she has fought for preventive screening and treatment for every woman because she believes ours is a nation where no one should lose a mother, daughter, or wife from a preventable illness.

As chairwoman of the Commerce-Justice-Science Appropriations Subcommittee, Senator MIKULSKI has led the charge to promote economic development, equip our first responders, and invest in science and research. Senator MIKULSKI understands the importance of the private sector, particularly small businesses, in creating job opportunities. That is why she has fought for legislation making it easier for businesses to make investments and hire new workers. No one has fought harder to support our emergency first responders than BARBARA MIKULSKI, who said:

We must protect our protectors with more than just words—we must protect them with the best equipment, training and resources.

Senator MIKULSKI is also committed to the promotion of scientific research and laying the groundwork for main-

taining U.S. leadership in the area. She has advanced legislation to substantially increase the number of students earning degrees in science, technology, engineering, and math.

As a Senator from Maryland, Senator MIKULSKI understands the importance of the Federal workforce. Many of her constituents are responsible for the high quality of life many of us take for granted every day. Whether its food inspectors, air traffic controllers, or medical researchers, many Marylanders who make up the Federal workforce contribute to our Nation's health and safety. Fortunately for them, and the rest of us, they have a powerful advocate in the Senate. Senator MIKULSKI said, "I want every Federal employee to know I am on their side." Indeed she is—not only because it is in the interests of her State, but because she knows well that an effective Federal workforce is in the interests of every citizen in every State. Throughout her career, Senator MIKULSKI has fought off misguided efforts to privatize essential functions of the Federal workforce, and fought for fair pay and benefits for these committed public servants.

Fair pay has been a focus for Senator MIKULSKI, and women across the country can be grateful for that. In 2007, the Supreme Court considered the case of Lilly Ledbetter, a woman who for nearly 20 years had been paid less than her male coworkers for equal work. In its decision, the Court ruled that Ms. Ledbetter could not proceed with her case, not because it had no merit, it did; but because of a technicality. Once the Supreme Court rules against you, where can you turn? Just ask Ms. Ledbetter; she will tell you. Senator BARBARA MIKULSKI introduced the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act to address the flawed Supreme Court decision; and on January 29, 2009, it was signed into law.

In the Book of Genesis, the first question asked of God is "Am I my brother's keeper?" Senator BARBARA MIKULSKI has spent a lifetime and built a career in answer of that question. She said:

I feel that I am my brother's keeper and my sister's keeper. I think that's why I am shaped by the words of Jesus himself: Love thy neighbor. And I took it seriously.

The Senate is better off because she did. The people of Maryland are better off. Our Nation is better off. I am grateful not just because she has become the longest serving woman in the history of Congress, but because she has served her Nation so well.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, today I wish to offer my heartfelt congratulations to my esteemed colleague and dear friend, Senator BARBARA MIKULSKI, on becoming the longest serving woman in the history of the United States Congress. This milestone, reached on March 17, marks 12,858 days—more than 35 years—of dedicated service to her beloved State of Maryland and to our Nation.

A little more than a year ago, in January of 2011, Senator MIKULSKI began

her 25th year in the Senate, surpassing my personal role model in public service, Senator Margaret Chase Smith, the Great Lady from Maine. Adding in her 10 years in the House, Senator MIKULSKI now establishes the record for longevity in either chamber, set by Congresswoman Edith Nourse Rogers, who represented Massachusetts but was born in Maine.

For me, the special meaning of this occasion goes far beyond such coincidences. Just as Congresswoman Rogers and Senator Smith inspired young women in the past to lives in public service, Senator MIKULSKI inspires the young women of today. As a new Senator in 1997, I was welcomed by her kindness and helped by her wisdom. She taught me the ropes of the appropriations process and instituted regular bipartisan dinners for the women of the Senate.

It has been a privilege to work with Senator MIKULSKI for 15 years. During that time, I have come to know her as a fighter and a trailblazer.

Senator MIKULSKI is, above all, a hard worker. Growing up in east Baltimore, she learned the value of hard work at her family's grocery store. Her commitment to making a difference in her neighborhood led her to the path of service, first as social worker, then as a city councilor and as a Member of Congress.

Senator MIKULSKI's longevity is only the preface to her story of exceptional accomplishment. She has fought for increased access to higher education for our young people and for improved health care for our seniors. I am proud to have fought at her side on those issues, as well as for increased Alzheimer's research, improved women's health care, and enhanced educational opportunities for nurses.

As House colleagues during and after World War II, Margaret Chase Smith and Edith Nourse Rogers were instrumental in achieving full recognition for women in uniform. Senator MIKULSKI carries on that legacy as a determined advocate for all who serve our country. Working with her on the Appropriations Committee, I have witnessed firsthand how seriously she takes her responsibility to the American taxpayers.

Throughout her life in public service, Senator MIKULSKI has lived by one guiding principle: to help our people meet the needs of today as she helps our Nation prepare for the challenges of tomorrow. It is an honor to congratulate Senator BARBARA MIKULSKI for her many years of service, and to wish her many more.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, it is heartwarming to see such a spontaneous outpouring of respect and appreciation for the distinguished Senator from Maryland, Ms. MIKULSKI. It is certainly well deserved.

She is one of the hardest working and most effective Senators serving in the Senate today. It has been a great pleasure working closely with her on the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, today I wish to pay tribute to our dear friend and colleague, the senior Senator from Maryland, BARBARA MIKULSKI. This week, Senator MIKULSKI became the longest-serving woman in the history of the United States Congress. That is quite a milestone and I want to congratulate her on her many years of devoted service to the people of her home State.

Senator MIKULSKI is a Maryland native. Descended from Polish immigrants, she was born and raised in Baltimore. She attended college at both St. Agnes College in Baltimore and the University of Maryland.

After several years of working as a social worker in the Baltimore area, Senator MIKULSKI began her political career in 1971 when she was elected to the Baltimore City Council. She served there for 5 years before running for Congress in 1976. For 10 years, she represented the Third Congressional District of Maryland. Then, in 1986, she was elected to serve here in the Senate.

Although the milestone we are recognizing today is a significant one, it is not the first for Senator MIKULSKI. Indeed, throughout her time in the Senate she has been a pioneer for women in public service.

For example, Senator MIKULSKI was the first woman elected to statewide office in Maryland. She was also the first Democratic woman elected to a Senate seat that was not previously held by her husband. And, she was the first woman to serve in both the Senate and the House of Representatives.

I have known Senator MIKULSKI a long time, having served with her in the Senate for over 25 years now. While she and I have often found ourselves on opposite sides of many issues, I have long admired her commitment to her principles and, most importantly, her devotion to the people of her home State. Indeed, she has been a stalwart and often times fierce advocate for the interests of Marylanders.

I want to congratulate Senator MIKULSKI on this important milestone and I am grateful for this opportunity to pay tribute to her and to her many years of public service.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I greatly appreciate having this opportunity to join my colleagues in expressing our congratulations to BARBARA MIKULSKI as she reaches another great milestone in her career of service to the people of Maryland in the United States Congress.

Senator MIKULSKI is now the longest serving woman in the history of the United States Congress. Although outstanding in and of itself, it is an achievement that represents far more than the number of years she has served in the nation's Capitol. It is also a testament to her outstanding public service and her commitment to our future that has made it possible for her to help to make our great Nation both stronger and more secure.

Back home, Senator MIKULSKI's constituents have come to appreciate her

more and more as they have seen how hard she works to represent them every day. That is why they always come out in such great numbers every election day to make sure she will continue to do so. They can see the difference she has made all around them and they appreciate the way she has made their cities and towns better places to live.

I have often heard Senator MIKULSKI referred to as the Dean of the Senate women, a title she has earned that was conferred upon her with the great admiration, affection and appreciation of those with whom she has served. Over the years so many of them have acknowledged the difference she has made in their lives with her support, her encouragement, her guidance and her direction. She has been such a great mentor to them because she has always led the best way—by example. It is another mark of distinction that has come to her as, each day, she has helped to write another chapter of the history of Maryland and this great Nation of ours.

Looking back, she has played an active role in a long list of changes that have come to our country over the years. Because she has been at the forefront of so many of them she has been a role model not only for those with whom she has served, but for those who have been watching her in action back home. I have no doubt, in the years to come, many more women will serve in the House and the Senate who will credit Senator MIKULSKI for first giving them the idea of serving in the Congress. Her own record of success then assured them that it would be possible for them to do the same if they were willing to work hard and take their case to the people for their consideration.

In the end, that is what our service in the Senate is all about—doing everything we can so that the current generation will have the tools they will need to succeed and then take their place as the next generation of our nation's leaders. Thanks to good people like BARBARA MIKULSKI the people back home know that someone cares. She has given them a voice and it is heard and heard clearly whenever she takes to the Senate floor to make their concerns known.

I have often heard it said that the meaning of public service is found in the definition of the word "service." That is why we are taking a moment today to thank Senator MIKULSKI for putting her principles and her beliefs into action all these many years for her beloved Maryland and the United States of America. If I may paraphrase the words of Abraham Lincoln, it isn't so much her years of service that matters so much as the service of her years. Through the years she has made a difference in so many ways that will be long remembered and celebrated.

Congratulations, BARBARA. You are setting a record pace here in the Senate. From this day on, you will be set-

ting a new record every day. Thank you for your service, but most of all, thank you for your friendship. Diana and I have appreciated having the chance to come to know you and to work with you.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I rise today in tribute to Senator BARBARA MIKULSKI of Maryland, who has just become the longest serving woman in Congress, and to applaud the pioneering role that she has played in the evolution of the Senate.

Things have certainly changed since 1986, when Senator MIKULSKI was elected to the Senate. When Senator MIKULSKI joined the Senate as the first Democratic woman elected in her right as opposed to filling the term of a spouse, the Senate looked very different. There was only one other woman senator, Nancy Kassebaum, a Republican from Kansas. The Senate had just begun to televise their proceedings the year she was elected. And, obviously, there were no women in leadership positions in the Senate.

Senator MIKULSKI set out to change all that. She became the first woman in the Democratic leadership. She became the first woman to serve on the Appropriations Committee. And then she became the first woman to chair the Senate CJS Appropriations subcommittee.

And things certainly have changed. Now, in the 112th Congress, there are 17 women, both Republican and Democrat, in the Senate overall. There are seven women on the Appropriations Committee alone. Five women chair Senate committees. Women have had significant roles in both the Democratic and Republican Senate leadership.

While all of these changes were clearly not solely a function of Senator MIKULSKI's pioneering leadership, she blazed a trail as bright and as wide as anyone could possibly hope for. With her impassioned speeches, her plain spoken delivery, and her commitment to fairness and justice, Senator MIKULSKI could not be ignored or pigeonholed. She stood up for what she believed in, and she would not allow her voice to be silenced.

Senator MIKULSKI cared deeply about health care issues, and women's health in particular. When she learned that many Federally-funded research protocols did not include women, she led the fight to insure that would never happen again. She established the Office of Women's Health at NIH to ensure women would always have a voice in critical health issues.

One of her proudest accomplishments was working to pass the spousal impoverishment law, which changed the rules that forced elderly couples to spend all their assets and give up their home before the Government would help one member of the couple pay for a nursing home.

Finally, I would be remiss if I didn't mention Senator MIKULSKI's efforts on

behalf of her beloved State of Maryland. From the crabbers of the Chesapeake Bay to the steelworkers at Sparrows Point to the scientists at Goddard to all the other families all across the State, no one has worked harder to give them a voice on Capitol Hill than BARBARA MIKULSKI. On this historic day, I wish her the best, and I know that as long as she is a United States Senator, she will never stop fighting for what she believes is right.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, we mark March as Women's History Month, as a time of year for us to remember the valiant female leaders of our great Nation. One of them is very special to Montana. In 1916 Jeannette Rankin was the first woman elected to the United States Congress, 4 years before women were granted the right to vote.

As a member of the House of Representatives, her daring and vocal stance on controversial issues such as war and peace brought critical recognition from the press. In every situation, the strength of her values persisted, even under the pressures of unanimous opposition to a war with Germany. Jeannette Rankin said, "I may be the first woman Member of Congress, but I won't be the last," and helped to pave the way for future generations of women leaders.

This past Saturday, March 17, 2012, marked a monumental day in American history. The Senator from Maryland, Ms. BARBARA MIKULSKI, celebrated her 35 year in the United States Congress.

That important accomplishment is a milestone for American culture and female leaders in Congress. Senator MIKULSKI is now the longest serving female in the Senate and in the history of the U.S. Congress. She spent her first 10 years in the House of Representatives, followed by the next 25 years here in the Senate. She has worked every day to make America a better place for the next generation.

When Senator MIKULSKI began her work in the House of Representatives, there were 18 female Members of the House and three female Members of the Senate. When she began her first term in the Senate, there were 23 female Members of the House and only one other female Member of the Senate. Now, she is a leader among our 17 female Senators and 76 female Members of the House of Representatives.

Her strong sense of community and instinctive nature pertaining to the needs of Americans is exemplified by her action-oriented attitude. Even before her tenure in Congress, as a social worker for the people of Maryland, Ms. MIKULSKI was active in local issues in and around the Baltimore area and worked to help at-risk children and seniors. She continues working passionately to address those issues throughout her tenure in Congress.

Her advocacy for justice and contributions to social issues are evident with her work to fight for women's

rights and improved access to health care, to better education, and to volunteering and national service opportunities. She offers tremendous leadership for the Senate both as the chairwoman of the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Subcommittee on Primary Health and Aging, and as the chairwoman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies.

Like Jeannette Rankin, Senator MIKULSKI has been a leader and an exemplar for strong and courageous women leaders in America.

