

coverage, you have to provide contraceptive services under that broad coverage of insurance, and these four States have identical religious employer exemptions as the rule the President announced.

Let me repeat, Arizona, New York, Oregon and California have identical religious employer exemptions, the same as the rule the President announced. I did not hear Mr. Romney going after the Governors of Arizona or of New York or Oregon or California. This has now become a political issue, and it should not be. It should not be.

Religious institutions continue to serve the public by providing exemplary health, education, and anti-poverty services in these States, and I am hopeful that nothing will change in the rest of the country. Twenty-eight States, half the people who already live in those States that cover the same thing.

The health of women in this Nation is far too important to become a sound bite on the evening news, a headline in the morning paper, or political rhetoric—again, to divide us. The President's policy and what we have done does not divide us. In fact, if anything it unifies the country. I do not think anyone thinks we should pass a law banning contraceptives. We did in the old days, you know. There was a Supreme Court case about that. As a matter of fact, I read it in law school when I was at Catholic University Law School: *Griswold v. Connecticut*, if I am not mistaken.

The Supreme Court said, no; the State has no interest, no vital interest in telling women they cannot use contraceptive services and devices. That is an old case. If someone is conscience-bound and they say they don't want to—that is fine. No one is being forced to do anything against their consciences. No one is being forced to do anything we have not already done in this country in 28 States. But now it has become political rhetoric. How else do we explain Mr. Romney's total misinformation? To try to divide us as a country again.

It is time to put this aside. It is time to put aside these differences, these divisions, and focus on giving people access to the affordable health care they deserve. That is what the Affordable Care Act does, and we should not let political rhetoric, political gamesmanship, a political campaign again try to tear us apart, try to misinform people to inflame passions that somehow we have gone off on a different path; that we are doing something totally different than what we have done before. We are not. We are not. To include in this the inflammatory rhetoric of abortion and all that it entails is doing a disservice to the women of this country.

I hope the truth will get out, that this misinformation will fall by the wayside, and people will see this for the political rhetoric it is, and that we will move forward with a health care

system that does provide broad preventive services to every woman in America. That is what this is about.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. UDALL of Colorado). Without objection, it is so ordered.

MOVING AHEAD FOR PROGRESS IN THE 21ST CENTURY ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I now move to proceed to Calendar No. 311, S. 1813.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 311, S. 1813, a bill to reauthorize Federal-aid highway and highway safety construction programs, and for other purposes.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have a cloture motion at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The assistant 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 the debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 311, S. 1813, a bill to reauthorize Federal-aid highway and highway safety construction programs, and for other purposes:

Barbara Boxer, Max Baucus, Mark L. Pryor, John D. Rockefeller IV, Benjamin L. Cardin, Al Franken, Jack Reed, Sheldon Whitehouse, Amy Klobuchar, Bernard Sanders, Patrick J. Leahy, Tom Udall, Frank R. Lautenberg, Richard Blumenthal, Jeff Merkley, Richard J. Durbin, Harry Reid.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived; further, that the cloture vote on the motion to proceed to S. 1813 occur at 2 p.m., Thursday, February 9.

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

FAA CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, last night, the Senate adopted the final version of a long term reauthorization of the Federal Aviation Administration. The process has been long and less than elegant as we worked through differences between the chambers, across parties and regional differences. I voted for the bill and am pleased that there is now more stable funding and policy to support our national aviation

system. There are aspects of this bill that I do not agree with and would have done differently.

The FAA authorization expired in October of 2007. For more than 4 years, we have been operating on short-term extensions—23 total short term extensions. The FAA, airlines and flying public all deserve a long-term authorization to provide certainty to our national aviation system.

One reason I voted for this legislation is that it is a jobs bill. The FAA estimates commercial aviation is responsible for 5.2 percent of gross domestic product and generates \$1.2 trillion in economic activity. The aviation industry provides \$346 billion in earnings and 11 million jobs. And this bill will help grow those numbers.

The funding provided in this bill will support 280,000 jobs. The economist Mark Zandi said, "Aviation is the glue that keeps the global economy together." This bill will boost our economy now and keep the United States competitive in the global marketplace in the future.

