

Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 410, S. 3220, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes.

Barbara A. Mikulski, Harry Reid, Maria Cantwell, Patty Murray, Frank R. Lautenberg, Jeff Bingaman, Sheldon Whitehouse, John F. Kerry, Kent Conrad, Jeanne Shaheen, Bernard Sanders, Tom Udall, Amy Klobuchar, Carl Levin, Mark R. Warner, Mark Pryor, Jack Reed, Kirsten E. Gillibrand.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to S. 3220, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes, 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 Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK).

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 52, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 115 Leg.]

YEAS—52

Akaka	Hagan	Nelson (NE)
Baucus	Harkin	Nelson (FL)
Begich	Inouye	Pryor
Bennet	Johnson (SD)	Reed
Bingaman	Kerry	Rockefeller
Blumenthal	Klobuchar	Sanders
Boxer	Kohl	Schumer
Brown (OH)	Landrieu	Shaheen
Cantwell	Lautenberg	Stabenow
Cardin	Leahy	Tester
Carper	Levin	Udall (CO)
Casey	Lieberman	Udall (NM)
Conrad	Manchin	Warner
Coons	McCaskill	Webb
Durbin	Menendez	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Merkley	Wyden
Franken	Mikulski	
Gillibrand	Murray	

NAYS—47

Alexander	Enzi	Moran
Ayotte	Graham	Murkowski
Barrasso	Grassley	Paul
Blunt	Hatch	Portman
Boozman	Heller	Reid
Brown (MA)	Hoeven	Risch
Burr	Hutchison	Roberts
Chambliss	Inhofe	Rubio
Coats	Isakson	Sessions
Coburn	Johanns	Shelby
Cochran	Johnson (WI)	Snowe
Collins	Kyl	Thune
Corker	Lee	Toomey
Cornyn	Lugar	Vitter
Crapo	McCain	Wicker
DeMint	McConnell	

NOT VOTING—1

Kirk

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 52, the nays are 47. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I enter a motion to reconsider the vote by which cloture was not invoked.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is entered.

Mr. REID. I now withdraw my motion to proceed to Calendar No. 410, S. 3220.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is withdrawn.

AGRICULTURE REFORM, FOOD, AND JOBS ACT OF 2012—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. REID. I now move to proceed to Calendar No. 415, S. 3240.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is pending. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows: Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 415, S. 3240, a bill to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2017, and for other purposes.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have a cloture motion at the desk on the motion to proceed to this matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. 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 the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 415, S. 3240, a bill to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2017, and for other purposes.

Harry Reid, Debbie Stabenow, Carl Levin, Kent Conrad, Jeff Bingaman, Herb Kohl, Patrick J. Leahy, Michael F. Bennett, Christopher A. Coons, Al Franken, Max Baucus, Barbara A. Mikulski, Ben Nelson, Amy Klobuchar, Sherrod Brown, Jeff Merkley, Robert P. Casey, Jr.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

PAYCHECK FAIRNESS ACT

Ms. MIKULSKI. Will the leader yield for a question?

Mr. Leader, I noted that on the last vote, you voted no. Was that so the bill could be reconsidered?

Mr. REID. I say to my friend, through the Chair, there is no one in this body who has a reputation for a bigger and better fighter than BARBARA MIKULSKI, the senior Senator from Maryland. I entered the motion to reconsider the vote because I want the fight to continue.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I would like to respond to the majority leader. We want to fight too. We thank him for his vote and his voice. I want him to know that although we lost the vote today, we are not going to give up on this vote. It is a very sad day here in the Senate, but it is a sadder day every day when paycheck day comes and women continue to make less than men.

We are sorry that this vote occurred strictly on party lines. Under the leader's effort to reconsider, we hope to bring up this bill again. We hope to forge a bipartisan vote. We are coming up on the 49th anniversary of equal pay for equal work. We are not going to let this bill die in parliamentary entanglements. The majority should rule in the Senate.

I want to say this, in the words of Abigail Adams. While John Adams and all the guys were sitting around Philadelphia writing the Constitution, she wrote him a letter and said, "Don't forget the ladies." And they did it for 150 years, and then they forget, too, to get rid of the loopholes in the Equal Pay Act now. Well, Abigail said: If you forget us, we will foment our revolution, and we are going to foment our revolution.

So I say to the women here, to the good men who support us, to the women out there in America, let's keep this fight going. Put on your lipstick, square your shoulders, suit up, and let's fight for this new American revolution where women are paid equal pay for equal work. Let's end wage discrimination in this century once and for all.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the statement made by the Senator from Maryland, as usual. She will outline a way to proceed on this matter that will be dignified and strong.

I filed cloture on this motion to proceed to this very important bill relating to farm programs in America and nutrition programs in America—extremely important legislation. I am confident—maybe it is the wrong thing in the temperament of the Senate today—that we are going to be able to complete this bill. It is an important bill for America. It will be a good thing for this Congress to do this farm bill. The two managers of this bill, Senator STABENOW of Michigan and Senator ROBERTS of Kansas, have done a remarkably good job. This bill creates jobs and reduces subsidies by a significant amount. Where else would you find a bill that reduces the debt of this country by \$24 billion? This is a fine piece of legislation, and I hope we can work something out so we do not have to have a vote on this matter on Thursday, that we can start legislating.

We have had good fortune shine upon us on the last couple of big bills we brought through here. We had the managers work with floor staff to work on the relevant amendments and then have a way to finish the bill. I hope we can do that.

I repeat, I have confidence in Senator STABENOW and Senator ROBERTS. They are very good legislators. We need to proceed on this bill. This bill is not a Democratic bill or Republican bill, it is a bill for America.

Mrs. BOXER. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. REID. I will be happy to.

Mrs. BOXER. I want to say that I agree with my friend's comments about

Senator STABENOW and Senator ROBERTS. I consider both my friends. They are terrific legislators.

THE PAYCHECK FAIRNESS ACT

I do want to go back to the vote that just occurred. I would note that we had present in the Chamber some of the House Members, women of the House. I think they are gone now. It was to underscore the importance of this vote and what it means.

My question goes to this: Is my colleague aware that women in their lifetime are so shortchanged that the average woman, in the course of her career, by the end of her career has made \$400,000 less than her male counterpart? Is my friend aware of that?

Mr. REID. Yes. In the State of Nevada—I am sure it is maybe more than that in California—in the State of Nevada, women earn \$400,000 less. A man in his lifetime makes X number of dollars, and in Nevada a woman makes \$400,000 less—in fact, a little more.

Mrs. BOXER. I think it is important for people to understand what just occurred. We had a straight party-line vote on an issue that impacts every single woman in this country. I think when people say there is a difference between the parties—I like working with my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. I have good relationships with them. But for goodness' sake, how can you have a party that, to a person here, votes against equal pay for equal work?

I will close with this question to my friend. It is my understanding that 90 percent of the people support the idea of equal pay for equal work. Is my leader aware of this, and when does he think he might bring this back before the body?

Mr. REID. I say to my friend, through the Chair, she is absolutely right. Seventy-seven percent of Republicans across America support this legislation. Eighty-one percent of men across America support this legislation.

Mrs. BOXER. I thank the Senator.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FRANKEN). The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, before speaking about moving forward on the Agriculture Reform, Food and Jobs Act, I want to thank our leader. I also want to thank Senator MIKULSKI. Together we have brought forward the issue of equal pay for equal work, and we intend to focus on that until we make this truly the law of the land.