Senator MIKULSKI gets things done, and I have enjoyed our friendship during our work together in the Senate. Her brave spirit is one that sets the bar for new and incoming Senators, both male and female. I congratulate Senator MIKULSKI on her special day and I look forward to continuing our work in the Senate together.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, first of all, let me say I am enormously touched and gratified by the warm words my colleagues have spoken on both sides of the aisle. I am particularly moved by the fact of the men of Maryland who are here today. I am moved by the wonderful words of Senator CARDIN, my colleague. I am moved as well that Governor O'Malley is here today.

When I came to the Senate, Senator Paul Sarbanes was my senior colleague, and he is here today as well. Governor O'Malley and Senator Sarbanes are on the bench, but these men are certainly not back-benchers. I must say about the Governor and Senator Sarbanes and Senator CARDIN, they prove the old adage that men of quality will always support good women who seek equality. I have enjoyed their support, their wise counsel, and their collegial efforts on behalf of the people of Maryland during my years in Maryland politics.

It is a great honor to be here today passing this significant benchmark of becoming the longest serving woman in the history of the Congress, both in the House where I served for 10 years, and in the Senate. It is a great honor for me to be able to pass into the history books along with such an esteemed person as Senator Margaret Chase Smith. We spoke about that in January 2011 when I was sworn in. There were tributes that day and wonderful words from our two women Senators from Maine. Today—actually over the weekend—I surpassed the record of Edith Norse Rogers who was the longest serving woman in the House. Both of those women came from New England. They were both hardy, resilient, and fiercely independent. I, as I have read their histories, so admired them. They were known for devotion to constituent service, an unabashed sense of patriotism, and kind of telling it like it is. I hope that as I join them in the history

books, I can only continue with the same spirit of devotion to duty and that fierce independence and patriotism.

I didn't start out wanting to be a historic figure. To, "What do you want to be when you grow up?" you don't say, "I want to be a historic figure." When I was growing up, it was about service. For me, it is not how long I serve, it is not about history. For me, history books were Jane Adams and Abigail Adams and powdered wigs. I just welcome a day when I have time to even powder my nose, let alone powder my wig. But the fact is, when I grew up, I wanted to be of service. I learned that in my home, in my family, in my community, and with the wonderful nuns who taught me.

Today my colleagues have spoken about my wonderful mother and father. I had a terrific mother and father. I am so happy my two sisters and my fantastic brothers-in-law are joining me today. I only wish my mother and father could be here with me because they worked so hard to see that my sisters and I had an education at significant sacrifice to them. But they were really wonderful people where others saw them in a life of business. Every day my father would open his grocery store and say, "Good morning, can I help you?" When he did, he wanted to assure that his customers got a fair deal.

My father opened his grocery store during the New Deal because he believed in Roosevelt and because, as my father said, "Barb, I know Roosevelt believed in me."

I also had the benefit of the wonderful Catholic nuns who educated me. I had the benefit of going to a school called the Institute of Notre Dame and then Mount St. Agnes College, the Sisters of Notre Dame and the Sisters of Mercy. These women, who concentrated their lives on the message of Christianity and the message of Jesus Christ, wanted to make sure that women in America could learn and be a part of our society. They didn't only teach us our three Rs, they taught us about leadership and service. But they also taught us about other values—the values of love your neighbor, care for the sick, worry about the poor, and be hungry and thirsty for justice.

When I was at the Institute of Notre Dame, a school that NANCY PELOSI went to as well, there was something called the Christopher movement after St. Christopher. The motto was, "It is better to light one little candle than to curse the darkness." That is what I wanted to do. I wanted to be a social worker. I even thought about being a doctor. One time I even thought about being a Catholic nun, but that vow of obedience kind of slowed me down a little bit.

In this country wonderful things happen. When my great-grandmother came to this country, she had little money in her pocket but a big dream in her heart: that she could be part of the

American dream, that she could own a home in her own name, in her own right; that she could have a job and so could the people in her own family; and that based on merit and hard work you could be something. Well, in three generations, I have become a Senator. Only in America the story of my family could have occurred—modest beginnings, hard work, effort, neighbor helping neighbor.

Much has been said about my fight for the highway. I was thinking about getting a doctorate, a doctorate in public health at Johns Hopkins. But they were going to run that highway through the neighborhoods, the older ethnic neighborhoods, the African-American neighborhoods. We were viewed in some of those neighborhoods as the other side of the tracks. I wanted to fight to keep those neighborhoods on track. So I took on city hall, and I did fight them.

In this country, what happened? In another country, they would have taken a protester like me and put me in jail. Instead, in the United States of America, they sent me to the city council. I worked hard there, and 5 years later, when Senator Paul Sarbanes, who was a Congressman, ran for the Senate, I ran for his House seat, and I got the job.

When I arrived in the House in 1976, only 19 women were serving: 14 Democrats and 5 Republicans; only 5 women of color. In 2012, there are 74 women in the House: 50 Democrats, 24 Republicans; 26 women of color. In the Senate, there are now 17 women serving: 12 Democrats, 5 Republicans. Today, we saw visiting us Senator Carol Moseley-Braun, a woman of color who served well while she was here.

Those are the numbers and those are the statistics. And though I join this long number of firsts, for me it is not how long I have served but how well I have served. When I came to Congress, I became a Member for the fabulous Third Congressional District of Maryland. My job was to represent a blue-collar community that was in economic transition. What did we do? We were a community that built things here so we could ship them over there. We built cars. We built ships. We made steel. We knew if a country did not make something and build something, it could not make something of itself.

I fought for those blue-collar people. I fought to keep those jobs in manufacturing. We fought for the Port of Baltimore, its dredging, so we could bring in the big ships so we could have exports. We worked again for those people in those manufacturing areas while we saw jobs go overseas. Then we worked very hard for cities to make sure our cities were safe, that we had great schools, and that they had a chance of making it.

I fought hard for health care. One of my greatest pieces of legislation was the Spousal Anti-impoverishment Act, so that if one spouse went into a nursing home, the other spouse would not

have to spend down their life's savings and lose their home. AARP tells me my legislation of so many years ago, that stands today, has kept 1 million people—1 million people—from losing their home or their family farm.

Those were the battles then. Those were the battles when I changed my address and I came to the Senate. Although I changed my address, the battles are still the same: jobs, social justice, opportunity, based on hard work, peace in the world, and I continue to fight for this.

But for me, it is not only about issues. Issues are so abstract. Issues can be so bloodless when we talk about it. For me, issues are about people—the people I represent in my own hometown, the people I represent in my State, and the people who live in the United States of America.

My favorite thing is being out there talking to the people, going into diners, going table to table, listening to their stories, holding roundtables with parents whose children have special needs, meeting with scientists who have discoveries they think will lead to new ideas and new products that will bring new jobs, meeting with universities that train our workforce. For me, it is about the people.

So as I pass this important benchmark, which I am so honored to do, I want people to know I am still that young girl who watched her father open that grocery store every day and say: "Good morning. Can I help you?" I am still that young girl who went to the Institute of Notre Dame and Mount St. Agnes College who said: I am going to light one little candle. I do not want to curse the darkness. I want to continue to fight for a stronger economy, a safer America, the people of Maryland.

In conclusion, I want to say thanks. I am going to thank the Dear Lord for giving me the chance to be born in the greatest country in the world, to be able to work hard and serve in one of the greatest institutions in the United States of America. But nobody gets to be a "me" without a whole lot of "thee."

I thank my family. I thank the religious women who educated me. I thank all of my staff who have worked so hard to help me do a good job. And I thank the countless volunteers who believed in me and worked for my election when nobody else did. Most of all, I thank the people of the Third Congressional District and the State of Maryland for saying: BARB, we are going to give you your shot. Don't ever forget this. Don't ever forget us. I want them to know, though I have now served in the Senate 12,892 days, I will never forget them. Every morning I am saying in my heart: Good morning. Can I help you?

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

(Applause, Senators rising.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I am so honored to join so many of my Sen-

ate colleagues and people from Maryland and across this country in recognizing and congratulating the amazing woman you just heard from, my good friend from Maryland Senator BARBARA MIKULSKI, who, as you have just heard, has just become the longest serving female Member of Congress in the history of the United States.

This is an achievement that takes courage, it takes passion, and it takes commitment. Those are three attributes all of us who know her so well know she has in abundance. But my good friend, Senator MIKULSKI, has not just served long, she has served well.

The senior Senator from Maryland, over her 35 years in Congress, has established herself as a trailblazer, as a leader, and as a fighter for the people of her State. It is fitting that this milestone was reached during Women's History Month because Senator MIKULSKI has given so much of herself in support of other women in Congress. She has guided us, she has shown us how to stand and fight, and she has taken all of us under her wing.

Senator MIKULSKI realized when she arrived here that there was no rule book for women in Congress. So she took it upon herself to guide the way. She drew on her own experiences to make the transition easier for all of us.

She organized seminars that you have heard about. She taught us how to work together. She taught us about the legislative process, the rules on the floor, and the many more subtle rules off the floor.

In short, Senator MIKULSKI showed us the ropes, and she has done it every day I have been here for all the women who have come since she has been here. While she knows it is important and courageous to lead the charge, she also understands the first ones have to be responsible and successful so others can follow. It is because Senator MIKULSKI has done her job so well that other women have been able to follow in her footsteps.

She is here today as the longest serving woman in Congress, not by accident or by happenstance. She is here because she has earned it, because the people of her State know she is an indispensable champion of their causes, because she does work across party lines, and because she delivers results.

I know many years from now when women have achieved a larger, more representative role in our Nation's Capital, Senator MIKULSKI will be at the very top of the list of people to thank—the person who not only forged the path but who went back and guided so many of us down it.

I know many of my colleagues are on the floor today to thank Senator MIKULSKI. But I am here especially to thank her, as one of those women who have followed in her footsteps, for her more than 35 years of service to her State and to her country. Those of us who know her well know she is not even close to being finished.



So, Mr. President, my very best to my very good friend, Senator MIKULSKI. I wish her very well in her next 35 years.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President I too want to speak of my dear friend BARBARA MIKULSKI, who is just precious. She is precious to her family. She is precious to the people of the Third Congressional District that she represented for 10 years. She is precious to the people of Maryland, precious to the people of the United States, and precious to those of us who have the privilege of serving with her in this body.

She has been affectionately known as a few things: The dean of women; the breaker of the ceiling, as PATTY MURRAY just said; setting the stage, setting the rule book—writing the rule book—for women in the Senate.

There will be 51 women in the Senate 1 day—there will be—and it will come much more quickly because BARBARA MIKULSKI was the first. There is no question about that. The Senate will be a better place for it in so many different ways.

She is also not only known as the dean of women, we love her. She is known as BARB. I love calling her on the phone late at night and having her say: This is BARB. Please call me. Make sure you say the words and leave your phone number twice.

Of course, when BARB says something, we all do it. So I always leave the phone number twice.

I admire so much about her. But one of the things at the top of the list is who she is. She is the real deal. She knows where she came from. She has never forgotten where she came from. As I have told her personally, she has that internal gyroscope of who she is, what she should do, and how she should do it that guides her almost instinctively, and it is probably the most precious thing a politician can have. Not very many people have it, but hers is about the best I have ever witnessed.

It started from her upbringing and her faith, which she mentioned. We have talked about Willy. She has mentioned Willy. But you never forget how she reminds us because it is with her, and you can see it in her actions every day—how when people would come into the store that Willy had, the grocery store in east Baltimore, when they had lost their job or someone was very sick and Willy would say: Take the groceries and pay me later.

It reminded me of my grandfather Jake—we have talked about this—who was an exterminator, not quite the same as Willy and not providing the same services, but he would tell people: If you have roaches and rats in your house and you can't pay, I will still exterminate. Pay me when you have the money. So I understood that instinctively.

I would have loved Willy to have met my grandfather Jake because I am sure

they were kindred souls in a lot of ways. And the guidance of Willy and BARB's mom—you can see it every day in the way she acts.

I just want to say another thing about BARB. She got into public service as a community activist. There was a highway that was going to tear up an important and historic part of her community, and she got involved. Being schooled by her and many of my colleagues, many women believed, oh, they would be excluded from politics if they went into politics directly. But when you are a community activist and you take a lead because something is bothering you about your home or your neighborhood, politics just followed sort of naturally. It is a little bit like PATTY MURRAY's story as well.

These days, because of what BARB has done, I think my daughters can aspire—I do not know if they do, but they can aspire to go into political life directly. In those days, it was much harder. But there she was. She led this fight. She went on to the city council, of course the Third Congressional District in Maryland, and now to this august Chamber. She has done so much. It has been cataloged by all my colleagues.

Medical research: There are probably millions of people alive today because of the 35 years she has pushed to make that happen. They do not know who they are, but they are there; and they are living happy and healthy because of BARB MIKULSKI.

How about veterans and health care needs? Again, literally tens of thousands, maybe hundreds of thousands, of our veterans are living much better lives because they were able to get the health care that BARB MIKULSKI spearheaded, particularly in the earlier days when this was not a popular cause.

The list goes on and on and on. She has done so much. In our Chamber she is beloved. Beloved. People are sometimes afraid of her when she gets mad. People want her approval. But most of all, I think what most of us seek is her advice, because after so many years in politics, she has that gift to understand what the average person needs and to talk directly to them. She does not talk through her colleagues or does not talk through the media or does not talk through some community leader or other politician. She still is talking to that family sitting in east Baltimore or in Hagerstown or in Annapolis. She almost has them in front of her eyes wherever she goes. That is why her speeches are so effective. She does not try to polish them. That is not her. She speaks from the heart directly to the people, and she cares so much about them that it comes through. It is an amazing trait.

