

I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

VETERANS JOBS CORPS ACT OF 2012—MOTION TO PROCEED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 3457, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 476, S. 3457, a bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a veterans job corps, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the next 70 minutes will be evenly divided and controlled between the two leaders, with Republicans controlling the first half.

The Senator from Tennessee.

MAKING TOUGH CHOICES

Mr. CORKER. Madam President, this is a great Nation.

I was interested to hear the comments of our two leaders today, and I am saddened, as are all of us here, regarding the news of Ambassador Stevens and three other hard-working public servants who represent us. We are a great Nation. This is a great Nation. People such as those individuals demonstrate the exceptionalism of Americans all around the world.

That is why it saddens me to come to the floor today, on the eve of hearing about whether the Federal Reserve, which will decide tomorrow, is going to print more money. Our markets are volatile each day, trying to figure out and read the minds of what our central bankers are going to do. Two days ago I spoke with one of our leading administration officials—someone whom I respect greatly—who had just attended a meeting in the Asian area where Christine Legarde was speaking to a small group of folks. She is the head of the International Monetary Fund. She stated that the real difference in how the world is going to evolve over the next short term and how the economies of the world are going to react is based upon whether people in Europe and people in the United States of America are going to rise up and deal with the problems they have internally.

I look at what is happening on both sides of the Atlantic, with central bankers printing money to buy debt of great nations—nations that have evolved, that are sophisticated, that are democracies. They pave the way for other cultures to evolve and develop economically themselves. Yet we wake up in a world where because politicians in Europe and politicians here in the United States of America have not risen to deal with the fiscal issues

within their own countries, the central bankers are left in a situation where they are printing money and buying debt in order to move a crisis further away from the day we now live in.

I know the majority leader talked about negotiations that are taking place regarding sequester and I know everybody in this body has been involved in some meeting of some kind to deal with the fiscal issues our Nation faces. I realize that over the next 60 days there is likely nothing that we as a body are going to do. I understand that. I don't think anyone in America expects that is going to happen over the next week and a half. We will figure out a way to move out of here and hopefully not do any damage to our country.

What I hope will happen is when we come back after the election, during a lameduck session or shortly thereafter, all of us will get serious about dealing with our Nation's fiscal issues. The majority leader spoke to the economy. I want our economy to do well. I want citizens in Tennessee and New York and all across our country to do well. Yet what we have done over the course of the last year and a half or so is passed silly little bills that have nothing whatsoever to do with sustaining a long-term economy, and we find ourselves again waking up on the eve of finding out whether the Chairman of our Federal Reserve is going to print more money to buy our debt to make it less painful for us and cause us to be in a position where we put off making the tough decisions. I hope the Federal Reserve Chairman tomorrow is going to show the humility he needs to show, that monetary policy has its limits, and it is up to us now to do our job.

So I am saddened today about the news of some wonderful public servants having lost their lives. I wake up every day with a tremendous sense of privilege to serve in this body and to represent people such as those who died, who are living in tough circumstances around the world, to make sure that all of us here are safe. I hope what will happen in this body is that Republicans and Democrats alike will honor the sacrifices, as we honored them yesterday and we today solemnly think about, that people make around this world on our behalf to keep us free and safe, and that we as a body, Republicans and Democrats, are going to rise and do the things we need to do to put in place a real fiscal reform package that will not rely upon the sugar of the Federal Reserve, but that we will do the things we need to do to create a sustained economy.

I believe—and I think most people in this body know it when they think about it—we are one fiscal reform package away from being able to focus on being a great Nation—we are a great Nation—but to be able to focus on that. When we look at where we are as a country, with the tremendous energy resources that 2 years ago we didn't even realize we had in this continent;

when we look at the technology breakthroughs that are happening in this great country; when we look at the pharmaceutical breakthroughs that are happening and saving lives around the world, we are one reform package away from putting this problem in our rear-view mirror and focusing on the greatness of this Nation.

So, again, I know we are not going to do anything over the next week and a half and we are not going to do anything over the next 60 days. But I hope Senators from all around this country and House Members from all around this country will come back after this election and have the courage that has been demonstrated so often by so many Americans to make the tough choices that are necessary to put our fiscal woes behind us, to cause this economy to grow, to allow the standard of living of Americans to rise and, candidly, to help lift hundreds of millions of people around this world out of poverty. That is what people are depending on. It is an embarrassment to find ourselves in this position where we are being diminished around the world, because people are looking at us—the great example to the world of free enterprise and limited government and democracy—and knowing that we don't have that courage today.

So I am hopeful we are going to come back and deal with these issues, we are going to do it in a bipartisan way, and then as a Nation we can continue to focus on our greatness and we can help not only uplift our own citizens through economic growth but help continue to be a beacon to the world.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HONORING OUR FOREIGN SERVANTS

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Madam President, I have been coming to the Senate floor on a daily basis to talk about the importance of the wind production tax credit, and I intend to do so today. But before I bring up that important topic I want to speak to a situation, an incident, that is on everybody's mind; that is, what happened in Libya earlier today.

I think all of us in the Senate adhere, or should adhere, to the concept that politics should cease at the water's edge. I hope in this terrible tragedy that philosophy will hold fast. I, along with all Coloradans, absolutely condemn the murders—and that is what they were—of Ambassador Stevens and other U.S. State Department personnel today in Libya.

I am a member of the Senate Committees on Armed Services and Intelligence, and I know the men and

women of our diplomatic corps do absolutely vital work under difficult conditions every single day. Ambassador Stevens was a dedicated public servant who was working in Libya to advance freedom and democracy, and we will continue undeterred in our pursuit of those goals.

We salute the service and sacrifice of all those who were taken from us today, and their families are in our thoughts and prayers.

WIND PRODUCTION TAX CREDIT

Madam President, as I mentioned when I first rose, I am here again on the floor of the Senate to urge all of us to take action on an issue that already has broad bipartisan support; that is, the renewal of the production tax credit for wind energy.

I was back in my home State of Colorado for the August work period, as I know the Presiding Officer and all my colleagues were, and I saw firsthand the very positive effects wind energy has had on my State of Colorado. I also saw the sobering effects of congressional inaction, which only strengthened my resolve to have extended the production tax credit.

I want to share some specific insights and developments in Colorado and then move to the State I am going to discuss today in a little bit.

Xcel Energy operates in my home State. It has a wide area in the upper Midwest as well, but it announced it had set a record for the amount of electricity generated from wind resources. At one point Xcel's Colorado customers got over half—to be precise, 57 percent—of their electricity generated from wind power. This is a huge success, and it highlights in so many ways the potential that wind energy has to fill a larger and larger portion of our energy portfolio as this industry fully matures.

Sadly, though, I also saw the negative effects of our failure to renew the wind PTC. Vestas Wind systems, which the Presiding Officer is familiar with, does business in Colorado. It announced layoffs last month affecting 2,300 workers worldwide who are manufacturing the turbines themselves, including about 100 workers at Vestas' facilities in Pueblo and Brighton, CO.

This was both predictable and predicted, and it is time for us to act to protect American workers in the wind energy industry. Each day we fail to act to extend the production tax credit, more American jobs are put at risk, and we further cede more of our clean energy leadership to foreign competition. Look no further than Colorado for both the promise of wind energy but also the peril of congressional inaction.

Of course, these effects are not limited to my State. I am biased. I think I represent the best State in the Nation, but every day I come to the floor and I highlight a different State and the positive impacts wind energy has had there. Literally every State in the Nation has a stake in this crucial wind industry space. Today, therefore, I

would like to talk about the great State of North Carolina where wind energy has literally boomed in recent years.

North Carolina—as have a lot of States—has seen a tremendous growth in its wind manufacturing sector. What are the numbers? Well, as of 2012, there are at least 17 wind manufacturing facilities in North Carolina that provide jobs to their local communities, and at least one more facility is scheduled to come online soon. The facilities produce everything from steel to lubricants and bearings.

We can see all the green circles which designate where these facilities are all across the great State of North Carolina. Let me focus on one manufacturer in North Carolina. It is PPG Industries. PPG is a major supplier of fiberglass to the wind industry, and there are hundreds of jobs linked to its activities. Their fiberglass facilities are in Shelby and Lexington, which are outside of Charlotte and Greensboro, respectively. Their growing role has been good for not only the company but for North Carolina. In 2010 PPG expanded its presence and brought online an additional furnace and created another 1,800 jobs. In sum, across North Carolina there are over 2,000 good-paying jobs, and those jobs then create a ripple effect.

If we want to look more broadly at North Carolina, they are manufacturing but they also have very significant wind energy potential in the State itself. Offshore wind resources are abundant. The American Wind Energy Association estimates that wind energy could provide enough electricity to power some 800,000 homes. That is not all: Onshore wind resources could also provide a substantial amount of power for the State.

If we look at these numbers, this is an important industry in North Carolina. It certainly has made a difference. But if we do not extend the wind production tax credit, this strong growth in the manufacturing sector plus the potential to harvest the wind in North Carolina is at risk and the years of strong progress we have seen here toward a clean energy future in North Carolina could be literally dashed if the wind production tax credit expires at the end of the year.

Here is the bad news. The wind industry in North Carolina, because they are anticipating the expiration of PTC, is beginning to downsize and shelve expansion plans, predictably. This story is being repeated potentially all over the country. It is heartbreaking. I remain hopeful, however. I am dedicated to extending the PTC. I know the Presiding Officer has been very helpful and very supportive and understands its importance.

A little bit of good news. The Senate Finance Committee passed a bipartisan tax extenders package as we left for our August State work period and it did include an extension of PTC. I want to stress an important point about that

effort: The package was bipartisan. I want to see the Senate take up the Finance Committee's legislation immediately and pass it immediately.

In a few hours the House is going to see an interesting discussion. The Presiding Officer served in the House. So did I. They are an equal partner of ours in the Senate. Over a dozen Members in the House are going to take the floor today and express their strong support for American jobs and the extension of the PTC. I am pleased these members of the House Sustainable Energy and Environmental Coalition will be adding their voices to what has become a bipartisan and now bicameral push to extend the PTC.

As I begin to close, let me also talk about the support that is out there in the country. It is a broad array of groups that have stood and said we think the PTC ought to be extended. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the National Governors Association, the Governors' Wind Energy Coalition, the American Farm Bureau Federation and many major national newspapers have all weighed in saying this is important to our country's future.