Mr. President, I rise today to urge my colleagues to allow us to proceed to the Agriculture Reform, Food and Jobs Act, commonly known as the farm bill. I first want to thank my friend, colleague, and partner as we moved through the committee process, Senator ROBERTS. It has been terrific working with my ranking member and his staff. We worked in a truly bipartisan way. I think that is reflected in the fact that this bill came out of committee with a strong bipartisan vote of 16 Members and only 5 dissenting. We

are looking forward to working with all of our colleagues on the floor of the Senate to have this same kind of strong bipartisan vote as we move through the process in the Senate.

There are 16 million people in this country who have a job that relies on the strength of American agriculture. The farm bill is a jobs bill. Over the last few years when our Nation's economy has seen some very rough times, agriculture has been one of the few bright spots. In fact, in Michigan, during our toughest times in manufacturing, agriculture was growing five times faster than any other part of our economy. Agriculture is one of the only parts of the economy with a trade surplus. I think it is, in fact, our No. 1 trade surplus with \$42.5 billion in trade surplus.

We are growing it here, we are processing it here, developing it here, selling it overseas, but the jobs are here. This farm bill is all about keeping it that way. Last year our farmers exported \$136 billion worth of goods, which is a 270-percent increase in the last 10 years. This is about jobs, and we want to continue our leadership not only in this country but internationally in agriculture through this important bill.

We also know our country is facing serious deficits. Last August the Senate passed the Budget Control Act by a vote of 74 to 26. That law created a deficit reduction committee, which we called the supercommittee. They set out a process to find significant savings, and I am very proud of the fact that the Agriculture Committee came together in the House and the Senate. The chairman and the ranking member in the House—along with me and the ranking member in the Senate—did some very tough negotiating and made tough decisions, worked long hours, and came up with a detailed deficit reduction plan. I wish we had that same kind of opportunity with every committee.

Unfortunately, in the end, the Agriculture Committee was the only committee that did that. We did our part, and we believe the work we did in the fall helped to not only build relationships that are important to allow us to work together, but also set up a foundation from which we have written what we call the farm bill, or the Agriculture Reform, Food and Jobs Act.

We have built into this bill a real deficit reduction of \$23 billion. Let me emphasize that the Agriculture Committee strengthened the economy and cuts the Federal deficit. This \$23 billion is roughly 2 percent of what the Budget Control Act put in place in terms of sequestration next January of \$1.2 trillion. We are roughly 2 percent of Federal outlays. In those efforts are agriculture production, conservation, and nutrition through the USDA.

The USDA is roughly 2 percent of Federal outlays. We are taking responsibility for 2 percent of the cuts, and

this is more than is actually required in the Budget Control Act, and it is double what was recommended in Simpson-Bowles and the Gang of 6.

So agriculture is doing its fair share, and we are doing it in a responsible way that focuses on reform and strengthening those efforts to make sure we have a strong agricultural economy, strong conservation practices, and support for jobs through energy and other important nutrition efforts.

We end direct payments. That means no more paying farmers for crops they don't grow and no more payments for farmers when they are already doing very well. In fact, the biggest savings in the bill comes from eliminating direct payments and consolidating three other commodity subsidy programs. America's farmers know in order to lower the deficit we all need to do our fair share. Agriculture has stepped up and is willing to do that.

We also make sure millionaires no longer get payments from commodity programs. We tightened payment limits to half of what farmers currently are able to receive. We closed what is known as the managers' loophole that lets people get farm payments when they are not farming. Instead, we support a strong safety net based on crop insurance and risk.

If someone has a risk, if they have a loss, then it is critically important we stand with American agriculture. We have the safest and most affordable food supply in the world, and it is critically important that we have the risk management tools available for our Nation's farmers.

We heard over and over when Senator ROBERTS was in Michigan—and I am grateful he joined me. I was pleased to have joined him in Kansas. We heard the same issues in our hearings in DC and around the country that crop insurance was the most important tool for our producers.

Nobody wants to see a family farm—some passed down from generation to generation—go out of business because of a few days of bad weather or because of other changes in the markets beyond their control. I cannot think of a more high-risk venture, frankly, than agriculture.

This year in my State when it got very warm in February and March, the cherry blossoms, apple blossoms, peaches, and grapevines all thought it was spring and the blossoms came out. Then when the freeze and the snow came, we were literally wiped out of tart and sweet cherries, apples, peaches, and grapes. Everything across the board was devastated. I can't think of any other business that has to go through that kind of risk other than farmers.

So we put in place a strengthened program so more specialty crops and more fruit and vegetable growers can get access to crop insurance. We have new capacity to support expanded risk tools. We substituted that with a market-oriented, risk-based approach that

supports farmers in the bad times; so they will not get a government check in the good times but in the bad times when we need to make sure our farmers can survive and thrive.

This bill does not set a government price. It focuses on what is happening in the marketplace. The farmers are choosing what to plant from the market. We make sure no farmer goes off the cliff when a price drops immediately, and that crop insurance is there for them as well. Independent economists have said this is a fair system that is equitable to all regions and all commodities.

We have a very diverse country. We know we have colleagues that still have concerns, and we are certainly working with them to fine-tune this bill, but we also know moving to a risk-based system treats all regions fairly. It is the kind of reform people across the country, including taxpayers, are asking us to do.

This bill is much more than just a bill related to production agriculture—as important as production agriculture is. I am very proud of what we have been able to do on conservation. We have gone through every program, streamlined them, and increased flexibility. We have done what families and farmers across the country are doing, analyzing and stretching every dollar.

Frankly, we have a conservation title that does more with less. We have taken 23 programs, consolidated them into 13, and put them into four different areas with a lot of flexibility. We are maintaining our conservation tools and strengthening key priorities. There are certain areas that did not have any funding when this farm bill ends on September 30. We have been able to combine that into a larger effort, and we are now able to continue and strengthen conservation. That is why we have heard from 643 conservation groups in all 50 States that support the approach we have taken in this bill. We continue the important work done in the farm bill around nutrition and helping families who are most in need.

I have heard from so many people in Michigan in the last few years, with the huge recession we have gone through, who never imagined in their lives they would need help putting food on the table. They paid taxes all their lives and never thought they would have to ask somebody to help them and their children get through the month but are now in that situation. I am committed to making sure every single dollar goes to people who need it.

We are cracking down on trafficking. We have had at least two situations in Michigan where lottery winners somehow maintained food assistance. Obviously, that is crazy, and so that will not happen anymore under this bill.

Students who live at home with their parents and have been able to go through the loopholes to get food help, it is not right. That is not where it is intended. We address that as well. We

have tightened a number of areas on accountability. We know there are areas where we can make sure there is accountability, there is transparency and, in fact, families in need know they can help feed their children during these tough economic times.

We are also recognizing the diversity of agriculture in America by strengthening support for fruits and vegetables and other specialty crops. We are making sure we are getting those healthy foods into schools, supporting organic farmers, farmers' markets, and food hubs locally. By the way, that also creates jobs.

We are continuing our work on energy and helping farmers save money on their bills while getting America off of foreign oil. We are opening opportunities for new innovative companies involved in biomanufacturing. This is an exciting area for me as we look at how we make and grow things in this country and bring those two together. I think that is why we have a middle class in America—because we make and grow things.

Biomanufacturing is the process of taking raw materials from agricultural products, whether it is soybean oil, corn byproducts, wheat husk, biomass materials, and using them to create products and replace chemicals and petroleum in plastics, for example, with biodegradable bio-based products, which is very important for our future in so many ways. That is what the Agriculture Reform, Food and Jobs Act is all about.

As we go further in this debate, I will have much more to say about all of the specifics in the titles. But let me just end with this before turning to my friend to speak.