I most admire people in political life who never forget where they came from. She is one of the most powerful people, not just women, one of the most powerful persons in America. I did not know BARB MIKULSKI when she was a community activist in East Bal-

timore, but my guess is she is exactly the same today. All the power and the accomplishments and the emoluments and the praise, all deserved, have not changed her a whit. That to me says an amazing thing about an individual.

BARB, I know my colleagues are waiting, but we love you. We cherish you. And as PATTY MURRAY said, I will put it my own way, I am sure that BARBARA MIKULSKI, knowing her as well as I do, the best is yet to come.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I wish to join my colleagues in a tribute to Senator MIKULSKI.

I am delighted to join my colleagues in joining in this tribute to perhaps our favorite colleague, BARBARA MIKULSKI, on her becoming the longest serving woman in congressional history. Her work in these Halls has made our country stronger. In a place where partisan rancor too often rules the day, she has established a legacy of service to her constituents and to all of us in this body that stands as an example to every one of us.

Her political career began in the late 1960s when she launched a campaign to stop the construction of a highway over a historic neighborhood she wanted to protect in Baltimore. She won that battle and went on to run for the Baltimore City Council in 1971. More than 40 years later and following a successful stint in the House of Representatives, BARBARA MIKULSKI continues to blaze an impressive trail.

During her 27 years in the Senate, she became the first woman to sit on the Senate Appropriations Committee, the first woman to chair an appropriations subcommittee, and the first Democratic woman elected to Senate leadership. Last year, we celebrated BARBARA as she became the longest serving female Senator. Now she has crossed yet another milestone, passing Congresswoman Edith Nourse Rogers of Massachusetts, having served in the Congress longer than any woman in history.

Of course, we do not just celebrate the quantity of BARBARA's service but its quality. No one is better at drilling down to the heart of an issue and expressing it in punchy, unforgettable terms. No one cheers us up more than BARBARA when she tells us to: Stand tall, square our shoulders, put on our lipstick, and rise to the occasion. We do not all put on lipstick, but we all get the message.

No one better combines the idealism of politics with the proactive abilities of government. She told me once with a twinkle in her eye, "I am a reformer, but I am a bit of a wardheeler too." Practicality and passion combined is what makes politics successful, and no one does it better than BARBARA.

When she was first elected to the House in 1977, she was 1 of 21 women in Congress; 18 in the House and only 3 in the Senate. Today there are 93 women

servicing including 17 Senators. BARBARA has earned the distinction of dean of the Senate women. But she never, never forgot her roots as a champion for those who need a voice in this building.

In her years in the Senate, BARBARA MIKULSKI's dedication to her constituents and women's rights has been clear, from becoming a champion of women's health issues to organizing training seminars for women of both parties elected to the Senate, to sponsoring and pushing through with a force that we all remember the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act of 2009.

During my much shorter tenure as a Senator, I have had the great privilege and pleasure to work with BARBARA to pass landmark health care reform legislation out of the HELP Committee. I have also served with her on the Intelligence Committee, and worked closely with her on the Senate Intelligence Committee's cyber task force to evaluate cyber threats and issue recommendations to the full committee. I have taken from those experiences great affection and respect for Senator BARBARA MIKULSKI. These are issues that are complex, complicated, difficult, and abstruse, and she brought to them the verve and the vigor and the vision to move on them. And those really are her hallmarks: verve, vigor, and vision.

I know all of us here in this Chamber are proud to call Senator BARB our colleague and friend as she makes history yet again. Her hard work and collegial spirit have enriched this Senate. I wish her all of the best in the accomplishments ahead. On behalf of all Rhode Islanders, Senator MIKULSKI, I congratulate you for this milestone in your history, the Senate's history, and our Nation's history.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. ISAKSON. Madam President, I consider it an honor and a privilege to rise for a moment to pay tribute to Senator MIKULSKI from the State of Maryland, and in so doing, I think it is only appropriate that I quote from a speech made on November 22 in 1922 by the first woman ever to serve in the Senate.

Rebecca Latimer Felton was the first woman Senator. She was appointed for 1 day. Governor Brown had run against Walter George for the Senate. Walter George won. And because of Ms. Felton's unending help to him in his race, he asked the Governor if he would appoint her for a day to his seat before he took it and was sworn in.

She came to Washington, DC, to serve for 1 day and she made one speech. In that speech she had a paragraph that to me exemplifies BARBARA MIKULSKI. She said, "Let me say, Mr. President, that when the women of the country come and sit with you, though there may be but very few in the next few years, I pledge you that you will get ability, you will get integrity of

purpose, you will get exalted patriotism, and you will get unstinted usefulness."

That was Rebecca Felton in 1922. Today, in March of 2012, we honor a Senator who has lived up to every one of those promises Ms. Felton made almost 100 years ago. I have had the privilege to serve on the HELP Committee with the Senator, worked very closely on the Alzheimer's legislation which she has been such a leader on, worked with her on many other projects, including one I am happy to remind her about, and that was the confirmation of Wendy Sherman a few months ago when together on the floor of the Senate, we worked together to see that she was appointed and named and confirmed Under Secretary of State for the United States of America, serving under Hillary Clinton.

On that night when we worked on getting that UC done, and it was not easy, I saw the tenacity, I saw the grace, I saw the patriotism, and I saw the integrity of BARBARA MIKULSKI. It is an honor for me to rise today and commend her on a great individual achievement, not just for herself but for all of the women who have gone before her and all the women who will come later on, and to my five granddaughters and my daughter.

She has led the life in the Senate exemplary of the contributions that all women can make to our society. I commend her on her service, her compassion, her integrity, and all that she has done for the State of Maryland, the United States of America, and peace on this Earth.

BARBARA, congratulations to you on a great achievement. It is an honor for me to be here.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. KLOBUCHAR). The Senator from Delaware is recognized.

Mr. COONS. Madam President, I am honored to follow my good friend and colleague from the State of Georgia in recognizing the remarkable contributions of Senator MIKULSKI, now the longest serving woman in the history of the Congress.

Today we have been joined by many great Marylanders. We have had Governor O'Malley and Senator CARDIN, and former Senator Sarbanes, and Senator MIKULSKI's own family, her sisters and brother-in-law in attendance. I am also pleased that we have got two of her favorite constituents, my father and my brother, who are with us today as well. They live in Annapolis and they have known what I have known since childhood when I lived in the suburbs of Baltimore, that Senator MIKULSKI is a remarkable, a tireless, a passionate, and an effective Senator.

Reference has been made to her start as a community organizer, someone who saved Fells Point from a 16-lane superhighway, someone who was not afraid to get into the gritty issues of a local community and standing up for folks who did not have anyone to fight for them. We have also heard about her

early years as a social worker, helping folks in need understand the programs available to them and then fighting for the programs that should have been available to them.

It is no surprise to any of us that the district she first represented in the House of Representatives, the Third, was known as the "steel district" where lots of men and women worked in the Bethlehem Steel plant. It is no surprise that she has earned a reputation here in the Senate as a woman of steel, who fights for manufacturers, who fights for Federal workers, who fights for Western Maryland, who fights for poultry on the peninsula of the Eastern Shore of Maryland, who fights for her constituents day in and day out.

It is indeed just that in this Woman's History Month we would be recognizing Senator BARBARA MIKULSKI, who has stood up for Maryland each and every day. And though like me she comes up a little short every time she stands, she stands incredibly tall in the company of Senators throughout American history. She is someone who is passionate for people, who has determination to continue in the tradition of her father, that fair deal grocer, who asked every day that simple question: How can I help, and then gets busy answering it.

She is a role model for me, for all of us, for my daughter, for my family, for our community. She is the only Senator I have heard say to me, fiercely, before going on a vote on the floor: To the barricades. And she is the only person who could say that and mean it. For a lifetime, she has been at the barricades of justice. She has been at the barricades of service. She has been at the barricades of making a difference. And for that, we are all grateful.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska is recognized.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, I too stand today to pay recognition to a friend, a colleague, and truly a woman who brings a smile to my face. Because for as many years as she has served her State of Maryland, for as many years as she has served in the Halls of Congress, she has the enthusiasm, the spontaneity, the excitement when she approaches an issue as a brand new rookie freshman coming into this body.

That is quite remarkable because around here we can get kind of dragged down by the day-to-day politics, the partisan nature, and the conflicts that are inherent in this process.

BARBARA MIKULSKI is one who embraces life and the responsibilities that are put before her. She has an opportunity to represent her constituents, and she embraces it with an enthusiasm that should be a reminder to us all of why we are here to serve.

I have so many different stories and quips and quotes about Senator MIKULSKI, whose name sounds somewhat similar to mine—MURKOWSKI. Every

now and again, we have an opportunity to share the same stage, the same podium, and the individual who is introducing us will trip on his or her tongue and refer to us wrongly. There was one occasion where we were being recognized by the National Geographic Society, and she pointed out to the individual making the introduction: She is the vertical one, and I am the not so vertical one.

This is just a recognition again that regardless of the situation, BARBARA MIKULSKI has a good comeback, a quick quip. She is a quipmeister if there ever was one. It speaks again to the enthusiasm and passion she brings to the job she has in front of her.

With names such as MURKOWSKI and MIKULSKI, we clearly have a Polish heritage we look to with pride. She reminds me of mine because she is perhaps a little more connected to those Polish roots. Again, there is a sense of pride with whom she is, where she has come from, and what her family has done preceding her that allows her to go on and do so much for so many.

We have had the opportunity to work together on issues that, coming from different parts of the country—truly different ends of the country—and one would not think we would have as much commonality on some of the issues. As the chairmen on the Commerce, Justice, Science Appropriations Subcommittee, we have worked closely on issues that relate to our fisheries, coastal issues, and judiciary issues. She is always reminding me that we have to take care of our fishermen out there and make sure our families who rely on our waters are appropriately cared for.

We have worked together on women's health issues. We were recently at the Sister to Sister event. I do feel a kinship and a relationship with this Polish sister as we talk about those issues that are so important to women's health.

We share the same concerns about how we do more for our first responders, our servicemembers, and our veterans. Just this past week, as Senator—I almost called her MURKOWSKI myself—Senator MIKULSKI was chairing a committee, and I brought up an issue as it related to the late Senator Ted Stevens and the Department of Justice investigation that failed so miserably—and we are now pursuing it, through different avenues, to make sure nobody should have to go through what Senator Stevens did—Senator MIKULSKI literally stopped the committee hearing to remind the Attorney General that, in fact, this was not a partisan issue; this was an issue where we all should be concerned and that if there is no justice within the Department of Justice, what does that mean for us as a nation.

She is never hesitant to speak and stand and make very clear, when these issues are important to the Nation, it should know no bounds by party. BARBARA MIKULSKI has held true to that.

In many different ways, that makes this milestone we are recognizing even more important because I think there is a kind of a piling on of events that can happen in the Halls of Congress, where the weight of what we do on a daily basis gets to be a load. To a certain extent, one can get tired, one can get worn, but BARBARA has not let the weight of that responsibility bring her down.

I was joking with her a little bit ago when all the accolades were coming her way. I said: BARBARA, with all these kind words that are being said about you, by the time the tributes are done, you are going to be 7 feet tall. That woman is 7 feet tall in the minds of so many of us. She is a giant for the people of Maryland. She has proven herself to be a giant in so many ways as she works to do good for so many.

I am proud to stand with so many colleagues in recognizing her tenure, recognizing this historic place she has carved for herself within the Congress, and to call her my friend.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, I rise to honor the service of one of our most distinguished and long-serving colleagues, the tireless, sometimes relentless, and often spirited senior Senator from Maryland, Ms. BARBARA MIKULSKI.

To say she is a trailblazer for women in politics is an understatement. She has blazed a bold trail not just for women in politics but for all women in every endeavor. She is a fighter, an advocate, someone whom one is hopefully on the same side with because she is a formidable opponent when one is on the opposite side. She is a role model for leadership and getting things done.

Her impressive list of accomplishments is far too long to recite in a few minutes or even a few hours. It would not adequately do justice to her incredible service to Maryland and the people of this Nation. Senator MIKULSKI has dedicated her career to serving Marylanders and has dedicated her life to public service.

She began as a social worker in the neighborhoods of Baltimore, working every day on the street helping at-risk children find their way and giving seniors the help they needed.

She was not, and is not, a bleeding heart, but there is no one who has a fuller heart, a more open heart to the deepest needs of the least powerful among us than Senator MIKULSKI. She is someone one wants on their side.

Senator MIKULSKI came to public service with what I like to call the long view. She can see beyond herself to the needs of society as a whole, and she has fought for those needs and won on far more occasions than she has lost.

When she first ran for public office in 1971, I know she had in her heart the deep and abiding memories of those kids and seniors she met in Baltimore when she began her career. I know she

carries those memories with her to this day. To this day, she has never forgotten the people of Maryland who need her the most and have had the wisdom to elect her time and time again.

Her political career has taken her from the Baltimore City Council to the House of Representatives and to this Chamber, where she has honorably served for the past 26 years. For 7 years, I have had the opportunity to work with her in this Chamber, and there has been no stronger, more knowledgeable, more committed colleague on this side of the aisle. She is an example for all her colleagues, determined to work across the aisle when possible and ready to fight for her beliefs when necessary.

She was the first woman elected to statewide office in Maryland, the first Democratic woman elected to the Senate in her own right, the first woman to serve in both Houses of Congress, and the longest serving female Member of the Senate.

As we all know, this past Saturday, Senator MIKULSKI became the longest serving woman in the history of the Congress, serving more than 35 years in the House of Representatives and the Senate.

It is only fitting that she achieve this milestone during Women's History Month because she has not only paved the way for women in politics but she has helped pave the way for women everywhere.