Members on both sides of the aisle, as I have mentioned, have said the PTC should be extended because they know and they have seen the positive effects of the PTC on their communities and across the country. They also know that wind energy—and renewable energy more generally—is the future. It is the wave of the future. There is no question. All you have to do is look at the rest of the world—look at China, look at Spain, look at Denmark, look at every developed country and the developing countries in Asia and India. They are all investing in clean energy. This is not something they are doing just to feel good. It is where economic growth will occur.

In sum, extending the PTC is a no-brainer. It is common sense. We ought to be doing the job we were sent here to do. We ought to be extending the PTC as soon as possible. PTC equals jobs. We ought to pass it as soon as possible. I am going to continue coming to the floor every day until we finish the job. I will not stop until we vote to protect American jobs. Failure to act has already hurt this vital industry. Continued inaction will result in the loss of thousands of American jobs which then has a ripple effect on the rest of the Nation's economy.

Colleagues, stand with me, stand with the Presiding Officer, stand with American workers. Let's extend the production tax credit now, as soon as possible.

I thank the Chair for her support and her interest.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent for 10 minutes to address the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HONORING OUR FOREIGN SERVANTS

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, last night when I went to sleep I was going over in my mind the speech I wanted to give here today—which is an important day in the history of the American space program. It is the day that President Kennedy challenged us to go to the Moon, to land safely on the Moon and to return safely as well.

When I woke up this morning I woke up to terrible news, to learn that our Ambassador in Libya had been killed by a mob. We've lost Ambassador Chris Stevens. We lost three others at the American Embassy in Libya. It is a terrible tragedy.

At the same time yesterday our Embassy in Cairo was stormed. Thanks to the vigilance of its leadership and our wonderful Marine Corps defending the Embassy, we lost no one in Cairo.

Madam President, I first want to extend to all of the families who lost someone in Libya overnight my extreme and definite condolences and sympathy. I am a little bit at a loss for words because these tragedies that happen to our men and women who serve at our Embassies happen all too frequently and then we say: A grateful nation never forgets; and then we go on to bash our Federal employees and our State Department people, saying: Oh, they have these cushy jobs in exotic places and they must be out eating brie somewhere.

We lost, at the Nairobi bombing, Consul General Bartley, head of our consulate service, who was serving there, one of the highest serving African Americans in our Foreign Service. His son interned there that summer, wanted to be like his dad. They died there. They died there. But he was at his duty station.

It has been almost 15 years. These men and women were serving the United States of America. They were at their duty station. They were trying to help Libya to rise up now to be able to create a government and be able to create opportunity for its own people, and they gave their lives. Ambassador Chris Stevens had already served two tours in Libya but wanted to go back again at this new moment in history, to stand up, to help Libya stand up a true government that was free and would give their people a chance at democracy and participating in a new Middle East.

And then there was Sean Smith, who was a 10-year veteran of the Foreign Service. He was an information management officer. He had served in Iraq. He is a father of two children, a devoted husband. We know what happened to them.

So we must continue our strong partnership with Libya after the fall of Qaddafi. But I call upon the new leadership: Call for calm, call for tolerance. If you are angry, there are ways to do protests and so on. You don't have to go around killing the American Ambassador when our Air Force flew over Libya and our President and our Con-

gress worked to support this new government coming up.

And then there is Cairo. Because of anger over a video—I do not know about this video. I don't know its content but I do know the outcome—that our Embassy in Cairo was stormed. They tore down our American flag. They replaced it with another flag. But it is the flag of the United States of America and our flag is in Egypt. Our flag is in Egypt because we are great allies to the Egyptian Government and great supporters of the Egyptian people as they come through the Arab spring—again, trying to create a new day and a new way.

I say to Ambassador Patterson and the entire staff, again: Our thoughts and prayers are with you. I was in Cairo. I know what they do every day. I know how, during the Arab spring many of them were locked in the Embassy, trying to keep our government functioning while their own families had to be evacuated. Some did not see their families for 3 weeks because they were inside, they couldn't leave, and we had the most massive evacuation of civilian employees in our history since, really, the beginning of some other armed conflicts.

So I say to those embassy staff, both our wonderful Ambassador, Anne Patterson, but to a lot of the little people who work at the Embassy, the people who keep the commercial commerce office open, the people who are doing the wonderful work with NGOs to show them how to build a free and new kind of society, and also to the foreign nationals who work in our Embassy—we think about you.

I say to the leadership in both countries again: Call for calm, call for tolerance. But I say to my colleagues here, we have to call for calm and tolerance right in this institution. We have to support our men and women in the State Department, our men and women in the military. All who serve overseas are representatives of the United States of America. Whether you are the Peace Corps or the Marine Corps; whether you are the Foreign Service or the commercial service or whatever—you are in the service of the United States of America, promoting our values, trying to help promote democracy and also trying to have economic and strategic cooperation.

I thank our Foreign Service staff. Many of them live in Maryland but that is not the point. They live in the United States of America. So I say to all, when you point your finger and say we don't need a government—I think we do need a government. And when we talk about standing up for our military now, in these tough budget times, absolutely we should. But remember there are others overseas who also carry our flag in very dangerous areas.

Let's start respecting the people who work for our government. Let's make sure they have the right resources to do their job and then let our President, our talented Secretary of State, help

work with the other world leaders to do something to bring about stability.

I feel very strongly about this. I guess what you are hearing from Senator MIKULSKI is grief for what has happened in Libya, worry about what has happened in Cairo, tension about what continues to happen in the Middle East, and then frustration about what goes on here. When all is said and done—more gets said than gets done and what is said is often not very good.

The world is watching us here. We are supposed to be the greatest democracy in the world. Not only are we supposed to be, I believe that we are. But democracy begins with us. Democracy is not only something written on a piece of paper which are our founding documents but we have to live what is in those founding documents. We have to, first of all, start with civility, start with respect, start with conversations among ourselves about how we could truly work together to help our country and to help our country help the world.

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S SPACE FLIGHT SPEECH

This is what it was all about 50 years ago when a young President went to Rice University. The Russians were pounding their chests. They put something up in the air called Sputnik. President Eisenhower had responded. We were going to do something called the National Defense Act. We were promoting math and science to catch up with the world. Does it sound familiar? Then, also, though, our President wanted to do more and he went to Rice University. During that speech he rallied the Nation on why, as part of his vision of the New Frontier, why we should travel into space. That historic day he said:

We choose to go to the moon. We choose to go to the moon in this decade, and do other things, not because they are easy, but because they are hard, because that goal will serve to organize and measure the best of our energies and our skills.

That is how in a robust way we took a nascent space program and transformed it into a space superpower. It literally took us to the frontier of space and took us to a new frontier.

For those 50 years, America continued to lead the way in space and to keep space a peaceful area. Not to militarize space, not to colonize it for a single country, but to explore and along the way in exploring the universe to get to invent science and technology that would help transform our lives here.

America continues to lead the way in space. As an appropriator for the space program I am so proud of what we continue to do—what we continue to do in the area of space exploration, space and space science.

Look at where we are now. We are right up there in the space station. We have completed its development. We are going to do new research that has never been done before and we are part of our wonderful, gallant astronaut

program. At the same time, we have invented new technologies to explore the universe. The work for the Hubble Telescope is located in Maryland both at Goddard and the Space Telescope Science Institute.

Most recently, we landed Curiosity on Mars, a robot the size of a Mini Cooper, that will tell us so much about our nearest neighbor. As President Kennedy might have said, I sent Curiosity to Mars not because it is easy but because it is hard and we are very curious.

Over the summer, we lost two of our great people—two of our great astronauts. We lost Dr. Sally Ride, the first woman to go into space, whom we so admired, and then we lost astronaut Neil Armstrong, who on July 20, 1969, took that giant step for mankind.

Tomorrow at the National Cathedral we will honor Astronaut Neil Armstrong, and later this year at the National Space Museum we will honor Dr. Sally Ride. We not only want to respect our astronauts of the past, we want to respect the astronauts of today and our astronauts of tomorrow. We want to respect all those wonderful young men and women who want to study space and aeronautics, who want to explore the new frontiers of today and will come up with new ideas that will lead to new jobs tomorrow.

We keep asking NASA to do the hard jobs, such as explore the universe, protect the planet, make airplanes safer and more reliable, look beyond the reach of Earth, develop those new technologies, and search for extraterrestrial life out there. Maybe it is out there, maybe it isn't—study Earth as if it were a distant planet. Maybe there is intelligent life on Earth. Let's look for that, and let's look for it right here. We need to continue to broaden our reach, to go beyond low-Earth orbit and also continue our research.

This year, there was a unique, bold partnership when a private company, SpaceX, sent cargo to dock at the International Space Station. No private company and few nations have accomplished that. This year, SpaceX will be joined by another private company, Orbital Science, which will launch from the east coast Spaceport Wallops. They are located in Virginia. It is a Maryland-Virginia cooperation. How exciting.

Our future in space will be built on innovation and discovery, whether it is the commercial rocket industry, the James Webb Space Telescope that will take us well beyond the work of the Hubble, new technologies, including fixing satellites or, again, that mission to planet Earth. New technologies don't just happen; they come from American ingenuity, but they are built through investments. They made America great and they made the missions of the United States worth imitating.

In the last couple weeks the Presiding Officer talked about an exceptional America. America is exceptional

because of the daring and the do of people such as our astronauts, because of talented people who think and study and come up with new ideas and because their government backed them.

I wish to conclude by saying I am proud of what President Kennedy announced. Right here in this body two people teamed up. Actually, it was one person in this body and the other was a Vice President. It was an odd couple. Their names were Vice President Lyndon Johnson and Margaret Chase Smith. Margaret Chase Smith was once the longest serving woman in Congress. I now hold that record. Margaret Chase Smith, from Maine, was a devotee of the space program. President Kennedy set the goal. He gave it to Lyndon, his Vice President, to make the goal into a reality. The Vice President turned to Congress, and Margaret Chase Smith helped carry the weight of the Congress to put in the right policies and the right funding. Isn't that a wonderful story? It is a wonderful story we need to take with us, that when we work together with our President and both parties work across the aisle, that is the new frontier which takes and keeps America an exceptional Nation.

God bless our President Kennedy, all the astronauts who risked their lives, and everyone who worked to create these new frontiers.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FRANKEN. Madam President, I rise today to express my strong support for the Veterans Jobs Corps Act. I am proud to be a cosponsor of the bill. I would like to thank Senator NELSON for introducing the bill, and I would like to thank Senator MURRAY, chair of the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee, for bringing this bill to the Senate and for all she has done for our Nation's veterans.