As importantly, this bill will improve the safety of our aviation system. Improving runway safety is one of the National Transportation Safety Board's "Most Wanted" list. There were 988 runway incursions last year. This year there have already been 66 incidents. This bill will require FAA to review all commercial service airports in the United States and initiate action to improve lighting, signage, and runway and taxiway markings.

Another key component of this bill is NextGen, the term we use to describe our transition from radar-based air traffic control system to a GPS-driven system. NextGen will give pilots and air traffic controllers the ability to accurately pinpoint aircraft in the sky—to avoid problems, to monitor traffic, to move things more smoothly, safely and efficiently. The FAA has called for action on implementing NextGen.

Last year, U.S. airlines carried 704 million passengers. Soon, those numbers will increase significantly. The FAA reports that U.S. airlines will carry more than one billion passengers by 2023 and more than 1.2 billion passengers by 2030. Our outdated air traffic control systems cannot safely and reliably handle this increase in traffic. But with NextGen, we hope to triple the capacity of our national aviation system.

This technology will allow planes to fly the straightest, quickest route from point A to point B. And with more precise information and better communication between the ground and the cockpit, we can fit more planes safely in our airspace. Doing so will save airlines at least 3.3 billion gallons of fuel a year—or more than \$10 billion annually by 2025. NextGen should also reduce airport delays significantly.

Chicago's Midway Airport was ranked dead last over the past few months for on-time departures. Chicago's O'Hare airport has won that dubious distinction more than once. The

main reason for these delays is the lack of capacity in our aviation system. Fully implementing NextGen could reduce those delays by half.

NextGen will also save more than 1.4 billion gallons of fuel and provide \$22 billion in savings to airlines and flyers. This is a great investment. This bill will help airports and air travelers in Illinois and nationwide save time and money.

In Illinois, we are in the middle of the largest airport expansion project in U.S. history at O'Hare airport. This \$6.6 billion project will completely reconfigure the runways at O'Hare to make sure we can move more traffic in and out of Chicago more efficiently. Moving this project along means a lot to the people of Chicago and Illinois.

O'Hare already generates 450,000 jobs and \$38 billion in economic activity for the Chicago region and the State of Illinois. The O'Hare modernization project will create 195,000 more jobs, and another \$18 billion in annual economic activity. This bill will allow O'Hare to keep moving forward by funding the airport improvement program at healthy levels. And it isn't just O'Hare. Airports in Illinois will benefit from more than \$3.3 billion per year for AIP projects.

Last year, airports in the Quad Cities, Rockford, Decatur and Springfield all used AIP program funds to make critical improvements to their airfields. Keeping this funding flowing will allow these airports to handle the traffic of today and the future increases of tomorrow.

The bill helps rural areas keep the commercial air service they have now and attract new service in the future. The Senate Conferees defeated an attempt to completely dismantle the essential air service program. This bill fully funds essential air service and puts in place important reforms so the Department of Transportation works with businesses, local communities and the airline industry to start and retain quality air service to rural communities.

Without a robust EAS program, many rural communities would have no commercial air service at all, and residents of smaller cities would have to travel significant distances for flights. This bill will ensure communities in Quincy, Marion and Decatur have scheduled commercial air service—an enormous tool for communities to retain and attract businesses. Scheduled air service as an important requirement for many businesses when they choose a headquarters or office.

While I voted for this bill for all the reasons I have already mentioned, I have very serious concerns about some of the labor provisions included in this bill. Several times, Republicans held up passage of a reauthorization bill on unrelated labor issues. And last year, these disagreements led to a lapse of authorization for several days before we were able to pass the latest short term extension. During that lapse,

some 4,000 Federal aviation workers were furloughed, airline construction projects like the O'Hare Modernization Project were threatened, and it cost the Federal Government roughly \$25 million in tax revenue each day.

So, Senator REID made a tough decision—he negotiated with House Republicans for the removal of language overturning the National Mediation Board rule, but in exchange the bill now includes the current labor provision which could make it more difficult for workers to organize and form a union. It is unfortunate that Republicans insisted on bringing Federal labor law into this legislation without hearings or adequate debate. But I could not allow Republicans to continue holding this bill hostage. It is too important to airline safety, the economy, my State, and the country as whole.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I support a clean extension of the FAA bill. But I cannot support the conference report that's before the Senate today because it includes a radical provision to undermine our rail and airline workers' right to organize.