I had the opportunity to work with Senator MIKULSKI during the long and difficult debate and negotiations on health care reform. Her work was instrumental in ensuring that women have access to the comprehensive health care they are now guaranteed under the law. During that debate, no one's voice was clearer, no one's voice was stronger, no one was more convincing than she in the fight for a woman's right to comprehensive health care coverage.

She fought for mandatory insurance coverage of essential services, such as mammograms and maternity care, services that many insurance companies refused to cover. She fought to end gender discrimination by insurance companies.

As a result of the affordable care act and, in large measure because of Senator MIKULSKI's tireless efforts on behalf of women, being a woman is no longer a preexisting condition, as insurance companies used to say, that can be discriminated against.

Those insurance companies that routinely denied coverage of basic women's health services—essential services—are now required to cover those services under the comprehensive women's health services provision of the law.

Whenever there is a need in the Chamber for a strong voice for women, whenever there is a need for an advocate to stand for the powerless against the powerful, whenever there is a child who needs a friend or a senior citizen

who needs a hand, BARBARA MIKULSKI is there.

I believe there are many times she comes to this floor remembering, as she said, her days back in Baltimore, and she is right there—an advocate's advocate—fighting for those children and seniors she met along the way.

The rest of us are better off because she comes here with a full heart, ready to do what is right, not just what is politically expedient.

Her bill, the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act, was signed into law by President Obama just days after his inauguration. I was proud to work with her on that bill and on so many other efforts as well that make a difference in the lives of average Americans.

Finally, Senator MIKULSKI has been a tireless advocate for something that is near and dear to my own heart—for those who suffer from Alzheimer's and their families.

As the son of a mother who battled Alzheimer's for 18 years and lost her life to it, I understand firsthand the unique challenges of providing long-term care for a loved one. Senator MIKULSKI has come to this floor on countless occasions advocating for increased research, education, and programs for individuals with Alzheimer's. She has found support from her colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

It is estimated that 5.4 million Americans are currently living with Alzheimer's and millions more have been touched in some way by this debilitating disease.

I thank the Senator from the bottom of my heart for her passion for helping those who suffer from this disease. I look forward to continuing to work with her on this issue until we find a cure for Alzheimer's.

The bottom line: BARBARA MIKULSKI is a deeply committed public servant. The State of Maryland has rightly recognized her invaluable service for many years. Because of her efforts, those Maryland families know their interests are protected and their voices are heard.

It has been an honor to serve with her. All of us in this Chamber can only hope to serve our States with the same conviction, selflessness, and pride as Senator MIKULSKI has throughout her 35 years of service to the State of Maryland.

I am reminded of what Mother Teresa said when she got the Congressional Gold Medal:

It is not the awards and recognition that one receives in life that matters; it is how one has lived their life that matters.

In that respect, BARBARA MIKULSKI has lived an extraordinary life. We thank her for what she has done and not just for the people of Maryland but for all the people of America.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, I am proud to be able to join my colleagues on the floor this afternoon in

honoring Senator BARBARA MIKULSKI for her service to Maryland and for the endless contributions she has made to the people of this country.

It is very hard to adequately describe a political icon such as BARBARA MIKULSKI. For all of us women in politics, she is a model of what we can aspire to or what we would hope to aspire to. I just want to tell a simple story about BARB that I think reflects her ability to get along with people, her zest for life, as so many of my colleagues have described, and the connection she makes that makes a difference for people.

She and I were on a flight with four other Senators to the security forum in Halifax, Nova Scotia, a couple of years ago, and the weather was bad, so our flight was diverted to Bangor, ME. It was winter in New England, and of course, when there is bad weather in New England in the winter, it sticks around for a while, so we were trapped overnight in Bangor. Most of us just sort of sat there waiting to figure out what was going to be done while we waited for a flight the next day, but not BARBARA because she doesn't sit still. She is never afraid to pick up the phone and take action, and that is exactly what she did. BARBARA dialed up her old friend and colleague—the colleague of all of us—Senator SUSAN COLLINS, and said: Guess where I am. And that is how those of us who were on that flight—the six Senators and the Secretary of Homeland Security—wound up joining Senator COLLINS and the legendary Troop Greeters of Bangor, ME, in welcoming troops at the airport as they returned home from overseas. So what had earlier seemed like an inconvenience turned into a fabulous opportunity to thank our brave men and women in uniform and to have a good time while we were doing it.

You find those kinds of things happening if you spend time with BARBARA MIKULSKI. It is a byproduct of her relentless energy, her drive to better her community and our Nation as a whole, her deep commitment to fighting for women's health, and her unflinching grace and gumption as a legislator, a colleague, and a friend.

As has been said, she got her start as a social worker trying to make the lives of men and women in her native Baltimore a little easier to bear. She was working in the service of values that were taught to her by her family, who owned the neighborhood grocery store. And as so many have commented, she often tells the story of her father opening the store early so that steelworkers coming in for the early-morning shift would have time to buy their lunch. BARB has carried that spirit, those values she learned from her family in that grocery store here to the Senate, and often those values are sorely needed here.

As dean of the Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues, she has built a sense of community within the caucus.

Her bipartisan women's dinners are legendary. And, of course, what happens at those dinners stays at those dinners. Those are MIKULSKI's rules. But we really don't need to look any further than that wintry night in Maine to know how effective she has been in making things happen for people.

I look forward to more of her dinners, to more conversations with the Senator, to more chances to work with her as she fights on behalf of women and seniors and veterans and all those who don't have a voice in government and at the table. I thank the Senator for her friendship, for her leadership, and for her many years of service.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. MANCHIN. Madam President, I too am honored to be able to rise today to speak of our dear friend BARBARA MIKULSKI. So many good things have been said, so many accolades have been shared about what BARBARA has done and what she means to all of us. I can only tell you there is not a better ally, mentor, neighbor, and, most important, friend to have in the Senate than BARBARA MIKULSKI.

My State shares a border with BARBARA's State. Maryland and West Virginia have had a long and illustrious relationship. As Governor, I had always known of BARBARA and had met her a few times when I served the great State of West Virginia. But as a Senator, I have had the privilege of being her colleague and working with her and becoming friends, listening to her and watching her in how she works with her constituents, how she considers the issues, how she fights for issues. I don't think anyone has ever had to guess where BARBARA stands on an issue because we all know.

In the 15 months we have worked together, I can say it has been extremely rewarding to serve alongside her, whether it is her wisdom she shares on the train ride over to our sessions here or whether we talk about our both being raised in a grocery store. My grandfather had a little grocery store and, as you know, BARBARA was raised with her father in a grocery store. I think, basically, if you have retail in your blood, you understand the people of America.

Her sense of humor is something to behold. Every day I have the privilege of serving with her is a good day in the Senate.

I know colleagues have all shared their stories about BARBARA, and they have had more experience with her in the Senate. As a freshman, being here only a little over a year and a half, I have not had that many personal experiences, but I can tell you this: If there is a fight that breaks out, if there is something going wrong, you want BARBARA on your side. She is the person to have in that foxhole when the shooting starts. And I have been so appreciative to have her as my friend and always counting on her.

As we have all heard, she has been an advocate for women's health, the space program, and her most beloved State of Maryland, which she fights for every day.

Last year she became the first woman to reach the milestone of serving a quarter of a century in the Senate. Madam President, I have staffers who are younger than her years of service. But I also have young staffers, especially my female staffers, who have said they see a world of possibility because of the trail Senator BARBARA MIKULSKI has left for them. With all of that, she has blazed a trail for all of us. No one will be able to fill the shoes of BARBARA MIKULSKI. We will all be lucky enough to follow in her footsteps.

When she began serving on the Hill in 1977, there were 20 other women in all of Congress. She and 17 others served in the House, while there were 3 in the Senate. Today, 35 years later, there are 17 women serving in the Senate. If there is anything we can learn from Senator BARBARA MIKULSKI, it is that 17 women is far too few. We need more women like you, BARBARA, and, just as important, we need more Senators like you.

I can honestly say that I know the State of Maryland is much better off because of BARBARA MIKULSKI, but I can tell you that the United States of America is a better country because of BARBARA MIKULSKI. So I say thank you to my dear friend BARBARA for her service to this great country and to all the constituents in Maryland who must be extremely proud of her and have a right to be so. I too am so proud to call her my friend and my neighbor.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Madam President, we have listened with interest and total accord as the life of BARBARA MIKULSKI in the Senate has been reviewed by so many people. We have heard the friendship and good will we all share toward her.

Her record is quite well known. She is determined to get things done. She never lets minutia stand in the way or block an accomplishment. And I have noticed one thing: When BARBARA MIKULSKI starts to talk during a debate, the noise around the room quiets down. And if it doesn't, beware; BARBARA will call your attention to it and say it in a way that demands attention.

BARBARA and I arrived in the Senate in fairly close proximity. I came here in 1983 and BARBARA arrived in 1986, as I recall. We were both on the Appropriations Committee. I had some slight seniority over her, and one of the things that were being dealt with was seniority. BARBARA asked for my help in the choice of subcommittee, and I tried to step out of the way and help BARBARA obtain the chairmanship of a subcommittee in Appropriations, which she managed so well and so effectively. She once called me her Galahad, and I

was proud of the moniker because it was intended to be a compliment and a sign of friendship.

Strikingly, BARBARA MIKULSKI and I have backgrounds that are not dissimilar. I came from Polish heritage. My grandparents on my paternal side were born in Poland, as BARBARA's family was. They were immigrants. My parents were brought as children from Europe and went through the traditional immigrant absorption.

My folks found it very hard to make a living as they grew up here in America. My grandparents were essentially poor people with a kind of blue-collar background. They had to resort to storekeeping to keep food on the table, a roof overhead, and clothes on their backs.

The one thing that threaded through those years for me—and I heard it coming from BARBARA MIKULSKI so many times when she spoke—was there was always dignity in the house, there was always a positive outlook.

As I heard, my parents, like hers, were not able to do much with presents and valuables. But they did something else, and you see it so fundamentally clear in BARBARA MIKULSKI's demeanor and her behavior: that what she learned at home, the same thing that I learned at home, was the meaning of values not valuables but values. And values included a character obligation for hard work and honesty and decency. They were the yardsticks by which we were measured as children and as adults.

I worked very closely with BARBARA. I left the Senate, as is known, for 2 years and my seniority slipped as a consequence. BARBARA's seniority continued to grow, and she is chairman of the appropriations subcommittee. BARBARA always brought a degree of strength and energy to the things that she said and to the things she did. Although BARBARA during a presentation wanted to make sure that she was heard, and heard correctly, she would also pop up with humor. She had a facility with words and a facility with expression that would have you engrossed in what she was saying and caught off guard when a joke or a humorous statement would pop up.

When we note that BARBARA MIKULSKI, from this modest background, was always on the side of working people, it was never a mask; it was the truth and it was where she wanted to be. I must say that she, for me, was always a steadfast beacon that would remind us: Don't get carried away too much with your personal importance. Get carried away with the things you have to do in your responsibility as a Senator.

When BARBARA MIKULSKI came these years ago, as was noted, she was the first among the women to come to the Senate and ultimately, as we now know, became the longest serving and carried herself through all of the difficulties we have had. But always, always you could depend on BARBARA MIKULSKI. When BARBARA stood up, peo-

ple stopped talking about things that were extraneous and they would listen carefully, because BARBARA MIKULSKI always made so much sense and she didn't let you get by without a challenge if she believed you were wrong.

We have heard about her record, we have heard about her accomplishments, and everybody had wonderful things to say about her. I listened carefully to the statements that were being made and thought about our days together and how wonderful it was to be able to hear BARBARA MIKULSKI make sense out of what often escaped that challenge. She would offer the challenge and she would offer solutions.

I, like our other colleagues, stand here in awe and respect and note that BARBARA MIKULSKI, the storekeeper's daughter, is so much like that which I saw in my own life and we have seen in America in the past century; and BARBARA MIKULSKI who, in all due modesty, without any impression of a smug satisfaction, is always ready to take up the battle for the people she served, not only in the State of Maryland but across the country. She is an inspiration for women coming to government, and she serves so well as a demonstration of what could be.

I am delighted to be here, to stand here as a friend and an admirer of BARBARA MIKULSKI, and wish her many more years of service. I know that with BARBARA around, you can always count on sense and good judgment to result.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Madam President, I associate myself with the remarks of my colleague, the Senator from New Jersey.

It is with great admiration that I rise today to join all of my colleagues who have spoken before me and who will continue to speak honoring the Senator from Maryland, BARBARA MIKULSKI, as the longest serving woman in the history of the Congress.

It has been such an honor to serve with Senator MIKULSKI. In my 3 years in the Senate, she has quickly become a dear friend and an invaluable mentor, as she has been for all of the other female colleagues as the dean of women Senators.

It wasn't until 1932 that Hattie Caraway became the first woman ever elected to the Senate, and it wasn't until a half century later in 1986 that, against all odds, BARBARA MIKULSKI became the first Democratic woman elected to the Senate. That is right. When she arrived in the Senate, she was just one of two women serving in this body. Now the longest serving woman in congressional history, Senator MIKULSKI is showing what is possible when you ignore conventional wisdom, never stop fighting for what is right, and honor our commitment to families who elect us every single day.

One of her hallmark battles has been the fight for equal pay for work for women. This is not only an issue of

equality and justice but an economic imperative, because as we stand here today, with more dual income households than ever, women only make 78 cents on the dollar compared to men. For women of color, the disparity is even greater, African-American women earning 62 cents on the dollar, and Latinas 53 cents on the dollar. I know Senator MIKULSKI won't give up until we correct this outrageous injustice, and I am honored to be fighting alongside her.