The current farm bill, the Agriculture Reform, Food and Jobs Act—the current farm bill expires this September 30, when farmers are getting ready for the harvest. If Congress cannot come together in a bipartisan way, as we did in the Agriculture Committee and as we did in the fall with the agricultural leaders, and pass this bill before then, it will create tremendous uncertainty and job losses in communities all across America, and it will have a serious impact on our economic recovery. I hope our colleagues will work with us, will join with us to make sure that does not happen.

We have received broad support for this legislation from 125 farm groups, healthy food groups, and other stakeholders. I am very grateful to 45 of our colleagues who, on a bipartisan basis in a letter to leadership, urged that this bill be taken up. It is clear there is broad support in Congress and across the country for the farm bill. So I urge my colleagues to let us begin the debate on this important jobs bill that affects 16 million people across this country.

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I intend to give my full opening comments

in regard to the farm bill tomorrow, but I wish to quickly say thank you to the chairwoman for helping to bring us to this point. I thank her for her leadership. It has truly been a bipartisan effort. It has been a team effort.

I wish to reiterate what the chairwoman has said. I wish to tell our colleagues this is a true reform bill. I could say that 10 times over for emphasis, but it is a true reform bill. It also reduces and streamlines the Department of Agriculture programs—long overdue. We cut \$23 billion in mandatory spending, and it was voluntarily, without any direction from the Budget Committee or anybody else, and it is real money. It is mandatory money.

The Super Committee tried to work out a deal, and they weren't so super. They tried hard. I am not trying to criticize a tough deal. We are the only authorizing committee that I know of in the Senate that has voluntarily come forth and said: Here is real deficit reduction in mandatory spending—over \$23 billion. It is rather remarkable that people who tend to be critical of agriculture would all of a sudden discover it is the Agriculture Committee, in a bipartisan effort, that has cut real money, real mandatory money.

How many times have we heard folks back home say: Why don't you work together? Why can't we all get along? Why can't you reach across the aisle and accomplish something? We did that in our committee, with strong bipartisan support, and we achieved this true spending reduction. We eliminated four of the commodity programs.

I just had a colleague come in to visit with me this morning. He said: I looked at this farm bill and I couldn't figure it out. It is so complex I don't know how anybody can figure it out. That is pretty true in farm country too—trying to figure out all of the complexities, and when they go down to the farm service agency, trying to figure out what is in each program and which one they should pick. We eliminated four commodity programs and made it much simpler. We strengthened and improved crop insurance, which is the No. 1 issue we heard about in every hearing we had. We eliminated \$6 billion in conservation spending while streamlining 23 programs into 13 to eliminate duplication. When have we heard: When are you going to start to streamline and reduce duplication? We have done that. We cut \$4 billion in nutrition programs—a painful cut for some, I understand that. But it is not going to affect anybody's payments so much as it is the \$4 billion—that is 82 percent, by the way, of the agriculture budget is in nutrition.

We have eliminated a grand total of more than 100 programs. Get this: We have eliminated a grand total of more than 100 programs—I don't know of any other committee that has done that—and authorizations totaling nearly \$2 billion in reduced authorizations alone. So we dealt with not only mandatory spending but also \$2 billion in authorizations.

This is, as I have said, a reform bill. We need to get this thing passed. We need to get the farm bill passed. The current law expires on September 30 of this year. Failure to pass the bill means we revert to permanent 1949 law that would provide absolute chaos in the countryside. If we don't pass this bill by September 30, then we are back here voting on an extension. Who wants to extend the current farm bill? It is yesterday's farm bill. This is tomorrow's farm bill. We can't go back to 1949, and I do not think we need to be in any business of trying to extend the current act when we have a true reform bill and one that is fiscally sound.

The big thing is we need to provide set guidance to our producers and their lenders—our farmers, ranchers, bankers, all up and down Main Street who depend on agriculture, including every rural community and, for that matter, anybody who eats, every consumer. We are talking about the hometown banker and the farm credit agencies so they can know exactly what this farm bill looks like when, as early as this August, they will begin to discuss their operating loans for the coming year.

I know we are debating the motion to proceed at this time, but the chairwoman and I and our staffs are available. We are available. If someone has heartburn, we are available. We have the Roloids; don't worry about it. Our staffs are available. Come to us if a colleague wants to discuss a possible amendment. Come to us and talk to us. We are working together in a bipartisan effort. I urge Members who intend to offer amendments to please come to us and allow us to begin working with them now. We stand ready and willing and, with the help of Members, able.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. MANCHIN. I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

ALWAYS FREE HONOR FLIGHT

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, I rise to recognize a very special event taking place tomorrow in our Nation's Capital: West Virginia's first ever Always Free Honor Flight, a free trip for our veterans to see the monuments built for their service and sacrifice.

I have always said West Virginia is one of the most patriotic States in this great Nation, and we are so proud of the number of veterans and Active-Duty members who have served our country with honor and distinction. The 31 veterans who are traveling to the Capitol tomorrow embody our State's history and contributions to the freedom of this Nation: 12 of them served in World War II, 3 in the Korean war, and 16 in Vietnam.

I wish to tell my colleagues a little bit about this very special group. These heroes engaged in combat across the globe, fighting in the Aleutian Islands, England, Normandy, France, Germany,

Luxembourg, the South Pacific, the Philippines, Japan, Korea, and Vietnam. Some served here at home, servicing aircraft with ammunition. Some served in historic events such as the Battle of the Bulge, the liberation of the Philippines, and the front in Japan. They took on different roles, serving as infantrymen, door gunners, ammunition soldiers, combat fighters, tactical fighters, and medics. One brave World War II veteran received the Legion of Honor Chevalier Award from the French Embassy.

These veterans come from all parts of our great State—from Welch to Beckley, to Huntington, to Princeton, to Bluefield, to Lester, and all the places in between.

I especially wish to point out one special person. His name is Gene Cecil Pennington of Princeton, WV, and he will be joining us tomorrow also. He is the youngest West Virginia veteran of World War II, and that is because he lied about his age to join the Navy in the 1940s and first saw combat—think of this—first saw combat at the age of 16. He is 83 now, and we are so proud he will be visiting with us.

In addition to the veterans visiting us, a number of volunteer escorts will also be accompanying them. Seven of these escorts will be representing their deceased fathers who served in various wars throughout the years. Three of our World War II veterans are accompanied by their sons who themselves are veterans of the Vietnam war. Service is truly a family tradition in our State and in this Nation.

Our veterans have a full day's journey ahead of them tomorrow. They will leave Princeton, WV, at 2:15 in the morning, traveling here by bus. They will return to West Virginia after touring our beautiful Capitol Building, the World War II Memorial, the Korean War Memorial, the Vietnam War Memorial, and the Iwo Jima Memorial. These monuments to service and sacrifice have important meaning to everyone in this country, but I know our veterans will find special meaning tomorrow when they tour these sites.

This is the first time for many of these veterans to see these monuments, which is why I am very grateful for the hard work of the West Virginians who made this trip possible by bringing the Honor Flight Network to our State—the Denver Foundation and Little Buddy Radio located in Princeton, WV. These nonprofits were founded by Bob Denver—also known as Gilligan from "Gilligan's Island"—and his wife Dreama, a West Virginia native. Their love of West Virginia, their vision, and their dedication to service have truly been a gift to our great State.

The Honor Flight Network is an idea that started with Earl Morse, a physician assistant and retired Air Force captain who wanted to honor the veterans he had cared for over 27 years. Earl found that many of his patients couldn't afford to see the monuments

built to honor their service, so he took it upon himself to make that happen.