Veterans have done so much for our country, serving courageously in the military, and they have been tested so profoundly and so many times over the last decade. These men and women have done everything for us. We owe them. That means they deserve the best health care and other benefits they have earned from the Department of Veterans Affairs.

And that means a home. Last weekend I was back in Minnesota for Habitat for Humanity, making critical home repairs for a Minnesota Guard veteran, SGT Brian Neill, and his family. Brian is a 23-year veteran of the National Guard, is part of the Minnesota National Guard unit, the legendary Red Bulls, who had their deployment in Iraq extended so that it

was one of the longest, if not the longest, deployment in U.S. history.

While Brian was in Iraq, his son was hit by a drunk driver while returning home from his junior ROTC training. He sustained a severe brain injury and is severely disabled.

In Iraq, Brian, who mentored younger soldiers, saved the life of one of those soldiers. Brian, being a 23-year vet, mentored these young kids. They were in a convoy, and he saw one of them get out and collapse. He recognized the heatstroke and saved his life.

Sergeant Neill himself returned from Iraq suffering from very serious physical and psychological wounds that leave his wife Jane as a caregiver for both Brian and their son. I have to tell you, they are the most wonderful people. It was an amazing experience to help them with home repairs to make sure they will have the home that meets their needs.

But when I talk to veterans in Minnesota these days, the thing I hear most about is jobs, about employment. Jobs mean money, of course, but it means much more. It means a new mission. Without a job, you really cannot reintegrate into your community and start a new phase of your life.

Veterans unemployment in Minnesota, as I am sure it is in the Presiding Officer's State of New York, is way too high. My message to employers in Minnesota is simple: These are the people you want to hire. They have skills. They have discipline. We all have a role to play in making sure veterans have jobs—employers in the private sector, State government, colleges and universities, municipalities, and also the Federal Government.

This is how we do it in Minnesota. Let me give an example. We had several thousand Red Bulls deployed to Kuwait. The Minnesota National Guard recognized that a large number of them were not going to have jobs when they came back, so the Guard and Minnesota's outstanding Department of Employment and Economic Development went upstream, as they say, to Kuwait to get ahead of the problem. They brought corporate leaders from Minnesota, businesses such as Target and Best Buy, and they also brought folks from MNSCU, which is the Minnesota State Colleges and University System, to Kuwait to provide training for the Guard members on entering or reentering the workforce. They were able to share valuable information with the Red Bulls on writing resumes, getting ready for an interview, and doing it well.

One of the problems is that very often soldiers coming back from Afghanistan, coming back from Iraq, from Kuwait, very often in a job interview will say: We did that, we did this, we did that. That is how you think in the military. Employers want to know what you yourself individually did. So it was simple. The employment guys from Target said: Say "I"—you know, little tips like that. And it has been very helpful.

So we all have a role to play. At the Federal level, last year we passed the VOW to Hire Heroes Act that expanded and created new tax credits for businesses that hire veterans. I have been spreading the word in Minnesota—I know the Presiding Officer has been spreading the word in New York—so our businesses know that for every unemployed veteran they hire, they can get a tax credit for up to \$9,600. That is \$9,600 for hiring a veteran who has a service-related disability and then ratchets down a little bit. But this is a good incentive for businesses to be hiring our veterans.

The legislation we are considering today, the Veterans Jobs Corps Act, is the next step that we can and should take at the Federal level. The bill creates a Veterans Job Corps through the Department of Veterans Affairs, in cooperation with other departments, where thousands of veterans will be able to work on conservation and resource management in our Nation's public lands. Under this bill, veterans will have the opportunity to restore and protect parks, forests, and other public lands, whether they be national, State or tribal. Veterans will be hired to maintain the infrastructure and facilities on these public lands. It will also provide funding for veterans to become firefighters and law enforcement officers. It will also provide licensing and certification for certain skills veterans had when they were deployed—emergency medical, nursing assistants, and also drivers. Many men and women drive in these theaters, and to ease their getting certification, this bill does that as well so they can work in our Nation's parks and these national lands that are so treasured.

This is really based on the Civilian Conservation Corps, the CCC from the New Deal, which was created through a combination of actions by Franklin Roosevelt and legislation, of course, by Congress. It was very successful. It was the most popular program of the New Deal. In fact, at that time veterans were specifically included among those who could be enrolled in the CCC. As I said, the CCC was one of the most successful programs to help us get through the Depression.

My wife Franni's uncle James, who died not long ago at the age of 96, worked for the post office, the Postal Service, and served with the U.S. Army postal service in England, France, and Germany during World War II—a "greatest generation" guy. But before that, during the Depression, he joined the Civilian Conservation Corps. He was part of the crew that built the road through Evans Notch, a beautiful, mountainous area at the border of Maine and New Hampshire. My wife is from Maine. This was one of James' proudest achievements in life. If you read his obituary, it was one of the most prominent parts, along with his service during World War II.

That is the kind of thing the Veterans Job Corps can be. We have to do

this work on our public lands, our parks, our forests. Our public lands need to be maintained and preserved and improved. Why not put our veterans to work doing it? They have the skills, they have the experience, and they have the discipline. For instance, if you spent a lot of time on duty outside and you work in teams, which is obviously true of a huge number of those who served in Iraq and Afghanistan, you are going to be very well suited for this work. If you built roads in Iraq or Afghanistan, you are well prepared to maintain or manage resources in Minnesota's beautiful parks, forests, trails, and other public lands—under a little less pressure, by the way.

Minnesota has over 227,000 acres of land in 73 State and national park and recreation areas. That does not count our innumerable public lands under more local jurisdiction. Those are some of the most beautiful places in the country—the Boundary Waters Canoe Area, Voyageurs National Park, Superior and Chippewa National Forests, or the trail along the Mississippi and St. Croix Rivers, just to name a few. Those need to be protected, maintained, improved, and restored too. This is important work, and it is dignified work. If you are making sure it is in your obituary 70 years later, you know it is very important, dignified work. What better way to preserve the beauty of these places than having veterans do it, for our heroes to do it.

The bill also incorporates a number of other veterans job provisions from other bills sponsored by my colleagues from both sides of the aisle. The one I started to mention before is the certification-licensure requirements for becoming a nursing assistant or emergency medical technician—I knew I was looking for a word; it was "technician"—and for getting a commercial driver's license. This is also an issue on which my colleague, my senior Senator from Minnesota, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, has spent a lot of time.

The provision in this bill authored by Senator PRYOR also states that they have to take military training into consideration in issuing licenses for those jobs if they want to continue getting Federal funds for some important veteran employment programs that States administer. This will provide an additional incentive for States to make sure that servicemembers' highly relevant training and experience in these fields can be translated into civilian qualifications, eliminating the need for duplicative training and opening the door to many more jobs for highly trained veterans.

I can tell you, after seven USO tours, our men and women in the military are magnificent. They are highly trained and, man, are they disciplined and, man, are they great. They deserve this. The Veterans Job Corps is a great idea for employing our Nation's veterans doing the important work of preserving, protecting, and improving our Nation's public lands and serving as

first responders, police, and firefighters.

It is my strong hope that we will be able to bring debate on this bill to a close, pass it, and have it enacted into law. Our Nation's veterans deserve nothing less.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to talk about the bill that is pending, and I must say: Here we go again. And let me say that what we are doing today, under the auspices of helping returning veterans get jobs—and there is nothing wrong with wanting to do that and there is nothing wrong with trying to pay for that—is really passing a bill for political reasons so we can say we did things, because this is not going anywhere in the House of Representatives.

A couple of points I would make are that, first, yesterday, on the anniversary of 9/11, we started the consideration of this bill, but this bill has had no hearings, no committee work, and essentially no debate until today, despite the fact that it will affect six different Federal agencies, at a minimum.

Before I discuss the bill itself, though, I want to mention another anniversary. One year ago yesterday, SPC Christopher D. Horton, Army SPC Bret D. Isenhower, and Army PVT Tony J. Potter, Jr. were killed in Afghanistan. They were 1 of 13 Oklahomans from the Oklahoma National Guard serving in Afghanistan who paid the ultimate sacrifice—a pure and noble sacrifice. As we debate a bill that will largely benefit those who have safely returned home after serving their country, it is important that we not forget those who gave the ultimate sacrifice, this pure and noble sacrifice for the benefit of the rest of us.

The bill before the Senate provides \$1 billion—\$1 billion—in mandatory spending. For the folks at home that means it is not subject to appropriations; it will be spent, period, regardless of what we do if we pass this bill and the President signs it—over 5 years for the creation of a new mandatory program called the Veterans Jobs Corps.

One point I will make is that we already have six veterans jobs programs and not one of them has a metric on it to see if it is working. There hasn't been one hearing to see what the jobs programs we are running now are doing, to measure their effectiveness or their cost effectiveness and see if they are actually performing for veterans what we say we want them to do. Yet we have a bill on the floor that didn't go through that committee, where no

hearings were held, and we are going to do the same thing again. Because there is not a metric in this bill.

So what is happening here is we are playing the political election card to say, How could anybody oppose a veterans jobs corps bill? The real question to be asked is: How callous is it to put forth a political bill when we have no idea whether it may or may not work, for the pure political purpose of an election, without looking at the whole of the veterans jobs programs? There is not going to be any congressional oversight on this.

Just 2 weeks ago I released a report on job training in my own State. I was highly effective in looking at every Federal Government job training program, veterans and nonveterans alike, in my State. I looked at every State job training program and then published a report. Here is what the report found.

And, by the way, we have 47 other job training programs, of which 90 percent don't have metrics on them, and we spend \$19 billion a year on those job training programs.

What we found is that State-run, State-financed, State-supported job training programs work in Oklahoma. We actually take our own money, with our own institutions, with our own individuals and our own employees, knowing what businesses and industry need, and we match job training to what those needs are and actually put people to work. Consequently, Oklahoma has a 4.7-percent unemployment rate. So we are highly effective at training people for the jobs that are available. But we are not very effective with the Federal programs.

The assessment in Oklahoma—and I am not sure it applies across the country, but it certainly does in Oklahoma—is that we are very good at employing people in the job training industry but not very good with Federal dollars when it comes to training people a life skill to keep them employed.

This legislation is going to provide \$1 billion for the Federal Government to hire veterans on a temporary basis.

I understand that Senator BURR's recommendations are going to be incorporated. That is a marked improvement to the bill. His puts them in line for a career, not a temporary job—which shows the lack of thinking because Senator BURR, the ranking member on VA, couldn't get a hearing. We didn't have a markup, didn't have a chance for ideas to flow through. I am not certain we are going to have amendments. I have four I would like to offer to the bill that are better pay-fors and will actually improve the bill. I am not sure we are going to do that either.