Senator MIKULSKI has also led the fight to strengthen our laws against domestic violence, and open access to health screenings and treatment that saves women's lives. Close to my heart, she was among the first to stand up to insurance companies that said that being a woman was a preexisting condition. You can always count on Senator MIKULSKI to lead the charge in drawing a line in the sand in the Senate when it comes to protecting women's health and women's right to choose. We saw it yet again when she stood up to the dangerous overreach of the Blunt amendment that would have denied women of this country the ability to choose which medications to take and leave that decision to their boss.

She embodies the words of Eleanor Roosevelt:

The battle for individual rights of women is one of long standing and none of us should countenance anything that undermines it.

It is that spirit—making your voice heard, never backing down in the face of injustice—that has made Senator MIKULSKI one of the strongest voices we have for women in this country and women around the world. Every single day she is paving the way for more women leaders in America by showing the young women and girls of this country that women's voices matter and are needed in our public debate.

I close by expressing my personal debt of gratitude to her for her vision, her leadership, and her pioneering spirit. I simply could not imagine working in this body without her leadership. She has taught me so much in such a short period of time. And, as importantly, she has fostered an unbreakable bipartisan spirit among our colleagues that has resulted in important victories for the American public.

Thank you, Senator MIKULSKI, and congratulations on your historic achievement. It is an honor to serve with you, and I hope to continue to serve with you for many years to come.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Both Senator SESSIONS and Senator SNOWE are here, and I don't know if they wanted to speak. I know we have had a flow of speakers on this side, and if one of you wants to speak before I speak, I think it is the fair thing to do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama is recognized.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, my understanding was that Senator

DURBIN is going to make a UC request, which I plan to object to, and there might be some brief discussion of that. But I don't see Senator DURBIN on the floor.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. I am probably going to be the concluding remarks on celebrating Senator MIKULSKI, so I am going to proceed with that.

Madam President, we have been here now for almost 3 hours—I was down here when we started. Senator FEINSTEIN started about 2:00 and we are approaching 5:00 now—for an incredible celebration of BARBARA MIKULSKI's career. I have listened to a lot of it both at my office and here on the floor, and it is pretty remarkable to hear the kinds of things she has done with her life and I rise today to honor my colleague, Senator BARBARA MIKULSKI.

As has been noted, this month Senator MIKULSKI becomes the longest serving woman in the history of Congress. With her perfect sense of timing, BARBARA reaches this historic milestone during Women's History Month. And it is for the history books. But, as BARBARA has said: It is not how long I serve but how well I serve. And she has served very well. She has served her beloved State of Maryland very well, and she served this country in a number of capacities on the Appropriations Committee and on various committees in the Congress.

We celebrate this historic occasion but, more deeply, we celebrate BARBARA's record of achievement—a record that transcends gender, a record that is rooted in a life dedicated to public service.

Since she was first elected to public office in 1971 to the Baltimore City Council, BARBARA has been setting milestones. Think about that for a minute—1971. This is 40 years plus of public service. As the Chair knows, this is pretty remarkable. She served in public service for a while. I have served for a while. But 41 years of public service is remarkable—the first woman elected to statewide office in Maryland; the first Democratic woman elected to the Senate in her own right; the first woman in the Senate Democratic leadership; and the first Democratic woman to serve in both Houses of Congress. Yet it is not her being first that is the most impressive; it is her commitment to putting others first. BARBARA has shown that commitment time and again.

In over 35 years in the Congress, she has never wavered in her service to our Nation and her dedication to the people of Maryland. She has fought for quality education. She has fought for American seniors. She has fought for women's health and for veterans. For women facing unequal pay, BARBARA championed the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act. For senior citizens facing bankruptcy because of a spouse's nursing home care, BARBARA wrote the Spousal Anti-Impoverishment Act. Yes, she is a trailblazer, but she blazes those trails to help others—for young

people who dream of going to college, for families facing devastating illness, for opportunity for all Americans. That has been her passion, that has been her true achievement, and that will be her greatest legacy.

When BARBARA was first elected to the Senate in 1986, there was only one other female Senator. Now there are 17. BARBARA is, rightly so, the dean of the women. She is a mentor to her female colleagues, but no less so she is an inspiration to all of us.

I admire BARBARA's remarkable determination and her tenacity, but also her ability to work with others to get things done. She will fight for what she believes, but she will sit down to dinner with her colleagues across the aisle. And she has never forgotten where she came from. The daughter of a Baltimore grocer, each night she returns home to Baltimore. She has never forgotten the values she learned there: hard work, helping one's neighbor, patriotism.

She is diminutive in height only. That was evident early on. The story is well known how, as a young community activist, BARBARA stopped that 16-lane highway from coming through Baltimore's Fells Point neighborhood. She is not afraid to stand up to power, and she is not afraid of speaking strongly to power. In all the ways that count, Senator BARBARA MIKULSKI is a towering figure.

Albert Schweitzer once said: I don't know what your destiny will be, but one thing I know for sure. The only ones among you who will be truly happy are those who have sought and found how to serve. This BARBARA MIKULSKI has done. From her early days as a social worker to her years in Congress, she has served. She has served long and well.

Congratulations, BARBARA. It is an honor to be your colleague.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I couldn't be more pleased as well as privileged to join all of my colleagues today in congratulating a very good friend and colleague, the dean of the women of the Senate, Senator BARBARA MIKULSKI, on overtaking Congresswoman Edith Nourse Rogers as longest serving woman in the history of the Congress.

As someone who has had the privilege of knowing Senator MIKULSKI since 1978 when I was first elected to the House of Representatives, for me, this milestone represents a watershed moment in the life of American politics.

For nearly 35 years, I have witnessed BARBARA MIKULSKI summon and harness a seemingly limitless reservoir of energy as a fierce advocate and a champion on behalf of the people of Maryland as well as the country. With equal parts vigor and vigilance, she has demonstrated a devotion to her constituents that has been unerring in its promise and ironclad in its purpose.

It is precisely that caliber of service that the people of Maryland have rewarded time and time again.

As I stated on this very floor at the outset of this Congress when she surpassed the length of service of Maine's legendary Senator Margaret Chase Smith, Senator MIKULSKI is synonymous with "the special bond of trust which should exist between the governing and the governed." She has "recognized injustice and acted boldly to quell it . . . giving a voice to the voiceless . . . power to the powerless."

What Senator Margaret Chase Smith and Congresswoman Edith Nourse Rogers exemplified as standard bearers in the last century for length of service, Senator MIKULSKI embodies in this century—that the commitment to advancing the common good is bound neither by geographic region nor political affiliation but, rather, by an undaunted desire to serve others.

A consummate role model and admired mentor, Senator MIKULSKI always stands as a shining example that the robust pursuit of policy and the willingness to hear and consider dissenting views are not mutually exclusive. As I have often said, Senator MIKULSKI knows only one speed, and that is full speed ahead. But by the same token, she only knows one way to govern—through what she aptly referred to as the zone of civility. That approach, so integral to making this institution work, is indisputably one of the hallmark measures of Senator MIKULSKI's longstanding success in public life. Indeed, it is the blueprint for interaction that she has imbued in all of us who are women serving in the Senate. She has worked to establish a tone of respect that infuses our conversations, our collegiality, our collaboration. It is a personal cause to Senator MIKULSKI that is exemplified by the monthly dinners for women Senators that she initiated along with the Senator from Texas Mrs. HUTCHISON, a tradition that has become a catalyst for camaraderie and central to what Senator MIKULSKI calls our "unbreakable bond."

There has been no greater friend for women who have come to serve in the Senate, and I am sure it is a result of Senator MIKULSKI having arrived here as the second woman to serve in the Senate, along with the Senator from Kansas, Senator Kassebaum, as she said at the time—and that is why she was so willing to serve as a mentor for other women who arrived in the Senate, because she was only one of two women who were serving in this institution. As she said, the Senate had a long tradition of every man for himself. She was determined, she said, that it would not be every woman for herself while she was in the Senate.

As my colleagues also well know, when it comes to having an ally in the legislative foxhole, there is none more feisty, none more formidable, and certainly none better than Senator BARBARA MIKULSKI. I have witnessed her

tenacity firsthand, having worked with her side by side over the decades, whether on matters of equity for women in the workplace, ensuring gender-integrated training in the military, working on cybersecurity, working on every other issue where we are bringing justice to those who have borne the brunt of injustice.

Nowhere has her leadership been more unmistakable, of course, or more monumental than in the area of women's health. I well recall, when I arrived in the U.S. House of Representatives in 1979, I joined what was then known as the Congresswomen's Caucus on Women's Issues, which is where I ultimately became the cochair for a better part of the decade. Senator BARBARA MIKULSKI, at that time being in the House of Representatives, served in that caucus as well.

When I arrived in the House of Representatives in 1979, there were only 16 women serving in that institution. That is why the congresswomen's caucus was formed, to focus on those issues that mattered to women and to family and to children. We recognized that it was our obligation and responsibility to work, to focus on those issues because otherwise they would languish on the back burner rather than being on the front burner. We also understood that if we did not focus on these issues, if we did not advance these issues, no one else would. So we began to tackle systematically many of the discriminatory laws or inequities that were embedded in Federal law that failed to recognize the dual role women were playing, both at home as well as in the workplace.

We began to work on these issues one by one because there were so many issues across-the-board that were affecting women, where they were ultimately bearing the burden and the consequences of these inequitable laws. We did that with respect to pensions, for example, where women discovered that after their husbands died, their pensions had been canceled.

We discovered it when it came to family and medical leave, which took us the better part of 7 years to enact that legislation. But, again, women were bearing the burden of taking care of their ailing parents or their children at home and paying the consequences in the workplace.

Then, of course, there was the issue we discovered of discriminatory treatment in our clinical study trials. Regrettably, at the time our National Institutes of Health were actually discriminating against women and minorities, excluding them from clinical study trials because it was too complicated to include women in these study trials because we were biologically different. As a result, any of those treatments that were developed as a result of those trials could not be applied to women. Ultimately, this could make the difference between life and death because the kinds of procedures and treatments that were derived

from these clinical study trials could not be applied to women.

When we discovered that these inequities and this discriminatory treatment existed, we set to work on how to redress this wrong. It is hard to believe there was a time in America where women and minorities were systematically excluded from these trials that, as I said, had lifesaving implications. Who would have thought that women's health would have been the missing page in America's medical textbooks or merely an afterthought.

So I, as a cochair along with Congresswoman Pat Schroeder in the House, on behalf of the caucus, and, of course, then-Senator BARBARA MIKULSKI in the Senate teamed up in a close bipartisan, bicameral collaboration to establish the groundbreaking Office of Research on Women's Health at the National Institutes of Health so that never again would women be overlooked when it came to key clinical study trials that were underwritten by the Federal taxpayers and Federal funds. In fact, Senator MIKULSKI, as I well recall, launched the key panel of stakeholders at Bethesda to give this initiative critical national attention and momentum—as only she could—as well as fundamental policy changes that ultimately resulted from that panel that reverberate to this day, resulting as well in lifesaving medical discoveries for America's women.

That is the passion and power of Senator MIKULSKI that has led her to this historic day. BARBARA is not about legacy, she is about problem-solving. As somebody described it, her ideology is grounded in the practical, and that is so true. It is not only the practical but giving power to the people and developing practical solutions in their everyday lives.

She is a guardian of the common good, a woman who redefines the word "trailblazer," a pioneer of public policy. Senator MIKULSKI continues to shape the landscape of our Nation for the better, with a force and a might and a stature, one of the giants of public service, not just in our time but for all time.

On the occasion of Senator MIKULSKI's recordbreaking service, we congratulate her, we salute her, and we are honored to be able to express a profound appreciation for her extraordinary and legendary tenure in the Senate.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mrs. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I come to the floor this afternoon to celebrate BARBARA MIKULSKI's service to this country. I had the honor of presiding for the last hour and heard the statements of so many of my colleagues. I heard them talk about how, when she joined this Chamber in 1986, BARBARA MIKULSKI was the first woman elected to the Senate who was not preceded by a husband or a father,

the first woman elected to the statewide office to serve the State of Maryland, and only the 16th woman to have served in the Senate ever.

Today she is truly the dean of women Senators. She is a mentor and a friend to the rest of us, and she has always set the bar high. This is a woman who took on city hall as a young social worker in Baltimore—and won. This is a woman who has championed landmark legislation that has touched the lives of millions on issues ranging from health care to education to civil rights. She has shattered glass ceilings, not just in the Senate but in the Congress as a whole.

If that is not enough, she has even graced the glossy pages of *Vogue* magazine. Most of you may not have seen the photos that were taken in front of the Capitol Building with a number of other women leaders, including Meryl Streep, who was in town for a screening of her film “*The Iron Lady*.” So I think it is fitting, to borrow a phrase from the *Iron Lady* herself, Margaret Thatcher, who famously said, “In politics, if you want anything said, ask a man; if you want anything done, ask a woman.”

I don’t think my male colleagues who are here today will take offense at that one since anyone who has ever worked with BARBARA MIKULSKI knows she is a force of nature. She may not be the tallest Member of the Senate, but she is certainly the most tenacious. She is a tireless advocate for the people of her State, and she has a fierce and enduring love for those she represents. She knows where to pick her battles, and we have seen her face some tough debates in the Senate over the past few years. Whether it was working to take C-sections off lists of preexisting conditions at insurance companies or fighting to ensure equal pay for equal work for women or promoting better educational opportunities for children with special needs or ensuring that our troops and families receive the benefits that they have earned and that they deserve, she has never stopped working for fairness, justice, and decency.