The FAA bill is a jobs bill that keeps air safety employees and construction workers at airports on the job. According to the U.S. Department of Transportation, every dollar spent on transportation isn't just an investment in concrete and steel, it is an investment in our workers that creates jobs. Reauthorizing this bill keeps thousands of Federal employees and tens of thousands of construction workers on the job and not worrying about whether they will receive a paycheck.

A reauthorization of the FAA bill means 4 years of stability. It will modernize and upgrade our air traffic control system. And it will provide billions in investments to improve our airports with new runways, aprons, lighting, and land purchases. A clean FAA bill saves jobs, protects the flying public, and stimulates our economy.

But this FAA bill comes with a poison pill labor provision that was added in Conference. I cannot vote for such a radical provision that makes it more difficult for rail and airline workers to organize and sets a dangerous precedent of opening the Railway Labor Act up for hostile anti-worker amendments on unrelated must-do transportation bills.

This is just another example in a persistent pattern of attacking workers' rights. The Republicans have made it clear that the price of their support for a much-needed investment in our air infrastructure is to undermine our workers' right to organize and decide whether they want to be represented by a union.

During the Senate's debate of the FAA bill last year, the Republicans tried to strip hardworking Transportation Security Administration workers of their collective bargaining rights.

Last summer, the FAA shut down for 2 weeks because the House Republicans

insisted on a provision to make it harder for rail and airline workers to form unions. Now, we are days away from the expiration of the latest of 23 short-term extensions to the FAA bill, and the conference report includes another attack on workers' rights. The Republicans need to get off of it with labor, and get on with the business of creating jobs.

Unions play a vital role in ensuring safe and fair working conditions. We encourage the right to organize around the world. We need to encourage it on our own FAA bill.

Our rail and airline workers are hard at work every day protecting Americans. They keep us safe and secure as we travel. In return, they deserve a decent wage and safe working conditions. They deserve to have their right to organize and negotiate protected. And they deserve our thanks and respect.

I support a reauthorization of the FAA bill, but I am not prepared to trade away our workers' rights to get it done. I cannot support this conference report.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to voice my support to the Federal Aviation Administration Modernization and Reform Act conference report which was passed by the Senate last night, and will provide a greater sense of financial security than the Federal Aviation Administration, FAA, has seen in a long time. No agency should be subjected to the budget uncertainties that FAA has been forced to experience, nor strung along year after year unable to make long-term plans. For more than 4 years, the FAA has operated under more than 20 short-term funding extensions. I think that is unprecedented in the history of agency funding. At any rate, it is no way to run a railroad or a national aviation system.

I also support the conference report because it would finally allow the FAA to move forward on the NextGen air navigation program, would give the passenger's bill of rights the force of law, and would provide billions of dollars to improve and develop public airports across the country. For these reasons, the legislation is long overdue and sorely needed.

The conference report, however, does contain a provision about aviation security and the Transportation Security Administration, TSA, that is deeply troubling to me and about which I feel duty bound to express my disapproval.

At stake is TSA's management of the Screening Partnership Program, SPP, which allows a limited number of airports around the country to replace Transportation Security Officers, TSOs, with private contractors to screen passengers and their baggage. TSA has implemented this program at airports where, due to low-traffic volume, full-time, year-round Federal staff is unnecessary. A handful of larger airports take part in the program so TSA can measure and assess its performance and cost effectiveness

against the private contractors. It is telling that TSA's assessment after comparing the two systems is that it can secure airports more economically than private screeners can.

Regrettably, some of my colleagues in the House and Senate are resolved to undermine TSA—and therefore airport security itself—by advocating for the pre-9/11 system of screening by private contractors. My response to that is, how quickly we forget.

Mr. President, we have already tried an aviation security system run by private contractors. It very tragically did not work. The 9/11 attacks did not occur because of one, two, or three specific vulnerabilities. They occurred because a number of our defenses—including our system of airport screening—were simply inadequate.