Earl was also a private pilot, and he offered a free flight to a World War II veteran who was also his patient. One free trip led to another, and with the help of more volunteers, Earl's efforts grew into the Honor Flight Network. The first flight took place in May of 2005, and by the end of that year, Honor Flight had taken 137 World War II veterans to visit their memorial. The Honor Flight Network has expanded to cities and States around the country, and in 2011, the network transported 18,055 veterans to see their memorials—at no cost to those veterans.

In West Virginia, we are lucky to have had the operations manager at Little Buddy Radio in Princeton, WV, Charlie Thomas, introduce the Honor Flight to our State. Tomorrow, Charlie will be representing his deceased father, Clifford Richardson, who served in the Navy during World War II.

I would also like to take a moment to thank the Vice President of the Always Free Honor Flight, Dreama Denver, who is the widow of "Gilligan"—Bob Denver. She is representing her deceased father, Glen E. Peery, who served in the Army during the Korean War.

I would like to thank Pam Coulbourne, who has been instrumental in planning West Virginia's first Honor Flight. She is representing her father Francis Fluharty, an Air Force aerial photographer on a B-24 Liberator during World War II.

Thanks to Charlie, Dreama, Bob Denver, Pam, and the hard work of so many others, 31 veterans will be traveling to Washington tomorrow on this very special journey. I commend them for their dedication and for giving West Virginia just one more way to say thank you to our veterans for their service and sacrifice.

I have always said we owe our men and women who have served more than a debt of gratitude. Showing our appreciation is something we should do each and every day. But tomorrow is a special day where we can pay tribute to those who have made the ultimate sacrifice for our great Nation. I am so pleased I am able to greet some of our most courageous West Virginia veterans who are all heroes. I ask the Senate to join me in honoring these 31 veterans and welcome them and their close friends and family to Washington, DC, tomorrow.

Thank you. I yield the floor and I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. SHAHEEN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Arizona.

SECURITY LEAKS

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, over the past few months there has been a

disturbing stream of articles in the media and common among them, they cite elite, classified, or highly sensitive information in what appears to be a broader effort by the administration to paint a portrait of the President of the United States as a strong leader on national security issues—information for which there is no legitimate reason whatsoever to believe should be in the public domain. Indeed, the release of this information in these articles harms our national security and puts in danger the lives of the men and women who are sworn to protect it.

What price did the administration apparently pay to proliferate such a Presidential persona—highly valued in an election year? Access. Access to senior administration officials who appear to have served as anonymous sources divulging extremely sensitive military and intelligence information and operations.

With the leaks that these articles were based on, our enemies now know much more than they did the day before they came out about important aspects of our Nation's unconventional offensive capabilities and how we use them. Such disclosures can only undermine similar ongoing or future operations and, in this sense, compromise our national security. For this reason, regardless of how politically useful these leaks may have been to the President, they have to stop. These leaks have to stop.

The fact that this administration would aggressively pursue leaks perpetrated by a 22-year-old Army private in the Wikileaks matter and former CIA employees in other leaks cases but apparently sanction leaks made by senior administration officials for political purposes is simply unacceptable. It also calls for the need for a special counsel to investigate what happened.

I am also pleased to report that Chairman CARL LEVIN has agreed, at my request, to hold a hearing on these leaks in the Senate Armed Services Committee. The Senate Armed Services Committee has a responsibility here, and I am grateful that Chairman LEVIN has agreed to hold a hearing.

In the latest of the recently published articles—published on June 1, 2012, just a few days ago—the New York Times documented in rich detail the President's secret decision to accelerate cyber attacks on Iran's nuclear enrichment facilities with a computer virus that came to be known as Stuxnet. The author of the article, Mr. David Sanger, clearly states that former and current American officials spoke to him but refused to do so on the record because the program is both highly classified and parts of it are ongoing. I repeat, the administration officials discussed a most highly classified operation that is both highly classified and still ongoing, an operation that was clearly one of the most tightly held national security secrets in our country until now. And I might point out to my colleagues that this is all about the Iranian effort to acquire nuclear weapons, which is one of the most

difficult national security challenges this Nation faces.

Other recent articles divulged critical and classified information regarding U.S. plans to expand the secret drone campaign against terrorists in Yemen and the Horn of Africa. One of these pieces was a sorry excuse for journalism that the New York Times published on May 29, 2012, which Charles Krauthammer rightly observed should have been entitled “Barack Obama—Drone Warrior.”

Finally, there was a recent so-called article about the so-called “kill list”—the highly classified list of counterterrorism targets against whom the President has authorized lethal action—in other words, to kill. It was reported in that article on May 29, 2012, in the New York Times that David Axelrod, the President's chief political adviser—who is running the reelection campaign as we speak—began attending the meetings in which this list was discussed. I repeat, the President's campaign manager was present and attending the meetings where lists of possible people to be eliminated through drone strikes was discussed and decisions were made. The only conceivable motive for such damaging and compromising leaks of classified information is that it makes the President look good.

These are not the only times I have been frustrated about national security-related leaks coming from this administration. The administration similarly helped journalists publish some of the highly sensitive tactics, techniques, and procedures that enabled our special operations forces—including the classified name of the unit involved—to carry out the operation to kill Osama bin Laden last year. It is entirely possible that this flurry of anonymous boasting was responsible for divulging the identity of Dr. Shakil Afridi, the Pakistani doctor who assisted us in our search for Osama bin Laden and whose public exposure led to his detention and a 33-year prison sentence in Pakistan. His name was divulged by members of the administration, and he has been basically given a death sentence, a 33-year sentence in prison in Pakistan. Our friends are not the only ones who read the New York Times; our enemies do, too.

Let me be clear. I am fully in favor of transparency in government. I have spent my entire career in Congress furthering that principle. But what separates these sorts of leaks from, say, the whistleblowing that fosters open government or a free press is that these leaks expose no violations of law, abuses of authority, or threats to public health or safety. They are gratuitous and utterly self-serving.

These leaks may inhibit the Nation's ability to employ the same or similar measures in its own defense in the future. How effectively the United States can conduct unmanned drone strikes against belligerents, cyber attacks against Iran's nuclear program, or military operations against terrorists in the future depends on the secrecy with which these programs are con-

ducted. Such activities are classified or enormously sensitive for good reason—in many cases, for reasons related to operational security or diplomacy. Their public disclosure should have no place in how this or any other administration conducts itself. These are the kinds of operations and intelligence matters no one should discuss publicly, not even the President.

With this in mind, I call on the President to take immediate and decisive action, including the appointment of a special counsel, to aggressively investigate the leak of any classified information on which the recent stories were based and, where appropriate, to prosecute those responsible. A special counsel will be needed because the articles on the U.S. cyber attacks on Iran and expanded plans by the United States to use drones in Yemen were sourced to—and I quote from the articles—“participants in the [cyber-attack] program” and “members of the [P]resident's national security team.” In the cyber attacks article, in particular, the author stated that “current and former American officials” spoke to him anonymously about the program because “the effort remains highly classified and parts of it continue to this day.”

What could be worse?

The suggestion that misconduct occurred within the executive branch is right there in black and white and is why a special counsel is needed.

As part of this investigation, this special counsel should also scrutinize the book from which the New York Times cyber attacks article was adapted, which was just released yesterday, for other improper or illegal disclosures.

Where classified information regarding cyber operations was leaked, the President should assess any damage that those leaks may have caused to national security and how that damage can be mitigated.

In my view, the administration should be taking these leaks, apparently perpetrated by senior administration officials, as seriously as it pursued those made by relatively low government personnel such as the Army private in the WikiLeaks matter or the former CIA employee who provided the New York Times with classified information about U.S. attempts to sabotage the Iranian nuclear program. The failure of the administration to do so would confirm what today is only an inference—that these leaks were, in fact, sanctioned by the administration to serve a pure political purpose.