So we didn't have a hearing, and we didn't have a markup. We come to the floor, and we are not going to have amendments. What is this really all about? Is this about veterans or is this about politicians? I suspect it is about

politicians. I suspect it is about elections and not veterans.

The legislation grants broad authority to the Department of Justice, Department of Defense, Department of Labor, Department of Agriculture, Department of Commerce, Department of Homeland Security, the Interior Department, and the Army Corps of Engineers to hire veterans in jobs such as conservation and first responders.

However, to comply with the pay-go rules, we manipulate the system again. We include revenue increases to equal the cost of the bill. We do that by requiring a continuous levy on payments to Medicare providers and suppliers—which is not a bad idea—and also by denying or revoking passports in cases of seriously delinquent taxes. I have heard that is going to be pulled, but nobody knows. Nobody has seen it. That is why we have committees, so we don't have to play with things before we have a base bill and we know what it will do.

The bill already violates the Budget Control Act's allocation for Veterans Affairs funding. It is subject to a 302(f) point of order because it is outside the bounds of their appropriations.

The bill also states a distinct preference for veterans of the current war in Afghanistan and the most recent war in Iraq by stating that these jobs are primarily for veterans who have served since September 11, 2001.

As with the veterans caregiver bill in 2009, this is blatant discrimination against our other veterans. One class of veterans is better than another class of veterans? Tell me how. Is somebody who died in the Vietnam war less honorable than somebody who has given their life in Afghanistan? Yet we are making that distinction in terms of the benefits available to those who served our country honorably.

So we are blatantly discriminating against veterans who served before 9/11. I would also remind us that those veterans didn't have the post-9/11 GI bill. They didn't have the other significant benefits that have come along and been passed down, both paid benefits, family transfer of the post-9/11 bill, or the educational benefits for in-service that the present veterans have.

Another thing I would remind my colleagues is that right now there is a preference in every branch of the Federal Government for hiring veterans. It is already written into law. Since 1944 the Federal Government has stated that veterans with honorable or general discharges are preferred for hiring in competitive positions and may also be hired without competition in many cases. In other words, they get an absolute preference. Disabled veterans get even a higher preference over non-disabled veterans. Veterans also have priority in retention in terms of government downsizing: If you were a veteran, you don't get downsized; if you are not a veteran, you will.

Senator BURR's bill—which it appears the majority will take and add to their

bill rather than replace their bill—will direct the Office of Personnel Management to require that each of the 10,000 job vacancies presently in the Federal Government today should be filled by veterans. This would actually provide a real career path for veterans, not a temporary make-work job slot that will go away as soon as the \$1 billion runs out.

According to a 2011 GAO report, there are six job training programs, which I have outlined, already on the books. They are not working, but they are on the books, and we are spending money on them. We have no metrics to know whether they are working. We have had no oversight hearings to know whether they are working. None has ever been held.

There is the Labor Department's Disabled Veterans Outreach Program. It does job readiness, skills training, retention training, and employment counseling.

The Labor Department's Homeless Veterans Reintegration Project does everything the first one I mentioned does.

The Labor Department's Veterans Employment Representative Program does exactly the same thing as the first two.

The Labor Department's Transition Assistance Program does job search and job readiness training.

The Labor Department's Veterans Affairs Workforce Investment, again, does all the same tasks as the first two I mentioned.

The Veterans Affairs' Rehabilitation for Disabled Veterans Program does nearly everything from job training to employment counseling to job referral to on-the-job training to basic adult literacy.

This bill and those training programs are in addition to the post-9/11 GI bill and the Tuition Assistance Program, which provides 100 percent tuition assistance plus expenses, plus a monthly stipend salary for unemployed or any other veterans to attend college, vocational training, pursue licensure, with fees paid for by the Federal Government, and allows them to transfer this benefit to their spouses.

The question I have, with that benefit—and we are doing another one now for political purposes, not because we really care about veterans—why isn't this one working? We are going to spend billions on the post-9/11 GI bill, and we are going to pay them at the rate of a noncommissioned officer all the time they are going to college. Why isn't that working? Where is the oversight hearing to see why what we just did 2 years ago isn't working?

Instead, what we are going to do is—which the Congress has done under both Democrats and Republicans—we are going to throw in more money and do another one. Instead of measuring what works and measuring what we are doing, we are going to create another program. Granted, supposedly it is only 5 years.

When it comes to 5 years, what will happen whether it works or not? Nobody will vote against extending the veterans program, will they? How can anyone be against veterans?

So we would not do the hard work of having committee hearings; we would not do the oversight. We would not even change this bill to make sure it has absolute metrics on what it is doing. So we are continuing down the road to bankruptcy, all in the name of putting a bill—that isn't going to pass the House—on the Senate floor so two or three Members of the Senate can go home and claim they did something.

I think it is hypocritical. I don't think it matches the pure valor of the three individuals I mentioned. It doesn't come close. It doesn't measure up. Those 13 Oklahomans who died in Afghanistan this last year from the Oklahoma National Guard, the Thunderbirds, represented the real value of America. This bill doesn't.

The post-9/11 GI bill pays 100 percent of the highest cost public school in any State. So veterans can go to the best public school paid for completely by the government if they are a post-9/11 veteran. They can get the same equivalent pay as a noncommissioned officer the time they are going. That is what we have already got out there.

Without this legislation, today any unemployed veteran who can get into a community college can go for free, receive 3 years' of pay, all their expenses paid, their housing paid—all of those things paid.

Well, if that isn't working, why isn't it working? Where is the hearing to find out why that isn't working? No, we are just going to pass another bill without a hearing, without a committee markup, for politically expedient purposes. Oh, it is just \$1 billion.

Where is our honor? Where is our valor? Where is our sacrifice?

The Department of Defense Tuition Assistance Program, another program, while you are in the military, is paid for. All you have to do is make a C or better—online, off line, whatever way you want to go.

So let me summarize: We have the Tuition Assistance Program, we have the post-9/11 GI bill, we have the GI bill, we have six separate VA job programs. We have a bill on the floor to do another one, and nobody is asking the question: What is wrong with what we are doing now, and why aren't we fixing it?

If what we are doing now isn't working, why aren't we fixing that? Why aren't we going to allow amendments to fix things? Why are we going to fill the tree and not allow the process that our Founders designed the Senate to work so that all ideas could be considered?

No, this is a political exercise. I am going to call it what it is. This isn't about veterans; this is about politicians. My hope is that we wake up before our country fails.

When I came to the Senate, the average family's responsibility for public

debt per individual was \$26,000. Within the 8 years I have been here, it is now 51,400 and some-odd dollars. We are playing a game. We are thinking short term. We are worried about political careers and elections, but we are not worried about the country. This is about the greatest example of the incompetence of the Congress of United States I have ever seen.

I am for helping veterans, I am for paying for it, and I am for making sure they get rewarded for their service and their sacrifice. This bill isn't it. This is a charade. That is exactly what it is. To call it anything else dishonors the service of those who have defended and protected our country.

I yielded the floor.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

HONORING OUR FOREIGN SERVANTS

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, like many of my colleagues, before I begin my remarks on the subject that brings me to the floor today, which is the DREAM Act, I wish to take a moment to reflect on the brutal, unconscionable attacks that occurred on our diplomatic posts in Libya and Egypt. Like many of my colleagues, I am outraged and saddened by the brutal murder of four courageous Americans in a cowardly, unconscionable attack on the U.S. Consulate in Benghazi, Libya. Their families are in the thoughts and prayers of my family as they are for many others of my colleagues.

These great diplomats were patriots and professionals, putting their lives on the line to advance American ideals and interests. Their vital work is done daily by countless Americans, diplomats abroad who serve in every corner of the world.

In my own visit to Libya last year with a number of my colleagues, including Senator MCCAIN and Senator GRAHAM, I saw the vital work and the accomplishments of such brave Americans on the ground as well as the great peril and severe danger they constantly face. I also saw their sense of satisfaction and patriotism in the work they are doing. I add my voice to that of my colleagues asking for more support for security, enhanced safeguards, and protection for our diplomats in these kinds of situations. They go about their work with understated perseverance and determination as well as constant courage in the face of often chaotic and unpredictable dangers.

The cowardly attacks on these patriots should not deter the people of Libya from moving forward. Neither should it deter us from working together with others abroad who have a common interest in tolerance, freedom of speech, and democracy.

I commend President Obama and Secretary Clinton for their immediate response to this situation, their words of encouragement. I wish Godspeed to the Marine Corps Fleet Anti-terrorism Security Team en route to Libya.

The diplomats who were killed in this tragic and brutal action embodied

American values and the highest traditions, not only of the professionals among our career diplomats, but all who serve and sacrifice for this country in uniform in very similar situations of danger—the marines who guard our embassies as well as the other marines and troops who are fighting on foreign soil to uphold our freedoms.

THE DREAM ACT

Those American values in some sense bring me also to the floor today to talk about the DREAM Act and about a young generation of people in our communities across America and across the country who would benefit from this important legislation. Our immigration system right now is broken and is in dire need of comprehensive reform. Any comprehensive immigration reform legislation must include the DREAM Act. I believe the DREAM Act is worthy of adoption without that comprehensive overarching reform because these young Americans in our communities deserve the opportunity to earn their citizenship by contributing to our Nation. That is exactly the opportunity the DREAM Act seeks to afford them.

Over this last recess I was pleased to talk to many of those DREAMers. I was particularly proud to talk to them about the work a number of us are doing here, to try to achieve and make possible this legislation that would enable and empower them to contribute further. I am grateful to Senator DURBIN and others who have championed this measure at the Federal level, much as I have done in the State of Connecticut as attorney general. I was also proud to talk about the Department of Homeland Security's Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals policy. This policy took effect on August 15 when DHS started to accept applications for deferred action.

Under the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, DREAMers will have a temporary reprieve—and I emphasize temporary reprieve—from deportation. This policy step is a good one. It is in the right direction. But it affords only a temporary reprieve.

The DREAM Act would afford a permanent path to individuals who qualify: individuals who have entered the United States before the age of 16; they have been brought here by parents who may be undocumented—but young children, many of them much younger than 16, most of them in fact younger than 5 or 6 years old and who have been present in the United States for at least 5 consecutive years prior to enactment of the bill; are here through no fault or action of their own but who want to be here permanently and contribute and give back. They must have graduated from a U.S. high school or have obtained a GED or have been accepted into an institution of higher education. They must be between the ages of 12 and 35 at the time of application and be of good moral character.