I know everyone has vivid memories of the days after the 9/11 attacks, and it is hard to forget the dramatic loss of confidence the public felt for the aviation security system. Air travel dropped off precipitously in the weeks and months after 9/11, the aviation industry was shaken to its core, and our economy suffered because of it.

It became clear to many of us that aviation security was inseparable from national security, and we could not, and should not, rely on the private sector to do the job. The security of our skies would have to become a government responsibility. Americans need to be safe and secure wherever and whenever they travel. And while I would not want to cast blame or criticism on any one contractor, we have already witnessed the results of a system utilizing private security companies which were constantly pressured to focus on costs first and security second.

Less than 2 weeks after the 9/11 attacks, a bipartisan group of 21 Senators introduced the legislation that would create TSA and turn airport screening over to Federal officials. Barely a month after 9/11, the Senate passed that bill by a vote of 100 to 0. The bipartisanship of that vote was heartening and demonstrated a unity among Members that I wish we could experience more often. In the years since, we have had a few near misses, and our defenses have been penetrated more than once, but no hijackings or terrorist incidents have been successfully carried out. In large part, we have a dedicated corps of TSOs to thank for that.

I know it is fashionable in some quarters to criticize TSA. Understandably, people are unhappy with pat-downs, body scans, and invasions of privacy. But TSA establishes its policies for a reason. They are a direct response to real terrorist threats, and they have evolved as the threat has evolved. When a terrorist put explosives in his shoes and tried to light them afire mid-flight in 2001, TSA asked passengers to remove their shoes for screening. When a terrorist plot was uncovered in 2006 that involved lighting flammable liquids aboard several planes, liquids, except in small quantities, were prohib-

ited. After the Christmas Day 2009 attempted attack with explosives hidden in a terrorist's clothing, better screening technology was developed. These are not hypothetical cases or academic scenarios. They are real incidents and the reason that TSA makes so many demands on the flying public. And we should not delude ourselves or the American people into thinking that adopting a contract workforce will eliminate the need for body scanners, pat-downs, or any other security procedure TSA determines is necessary to secure air travel. Regardless of whether a U.S. airport uses Federal screeners or private ones, the security procedures implemented are the same.

Yet a provision has been tacked into this bill that would make it more difficult for TSA to maintain its current system by lowering the burden of proof for admitting additional airports to the Screening Partnership Program. Right now, airports must demonstrate that a private screening workforce would be more effective, secure, and efficient, than the TSA. The standard tacked into this bill, however, would only require airports to demonstrate that using private screeners "would not compromise security or detrimentally affect the cost-efficiency or the effectiveness of screening."

While the TSA Administrator would still have the authority to deny an application to the Screening Partnership Program, this lower standard would make it far more difficult for him to do so. TSA Administrator Pistole has said that the Screening Partnership Program should be used judiciously and that airport screening is and should remain a core mission for the Department of Homeland Security since 9/11, and I agree with him wholeheartedly.

Another provision in the bill strikes me as counterproductive. This provision would require TSA to provide recommendations to an airport that was denied its application to the SPP on how that airport can overcome the denial, if it decides to resubmit its application. If TSA believes that it can screen passengers and baggage better and with more cost efficiency than a private contractor, why would it provide tips on how an airport can escape that system?

Private screening could also limit TSA's ability to react nimbly to intelligence threats. If screeners are privately employed and managed airport by airport, TSA may not be able to respond effectively by shifting personnel to where it is most needed or modifying procedures if it cannot exert direct control over screeners.

Mr. President, private screening at airports could undermine not just public confidence in the aviation security system but in aviation security itself. We have been there and experienced the consequences of private screening. The American public must feel secure when it travels, and security is the first priority of TSA.

Ultimately, I voted for the Federal Aviation Administration Moderniza-

tion and Reform Act. But I believe we should reconsider and revisit the language related to TSA's Screening Partnership Program. I would urge my colleagues to remember the lessons learned after 9/11 and work with me to ensure we won't make the same mistakes again.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, the long-awaited passage of the long term FAA reauthorization conference report is a great achievement for Chairman ROCKEFELLER, Ranking Member HUTCHINSON, and the many other Senators and staff members who were involved in this legislation. I'm pleased with the important nationwide achievements in this bill—NextGen radar systems, improved passengers' rights, and airline ticket transparency, to name a few.