As I continue to closely monitor developments in this matter, I hope to be proved wrong.

There is a Wall Street Journal article, “FBI Probes Leaks about Cyberattacks by U.S.” I am glad the FBI is going to probe that. It says Mr. Sanger, in an appearance on CBS News “Face the Nation,” suggested that deliberate White House leaking “wasn't my experience.”

He added:

I spent a year working on the story from the bottom up and then went to the administration and told them what I had. Then they had to make some decisions about how much they wanted to talk about . . . I'm sure the political side of the White House probably likes reading about the President acting with drones and cyber and so forth. National security side has got very mixed emotions about it because these are classified programs.

Mr. Sanger again is authenticating that senior members of the White House and our intelligence community decided to talk to him about classified programs. Their motivation for doing so—perhaps we don't know particularly at this time, but I don't think one could argue that these articles have all conveyed the impression that the President is a very strong warrior in carrying out his responsibilities as Commander in Chief, something I have disputed as far as Iraq, Afghanistan, and other national security issues, which I will discuss on another day.

I don't know how one could draw any conclusion but that senior members of this administration in the national security arena have either leaked or confirmed information of the most highly classified and sensitive nature. Some of these leaks have concerned ongoing operations. Since they were highly classified and sensitive information, that classification was there for a reason—the reason being that if that information was classified, it could harm our national security.

These are very serious actions on their part. They are very serious actions when ongoing operations in the war against terror and the issue of Iranian acquisition of nuclear weapons could trigger attacks either by Israel or the United States to prevent such an eventuality. We now find leaks which have exposed, not only to the American people but to the Iranians as well, exactly what American activity is of the most sensitive nature. This is not a proud day for the United States of America.

I ask unanimous consent that following the remarks of Senator CHAMBLISS, he and I be permitted to engage in a colloquy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASEY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(Disturbance in the Visitors' Galleries)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, I wish to thank my friend from Arizona for his very direct comments on this very sensitive issue. As vice chairman of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, I can say without a doubt that these ongoing leaks of classified information are extraordinarily harmful to our intelligence operations.

Every day we ask our intelligence officers and agents to be out there on the frontlines, putting their life in harm's way, gathering information, meeting sources, and using a variety of highly

sensitive collection techniques. Depending on where these officers are around the world, the operating environment can be both dangerous and downright hostile. This means they have to be as much or more on guard to ensure that operations don't get blown and their own lives and the lives of our sources are not jeopardized.

But each time classified information shows up in the media, the intelligence community's ability to do these dangerous assignments becomes that much more difficult. Not only do these leaks tell our enemies how we do our jobs and therefore how they can block or impede our efforts, but with each leak our friends and allies are left to wonder how much they can trust us with their own secrets.

These are not hypothetical concerns. Senator McCAIN alluded to a couple of anecdotes. Also, a few weeks ago, in the middle of an ongoing operation, we all—friends and enemies alike—learned the details of efforts to disrupt an al-Qaida plot to bomb a civilian aircraft. Up to that point, most Members of Congress knew nothing about this operation. That is how sensitive we were told it was. Unfortunately, rather than quietly recognize our—and, frankly, our partners'—successes and move on with the business of protecting the American people, some in the administration apparently decided that scoring political points in an election year outweighed protecting our intelligence operations as well as our liaison relationship with our intelligence partners around the world.

Whether we could have learned more from an operation that was cut short by this leak will now never be known, but we have been warned by some of our allies they will think twice before they share highly classified information with us.

Unfortunately, the leak of the airline plot was no isolated incident. From kill lists and bin Laden movies to cyber warfare, it appears nothing is off-limits, nothing is too secret, no operation is too sensitive, and no source is too valuable to be used as a prop in this election year posturing. The doctor associated with the bin Laden operation appears to be paying the price for this posturing. Following public disclosures of his involvement, he has been sentenced to 33 years in prison—a true life sentence of 33 years in prison in Pakistan. This hardly provides incentive for anyone else to help us.

These disclosures—whether quietly sanctioned or not—are simply unacceptable, and they are against the law. This administration reminds us repeatedly that they are prosecuting more people for leaking classified information than ever before, and I support that effort. But just as we hold ordinary government employees accountable for violating their oaths to protect our Nation's secrets, we must also hold the most senior administration officials accountable. Recently, the FBI began an investigation into the sce-

nario surrounding this latest bomb plot, and I applaud the FBI's efforts. Following the public disclosure in the press reports on comments made by senior administration officials, I sent a letter to Director Mueller and asked him to please include this aspect of these leaks in his investigation. I received a letter back today that he is indeed going to do that, and I applaud that. I don't know whether the reports are true. I have no idea. But if they are, they are serious violations of the law having been conducted by senior administration officials.

Beyond that, we still have to do more. So today I join with my good friend Senator McCAIN from Arizona in calling for the appointment of a special counsel to investigate this pattern of recent leaks. Leaks should never be tolerated, but leaking for political advantage is especially troubling. There must be swift and clear accountability for those responsible for playing this dangerous game with our national security.

The Senator from Arizona has been around here a lot longer than me. He has been involved in the world of national security for many years, both on the frontline himself as well as a Member of this body.

Has the Senator from Arizona ever seen anything as egregious as the purported leaks that are coming from this administration on these highly classified and sensitive number of programs that we have seen in the last few days and weeks?

Mr. McCAIN. As my colleague well knows, the leaks are part of the way the environment exists in our Nation's capital, and leaks will always be part of the relationship between media and both elected and appointed officials. I understand that. I think my colleague would agree there have been times where abuses have been uncovered and exposed because of leaks so this information was made public, and we have always applauded that.

There has also continuously been a problem of overclassification of information so government officials don't have to—be it Republican or Democratic administrations—discuss what is going on publicly.

But I have to tell my friend, I do not know a greater challenge that the United States faces in the short term than this entire issue of Iran acquiring nuclear weapons. The President of the United States said it would be "unacceptable." We all know the Israelis are going through an agonizing decision-making process as to whether they need to attack Iran before they reach "breakout," which means they have enough parts and equipment to assemble a nuclear weapon in a short period of time.

Here we are exposing something that, frankly, I was never told about. I was never informed of Stuxnet, and it is ongoing, at least according to the media reports. So aren't the Iranians going to

learn from this? I would ask my colleague, aren't the Iranians going to become more and more aware?

Drone strikes are now one of the leading methods of going after al-Qaida and those radical terrorists who are intent on destroying America. So now al-Qaida and our enemies, both real and others who plan to be, are very aware of the entire decisionmaking process in the White House.

I guess the most disturbing part—and I would ask my friend—it is one thing to have a private, in the WikiLeaks matter, who had access to it, low-level members of certain agencies, one in the CIA who I know was prosecuted, but this is, according to the articles that are written, the highest levels in the White House are confirming this classified information and maybe even volunteering it, for all we know.

But there, obviously, has been a very serious breach of perhaps the two most important challenges we face: the Iranian nuclear process and, of course, the continued presence and efforts of al-Qaida to attack America.

I wonder if my friend from Georgia would agree that these are two of the most challenging national security issues America faces.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, I think my friend from Arizona is exactly right. There have been rumors of the drone program for actually a couple years now, maybe back almost into some period back into the Bush administration. As a member of the Intelligence Committee, we were always told—and rightfully so—this is a covert program and we simply cannot discuss it. So we never have. Now we pick up the newspaper, and over the last several weeks we have seen the President of the United States discussing the drone program. We have seen the Attorney General of the United States discussing the drone program. We have seen the National Security Adviser discussing the drone program. Yet, technically, we as Members of Congress—particularly members of the Intelligence Committee—cannot talk about this because they are covert programs.