These requirements establish a path for people who want to contribute,

have come here through no fault of their own, know the United States as the only country where they have ever lived. They usually speak no other language. Their life and their friends and their future are here.

I want to talk, as I hope to do literally every week that I am able, about an individual who embodies the DREAM Act. Her name is Zuly Molina. Her full name, actually, is Zuleyma Molina, but she goes by "Zuly." She is a proud member of our Connecticut community, one of 11,000 to 20,000 young people living in Connecticut who would benefit from the DREAM Act. Zuly is here with us today through her picture. I want to talk about her life, which has been full of hardships and challenges, but also her future.

She was born in Mexico and brought to America when she was 6 years old. Her family settled in Connecticut—in fact, in New Britain. She had to learn English, which was not easy for her. In fact, she was taunted and bullied because of her lack of language skills. But she was up to the challenge. She learned English. She speaks it absolutely fluently. She decided to go to the library and translate books on her own so that she would have a command of English. She went through the New Britain public schools and graduated from New Britain High School in 2008, but at that point there were additional challenges.

Zuly wanted to stay in Connecticut and perhaps attend 2 years of community college before going to a 4-year institution. But she was not eligible at that point for in-State tuition and the option of staying in Connecticut was simply too expensive.

What did she do? Endlessly resourceful and determined, she decided to commute every day to Bay Path College in Massachusetts. There she worked in many leadership positions outside the classroom. She was president of Rotaract, which is Rotary's youth service club for young people. She was vice president of the Bay Path Christian Fellowship. She was cocaptain of the cross-country team. And she graduated with a bachelor's degree in biology, becoming the first college graduate in her family.

She felt discouraged even after graduation because she knew she could not apply for many jobs that require documentation. She decided to pursue further education, a master's degree from Bay Path College in occupational therapy. She understands now life will not be easy, but her goals of working for a hospital's feeding program and pursuing an MD are realistic. She hopes she can pursue that profession so she can work for nonprofits that help families with low income—not altogether different from the one where she grew up.

It has taken many years for Zuly to accept and thank her mother for sending her to America. She would be upset—more than upset—if the land of her life, the land that she loves—Amer-

ica—refuses to give her the opportunity to stay here. She has that opportunity temporarily with the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals Program. It is an administrative program. It could be ended with a new administration. It could be ended by any administration virtually overnight. She has applied for deferred action and she is undergoing the process, but she deserves more than a temporary reprieve. That is why I stand here urging my colleagues to enable Zuly to come out of the shadows, to seek a career that will enable her to contribute mightily and monumentally to all of us as a doctor, and to raise a family of her own here, as a proud United States citizen.

To these young people who identify as Americans and who were brought to this Nation at young ages as children or infants and who are here through no fault of their own, I urge my colleagues to offer one of the greatest gifts, one of the greatest privileges one can have, which is United States citizenship, so that we can say to the DREAMers on some day soon, "my fellow American."

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

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

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak as if in morning business.

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

THE RYAN BUDGET

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, we are at a moment in time when Americans across the country are confused by what they are hearing; it is hard to discern truth from fiction.

One of the proposals that is being talked about is from the Republican nominee for Vice President, PAUL RYAN, who is known for his budget proposals. We have to look at them squarely and decide what is reliable, what is true, and what is, as I said earlier, fiction.

Those proposals cut taxes for the rich, raise taxes on the middle class, while abandoning the sick, the poor, and our children. The Ryan budget can only be good for one very small group of Americans: the wealthiest among us.

Now, I was fortunate to succeed in business—succeed in a way that would have been impossible to dream about when I was growing up in a poor family. But I was helped by our country's government for my service in the military during the big war.

But in our democracy, each person gets one vote. So what do you do as a candidate for national office when your vision for the country is good for the

few and bad for the many? You can pretend it is good for everybody. You can say it will benefit all Americans. In short, you can substitute fiction for truth. This approach was on brilliant display at the Republican Convention when PAUL RYAN claimed the Republican plan would help the middle class—help that, frankly, we believe would take us downhill instead of Operation Uplift.

An article on Fox News' Web site described his convention speech as, "an apparent attempt to set the world record for the greatest number of blatant lies and misrepresentations slipped into a single political speech."

Fox News, a conservative communications organization. Maybe that is why they call him "Lyn' Ryan." His speech in Tampa was the most public and extreme example of the smoke-screen he has been blowing around here for a long time. So today I want to look at the numbers in PAUL RYAN's budget because numbers don't lie, even if some politicians do.

It is obvious PAUL RYAN doesn't want us to see the specific programs he would cut, but let's look at the devastating consequences if his cuts were distributed evenly.

Under the Ryan budget, 200,000 preschool children would be kicked off of Head Start rolls in 2014. We have a chart that clearly shows that. Imagine slashing funding for a program designed to help children learn how to learn. In our country today there are many situations where children don't have parental advice or the encouragement of parents to learn. Head Start is a terrific program because Head Start teaches these children that learning is fun, so that when they enter school they are ready to accept learning and they look at it as something that will be interesting and pleasant and worth doing. RYAN's cuts are shortsighted and they are cruel and they will only harm America's future.

As much as \$115 billion could be cut from education funding over the next decade if we follow the Ryan budget. With less support and rising costs for higher education, young people would be forced to take on more debt in order to attend college. If we were to talk to college students today, we would learn how tough it is, so that when they graduate from college they may have a debt of \$50,000 to \$100,000. And here they want the average college student to take on more. It is an outrage.

Why would anyone put obstacles in front of young people seeking an education? They are not concerned about those who want to learn or how they merge into our society.

I never would have been able to attend Columbia University without help from the government and the GI bill. When we came home from World War II, this country invested in us—and that investment helped create the "greatest generation" and decades of prosperity. The GI bill enabled me to cofound one of America's most successful companies, ADP. That company

today employs over 50,000 people in more than 23 countries. But instead of offering a helping hand to this generation's students, the Ryan proposal closes the door in their face.

Under the Ryan budget, government investments in science, technology, and medical research could also be shortchanged—cut by more than \$100 billion over the next 10 years. Medical research funding alone could take a hit of nearly \$6 billion by 2014. This would delay research on new treatments for diseases such as cancer, childhood asthma, and juvenile diabetes. All of these would start to fall by the wayside.

We have a chart that says the Republican budget plan would take \$5.8 billion that would otherwise be used for asthma, juvenile diabetes, cancer, autism, and more. Who would want to deliver a message to a parent in America that says: Your country cannot provide the funds to cure your child's illness?

The Ryan budget also wants to add pain to those dependent on health care programs. Instead of reassuring seniors that they can look forward to retirement in good health, he adds anxiety with cuts. He has proposed to end Medicare as we know it, giving seniors a voucher instead of a guarantee. If that voucher can't cover the cost of needed medical services, this is the Republicans' attitude: Too bad. You are on your own. If RYAN succeeds, tell the Medicare beneficiaries that their costs for medical services can be increased at the will of insurance companies.

RYAN's plan says: All right, cut Medicaid—that is a program for the impoverished—cut Medicaid by more than \$800 billion over a 10-year period. Medicaid is there to provide vital resources for expectant mothers and nursing home care for seniors. We created Medicare and Medicaid to be there for seniors and the poor when they get sick. RYAN, with that sharp knife of his, wants to cut funding and break that promise. It is shameful.

A budget isn't just a collection of numbers; it is an expression of principles and priorities, and we shouldn't look at a budget like an auditor. We should see it as a way to fulfill the obligations of our democracy and to be there for those who need help. A budget sets forth a vision for our Nation's future and makes a statement about what counts in America and what are our values.

So when we see the budget authored by PAUL RYAN called "marvelous" by Mitt Romney—Mitt Romney, candidate for President of the United States called this budget by PAUL RYAN and the budget passed by the House Republicans "marvelous"—we should be deeply disturbed. It is an outrage for Republicans to say we should give the wealthiest Americans more tax breaks as they increase the burden on a middle class already struggling to afford the essentials. Who are we going to fight for, middle-class families or the multimillionaires?

In our country last year, 400 people made over \$200 million on average. Should they carry their fair share of the country's opportunities and continue to invest in the country rather than shepherd the funds for their own personal use?

Everybody knows we cannot build a house from the chimney down and we cannot build a balanced society by soaking the poor to feed the rich. At a time when our economy is fighting strong headwinds, when too many Americans are out of work, PAUL RYAN and his running mate offer the same old prescription: tax cuts for the rich and austerity for everybody else. We will not hear this from him. PAUL RYAN likes to distract and distort. He has been hiding the truth about his budget so the American people do not truly know what is going on.

The bottom line is this: PAUL RYAN knows very well he cannot afford to tell the American people what his real agenda is because he knows what would happen. There would be no more buyers for what he is selling. Americans are now seeing the values the Republican Party and their new leader PAUL RYAN are fighting for.

We let the Republicans have their way for 8 years, and it led to the worst economic crisis since the Great Depression.

Very often we will hear them say: Obama has not done what he should have done. There are 4 million more people working now in the private sector than there were just two years ago and people are excited about the health care plan because they know this health plan is going to help them be better, have wellness in their lives. It ultimately will reduce costs substantially.

It goes that way. But rather than help those who could use a boost, could use some support—could use it to make sure their kids get educated or to help their parents, the people who built the strength of this country over the years, past generations—rather than help them, let's protect those, the wealthiest, who do not need the help.

During World War II, there was an excess profits tax. That tax was there, designed to take some of the excess profits that companies were making. Now we ought to apply the same logic. We have people fighting for their lives in Afghanistan and other places. Instead of saying let's make sure everybody feels like they are included in this great democracy of ours, they are saying: No, let them take care of themselves. As a matter of fact, it was suggested by Mitt Romney, the candidate for President—he said these college students ought to borrow from their parents. In many cases, the parents are struggling to keep food on the table or pay the rent or the mortgage.

Enough is enough. There is too much at stake to let ourselves be fooled by their tricks once again. We have to support the programs that have been working. Perfectly? Not yet, but they

are getting better all the time. More people are going to work and more people view America as an opportunity for them to succeed in life.

HONORING OUR FOREIGN SERVANTS

While I have the floor, I wish to pay my respects to Ambassador Chris Stevens' family and to note that four American heroes were murdered yesterday at the American embassy in Benghazi, Libya, people who had an assignment to make sure their country, America, was working in Libya to try to bridge the gaps that might exist. It is a terrible tragedy that happened. We all have to note our sorrow.