But I wanted to take a few moments to talk about the huge positive impact this legislation is going to have throughout almost every part of my home State of Oregon.

The big news for the Portland region is that the new slot exemptions at Washington National Airport will likely allow for the first direct flight from Portland International Airport to Washington National. This was not an easy victory for the northwest—many of my colleagues from both sides of the aisle had opinions on this issue and it seemed like we were not going to be able to come to an agreement. But I'm proud to say that both sides came to a compromise that will improve air service in the northwest and throughout the country.

One of the things I'm most proud of is that this bill permanently protects Crater Lake from the threat of noisy air tours. As most folks who have visited Crater Lake know, the quiet and peace of the park is just as important as its scenic beauty. This legislation says that Crater Lake is specifically off limits to any overflights that might threaten that tranquility.

This bill creates six new test areas for commercial use of unmanned aerial systems. In Central Oregon, folks are excited about the potential for using those test areas to advance the cutting edge aviation industry that already exists there. It's also an opportunity to monitor wildlife, do meteorological testing, and improve law enforcement in the vast acres of public lands now being co-opted by drug traffickers.

Perhaps the folks who are most directly helped by this legislation are in Independence, OR. Independence has a community of general aviation enthusiasts who live near Independence Airport and who keep their planes on their own property. The FAA recently decided to change the rules on them, putting their future in doubt. This legislation erases that doubt and allows those folks to continue an arrangement they've had for nearly 40 years with no significant safety issues and no significant noise complaints.

Finally, this legislation includes language to encourage recycling at airports, something I have been working

on for nearly a half dozen years. I'm glad that it will provide important tools for airport recycling going forward.

I commend my colleagues for moving this legislation forward as a positive step for the country and for my home State.

FLOOD PROTECTION

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I thank my colleagues for their help in passing S. 2039 by unanimous consent last month. This bill, which establishes a pilot program in North Dakota, will provide a great deal of help to citizens in my State.

I sponsored this legislation because Federal policy has stood in the way of flood protection measures necessary for communities in North Dakota. I want to highlight a couple of situations, one in Fargo and one in Minot, that illustrate the need for this bill.

First, Fargo, ND, has faced repeated flooding in the Red River, which runs through the heart of the city. The city has constructed a permanent levee to run along as much of the river as possible. However, over the years, some properties along the river bank were bought out using funds from FEMA's Hazard Mitigation Grant Program. HMGP guidelines prohibit the construction of any structure, including a levee, on land bought out under the program. So as a result, Fargo's levee stops every time it comes up to HMGP land. When the waters rise, the city builds a temporary extension of its levee that goes over the HMGP land and connects to the next section of the permanent levee, and when the waters recede, the city has to take down the temporary levee to remain in compliance with the HMGP no-construction policy. Year after year, Fargo has constructed and then removed several temporary levees at great expense and for no apparent reason other than the letter of the HMGP law.

Second, Minot, ND, is about to run into the same problem currently facing Fargo. As my colleagues know, Minot faced enormous flooding during the summer of 2011, losing thousands of homes and sustaining hundreds of millions in damages. In response, the city plans to build a major new flood protection system, including levees through the middle of town along the river. In order to build that system, Minot will have to buy out dozens of properties and create space for a levee. The Federal Government will make money available through the HMGP program for property buyouts, but we are unable to use it if spending it precludes construction of a levee on these properties.

In both cases, the solution is simply to permit levee construction on property purchased with HMGP funds. HMGP restrictions on construction were intended to ensure that the Federal Government would not be on the hook to pay for future flood damages

on property it had bought out. For the most part, that makes sense. But when a community wants to add flood protection in the form of a levee, it should be allowed to do so. A levee across HMGP-purchased land does not create future liabilities for the Federal Government; instead, it increases flood protection for local residents—something that will save the government money in future flood situations.