The daughter of a smalltown grocery store owner, she has made strengthening the middle class the centerpiece of her economic agenda because, as she always puts it, the women in the Senate understand issues not just at the macro level but also at the macaroni-and-cheese level.

When BARBARA MIKULSKI came to the Senate 26 years ago, she lit a torch that has brightened the path for so many of us, for the 16 other women Senators who serve today and for all the future generations of women leaders who will lead our country forward. I am humbled to call her a colleague and a friend, and I am honored to celebrate her incredible service to our country today.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, there are several of my colleagues here who

are continuing their tributes to Senator MIKULSKI. I have a statement that was scheduled at 5 p.m. that will take all of 10 minutes, and then I will yield the floor at that point. I don’t know if Members who are on the floor want to establish a queue of who will follow, but if anyone wants to make that unanimous consent request, I see that Senator CARPER and Senator CANTWELL are here on this side, Senator COATS is on the other side. I don’t know if Senator SESSIONS is planning to speak after I have spoken on a substantive matter beyond the UC request.

Mr. SESSIONS. No, although I wouldn’t mind seizing the opportunity to speak about Senator MIKULSKI for a minute, but otherwise, if the Senator has no—

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I am going to give a statement and make a UC request that I planned at 5 p.m. And if I could suggest I be followed by Senator SESSIONS, and then Senator CARPER, Senator COATS—

Mr. COATS. If the Senator will yield on that, I don’t want to interrupt the tribute to Senator MIKULSKI, and I know the Senator has some business he has arranged. I will give mine another time. You don’t have to include me in the queue. I don’t want to spoil the party. The tribute is worthwhile, and I will find another time to do this.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I wish to make an admission. I have spoken about Senator MIKULSKI earlier and this is a different issue. I suggest after Senator SESSIONS that Senator CARPER and Senator CANTWELL follow. I ask unanimous consent that the Senators be recognized in the order I have noted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. Would the Senator wish to request that the non-tribute-related portion of the discussion be put in a separate place in the RECORD?

Mr. DURBIN. That is what I was about to ask the Chair, to have permission that my statement not related to Senator MIKULSKI be placed in a separate part of the RECORD.

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

(The remarks of Mr. DURBIN and Mr. SESSIONS are printed in the RECORD under “Cameras in the Courtroom.”)

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, although I do not have prepared remarks, I wish to join with my colleagues in making a few comments about Senator MIKULSKI.

Senator MIKULSKI is a great Senator. She is a delight to work with, a formidable adversary, and a formidable ally in any important debate. She is someone whom all of us respect and admire. It surprises me she has been at this business so long. It doesn’t seem as though it is possible. She certainly hasn’t lost her enthusiasm for the job and she has played an important role in quite a number of issues with which the country has had to deal.

I remember her leadership on an important issue during the post-9/11 time,

when we were wrestling with how to deal with security for our country. She spoke firmly and strongly in favor of firm action to defend America from attack.

Another issue I don’t think has been mentioned but is exceedingly important—something I have observed her deal with and provide leadership on for some time—is space and NASA. She is one of the absolutely most knowledgeable and experienced Members of this Senate and the entire Congress in dealing with the complexities and the needs of NASA and she is a champion and advocate for exploration of space. This is an area where America has led the world, and for all her time in the Senate, she has been a champion of advocating that the United States maintain this leadership because I think we share the view that America is a nation of explorers. We are a nation that leads the world in exploring and it is part of our DNA. So I appreciate her leadership in that particular area, as I have watched her with great admiration in her activities.

I didn’t realize this tribute would be going on this afternoon and I didn’t have prepared remarks, but I wish to join with my colleagues to say how much I appreciate her efforts. We celebrate her great accomplishment in the Senate. I believe that as we go forward, we will find that on issue after issue she will play a critical and a positive role in making America a better place.

I thank the Chair and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I wish to follow my colleague from Alabama and speak for just a few minutes about our friend and colleague, Senator MIKULSKI, who celebrates her milestone through her public service to the people of Maryland.

I asked my staff to go to the Web page for Senator MIKULSKI, her Senate office, and I came across one paragraph which I wish to read to my colleagues, if I may. It says:

Barbara Mikulski has never forgotten her roots. Throughout her career she has returned each night to her home State of Baltimore, Maryland. From community activist to U.S. Senator, she has never changed her view that all politics is indeed local and that her job is to serve the people in their day-to-day needs as well as prepare this country for the future.

Sometimes people have come to Congress over the years and they come understanding clearly that our job is to serve. Over time, somehow they lose that thought a little bit and it is less clear who is to be served and who is to be the servant. She has never forgotten who the servant is. She knows she came as a servant, and she will leave someday as a servant—hopefully, not anytime soon.

If we ask most people around here what are maybe one or two words that best describe BARBARA MIKULSKI, I think a lot of people would say she is a fighter. Let me just say, if someone is



an advocate for a particular cause, she is the person one wants in the foxhole with them. There is no better advocate, and there is no better or more able opponent on an issue. It is a lot better to have her on your side than it is to have her against you.

I take the train home at night. I go through Baltimore on my way to Wilmington, DE. Along the route, we go by a place called Aberdeen. Sometimes the train stops there; sometimes it does not. We have seen Aberdeen Proving Grounds literally consolidated from around the country. Much of the important research activity the Army does is at the Aberdeen Proving Grounds. The person more than anybody else who has made that possible is BARBARA MIKULSKI. It is a vast facility, with tens of thousands of employees who I think are mostly civilian and a campus of over 100,000 acres that does great work, helping to provide for our defense against all kinds of attack, foreign and domestic. She is a great person to have on your side in leading that fight.

One of the other things I love about BARBARA is her devotion to first responders. There is a big national fire school in a town called Gaithersburg, MD. She has helped make that place possible to not only train folks who are first responders for the people of Maryland, but they train as well first responders for virtually every State in every corner of this Nation. People will go to bed tonight knowing that if there is a fire or a problem or an incident in their community, it will be responded to, and they can thank BARBARA MIKULSKI for helping to ensure the folks trained there are ready to do that.

As much as anybody I know, she is a person who values service. AmeriCorps is an organization that encourages young people—really people of all ages—to volunteer and to serve. Volunteers are the ages of our pages and a whole lot older and the ages of guys like me. We all have an obligation to serve and to bring that spirit of service, whether or not we are in public life.

I was struck by the fact that she often opened the store as a kid, beginning a lot of her days as her dad opened the family grocery store, early in the morning in east Baltimore. I was born in West Virginia in a town called Beckley. I lived there for about the first 6 years or so of my life, but I would go back many summers, and I had the opportunity to work there for a supermarket, a mom-and-pop supermarket, with my own grandfather who opened the store almost 6 days a week, and I had the opportunity to see him and his work and what he brought to that store every day as the butcher. I think I know more about serving by working my summers in that store than anything else I have ever done. I suspect one of the reasons BARBARA has adopted and retained the spirit of a servant is because of her childhood and growing up and seeing her own family, her own dad, in that particular store.

I mentioned my grandfather in West Virginia. His wife, my grandmother, suffered from Alzheimer's disease. My grandmother's mother suffered from Alzheimer's disease. My own mother suffered from Alzheimer's disease. I don't think there is anybody in this body who has done more to lead the fight to ensure that this scourge of our society—and the scourge of people all over the world—is reined in and overcome. When that day comes, people will stand and say: I did something about this. Nobody in this body I think can take more credit for conquering Alzheimer's disease and dementia than BARBARA MIKULSKI.

Finally, when people think of BARBARA, they think of a fighter, an advocate for voluntarism, and some of the other things I talked about. I don't know that many people think of her as an athlete, but I will say that she is very a big advocate for leveling the playing field. She wants to make sure people not just in athletic endeavors have a level playing field in which to compete, but she wants to make sure young people coming from the most impoverished backgrounds have an opportunity and have a real shot at life to get a decent education as a child, the chance to go to college and to increase their potential to not just earn money and support their families but to live productive lives. Those are just some of the things I think about when I think of BARBARA MIKULSKI.

I will close by saying she had been in the House I think for 6 years when I arrived in 1982, 1983, and for all the time we served there together, she was always very encouraging of me, very supportive of me as her Delmarva buddy, as we shared the Delmarva Peninsula. Even to this day we work together to make sure we have a strong, vibrant poultry industry on the Delmarva Peninsula. I like to say we are still Delmarva buddies as we look out for the mutual concerns of our respective States.

With that having been said, let me yield back my time. I see Senator CANTWELL is ready to speak. My guess is, she is going to say some more things about BARBARA. But those are some things I am glad I had a chance to say.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I do rise to celebrate the remarkable achievements of my colleague from Maryland, Senator MIKULSKI.

Last January we celebrated an obvious achievement of her becoming the longest serving female Senator. And last Saturday that milestone entered another chapter, with her 12,858 days of serving the people of Maryland in Congress, which means she is now the longest serving female Member of Congress.

I know BARBARA MIKULSKI started her career fighting for Fells Point, a particular location in the Baltimore area that she thought deserved and needed to be protected, and that galva-

nized her to 35 years of service, where she has been a trailblazer on so many issues.

Many people have talked about those today—about being the first woman elected to statewide office in Maryland, the first Democratic woman to serve in both Houses of Congress; the first Democratic woman to sit in a Senate leadership position, and the first Democratic woman to be elected to the Senate in her own right.

Throughout her career, she has faithfully provided a very strong voice for the people of Maryland. But it is here in the Senate we have all gotten to see BARBARA MIKULSKI, the dean of the women Senators, and to see her incredible work as a trailblazer on so many important issues.

She has been a tireless champion on issues from pay equity to increasing access to college education, for women's health, for women's health care law, and time and time again she has proven she knows how to fight on the right side of the issues.

For the women of the Senate, she is an incredibly important ally. When it comes to each of us who comes to the U.S. Senate, to find our way and to make our own mark, BARBARA MIKULSKI is the Senator who is always there with you to make sure you can achieve what you want to for the State you represent.

I know for me I am very excited—my colleague from Alabama was mentioning Senator MIKULSKI's love of NASA and space exploration—in that I can say Senator MIKULSKI is certainly interested also in sci-fi, and I would call her a “techie” Senator because she certainly has shown a great deal of interest in technology and science.

As the Chair of the Commerce, Justice, and Science Appropriations Subcommittee, she was a key partner in the funding of key science and technology issues, and for us in the State of Washington, when we needed a new Doppler radar technology system, she was there to help ensure that those people who lived in coastal regions were going to have the appropriate protections they needed for understanding inclement weather.

She also has helped in prioritizing efforts such as the cleanup of the Chesapeake Bay in Maryland—something we in the Northwest relate to because we strive to have the same cleanup of Puget Sound.

We have worked together on important legislation, such as passing the Lilly Ledbetter legislation.

But it is BARBARA MIKULSKI—when it comes to protecting women's access to health care or standing up to any attack on Medicare—who is the most articulate, the most determined, the most persevering advocate to make sure women's issues and their cause are understood in the U.S. Senate.

I was proud to stand with her when she went up against the House plan to defund critical women's health care access and there was a near shutdown of

government. As people tried to pressure Planned Parenthood, she was there to make sure we continued important programs such as breast cancer screening.

So today I join my colleagues from the Senate to thank her for those years of service in the U.S. Congress, both in the House and the Senate. While she may represent Maryland, we all want to claim that we are better off as a country having BARBARA MIKULSKI in the U.S. Senate.

And to my colleagues—or to the young people who are here with us on the Senate floor—to understand this moment and achievement, you have to understand that in the whole history of our country, there have only been 39 women Senators, and a good number of those women Senators only served a few days or a few years. So the fact that somebody has achieved not just a seat in the U.S. Senate but a leadership position in the U.S. Senate is an incredible achievement.

We are glad she has represented a time when women have ascended to leadership in the U.S. Senate, where she is considered one of the wise Members when it comes to strategy on so many policy issues.

We are better off as a body because BARBARA MIKULSKI has served with us, and we are looking forward to many more years of wisdom and, hopefully, many more women Senators joining the ranks of BARBARA MIKULSKI in their tenure.

I thank the Presiding Officer and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I rise today also to pay tribute to my colleague, the senior Senator from Maryland, BARBARA MIKULSKI.

As everyone has said, this is a landmark, this is a milestone: the longest serving woman Senator and Member of Congress in the history of Congress, serving more than 35 years.

As a relatively junior Member of this body, I love BARBARA MIKULSKI. I love her because she calls me “FRANKEN.” That is music to my ears. We are in the caucus lunch, I may be in her way, and she says: FRANKEN.

I am not only a relatively junior Senator, I actually kind of recently was a comedian at one point. And she is really funny—BARBARA. I remember the first time I saw her speak—it was years ago, years ago; I cannot remember what the event was—and I am going to try to quote her joke. It was her joke, remember, about herself. She talked about her first campaign effort. I think it was for city council or something like that. She said: I knocked on 7,387 doors, and I walked a total of 372 miles, and I didn’t lose a pound.

So I love BARBARA. And she is a force—a force—of nature. Being the dean of women here is not her most commanding title. Her most commanding title is: a fighter. She is a fighter. When she commits herself to a cause, she is a true champion.

She is a true champion for America’s seniors, preserving pensions; of Medicare, defending Medicare—boy, do not attack Medicare around BARBARA MIKULSKI—and combating poverty. No one works harder for quality education, fighting to make sure every child has a quality education, so that child can pursue the American dream. And she is committed to fulfilling our country’s promises to our veterans, which is so important, and to increasing community service and voluntarism.