My deepest condolences are with their families, their friends and loved ones as they mourn the loss of these patriots. This is a tragedy about which all Americans are deeply saddened.

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. MCCAIN. 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. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to engage in a colloquy with the Senator from Connecticut, Mr. LIEBERMAN, and Senator GRAHAM from South Carolina.

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

The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

HONORING OUR FOREIGN SERVANTS

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, it is with a heavy heart that I rise today to speak about the horrific attack yesterday on the U.S. Consulate in Benghazi that killed four American citizens. The two confirmed thus far to be among the dead are Sean Smith, an Air Force veteran turned State Department information management officer, and Ambassador Chris Stevens, one of America's finest and bravest Foreign Service officers.

I did not know Sean Smith—I know he was a great American who served his country—but I had gotten to know Chris Stevens quite well. In Ambassador Chris Stevens' death, the Libyan people have lost a great champion and believer in the peaceful aspirations of their democratic revolution; the American people have lost a selfless and dedicated servant of our interests and our values, and I have lost a friend.

My thoughts and prayers today are with Chris's family and the loved ones of his fallen colleagues. May God grant them comfort in their time of grief.

Our most urgent order of business now is to make sure our citizens still living and serving in Libya and Egypt and elsewhere across the region and the world are safe. Americans look to the governments in Libya and Egypt and elsewhere to meet their responsibilities in this regard. We also look to the Libyan Government to ensure that

those responsible for yesterday's attack in Benghazi are swiftly brought to justice. In all of these critical tasks, we are confident that our government will provide all necessary assistance and support.

Yesterday's attacks are an important reminder that so many of America's civilians and diplomats and development professionals are risking everything—everything—to advance our Nation's interests and values abroad. We must do everything in our power to ensure their security.

At the same time, our thoughts turn to broader concerns: the mourning of our fallen friends, and how we as a Nation should respond to these tragic events.

One of my most memorable meetings with Chris Stevens was last April in Benghazi. As U.S. Envoy to the Libyan opposition, Chris had traveled to Benghazi at great personal risk to represent the country he loved so much while Libya was still gripped in a brutal fight for freedom. It was clear there was nowhere that Chris would rather have been than Libya. We spent the day together, meeting Libyan opposition leaders and many ordinary citizens, who spoke movingly about how much the opportunity to finally live in freedom meant to them, and how grateful they were for America's support. Chris Stevens embodied that support, and his passion for his mission was infectious.

I kept in touch with him often and frequently after my visit. I was very happy when President Obama nominated him to be America's Ambassador to the new Libya. The last time I saw Chris Stevens was shortly after he had taken his post, during my most recent visit to Tripoli. I especially remember the lighter moments we spent together, including when Chris insisted on personally making me a cappuccino, a task that he carried out with as much pride and proficiency as his diplomatic mission.

That was on the morning of July 7—the day Libyans voted in their first election in half a century. Chris Stevens and I spent the day together again, traveling around Tripoli, visiting polling places, and speaking with Libyan voters. We met a man whose father had been murdered by Qadhafi's henchmen. We met a woman whose brothers had recently given their lives fighting for their country's liberation. We met countless others, including many older Libyans, who were voting for the first time in their lives. And everywhere we went, we were greeted by crowds of cheering Libyans, bursting with pride and eager to shake our hands and express their gratitude for America's support. It was one of the most moving experiences of my life, and it was only made better by the fact that I got to share it with our outstanding Ambassador, Chris Stevens.

What we saw together on that day was the real Libya—the peaceful desire of millions of people to live in freedom

and democracy, the immense gratitude they felt for America's support for them, and their strong desire to build a new partnership between our nations. That is why I am not surprised that senior Libyan leaders were among the first to condemn the horrific attack that killed Chris and his colleagues. And that is why I was not surprised to learn from our Secretary of State that many Libyans fought to defend our people and our consulate in Benghazi when they came under attack, that some were wounded while doing so, and that it was Libyans who sought to get Chris and his colleagues to the hospital. And that is why we cannot afford to view the despicable acts of violence perpetrated yesterday by a small group of fanatics as in any way representative of the country and the people of Libya. That is not the real Libya, the Libya Chris Stevens knew and learned to love so well.

After such a heartbreaking loss for our Nation, I know many Americans are asking whether the United States was naive or mistaken to support the vast movement for change that is known as the Arab spring. I know many Americans may feel a temptation, especially with so many domestic and economic challenges facing us here at home, to distance ourselves from people and events in Libya and Egypt and elsewhere in the Middle East. We cannot afford to go down that path.

Yesterday's attack in Benghazi was the work of a small group of violent extremists, whose goals and actions could not be more at odds with those of the people and government of Libya. The Libyan revolution began peacefully and was dedicated throughout to the ideals of freedom and justice and democratic change. When Libyans turned out by the millions to elect a new government in July, they gave the plurality of their vote not to religious fanatics but to a political party led by a moderate technocrat and committed to friendship with the United States.

Libyans arose last year to free themselves from exactly the kinds of murderers and terrorists who killed our American citizens yesterday in Benghazi. Their enemies are our enemies, and they remain as committed as ever to imposing their evil ideology through violence on people in Libya and the Middle East, and ultimately on us. They want to hijack the Arab spring for their own insidious purposes. If we turn our backs now on the millions of people in Libya and Egypt and Syria and other countries across the Middle East—people who share so many of our values and interests, people who are the true authors of the Arab spring—we will hand our common enemies—the terrorists and extremists—the very victory they seek.

We were right to take the side of the Libyan people and others in the region who share their peaceful aspirations. We would be gravely mistaken to walk away from them now. To do so would not only be a betrayal of everything

Chris Stevens and his colleagues believed in and ultimately gave their lives for, it would be a betrayal of America's highest values and our own enduring national interest in supporting people in the Middle East and the world who want to live in peace and freedom.

Mr. President, I am pleased to be joined by my friend from Connecticut. I know he shares with me the sorrow that we and all Americans feel at the loss of a brave and dedicated American. But it will be a long time before we forget Chris Stevens because he will stand as a shining example of patriotism and love of country.

Chris Stevens was not unaware of the danger he faced. He was privy to intelligence information, and others. But he went forward and did his job with a smile, with love of his country, and love of the country where he was serving. I cannot be more proud of Ambassador Chris Stevens.

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

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I thank my friend from Arizona for his very eloquent statement. I associate myself with it.

It strikes me, as I listen, that it was no accident that these violent extremists launched this attack on the American consulate in Benghazi, Libya, on 9/11, on September 11—a day of infamy in our history, a day when people across our country and around the world were commemorating the worst terrorist attack in our history, which was September 11, 2001.

Those who perpetrated the attack on the consulate in Benghazi, which resulted in the death of our Ambassador Chris Stevens carried out an act of terrorism and barbarism that they hope will sow fear and hatred between Americans and Muslims, just as Osama bin Laden and his followers hoped that attack of 9/11, 2001, would do 11 years ago. But we did not let bin Laden succeed then, and we will not let these violent extremists who killed Chris Stevens yesterday in Benghazi succeed in dividing America and the West from Muslims and the Arab world. Good, well-intentioned people in both great communities will rise and join together to renounce these extremists and killers.

I want to speak for a moment about Ambassador Stevens.

Simply put, Chris Stevens was one of the finest, bravest, most spirited, most talented diplomats in our Nation's service.

As a volunteer in the Peace Corps, he served in Morocco, where he was inspired to pursue a lifetime of service in the Middle East. When the uprising against Muammar Qadhafi began in February of last year, Chris was the deputy chief of mission at our Embassy in Tripoli, Libya.

He was evacuated, along with other American personnel, from the country, but returned to Libya within weeks as the Special Envoy of the United States

of America to the opposition there—courageously slipping into rebel-held Benghazi onboard a cargo freighter. It was an act of bravery that typified Chris Stevens' service to our country and his devotion to our Nation's ideals and his commitment to build bridges between Americans and Arabs, Americans and Muslims.

Chris remained in Benghazi throughout the war, standing with the people of Libya during some of the darkest and most difficult hours in their struggle for freedom.

He became, in fact, the bright symbol of America, a heroic and inspiring figure to many Libyans, as Senator MCCAIN and Senator GRAHAM and I heard during our visits, and was thus the natural choice of President Obama to become our Ambassador to Tripoli after the Qadhafi regime fell. This is also why his death at the hands of violent extremists in Benghazi, which was the seat of the revolution against Qadhafi, is so tragic and infuriating. Of course, we still do not know what happened at our consulate in Benghazi yesterday, but what is clear is that these attackers have to be apprehended and must be punished.

I am encouraged but not surprised by the statements of Libya's leaders condemning this attack. I say I am not surprised because these statements of condemnation of those who killed Chris Stevens are consistent with what I know the leaders of the new Libya to be, what I know to be their profound admiration and love for Chris Stevens and their respect and gratitude for the United States of America. We look now to the Libyan Government to act swiftly and decisively and to our own government to provide the Libyans whatever support they need to find the attackers and killers.

While a specific group of individuals was responsible for this evil act and their target immediately was the Americans in that consulate—but really their target was the new order in Libya, and they were animated in this by an ideology that is now all too familiar to us that we cannot ignore or excuse. This hateful and violent ideology is a threat not just to the lives of Americans like Chris Stevens and the three others who died yesterday in Benghazi but to the future of Libya and the future of the Muslim world. It is the exact opposite of the ideals that inspired millions of Libyans to rise up last year against Qadhafi to realize their dreams of a life of dignity, democracy, and human rights. For that reason, it is imperative now for those Libyan people themselves to echo their leaders and condemn this violence and take on the extremists who have taken shelter in their midst and who threaten to hijack their revolution and imperil the future of their country, returning them to days as dark as under Qadhafi.

I know the overwhelming majority of Libyans reject this violent extremist agenda. They want a good education for their children. They want foreign

investment that will create jobs and raise their standard of living. After 42 years of despair and oppression under Qadhafi, they badly want again to be part of the world, part of the modern world. The United States should stand ready and willing to help them on that path.

The fact is that the people who killed Chris Stevens yesterday in Benghazi do not represent the people of Libya or their elected leadership. But these killings require confronting the extremist minority that imperils this future, the fanatics who want a clash of civilizations between the Muslims and the West and who will try to justify their violence in the name of Islam. They are wrong. They are mistaken. They are on the wrong side of history.