The text of S. 2039 allows for levee construction on North Dakota land purchased through the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program. The legislation directs the FEMA Administrator to approve construction of a levee on HMGP land after the Administrator determines that the levee would provide better flood risk mitigation than maintaining the property as open space. The Administrator is also directed to ensure that the levee would comply with relevant levee construction and maintenance standards and would minimize future costs to the Federal Government.

And I would like to put particular emphasis on the subject of costs to the Federal Government. This legislation does not affect the amounts of money provided under the HMGP program. It does, however, allow communities like Minot to use HMGP dollars more efficiently by permitting property buyouts to be linked with new flood protection plans. The legislation eliminates the costs FEMA and the Army Corps of Engineers incur every time they are forced to build and then tear down temporary levees on HMGP properties. Finally, the legislation ensures that any costs associated with the process the FEMA Administrator and the Army Corps Chief of Engineers use to approve levee construction are borne by the State, local, or tribal government requesting the levee. Any Federal funds approved elsewhere of course remain available for levee construction and are not affected by this legislation.

S. 2039 has moved on to the House of Representatives where I hope it can be approved expeditiously and sent to the President. The bill will provide important benefits to the people of Fargo, Minot, Devils Lake, and other North Dakota communities facing repeated flood risks. I thank my colleagues for their support of this common sense legislation, and I hope it can be an example of how to improve flood protection nationwide.

REMEMBERING FOUR CHAPLAINS OF THE USAT "DORCHESTER"

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, today I pay tribute to four American heroes who embody the spirit of what it means to serve your fellow man. Those heroes are the four Army chaplains who served on board the United States Transport Ship *Dorchester* in 1943—Methodist Minister Reverend George L. Fox, Rabbi Alexander D. Goode, Roman Catholic Priest John P. Washington, and Reformed

Church in America minister Reverend Clark V. Poling.

On February 2, 1943, the *Dorchester* was making its way across the North Atlantic, carrying 904 service men, merchant seamen, and civilian workers. This area was under constant patrol by German submarines; it was a dangerous area for American vessels and several ships had already been sunk between Newfoundland and Greenland, the *Dorchester's* intended destination. At 12:55 a.m. on February 3, a German U-boat spotted the *Dorchester* and fired 3 torpedoes at the American ship, delivering a fatal blow.

The *Dorchester* began to take on water and would sink beneath the freezing ocean in under 25 minutes. Many had been killed or injured in the initial blast, and panic set in as the passengers and crew attempted to find life vests and get into lifeboats. Many of the surviving passengers recall the calm disposition of the four chaplains who made their way to a storage locker and handed out lifejackets. When there were no more lifejackets, the chaplains removed their own and gave them to four passengers who were without. Rabbi Goode was seen giving away his only pair of gloves, and throughout the chaos and panic survivors could hear the chaplains preaching courage as the ship went down.

There were not enough rubber suits onboard to protect the passengers from the frigid North Atlantic waters. Of the 14 lifeboats aboard, only 2 were successfully used in abandoning ship. Of the 904 passengers, only 229 were saved by nearby vessels. 14 bodies were recovered, and 661, including the 4 Army chaplains, were missing and unreported.

In recognition of the extraordinary heroism displayed by the chaplains when they sacrificed their lives by giving up their life preservers to other men aboard the *Dorchester*, Congress authorized the Special Medal for Heroism which was awarded by President Eisenhower on January 18, 1961. No such medal has been awarded again in our Nation's history.

Millions of men and women have served bravely in our military. Many, like the chaplains onboard the *Dorchester*, have gone above and beyond the call of duty. The 4 chaplains on board, despite their differences in faith, came together to bring comfort to the 904 men on board the *Dorchester*. And they proved that it is possible to serve not only their country and their God but also their fellow man.

On February 14, a monument to the four chaplains of the *Dorchester* will be unveiled in Sebastian, FL. In January, I had a chance to meet Ernie Heaton, the last living survivor of the *Dorchester* sinking and a key leader in the push to get a monument put up in Sebastian. It was clear after meeting Ernie that witnessing the four chaplains' sacrifice first-hand made a lasting impact on him, just as their story continues to inspire all of us.