So there is simply no question but that our enemy is better prepared today because of these various leaks and public disclosures.

Let me move to the other issue the Senator has talked about, though, the issue of the nuclear weaponization of Iran. There is no more important national security issue in the world today. It is a daily discussion at the United Nations, it is a daily discussion at the Pentagon, it is a daily discussion in Israel and in virtually every part of the Middle East that we cannot allow for the country of Iran to become nuclear weaponized. Here, all of a sudden, we see public disclosure, whether all of it is true or not, in a newspaper article on the front page of an American newspaper, detailing a purported program of attack against that Iranian program.

What are our friends in the intelligence community to think? What are

our friends in Israel to think? How much cooperation are they going to now give us from the standpoint of disclosing information to the U.S. Intelligence community on any program if they can expect that—if this is, in fact, true—what they tell us is going to be on the front page of the New York Times? Not only that, but it is not coming from some private who went on the Internet and found a bunch of classified documents. It is coming from statements made, supposedly, by high-level administration officials.

It puts us in a real—not a quandary. This is not a quandary. It puts us in a position of having to defend ourselves with our allies over certain statements that purportedly are made by high senior administration officials. I simply can never remember a scenario of information being leaked where we have the level of administration officials that now supposedly have made these comments, and they are quoted by name in some instances.

Mr. McCAIN. Could I finally add, the disturbing aspect of this is that one could draw the conclusion, from reading these articles, that it is an attempt to further the President's political ambitions for the sake of his election at the expense of our national security. That is what is disturbing about this entire situation.

I see our friend from Oregon is waiting to illuminate us, so I yield the floor. I thank my friend from Oregon for his patience.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

FOREST SERVICE AIRTANKER FLEET

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, yesterday I joined with Chairman BINGAMAN to introduce legislation to address an urgent threat to America's national forests: the lack of resources to fight serious wildfires that at this very moment are burning on more than 300,000 acres in our country. To date—and it is certainly early in the fire season—more than 830,000 acres already have burned.

The heart of the problem is, as the fires have gotten bigger, the Forest Service airtanker fleet to fight these fires has gotten smaller. In 2006, the Forest Service had 44 large airtankers under contract in their fleet. Last week, they had just 11 large airtankers under contract, and 10 of those averaged 50 years of age.

After the very tragic events of this past weekend—in which one of those airtankers crashed and its courageous pilots were killed and another had a failure of its landing gear and sustained serious damage—the Forest Service is down to nine large airtankers. This is an extraordinarily serious problem and a solution is long overdue.

The reason I have come to the floor this afternoon is that Congress has an

opportunity to expedite what could be the beginning of a solution. The Forest Service now is ready to begin awarding contracts for the next generation of airtankers, consistent with their large airtanker modernization strategy.

On May 25, as is required by law, under 41 U.S.C. 3903(d), the Forest Service gave Congress a 30-day notification of its intent to award four multiyear contracts, which contain cancellation ceilings in excess of \$10 million and require congressional notification.

These four contracts would, in effect, begin to fill the Federal Government's need for large airtankers to fight wildfires. The 30-day waiting period is simply delaying urgently needed action. Without congressional action, these contracts will not be awarded until June 25. My view is, with hundreds of thousands of acres burning and a severely depleted capacity for sending airtankers to battle these fires, I see nothing that can be served by the Congress sitting on its hands and waiting for those 30 days to expire.

The Forest Service requested that Congress waive the requirement to wait the full 30 days to award these important contracts. The sooner the Forest Service can award these contracts, the sooner the companies that receive the awards can begin to deliver those next-generation airtankers and get them out fighting the fires.

I wish to be clear that I do not know the details of these contracts and have no idea as to which companies that submitted bids are going to be the successful recipients, but I do know the Forest Service has complied with its obligation to notify the Congress. Congress has been notified with the required information, and I just fail to understand how the country is going to benefit by simply letting time pass. I urge my colleagues to see how important and how serious this fire situation is and approve the critical legislation I have introduced with Chairman BINGAMAN.

At this very moment, there are 11 uncontained large fires nationally, 152 new fires that have been reported in just the last 24 hours, and dire predictions about hot and dry conditions combining with strong winds, looming thunderstorms, and arid lands across much of our landscape. All these factors contribute to a dangerous fire situation on the ground. Yet, as we speak, the Forest Service now has only nine airtankers to assist those hard-working fire crews. Eight of those tankers are getting to the point where they ought to be considered museums in the sky.

While the Forest Service can and should use all possible assets—such as helicopters and innovative options such as the 20,000 gallon Very Large Airtankers—and the agency is likely to need to call in the National Guard, the large airtankers remain a critically important tool for fire suppression. In fact, the firefighting agencies mobilized airtankers 153 percent above the

10-year average in 2011. Yet these planes needed to assist on-the-ground firefighters have dwindled to the dire shortage—they have atrophied to the point I have described this afternoon.

This lack of resources is coming at a time when the Nation's forests are very vulnerable to fire. The fire season is early, but we are already seeing the production of record-breaking fires. Fire seasons are getting longer and they are more severe and we are seeing more and more of what the professional foresters called a megafire.

From 2000 to 2008, at least 10 States had fires of record-breaking size. The Forest Service indicated in its airtanker mobilization strategy that the agency will need up to 28 of these airtankers in order to adequately battle fire threats. So the Forest Service says we need 28. As of this moment, this afternoon, there are only nine.

I am asking today for the Senate to recognize the seriousness of the threat and let the Forest Service proceed in awarding these new contracts as rapidly as possible. The legislation Chairman BINGAMAN and I have introduced would enable the agency to do just that and begin to tackle this extraordinarily serious health problem.

In closing, I wish to express my thanks to all of America's courageous and dedicated firefighters. They put themselves in harm's way to protect our communities, and we should be grateful to them and to the pilots and companies and agency personnel who tirelessly battles these fires. I believe, on behalf of every Member of the Senate, it is appropriate to express our deepest condolences to the families and colleagues and friends of the recently deceased pilots. I hope by advancing the legislation I have described this afternoon, Congress will be sending a message to those courageous firefighters and those with whom they work that the Congress is beginning to put in place a system that would provide them real relief.

With that, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill 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 to speak as in morning business.

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

DREAM ACT

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, people wonder as they watch the Senate how bills get started. One of the bills that I have worked on probably the hardest in my career got started 11 years ago when there was a phone call to my Senate office in Chicago. It was a phone call from a friend of ours, Duffie Adleson, who was managing a program called the Merit Music Program.

It is a wonderful program in Chicago that offers opportunities for free musical instruments and free music lessons for kids from some of the poorest schools in town. The net result of it is a life-changing experience. One hundred of the Merit Music Program graduates go on to college. It is transformative.

Well, she had a story to tell me. It was about a young lady named Tereza Lee, Korean, who was a child prodigy when it came to the piano. She played it so well she had been offered many scholarships, including to the Manhattan Conservatory of Music. When she went to fill out her application, one of the questions was, What is your citizenship or nationality?

She turned to her mother and said: What is it, Mom? Her mom said: I do not know. You see, they brought Tereza to America when she was 2 years old on a visitor's visa. Her mom said: We never filed anything after that.

Mom and dad became citizens. Brother and sister born here automatically became citizens, but Tereza was a question mark. What am I? So she called Duffie. Duffie called the office, and we checked the law.