Finally, let me come back home and say—to echo what Senator MCCAIN just said—that I know there will be some here in our country who in the wake of this attack will be tempted to argue that it shows that America's support for the Libyan revolution was naive or mistaken, that the Arab spring will ultimately be defined not by a desire for democracy and freedom among the people of the Middle East and Arab world but by the dark fanaticism of al-Qaida and its associates and that the United States should give up trying to support people in this part of the world and instead retrench back here at home. That would be terribly wrong. That would misunderstand the motivations of the people who have risen in the Arab world to overthrow the totalitarian governments that dominated their lives. They do not want the fanaticism of al-Qaida. They want the bright light of a democratic future.

We cannot allow what happened yesterday to be a victory for the extremists and the terrorists because to do so would be a betrayal of everything Ambassador Chris Stevens stood for, which is to say a betrayal of America's best ideals.

I note the presence on the floor of the Senator from South Carolina. I would yield to him at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. GRAHAM. I will be brief. There is not a whole lot to be added to the eloquent statements of my two friends other than to be here and to let the family of Chris Stevens know that we saw in their loved one what you saw—a wonderful man who did great things with a life cut way too short.

I do not think most Americans can ever appreciate the leadership Chris provided in Libya and throughout the world at a time when we needed it the most. So America has lost one of her greatest diplomats, the Libyans have lost one of their best friends, and the family has lost their dear loved one.

The one thing I can say for sure—Senator LIEBERMAN just mentioned it—do not compound this tragedy. The worst possible outcome is to take the death of this wonderful, noble man and use it as an excuse to withdraw from

Libya and the region and turn it over to the thugs who killed him. Chris would not want that, it is not in our national security interest, and Republicans and Democrats do not want that.

To the American people who are war-weary and frustrated, I totally get it. But the Arab spring—call it what you like—is a historic opportunity to change things in the Middle East. It will not come without a fight.

What we are trying to do in the Middle East and what the people in the Middle East are trying to do is have a better life for themselves. If you are a young person, you have been exposed to life outside of the corrupt country in which you live and you see it can be better and, quite frankly, you are demanding it can be better. You are demanding a better say if you are a young woman. You are demanding economic opportunity if you come from a certain class, not available to you today. And Chris Stevens risked his life because he understood that those demands were just and in our best interests. The people whom we are fighting and the people the Libyan people are fighting are the ones who have no interest in this agenda of being able to choose a better path for young women, being able to be tolerant, open, accept free markets, and to have a place where people can live their own dreams.

The world which we are fighting—your dreams are defined by the Ayatollah. Your aspirations are defined by someone else's view of where you should go and what you should be based on their interpretation of God's plan for you. That, to me, is so unacceptable that it compels people like Chris Stevens to risk their lives. That is what is at stake.

The good news is that we will beat these folks. The ace in the hole is that the people in Libya, Egypt, Tunisia, Afghanistan, and Iraq now have been exposed to a different way of life. Given the capacity, they have the will to fight back. But if we think this is going to be done without a struggle, we are kidding ourselves. Chris knew that. He knew the fight that was going on for the heart and soul of the Arab spring in Libya was a fight worth engaging in and, yes, risking one's life for. What more can you say about a fellow human being, an American, than the fact that they realized their time on Earth could be best spent in service of a cause, as Senator MCCAIN said, greater than themselves. Chris understood what was at stake. He went to a place he did not have to go. He accepted risks he could have avoided. He did it for all the right reasons.

The one thing we should all unite around is that what compelled Chris Stevens to risk his life is absolutely in our national security interest; that is, to get the Mideast right, have a second opportunity never known before in the Mideast to live in peace with people who in the past wanted to kill us all. I am convinced that if we stick with it and we learn the lessons of Chris Stevens' life, we will eventually prevail

because the ones who want to kill us all are really a minority. The ones who would live with us in peace if they could just need our help. Let it be said that Chris Stevens was there to help.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. I thank my friend for his eloquent words. I would also like to again emphasize that there were four brave Americans—four. Sean Smith was one of them, a truly great American. There are two others—we do not even know their identity. So I hope the families who have suffered this loss appreciate that we grieve for all. We had the opportunity of knowing Chris Stevens. I did meet Sean Smith and the others. We mourn for them, and we thank them for their service to this Nation.

I ask my friend from Connecticut, wouldn't the worst legacy of Chris Stevens' service to this country be a movement of the United States to withdraw, to fortress America, to renounce our service to the world in helping these countries achieve the same democracy and freedom for which our forefathers strived? I do not mean to use his death as any kind of political agenda, but I remember him well enough to know that the worst outcome of this tragedy would be for the United States to withdraw. In fact, I am confident that if he were here, he would be urging us to get right back in, bring these extremists to justice, and press on with the democracy and freedom the people of Libya deserve and have earned at great loss of blood and treasure.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I could not agree more with my friend from Arizona. It would really dishonor the service of Chris Stevens and the other three Americans who served us in Libya if their murders by these extremists led us to retrench and pull out of Libya and stop supporting the new Libyan Government, democratically elected, pull out of other parts of the Arab world. That would be exactly the opposite of what Ambassador Stevens devoted his life to. As I mentioned, inspired by his experience as a Peace Corps volunteer in Morocco, he devoted the rest of his life to service on America's behalf in the Middle East. The last thing he would want this murder to do is to lead us to pull out, leave the area.

It would also be the fondest hope of the attackers, the extremists. Why do they attack? They attack to kill individual people, but they really attack to, as I said before, push America out and create a war between the Western world, America, and Islam. It is not natural. It is not the direction in which history is going. History is going much more toward integration. In fact, the revolution in Libya, which has gone so successfully when you consider the 40 years of dictatorship under which they lived—they held a free election. They elected what I would describe as a moderate rule-of-law slate to run the coun-

try. But those uprisings in Libya, Egypt, Tunisia, and now in Syria are the most profound rejection and defeat for the extremism of al-Qaida and its allies and presumably this group who attacked the American consulate in Benghazi yesterday. I understand that the results of some of the first elections are unclear, in some sense unsettled to some people here, but the fact is they have chosen democracy. People are self-governing, and they are looking for a better life. That is exactly the opposite of what bin Laden, al-Qaida, and I would guess the people who killed Chris Stevens yesterday desire.

Senator MCCAIN is absolutely right. I can almost hear Chris Stevens saying: Come on. Get up. Stay in the fight. Do not surrender to the crazies, to the fanatics, to the violent extremists. Stand with the overwhelming majority, with the people of Libya, who want what we want—a better future for themselves and their families.

Mr. MCCAIN. I wish to say in conclusion that I thank my old and dear friend from Connecticut and the Senator from South Carolina.

Finally, I would share with my colleagues that on last July 7 I was in Tripoli with Chris Stevens and it was the first free and fair election the Libyan people ever experienced. As we went from polling place to polling place, we met people who had lost brothers, husbands, fathers, mothers, and sisters at the hands of one of the more brutal butchers who has ever been on Earth, Muammar Qadhafi.

That night we went to the square, where some 200,000 people were driving around, honking horns, celebrating, and waving Libyan flags. It was a really auspicious start. And as Senator LIEBERMAN pointed out, it was a moderate group who were elected to govern Libya by the people of Libya. Chris Stevens was recognized by all of them. They knew Chris Stevens and they knew what he represented—the United States of America.

So those are memories I will never forget, and I hope his family will appreciate the magnificent service he provided to this Nation.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I would suggest the absence of a quorum. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. 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. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, before I say what I originally came down here to say, I want to join my colleagues in condemning the senseless, horrible attack at the U.S. Consulate in Libya and pay tribute to the four Americans, including our Ambassador there, Chris Stevens, who were killed. I think all of us hope the killers will be brought to justice quickly, and I suspect that will be the case.

Our country has lost four true public servants in the part of public service which is the least known and sometimes the most important. It is a high calling, public service in general, but especially in dangerous places around the world. Ambassador Stevens was a serious, dedicated, and highly experienced diplomat with a tremendous depth of expertise in Libya and the region. He and his colleagues spent their lives working on behalf of the United States of America and I hope their proud families and the entire diplomatic corps know we are deeply grateful as a people.

This cowardly attack is a setback, but it will not stop us from our mission of promoting freedom and democracy for the people of Libya, and it should not. It will not keep our diplomats from their important work overseas.

I remember when I was a student in Japan, the Ambassador there at the time, back in the early 1960s, was a fellow named Dr. Edwin Reischauer, who was probably at that time the pre-eminent Japanologist in America. He was a gentle, wonderful, marvelous person whom the Japanese loved. He was stabbed in one of those senseless things that happen. It can happen on American streets, but it can happen on the streets of other countries, even with security. Some mad person got in and stabbed him in a traditional Japanese manner with a Japanese sword. It was a horrible event, but he survived and it enlarged his legend. There was no bitterness from his family or his wife, and it didn't set anything back. The person was brought to justice.

Now I wish to speak also about other ways we must join together to help those who serve our country, and that is in creating job opportunities for our unemployed veterans. We have many veterans, and too many of them are unemployed or homeless. I am now talking about the Veterans Jobs Corps Act. This is a responsible investment and we should do it promptly.

Standing for our veterans has been one of my top priorities since I began public service. You can't help but be that way if you live in West Virginia. I suspect it is true in Oregon and lots of places all over the country. By definition it is true, but it is always personal, and in the Senate it has never waned.

Before I was a Senator, the person who held my seat for a long time was Senator Jennings Randolph. I took his place on the Veterans Committee and I have been on it now for 28 years. It is a glorious committee, brilliantly led now by Senator PATTY MURRAY. I was chairman once myself, perhaps not quite so brilliantly.

So many brave servicemembers, men and women, have fought to defend our way of life. People say that, and it is true, and they protect us each and every day. After such courageous and selfless actions, the least we can do is make sure when they return home they get good jobs, because they deserve those good jobs.

Military experience builds leadership, dedication, bravery, and teamwork, and these traits are learned from working on the frontlines. Not everything in the military happens on the frontlines, but I just happen to be talking about that particular aspect in my short remarks. No experience could prepare these workers better for the jobs they hope to do after they leave their military service.

I have a nephew who has just come back from Afghanistan. He may be 23, maybe 25, but he is almost unreachable in his strength, his patriotism, and what has happened to him as a human being internally, intellectually, and in broad vision. He has grown so large and so great. He has a job, so I am not talking about him, but with so many brave servicemembers—men and women—we need to pay attention to them when they come home.

Political rhetoric and partisanship have no business delaying efforts to help our veterans. Everybody likes to talk about veterans—actually, a lot of bills do pass but not as many bills as should. Veterans did not delay or decline when we called them for deployment, so we should not delay now.