As anyone who has watched proceedings here in the Senate knows, BARBARA MIKULSKI, as my colleague from Washington stated, is the greatest champion in the body for women’s health. Here is something that is pretty amazing to understand. I want the pages to hear this. She fought to include women in NIH clinical trials. Women were not included in the National Institutes of Health clinical trials until she made sure they were. This is hard to believe, isn’t it? But in your 16 years of life, you—at 16, you cannot conceive of this. This is how backward we were. Think of what she did. That is who we are talking about today.

She has improved access for women to mammograms and cancer screenings—for all women. She has fought for women to have their own say over their own body and reproductive system. Basically what I am saying is, when you have BARBARA MIKULSKI on your side, you have a strong voice in the U.S. Senate.

We have heard reference to her accomplishment on the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act. When advocating for this bill, Senator MIKULSKI said:

Women earn just 77 cents for every dollar [their] male counterparts make. Women of color get paid even less. The Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act will empower women to fight for fair pay by once again making employers accountable for pay discrimination. I will fight on the Senate floor to get this bill passed.

And the bill was passed. It was the first bill President Obama signed in office.

Senator MIKULSKI and I share a number of passions. One of them is early childhood education. Increasing early childhood education—access to it—is one of my top priorities because we know over and over that the benefits of early childhood education have been demonstrated. And BARBARA knows this.

I wanted to have a hearing on just the economic benefits of early childhood education—just the economic benefits—because a child who has a quality early childhood education is less likely to be a special ed kid, is less likely to be left back a grade, has better health outcomes; a girl is less likely to get pregnant before she graduates from high school, a child is more likely to graduate high school, more likely to go to college, more likely to graduate college, more likely to get a good-pay-

ing job and pay taxes, and much less likely to go to prison. It has been shown over and over that the cost-benefit is, for every \$1 spent, like \$16 in return.

I wanted to get a hearing just on this. Because we were talking about education, I thought this needed to be discussed, and we needed experts, economists who were credible on this. So I went to BARBARA and she, of course, said: Oh, yeah. OK. Let’s do it. She is Chair of the Subcommittee on Children and Families. I thought that would be a good place to do it, except I am not on that subcommittee. I am on the HELP Committee, which this is a subcommittee of, but I am not on that subcommittee. She said: OK, that doesn’t matter. You come anyway. And not only that but: What witness do you want?

She let me pick a witness, Art Rolnick, an expert in early childhood education—on the economics of it—who started out as an economist at the Federal Reserve in Minneapolis and got into the economic benefits of it.

She is a true ally. She is someone who used her resources as chairwoman of a committee to make sure something you feel strongly about will be aired, will be discussed.

You learn from BARBARA that what we do around here is not so much about policy, it is about people. For her, it is about the people of Maryland. She goes to bat for them time and time and time again. It is about kids. And it is about women, who often have to be both the breadwinner and the caregiver, and who should have every right and every opportunity at work and in society that men have.

As both a Member of the Senate and as a father of a wonderful daughter, I am enormously grateful to Senator MIKULSKI for being a tremendous role model to women in this country, for having fought her way to the Senate, and for proving that legislating was not a man’s job—or only a man’s job—it is a man’s job too.

This body is so much the richer for her, and Americans are so much better off as a result. But her work, our work is not over. Out of 100 Senators, there are still only 17 women. Our Nation is facing tremendously difficult challenges, and having more women like Senator MIKULSKI in the room will help us solve those problems. I am glad she is here leading the way.

With that, I would like to thank BARBARA for her leadership, her friendship, and for being such a fierce advocate. Congratulations, BARBARA, on your achievements thus far and on this milestone. I look forward to many years fighting alongside you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise, along with so many colleagues, to pay tribute to Senator BARBARA MIKULSKI, an extraordinary woman and Senator, someone who has become the longest serving woman in the history of the

Senate, indeed, in the history of the Congress. She surpassed, on January 5, 2011, the record of Republican Senator Margaret Chase Smith as the longest serving Senator. Just this Saturday, she became the longest serving woman in the history of the Congress, surpassing the tenure of Edith Nourse Rogers, a Republican Congresswoman from Massachusetts, who served in the House from 1925 to 1960.

Senator MIKULSKI is the first female Democrat to be elected to the Senate in her own right in 1986. She is a woman of many firsts. She is indeed the dean of the Senate women—I would actually say a dean of the Senate, with her great energy, her great eloquence, and her great passion, particularly for those who are often overlooked in our society. She comes at it honestly. She was a social worker in Baltimore, helping at-risk children and educating seniors about Medicare before being elected to the House of Representatives.

She has taken that concern for the vulnerable and a particular passion for the State of Maryland forward every day she has served in the House and Senate. She has served on numerous committees. She is a subcommittee chairperson on the Appropriations Committee—Commerce-Justice-Science. She has devoted herself to those issues, and many more. She serves on the Select Committee on Intelligence and has been a key member of the Senate Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee. She has left her mark on a broad range of programs that touch each and every American family. She has been particularly active in women's health, ensuring that women were included in NIH clinical trials, where in the past they were ignored.

Since one cannot ignore BARBARA MIKULSKI—which is virtually impossible—she made it a reality that they cannot ignore women in NIH clinical trials, requiring Federal standards for mammographies, ensuring uninsured women have access to screenings and treatment for breast and cervical cancer. She increased research dollars for Alzheimer's and enhanced the Older Americans Act.

She has been, since her first days in the House of Representatives, at the forefront in advocating for better health care and education particularly for the most vulnerable among us. She has been a champion of national service, understanding that in a great country one has to contribute as well as benefit.

She said one of the things she is most proud of—in her words—“strengthening the safety net for seniors by passing the Spousal Anti-impoverishment Act. This important legislation helps keep seniors from going bankrupt while paying for a spouse's nursing home care.”

That is a fitting and representative example of her service. Throughout her service, she has maintained national priorities but has never taken her eye off Maryland. She commutes every

evening back to Baltimore. She works hard to ensure that the people in Maryland benefit because of her activities.

I also thank her for the kindness and help she has given me personally—her concern, for example, with the fishing community in Rhode Island, which is under her jurisdiction on the Appropriations Committee, and in other ways. She has been terribly important and kind to us. She was instrumental in helping us to secure funding for the HOPE VI project in Newport, RI, which has created extraordinary beneficial housing for a mix of incomes in Newport. It is one of the most attractive as well as one of the most stable communities I think anywhere in the Nation. She has been there to help us constantly.

I could go on and on, as my colleagues have said. I simply want to say at this special moment in Senator MIKULSKI's career, we thank her, admire her, respect her, and she has set a great example for us. In the days ahead, she will not only continue to inspire and sustain us, she will continue to sustain and lead in her State.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. President, some time ago, I was reading a book about the beginnings of the interstate highway system in our country. I came across a paragraph when the highway builders and the Federal Government were going to run the interstate highway through some stable middle-class, working-class neighborhoods of Baltimore. The highway administration was greeted by an organizer who, on behalf of citizens of this neighborhood, said this is not the place to put this highway. She was successful in convincing them that the highway should go elsewhere so it would not be disruptive of so many homes, well-established small businesses, and the cohesive community in that part of Baltimore. The woman who led that effort several decades ago was BARBARA MIKULSKI. She was not yet on the city council. She was a citizen who spoke for her neighbors and has continued to do that as a member of the city council and then as a Member of the House of Representatives and for many years—3½ decades—of the Senate.

We heard Senator REID and others earlier today talk about Senator MIKULSKI being the first female Democrat to serve in both the House and Senate—to be elected to the Senate without succeeding a husband or a father and first to chair an Appropriations subcommittee. Most important, she helped to blaze this path. In 1987, there were only two female Senators. One was the daughter of a Presidential nominee a generation earlier, and the other was BARBARA MIKULSKI. Today, there are 17 female Members of the Senate. It doesn't look like America yet. There is not anything close to the number of minority members as a percentage of the population, but I hope

that changes. I think it will. It doesn't come close to representing the gender makeup of our society. But to go from 2 female Senators, when she first came, to 17 today—and if I can predict elections, which none of us can, and we certainly cannot try—I think there is a good chance there will be a number of additional women in this body this time next year.

I wish to say a couple more things about Senator MIKULSKI on a less serious note. I have been privileged to serve on two committees with Senator MIKULSKI—one being the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee. During the health care legislation, she was so helpful to so many of the causes we care about and to justice in this country, and on the Appropriations Committee, where she cuts a wide swathe of involvement for Maryland and this country, she champions women's health and many talked about this earlier. She cares so much about the National Institutes of Health, not just because it is located in Maryland but because it matters so much for scientific research, for curing a whole host of diseases and preventing diseases, and the number of jobs NIH creates, not just government jobs but the jobs that come out of commercialization of scientific research.

My State is one of the leaders; whether the jobs come out of Cincinnati Children's Hospital, Southwest Hospital, and where Case Western Reserve University is and its medical center around Cleveland, we see that kind of commercialization.

I often call her Coach B because she is someone who has been around here a long time and is always willing to advise newer and younger Members. She has been following, especially in my State, what is important, the issue of health care. My State has some of the leading health care institutions in America. Also, what she has done with the space program—the only NASA facility north of the Mason-Dixon line is in Cleveland, with a satellite in Sandusky, NASA Glenn, named after former Senator and astronaut, John Glenn. She has been one of the strongest advocates for the space program, and science, technology, and R&D. She has been particularly helpful to me as I fight for the kind of work NASA Glenn does in Cleveland, and I am appreciative of her for that.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BENNET). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

(The remarks of Mr. WHITEHOUSE pertaining to the introduction of S. 2219 are printed in today's RECORD under “Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.”)

## OHIO'S COLLEGE BASKETBALL EXCELLENCE

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. President, I rise to talk about a new record that has been set. It has nothing to do with the number of votes the highway bill garnered last week in the Senate, and it has nothing to do with length of service of Senator MIKULSKI.

For the first time in history, this year one State has four teams in the Sweet 16 of the NCAA Men's Division I basketball tournament: Ohio.

A special congratulations to the Ohio State University, in Columbus; the University of Cincinnati, in Hamilton County; Ohio University, in Athens, OH; and Xavier University, also in Cincinnati, for their outstanding run so far and making our entire State proud.

I am hosting, for the fifth time, an annual Ohio College President's Conference next week. We bring in 50 to 60 college presidents to meet with each other and with me and we bring in people from the administration, Republicans and Democrats, House and Senate Members, who lead on higher education issues. We bring 55 or 60 college presidents in from Ohio for a day and a half, and there are public and private institutions, 2-year community colleges, and 4-year colleges and universities. They learn best practices from one another. They build relationships that help all 55 or 60 of these college Presidents to do better.

Perhaps, we will talk more about college sports this year because of these four Ohio teams that made the Sweet 16.

We also know another point of reference for Ohio this year was that March Madness started in Dayton, in what has become an important tradition to Miami Valley and our country. This weekend, before the games started, Dayton's Oregon District hosted the First Four Festival, where 15,000 people crowded local restaurants and bars, listened to live music, and watched games on big screens.

A few days later, President Obama and British Prime Minister David Cameron came to the same city where the Dayton peace accords were negotiated and joined the Dayton community and teams from Kentucky, Mississippi, New York and Utah and their fans to watch the first rounds of the NCAA Division I men's tournament at the UD Arena. The UD—University of Dayton—Arena now holds the national record for the number of NCAA basketball tournament games held in a single venue.

The business community in Dayton, one of the most active in the country—the Dayton Development Coalition—rallied together to make sure military families from Wright-Patterson Air Force Base were able to attend, and \$3.5 million was pumped into the local economy, showcasing the Miami Valley's world-class tourism infrastructure of hotels, parks, entertainment, and recreation.

We saw the same thing later in the week in the Arena District of Columbus, where the city hosted games on

the opening weekend. Local Columbus leaders and businesses hosted teams from St. Louis, North Carolina, Michigan, New York, Tennessee, California, and Washington, DC, with their fans.

The city expected a \$10 million impact on the local community, with tens of thousands of people staying at hotels, eating in restaurants, and enjoying one of the fastest growing cities in America, where, I might add, the Presiding Officer once lived. We saw a boost in tourism in northern Ohio, where Bowling Green hosted the first and second rounds of the NCAA women's basketball tournament. Organizers in Bowling Green said the games were more than about basketball, it was about people from across the Nation coming to town and boosting the sales of small businesses.

All the excitement and economic activity goes to show that Ohio is a tremendous attraction of basketball tourism and basketball talent. As the tournaments continue, and Ohio's teams continue to win, I look forward to working with our communities and our business leaders to further leverage our assets in tourism and recreation to help create jobs throughout our State and to promote economic development.

I thank the Presiding Officer, I yield the floor, and 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. 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.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following morning business on Thursday, March 22, the Senate resume consideration of H.R. 3606; that the time until 12:30 p.m. be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees; that at 12:30 p.m., the postcloture time be considered expired and the Senate proceed to votes on the following: Reed No. 1931, Merkley No. 1844, as amended, if amended, and passage of H.R. 3606, as amended, if amended; that there be 2 minutes, equally divided in the usual form in between the votes; that upon disposition of H.R. 3606, the Senate then proceed to the consideration of the House message to accompany S. 2038, the STOCK Act; that there be 4 minutes of debate, equally divided in the usual form prior to the vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to concur in the House message to accompany S. 2038; that if cloture is invoked on the motion to concur, that all postcloture time be yielded back, the motion to concur with an amendment be withdrawn, and the motion to concur be agreed to; that the motions to reconsider relative to the above items be considered made and laid upon the table; and that all after the first vote be 10-minute votes.

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

## CAMERAS IN THE COURTROOM

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, by this time next week, the Supreme Court will have finished hearing oral arguments in the case challenging the constitutionality of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act. How important is this Supreme Court case on health care reform? Well, health care is such an important issue that Congress spent 1 year drafting and debating a bill that the Court is going to consider next week.