The law said Tereza Lee, who had lived in the United States for 16 years, had to leave for 10 years and after 10 years could apply to come back into the United States. She did not know where she would go. Her family had come to Chicago from Brazil, originally from Korea. There was no place to go, no other language that she spoke. This was the only country she ever knew.

So I wrote a bill and called it the DREAM Act. The DREAM Act said young people like her should be given a chance to become legal in America, to earn their way into legal status. The bill basically laid out some conditions: First, that they came to the United States as a child; second, they completed high school; third, they have no significant problems of moral character or a criminal record to speak of, and beyond that they had to do one of two things: finish at least 2 years of college or enlist in the American military.

Well, when I introduced this bill it was bipartisan. In fact, as many as 13 Republican Senators would vote with me. But we never quite got to that magic number of 60 votes in the Senate. We would get a majority but never quite get 60 votes. Then over the years this political issue started changing. Unfortunately, we started losing support on the Republican side of the aisle. Even those who were the original cosponsors of the bill started voting against it. They heard the talk about amnesty and all the criticism. They were swept into the belief that this should not pass.

But the bill is still very much alive, and it is the most important thing I have pending in the Senate, and has been for a long time. What it does, of course, is offer this opportunity.

I want to salute Senator MARCO RUBIO of Florida. He is a new Republican Senator, conservative, who took a look at this issue and said this is not an immigration issue; this is a humanitarian issue. We should offer these young people a chance, a chance to earn their way into legal status.

He is right. He remembered when 600,000 Cubans left to come to America to escape Castro's regime it was not the immigration system that welcomed them; it was the humanitarian effort by the United States to allow them to find a home. What a difference they have made, a positive difference in this country, not just in Florida but all over the country.

Look at MARCO RUBIO, a man who now represents Florida in the Senate. It was his father and grandfather who made it here because of that humanitarian gesture. He and I and many others are working now to try to find a bipartisan way to put this together again.

I have come to the floor countless times—dozens of times—to ask my colleagues to think about this issue in real human terms. Almost every week I come and tell the story of one of the students who would be affected by the DREAM Act. When I started on this issue, the DREAM Act students would hide in the shadows. They would wait in the darkness by my car to tell me: I am one of those undocumented immigrants. I am one of those students who has no place to go.

Well, times have changed. They are now stepping up and saying: Look at me. Know who I am. Realize, as Senator MENENDEZ has said on the floor many times, these are young people who spent their entire lives with their hands over their hearts pledging allegiance to the only country they ever knew. They only know one national anthem, and it is ours. They think it is theirs. But technically, legally, they have no legal standing.

Let me introduce you to a young man who has a great story. His name is Novi Roy. He grew up in Illinois. He was brought to the United States from India as a child. He was an especially good student. Novi attended Evanston Township High School just north of Chicago, graduated with a 3.9 grade point average.

During high school he volunteered working in the soup kitchen in Rogers Park and continues to do that even today. He went to the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, which we are pretty proud of, and he graduated with a bachelor's degree in economics. Just last month he had two master's degrees awarded to him, one in business administration and one in human resources. He is 24 years old now.

His dream is to work in the health care field to try to provide health care protection to people who don't have it today. He said this in a letter he wrote me:

I love America for all its opportunities and, like any other aspiring student, I want

a chance to realize the American dream. I owe the State of Illinois, its taxpayers, and America a huge debt of gratitude for the level of education I have attained thus far. I am confident that my education will serve me well enough to make a difference in people's lives [and] there is nothing I [would] like more than to give back to the community that has been so good to me.

For the record, Novi, because he is DREAM Act eligible, is not eligible for Federal assistance for education. These young people, DREAM Act students, have to work harder, borrow a lot more money, if they can, or save it, and it will take longer to get through. But they do it anyway because they are so determined to have a good life.

Novi has been offered jobs with Fortune 100 companies, but he cannot work legally in America because he is undocumented. Novi came to the United States legally, and his family applied for legal permanent resident status. When their application was denied, Novi was placed in deportation proceedings.

He never committed a crime. He grew up in this country. We have already invested in Novi, obviously, with an outstanding education from a great university. He has a potential to make America a better place. Despite these facts, even at this moment, Novi could be deported from the United States.

In his letter to me, he said this about that possibility:

I have never entered the U.S. illegally, nor broken any of its laws at any time. Unfortunately, my immigration case has simply fallen through the cracks. I have lived here in Illinois for the last 10 years, and my entire identity is exclusively based on my life in the U.S. I have nothing to go back to—no friends, no family, nothing. America is my home.

My office contacted Immigration and Customs Enforcement and asked them to consider Novi's request that his deportation be placed on hold. We just learned yesterday this request had been granted. But the decision to put Novi's deportation on hold is temporary. It doesn't give Novi permanent legal status, and he still is at risk of deportation in the future. The only way for Novi to become a citizen is for the DREAM Act to become law.

Would America be stronger and better if Novi Roy was deported? Of course not. He has all these years of education and his graduation from Evanston Township High School with a high GPA, two degrees from the University of Illinois, and we would let him leave and go to some other country and use his talents to make their country better? That makes no sense.

He has overcome great odds to achieve the great success he has so far. He doesn't have any criminal background problems or pose any threats to this country. He would make America a better place.

Novi is not an isolated example. There are literally thousands of others just like him around the country.

The DREAM Act would give Novi and other bright, accomplished, and ambi-

tious young people like him the chance to become America's future entrepreneurs, doctors, engineers, teachers, and soldiers.

Today, I again ask my colleagues to support the DREAM Act. Let's give Novi Roy and so many other young people like him a chance to contribute more completely to the country they call home. It is the right thing to do, and it will make America stronger.

OVERSEAS VISIT

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, last week during the Senate recess I traveled overseas to four countries: Ukraine, Turkey, Georgia, and Armenia. It was a lot of ground to cover in 5 days in a region with considerable history and great, challenging issues.

Before I go further on the matter, let me say for the record how impressed I am with the men and women who work representing the United States overseas. The ambassadors, all of their staff, the consular service, the military attaches, and those working through the Department of Agriculture do us proud every day. Many make a personal sacrifice to represent our country. They are on the front line.

I thank Ambassador John Tefft in Ukraine, Ambassador Ricciardone in Turkey, Ambassador Bass in Georgia, and Ambassador Heffern in Armenia for their public service. They are a reminder of why the relatively small amount of money we spend on our diplomatic and foreign assistance efforts makes a big difference in the world.

A visit through this region is a reminder of the legacy of the Soviet Union and the challenges facing countries such as Ukraine, Georgia, and Armenia as they try to rebuild independent and democratic nations. They inherited an environmental degradation that had been virtually destroyed by the Soviet Union, with broken economies built on a failed Soviet model and weak political and governing institutions. Sadly, these countries are not just trying to build modern nations, but must at times face continued and increased pressure from Russia on issues such as security and energy.

Ukraine is a good example when it comes to energy. They continue even though they face pressures from Russia to look west to the European Union, the United States, and NATO. They long to be in partnerships with the United States. We need to support that relationship, as well as the programs that help them transition away from the Soviet-era legacy.

There isn't enough time to cover all the issues facing these countries, but I will mention a few.

In Ukraine there has been a troubling development recently that threatens to overshadow so much of the economic and democratic progress they have made in recent decades. Specifically, this government currently in control has jailed former Prime Minister Yulia Tymoshenko over her alleged wrongdoing regarding a contract for natural

gas with Russia. Many people have read about her detention and hunger strike.

One need not agree with policy decisions of former politicians—and I am not here to judge whether that gas contract was sound, but I can say in a democracy one should not make a practice of jailing political opponents. It kind of discourages people from running.