Health care has been a critical issue for so long in our country that in the last century, nine different Presidents have spent time, energy, and political capital fighting for reform. It is so important that the Supreme Court reserved 6 hours for oral argument over the course of 3 days to consider the act's constitutionality. The last time the Court dedicated that kind of time to any one case was in 1966—if I am not mistaken, that was 46 years ago—when it considered *Miranda v. Arizona*. Not even the health care case is important enough for the Supreme Court to justify breaking its antiquated tradition of allowing cameras to televise the proceedings, so the American people are not going to have a chance to see and hear these historic arguments for themselves as they take place.

I cannot predict the outcome of the case, but I can tell you what to expect just outside the doors of the Supreme Court. It is a scene we have seen over and over again for decades. Thousands will gather outside the Court. Many are going to camp overnight, sleeping on the sidewalk in the hopes of getting about 1 of 200 seats available to the public. The vast majority of those wanting to see the Supreme Court argument on one of the most important cases of our time will be told: No, you are not allowed to come inside the Court. We don't have room for you. In a democratic society that values transparency and participation, there cannot be any valid justification for such a powerful element of government to operate largely outside the view of the American people.

For too long the American people have been prevented from observing open sessions of the Supreme Court. Except for the privileged few, the VIPs, the members of the Supreme Court bar or the press, the most powerful Court in our land—some might argue in the world—is inaccessible to the public and shrouded in mystery.

I am pleased to stand in the Judiciary Committee with Senator GRASSLEY, the ranking member of the Judiciary Committee, asking that the Senate pass our bipartisan bill that would require televising open Supreme Court proceedings. With the benefit of modern technology, the Supreme Court proceedings can be televised using unobtrusive cameras and the Court's existing audio recording capability. Our bill respects the constitutional rights of the parties before the Court and respects the discretion of the Justices.

The Court can decline to televise any proceeding where the Justices determine by a majority vote that doing so would violate due process rights of one or more parties.

In our view—Senator GRASSLEY and myself—this is a reasonable approach that balances the public's need for information and transparency, the constitutional rights of those before the Court, and the discretion of the Justices.

It is no secret that Senator GRASSLEY and I have strong disagreements about the actual law that is going to be considered by the Court. We have taken to the floor many times to explain our positions. Despite our disagreement on the substance of the health care bill, Senator GRASSLEY and I agree on a bipartisan basis to stand united in full support of S. 1945, which would finally bring transparency and open access to Supreme Court proceedings.

We are not the only Members of this body who believe these proceedings would produce greater accountability. In past years the Cameras in the Courtroom Act enjoyed bipartisan support. The last sponsor of the act before he left the Senate was Senator Arlen Specter of Pennsylvania. This version of the bill, very similar to his own, has the support of Senators CORNYN, KLOBUCHAR, SCHUMER, BLUMENTHAL, GILLIBRAND, HARKIN, and BEGICH. As Senator GRASSLEY would note, Democrats and Republicans from both Chambers have written to the Supreme Court asking it to permit live televised broadcasts of the health care reform arguments.

In November, Senators BLUMENTHAL, SCHUMER, and I wrote a letter to the Chief Justice making a request to open the Supreme Court for this historic argument and let America hear the arguments made before the Court and the questions asked by the Justices in open court. Chief Justice Roberts responded to our request last week, and it sounds as though he sent the same letter to Senator GRASSLEY. The Chief Justice informed us that the Supreme Court has respectfully declined to televise the health care arguments, but that the Court would graciously offer an alternative.

Here is the alternative: The Court will post the audio recordings and unofficial transcripts to the Court's Web site a few hours after the arguments are over. For that gesture, I guess we can congratulate the U.S. Supreme Court for entering the radio age. America entered the radio age 90 years ago. The Supreme Court is catching up with a delayed broadcast-audio only. But I think America deserves better.

Decisions that affect our Nation should be accessible by the people who are affected by those decisions and they should be produced in a way that Americans can both see and hear. The day of the fireside chat is gone. The day of radio transmissions exclusively is gone. Television—and increasingly even the Internet—is the dominant me-

diuum for communicating messages and ideas in modern America. It is not too much to ask the third branch of government at the highest level to share the arguments before the Court with the people of America. Understand, there will be hundreds of people present and watching this as it occurs. It is not confidential or private. It is only kept away from the rest of America because this Court doesn't want America to see the proceedings.

The Supreme Court is an elite institution in our government. Every member of the Supreme Court went to one of two Ivy league law schools. Most of the clerks before the Court come from one of seven law schools. None of the current Justices has run for public office. None of the current Justices has tried a death penalty case. And the lawyers who appear before the Supreme Court are part of a small and exclusive club. Perhaps this limited exposure is why many on the Court don't seem to fully appreciate the impact its decisions have on everyday America, and why the American people deserve to have more access to the Court's public proceedings. Since the Supreme Court is the final word on constitutionality, on issues that impact the lives of every American, the American people should have full and free access to its open proceedings on television.

Let's be clear about one thing: Our bill only applies to court sessions that are already open to the public. Supreme Court Justices should be able to consult with each other, review cases, and deliberate privately. No one in this bill, or otherwise, is calling for those private deliberations to be televised. I believe that televising private deliberations or closed sessions of the Court would cause harm to our judicial system. Our bill does not require that and I would not support that. Open sessions of the Court, however, where members of the public are already invited to observe are a different matter. They should be televised in real time and widely available.

Some who oppose our bill say that the elite cadre of seasoned lawyers with the rare opportunity to argue before the highest Court in the land will grandstand in front of the cameras, risking their professional reputations and even their clients' cases. Some say that the Court's Justices, who have been subjected to the most rigorous vetting process known to man and the most widely covered confirmation hearings, will shrink from the camera's glaring lens. I don't buy it. The experience of the State and Federal courts that have allowed the open proceedings to be televised proves these fears are unfounded.

While the Federal courts of appeals have not permitted cameras to broadcast all appellate proceedings, there was a 3-year pilot project in 1990 that assessed the impact of cameras in the Federal courts. Listen to what happened as a result of the pilot program. At the end of the day 19 of the 20 judges

most involved concluded that the presence of cameras in the Federal courts "had no effect on the administration of justice."

Don't take my word for it. Kenneth Starr, former Solicitor General and independent counsel, supports our bill and said this:

This fear seems groundless . . . The idea that cameras would transform the [Supreme Court] into "Judge Judy" is ludicrous.

For more than 30 years State courts have broadcast their proceedings and, in fact, what they found hasn't detracted at all from the pursuit of justice. Every State in our Nation permits all or part of the appellate court proceedings to be recorded for broadcast on television or streaming on the Internet. Expanding access to the Supreme Court by televising its proceedings should not be controversial. Public scrutiny of the Supreme Court proceedings produces greater accountability, transparency, understanding, and access to the decision-making in government. Congressional debates have been fully televised for more than three decades.

There are people who follow the C-SPAN broadcast religiously. I know. I meet them regularly. As I said in the Judiciary Committee, people will come up to me and say: One of your colleagues looks a little bit under the weather. Does he have the flu? Is he sick? By observing C-SPAN or following the floor of the Senate and knowing each of us, they think on a more personal basis. They hear these statements, they listen to the debates, and they feel better informed about their government. Wouldn't the same apply across the street in the Supreme Court?

Opponents of our bill say the public will be misinformed because all they see are brief clips of the Court's proceedings that could be misconstrued. As I said, this argument sounds a lot like an editorial from a few years ago, and it said:

Keeping cameras out [of the Supreme Court] to prevent people from getting the wrong idea is a little like removing the paintings from an art museum out of fear that visitors might not have the art history background to appreciate them.

In 1986, Chief Justice Burger wrote the following words in the Supreme Court's Press-Enterprise Company v. Superior Court opinion. These words are as true today as they were in 1986:

[P]eople in an open society do not demand infallibility from their institutions, but it is difficult for them to accept what they are prohibited from observing.

The time has long since come for the Supreme Court—for the highest Court in our land—to open its doors and allow the American people to finally observe its proceedings.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 1945

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, at this point I wish to make a unanimous consent request relative to this bill that would open the Supreme Court proceedings to be televised.

I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 319, S. 1945, a bill to permit the televising of Supreme Court proceedings; that the bill be read a third time and passed; and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I want to congratulate my colleague Senator DURBIN for his able articulation of his view. This is a matter that the Senate and the Congress has considered for quite a number of years. It has not decided to take this step to direct a coequal branch of government on how to conduct their business, and I don't think we should. So I think it would be inappropriate to pass this on a UC without a full debate and discussion and a full vote on it.

So I would say that.

Also, I would note the Justices have opposed this policy. I think we have a duty to respect the coequal branch of our government. They feel as though it would impact adversely the tenor and tone of the oral arguments. The Justices would also have to feel a burden and explain why they are asking a question, perhaps citing a case by name that all the lawyers would know but having to explain to nonlawyers now what is on their minds as a part of their process of questioning. So I think that is a factor.

I would also note it raises constitutional questions. Why would we want to push to the limit and perhaps push over the limit and try to dictate to a coequal branch how to conduct the adjudicative process? Not the political process; we are the political branch. Theirs is the nonpolitical branch, where Justices are given lifetime tenure so as to insulate them from pressure and to allow them to dispassionately decide complex issues. I would also note that in terms of what is said and how an argument goes, there is no difference, I suppose, between that and what goes on in chambers when the Justices meet in private and talk about what issues are before the Court and how they should be decided.

What is important in the adjudicative branch? What is the criteria and the fundamental essence of a judicial proceeding? Ultimately, it is the judgment. The judgment speaks. The arguments don't speak. The in camera discussions don't speak. The judgment itself represents the opinion of the Court. It is the law and the defining process.

I appreciate very much the work of my esteemed colleague. I know he loves the law; we both do. He believes this would improve justice in America. I can't conclude that to be correct. I believe Justices should be given the responsibility to conduct their branch consistent with their best judgment of how do to it. Therefore, I object. I thank and respect my colleague for his different opinion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 247, S. 671; that the committee-reported amendment to S. 671 be agreed to, and the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DURBIN. Reserving the right to object, it is my understanding the Judiciary Committee staff has been working on a package of important Judiciary Committee bills, including the very bill Senator SESSIONS has asked unanimous consent to move to—a bill which I quite likely will support.

Would the Senator be willing to modify his request to include the passage of other bills which are part of that package and have similarly important elements to them in terms of keeping America safe? They include the following: Calendar No. 246, S. 1792, the Strengthening Investigations of Sex Offenders and Missing Children Act; Calendar No. 233, S. 1793, the Investigative Assistance for Violent Crimes Act; and discharging the Judiciary Committee from further consideration of S. 1696, the Dale Long Public Safety Officers' Benefits Improvements Act; agreeing to a substitute amendment which is at the desk, and passing the bill, as amended?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator so modify his request?

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I appreciate the suggestion by the Senator from Illinois, as I believe I will be able to support all those bills, but I have information that Senators on our side oppose or have objections to two of them and would like to offer amendments or modify them. So I am not able to agree on behalf of colleagues that all the bills would be passed as written.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, until the time comes—and I hope it is soon—when we can reach an agreement on all four bills, I will object to moving one bill in the package.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I would note that the Presiding Officer is a cosponsor with myself of S. 1792, the Strengthening Investigations of Sex Offenders and Missing Children Act of 2011, and perhaps we will be able to make that work sooner or later. I am sure we will.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. DURBIN. 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 FURMAN BISHOP

Mr. ISAKSON. Madam President, this past weekend, Georgia lost a great citizen. Furman Bisher died in Fayetteville, GA, on Sunday afternoon of a tragic heart attack. He was the premier sports writer in the United States of America, covered every Super Bowl, every Masters, was at every major heavyweight fight.

From the day he started on his Royal manual typewriter until the day he died, he typed on that same manual typewriter that was over 60 years old. He was a brilliant writer, a compassionate individual, a great friend, and someone I looked up to very much. He was a pacesetter. He actually got the only interview of Shoeless Joe Jackson ever done by a reporter. He did it because of his cunning ability to be in the right place at the right time, and that twinkle in his eye that always made you want to take to Furman Bisher.

So as on the floor of the Senate today I pay tribute to Furman and his life, to all of his accomplishments in terms of the writing of sports in our State and around the world. To his family and loved ones, I extend my sympathy on behalf of not just myself but all of the citizens of Georgia.

#### IRISH E3 VISA BILL

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, yesterday afternoon I had the honor of attending the annual Speaker's Luncheon celebrating the long and enduring partnership between the Irish and American people. Among the guests of honor were the President and Vice President and Irish Prime Minister Enda Kenny. And this past Saturday, St. Patrick's Day, I joined Prime Minister Kenny, Illinois Governor Pat Quinn and Chicago Mayor Rahm Emanuel to march in Chicago's annual St. Patrick's Day parade. As one of the 40 million Americans of Irish descent, the chance to celebrate St. Patrick's Day with the Prime Minister of Ireland twice in 4 days is a rare joy.

At the parade on Saturday, Prime Minister Kenny hailed Chicago as "the most American of American cities." It is also the most Irish of American cities, home to the largest population of Irish-Americans in the United States. On St. Patrick's Day in Chicago, the river and the beer both run green and it seems that everyone is Irish either by heritage or simply by osmosis.

There is good reason that Americans of all backgrounds embrace St. Patrick's Day with such enthusiasm. From our earliest days as a nation, America and Ireland and America have been united by unbreakable bonds of friendship and family and by a shared commitment to liberty and freedom.

In fact, there might not be a United States of America were it not for the Irish. That is not just my opinion. That was the assessment of General George Washington and of Britain's Lord