Doing so has the bad taste of Lukashenko's dictatorship in neighboring Belarus—not exactly the model a modern democratic Ukraine should follow. I have seen that firsthand where, the day after his election, the last dictator in Europe jailed all of his political opponents. Talk about discouraging people from running for office.

As long as no criminal activity occurred, in a democracy voters should decide at the ballot box if they did or didn't like policy decisions of an elected official.

I had a heart-breaking discussion with Tymoshenko's daughter Eugenia. I was deeply troubled by some of the stories I heard about her mother's detention.

I also had a hopeful meeting with Prime Minister Azarov and President Yanukovich on many issues of shared U.S. and Ukrainian cooperation, as well as the Tymoshenko detention. They are going to move on a timely basis to deal with this detention, and I assured them that the West was watching closely. I hope she will be released from her detention as quickly as possible.

My second stop was in Turkey. I have been there several times before. It is a growing power in a region and the world, a thriving Muslim democracy and a strong NATO partner of the United States.

Turkey most recently agreed to build an important NATO radar base on its soil, an installation that is absolutely critical in keeping an eye on Iran and its nuclear ambitions. It was a hard decision by Turkey to agree to this installation for NATO, and they made it. I thank them for that. It makes the world a safer place.

Turkey is hosting on its border more than 20,000 refugees who have fled the violence in Syria. I visited one of these refugee camps in the town of Kilis. Almost 10,000 refugees—more than 60 percent of them women and children—were given a good, clean safe place to stay there, education for the kids, as well as health care.

The Turkish Government needs to be commended for the generous hospitality and kindness they provided to their Syrian neighbors fleeing Syrian President Assad's brutality. I wonder if the United States would be as welcoming under those circumstances. Well, Turkey has been and they should be commended for it.

I spoke with many of the Syrians in the camp, and they told me deeply troubling stories about the violence

they faced and why they had to leave everything behind and flee to a neighboring country. They were worried about family and friends who are still in Syria—particularly given the massacre reported last week in Houla.

The international community must do more to end the violence and foster a representative transition to democracy in Syria.

I have to note for the record that I saw my colleague, JOHN MCCAIN, on the Senate floor. He, Senator LIEBERMAN, and others have been to the same place and have met with refugees and have strong feelings about Syria. I have to say, and I said this to the Syrian opposition I met with, I don't believe there is an appetite in America for invading another Muslim country or sending in our Army. We are war weary after more than 10 years at it. What we are looking for is an international organization or others who will join in the effort to stop Bashir al-Assad.

We encouraged Russia to step up. It has always had a special relationship with Syria. If Russia can bring the various parties together and end the violence and start a transition away from the brutality of Bashir al-Assad, it will be in the best interest of Russia and of the world.

The Arab League needs to raise its voice about solving those problems in Syria. We cannot let Assad bring any further embarrassment to the nations around the world. He has proven himself unworthy of the support of Russia or any country.

I urge Russia to join the United States and Turkey and others to find a timely way forward in Syria.

Georgia and Armenia are two other friends of the United States. In Georgia, President Saakashvili has made great progress on democratic and economic reforms. He was a leader in the Rose Revolution. His term is ending soon, and I hope the ensuing election will serve as a model for the region.

We should also not forget one important thing about Georgia. It is still dealing with the aftereffects of the 2008 war with Russia that resulted in the breakaway republics of Abkhazia and South Ossetia. I investigated the South Ossetia borderline, and I saw the permanent Russian facility there. It is clear that Putin is trying to create a provocative environment within Georgia today.

We need to take steps to make sure the EU six-point plan is worked out—a plan that wasn't implemented after the war. I hope displaced persons and communities in South Ossetia and those in Abkhazia as well will have a chance to be reintegrated back into Georgia where they belong.

We need to take the steps to eliminate and reduce unnecessary human suffering. The EU has an important monitoring mission there, and I urge Russia and Georgia to work with them.

One last point about Georgia is that a lieutenant colonel in the U.S. Marine Corps, stationed at Tbilisi in our Em-

bassy, reported on what is a phenomenal thing going on. Georgia is not in NATO. President Obama has said they can be, and will be, and should be. At this moment, Georgia is contributing more forces and soldiers per capita than any nation on Earth to the NATO mission in Afghanistan. A lieutenant colonel in our Marine Corps, who is training Georgian soldiers, said they were great fighters. He went on to say: If you want to know how I can prove that, I am sending them to Afghanistan to stand next to our U.S. Marines and help us in the fight. That is as great an endorsement any marine could give to another fighting soldier.

Lastly, Armenia. There are so many Armenians across America who have made such a profound impact on our Nation—in fact, around the world. The diaspora of Armenian citizens is larger than the current population of that nation. They have lived through terrible brutality and loss of life. The genocide that occurred in the beginning of the last century may have claimed as many as 1.5 million lives as Armenians were displaced from eastern Turkey, and it is a legacy they will always remember.

I visited the Armenian Genocide Memorial and Museum to pay tribute and acknowledge the great loss of life that Armenia has suffered. There was a special tribute to Clara Barton, who may be remembered in American history for her work in establishing nursing and health care. She went late in her life—in her seventies—to Armenia to provide that same kind of assistance. She is given special recognition in the Government of Armenia today. The Armenian Genocide Memorial pays tribute to the many Armenians who died during this terrible period and the courageous leadership of those countries that went forward after their painful past.

I called on the President of Turkey, when I visited him, as I did several years ago, to work closely with the Armenians to try to resolve past differences and make an honest acknowledgement of the history between the two countries and try to work out a peaceful and cooperative relationship.

Mr. President, one encounter in Armenia in particular gave me hope that such a path forward is possible. I met with six Armenians who had participated in U.S.-supported cross-border reconciliation programs with Turkey. They were artists, journalists, business entrepreneurs, filmmakers, and high school students. Some of their stories were deeply moving.

One high school student named Victoria talked about the summer camp she visited in Vermont with Turkish high school counterparts and how they broke through stereotypes and started friendships. The filmmaker talked about joint films made with Turkish counterparts and then shown at the Istanbul Film Festival. An entrepreneur in Armenia talked about a service he set up to help businesspeople

from Turkey work in Armenia and invest there.

These stories gave me hope that some of the painful wounds between these countries can be healed.

Let me close by saying what a reminder these countries are of the importance still played by American leadership all over the world. At a time with so many economic and security challenges around the world, now is not the time for the United States to retreat from the global stage.

I support the President's ending of the war in Iraq. I believe we should remove our troops from Afghanistan as quickly as possible. I know we have to remain engaged. The world still looks to us for leadership and values that they can build their countries' future on as well.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill 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.

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.

TRIBUTE TO PHILLIP D. MORSE, SR.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, today I rise to recognize the extraordinary career of Phillip D. Morse, Sr., who served the United States Capitol Police with great distinction for 27 years, serving the final 5½ years as Chief of Police.

Chief Morse entered duty with the Capitol Police in May 1985. After training, his first duty assignment was providing security and law enforcement to the Senate. Since that time, he has worked in many different areas throughout the department, including the Containment and Emergency Response Team, Patrol Mobile Response Division, Capitol Division, and Office of Professional Standards and Compliance. Chief Morse eventually moved to the Dignitary Protection Division, where he implemented new financial management controls for the division and managed the overall security planning for the 2004 Democratic and Republican Conventions.

In 2004, he was promoted to the rank of Captain and returned to the Capitol Division. Upon his promotion to Inspector, Chief Morse assumed command of the Capitol Division and oversaw all police, security, and protective operations at the Capitol Building. During this time, Chief Morse established a Capitol Security Survey,