It is tragic that the unemployment rate for younger returning veterans is so much higher than the national unemployment rate. In 2011, the unemployment rate for young male veterans was over 29 percent, more than 11 percent higher than nonveterans of precisely the same age. It is heartbreaking that those who bravely served face unemployment or homelessness. This bill will not solve all problems, but it will solve many of them.

West Virginians understand the importance of military service. With nearly 170,000 West Virginian veterans, we need to be sure they have our full support: getting a job, getting health care, and getting their pensions. These words come out of one's mouth easily; getting the job done is harder.

The Veterans Job Corps Act invests in our veterans and in our communities. Veterans would have a new opportunity to serve and protect America by gaining priority placement in first responder positions, such as police officers, firefighters, and emergency medical technicians. That makes sense, doesn't it? Our veterans have the experience and the instinct to do these jobs—they did it while they served—and our communities need their help.

I don't know what is going to happen to the budget, but it is not going to be rosy and happy, and we need to have those jobs which help protect us and keep us safe in play, for our veterans and for others too. It would create conservation and resource management jobs for veterans, enlisting them in efforts to rebuild America through restoration of our forests, parks, coasts, and public lands. I think the Presiding Officer would agree that is important.

The Veterans Job Corps Act would establish a pilot program to provide veterans with access to the Internet

and computers to assist in job searches and would offer the military's Transition Assistance Program to eligible veterans—and their spouses—at sites outside military installations in order to make it easier to relocate and pursue job opportunities.

The legislation would also provide veterans in rural areas, such as West Virginia and Oregon, with greater access to career specialists to help them write resumes and prepare for interviews and therefore to find jobs. The programs in the Veterans Job Corps Act are supported by a fully paid-for \$1 billion investment in our veterans' futures. It is a responsible effort to support our veterans and provide help for communities across America.

In closing, I would like to especially thank Leader REID and Chairman MURRAY for working with me to protect West Virginian jobs as part of this bill. The Veterans Job Corps Act is an important investment in our Nation's veterans and our economy, and I hope we can quickly move this bill through the Congress.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. KLOBUCHAR). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I want to first join with the many Senators today who have strongly condemned the violent attacks against the men and women serving bravely in our diplomatic corps. The senseless murders in Libya are a reminder of the dangers these public servants take on every day and the courage they show in furthering our diplomatic goals all across the globe. We are all so grateful to them. My thoughts and prayers go out to Ambassador Chris Stevens and the other victims of the attack, and I stand with the President, as we all do, in supporting efforts to secure those who continue to serve us abroad.

I have come to the floor today to respond to the statements that were made here earlier, that are completely inaccurate, about the bill we are currently considering on the floor, the Veterans Job Corps bill. In particular, I want to respond to the baseless and frankly offensive charges the Senator from Oklahoma made, insinuating that supporters of this bill don't "really care about veterans" and that this bill "isn't about veterans."

I have been working on veterans issues in the Senate for nearly two decades and in all of that time, under Democratic and Republican-controlled Senates, under administrations of both parties and in times of war and peace, if there was one issue I have seen that rises above the day-to-day bomb throwing that often characterizes the debate here, it has been the care and benefits for our veterans.

We can certainly disagree about policy, of course. We can fight with all of our hearts for what we think is right. But never—never—have I seen accusations that one party or one group was not fighting for what they believed to be right for our veterans. In fact, the accusations leveled on the floor here earlier today were one of the biggest departures from the spirit of cooperation around veterans issues I have seen in my time in the Senate. So I am here today to set the record straight about the steps this bill takes to put our veterans back to work.

In doing so, I will not question the motives or the degree to which those who may oppose this legislation care for our veterans because, as chairman of the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee myself, I see Republicans' commitment every single day. I will not level allegations designed to make our veterans political pawns and I certainly will not mislead anyone about what we have set out to do. I will not because honestly I believe our veterans deserve far better. What they and the American people deserve is the truth.

The truth is that caring for our veterans and helping to provide them with the training they need to find jobs when they return home is a cost of the wars we have fought for the last decade. The truth is that less than 1 percent of U.S. citizens serve and sacrifice for the well-being of the other 99 percent. The truth is that what the Senator from Oklahoma calls a charade is an effort to give those veterans as many avenues as possible to find work. It is an effort to give them the economic security and self-esteem that only a job can provide and that is so essential to their return home.

I understand it has taken some in the Senate a long time to come to grips with the fact that our fiscal commitment we owe to those who wear the uniform does not end the day they are discharged. The truth is, it is not enough to give our veterans a pat on the back for their military service. We also have to give them a helping hand in the job market today. As the jobs report that was released last month reminds us, we have over 720,000 unemployed veterans across the Nation, including over 225,000 veterans who served since September 11. Despite what the Senator from Oklahoma may have said, this bill makes the resources available to all of them. In fact, that is exactly why we brought this bill forward.

What we need right now is an "all hands on deck," "all of the above" strategy. That is why in fact this bill includes both Democratic and Republican ideas. This is a bill that will increase training and hiring opportunities for all veterans, using proven job training programs from across the country. For instance, it increases grants under the COPS and SAFER Programs that we have seen work to train and hire qualified veterans to work as police officers, firefighters,

and other first responders. This is at a time when 85 percent of law enforcement agencies were forced to reduce their budgets last year. It comes at a time when we face a \$10 billion maintenance backlog for our public lands. This bill will help training and hire veterans to restore and protect our national, State, and tribal forests, our parks, and our other public lands.

Because training and hiring veterans has never been and should never be an effort that divides us, we have included a host of Republican ideas into this bill. We included a bill from Senator TOOMEY that gives veterans increased access to computers and Internet tools to help them find jobs in in-demand areas in their own communities. We included a bill sponsored by Senator BOOZMAN that will increase transition assistance programs for eligible veterans and their spouses. And we included a very important provision from Senators on both sides of the aisle that will help force our States to consider the military experience of our veterans when they issue licenses and certifications—something we have all heard when we go home.

We figured this comprehensive bipartisan approach would certainly be enough to gain Republican support, even if it did come as we are, of course, inching closer to an election. But over the course of the last 48 hours or so we have heard that Republicans, including Senator BURR, who is the ranking member of my committee, had an alternative version of the bill that Republicans wanted to push forward. The bill of Senator BURR includes a system to have States certify military experience for jobs skills and helps veterans get hired into the Federal workforce, among a number of other provisions. It appeared to all of us that this late alternative might derail what I believe can be and ought to be a bipartisan effort. But again, we are committed to making this a bipartisan effort. So, instead of showing our veterans that we are just about gridlock and partisanship, here is what we have done.

Because, as I said before, this has to be an “all of the above” approach, we have, therefore, added every one of the provisions in the alternative offered by Senator BURR to our bill. Now I believe we have an even more bipartisan, more inclusive bill on the floor right now awaiting action. This is a bill that is paid for with offsets that both Republicans and Democrats have supported. It is a bill unquestionably that represents ideas from both sides of the aisle, including now from the chairman and the ranking member of the Senate Veterans’ Affairs Committee.

There is no reason now that Republicans should not join us in passing this bill and passing it quickly, because this does not have to be an either/or situation. Neither party has the magic bullet to solve these problems, so we have to open as many proven opportunities to employment as we can.

You know, veterans are out there watching and waiting. They are tired

of excuses and they certainly have no stomach for the kind of political posturing they saw earlier today, that comes only at their expense.

I know some Republicans have pointed to the calendar as the reason for their opposition to this bill. Honestly, I wish it were not September and we did not have to deal with the silly season here in Washington, DC. But who could care less about what month it is or how many days out from an election we are? Here is the issue: Nearly 1 million unemployed veterans are looking for work today. They are concerned about what jobs are available in their communities. Their concern is what training program they can take advantage of and what is being done to honor their two or three tours overseas.

This is a bill now that offers them new resources to answer those questions. It is a bill that will help them serve their community and help them provide honorably for their families. I truly hope now, with the change we have added to the alternative bill offered by Senator BURR, we will have overcome our last hurdle before passage.

I come to the floor today to urge Republicans to join us now in rising above politics as we have done time and time again for our veterans. Ignore the calendar and the never-ending chatter about who is up and who is down. That is not what this is about. This is about making sure our veterans come first this and every week and that we intend to keep our commitment to them for their services.

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.

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

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

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I am here to talk about the important Veterans Job Corps Act of 2012 that is on the floor of the Senate. But I did wish to first express my thoughts, as so many of my colleagues have done on both sides of the aisle, that I strongly condemn the attacks in Egypt and Libya. I have been deeply saddened by the death of our Ambassador there as well as several other American citizens, and I join all Americans in not only condemning these attacks but also in sending my prayers and thoughts to the families of those killed by those senseless and horrific acts of violence.

On to the Veterans Corps Job Act. As we all know, as we have seen by this horrific violence and by what we have seen overseas and in the Mideast, our troops face that every single day when they are there, as do our diplomats. They face that kind of threat. When they come home to this country, we

must treat them with great dignity and respect.

I have always believed that when we ask our young men and women to fight in defense of our Nation, we make a promise that we will give them the resources they need to complete their mission. We also promise to take care of them when they come home to this country. When they signed up to serve, there was no waiting line, and when they come home to the United States of America and they need a job or they need health care or need an education, there should never be a waiting line.

As a Senator from Minnesota, fighting for our veterans has been a major focus. While we do not have an Active-Duty base, we have the fifth largest National Guard in the country. Given that our population is only 22nd in the country, we can see we have a lot of people who want to serve our country and sign up to serve on the frontline. We have worked to cut through the redtape and streamline credentialing to help servicemembers transition their military skills into good-paying jobs at home. To give just one example, right now returning paramedics are too often unable to count the medical training they receive in the military toward receiving a license to become a civilian emergency medical technician.

That is why I introduced the Veterans to Paramedics Act to fix that problem by encouraging States to give paramedics credit for the medical training they have already received in the military. Not only does this help our veterans, it also helps relieve the shortage of emergency medical personnel, especially in our rural areas, where we have seen those shortages.

With commonsense solutions such as these, we cannot only fulfill our commitment to our veterans but we can also help lift our economy and make sure people who have the skills fill the jobs we have available. This is what the Veterans Job Corps Act is all about, fulfilling our promise to our veterans, ensuring training and the opportunities they need to find good-paying jobs and strengthening our Nation in the process.

To list just a few of the important provisions in this bill, first, the Veterans Jobs Corps Act gives veterans a new opportunity to serve and protect America by granting them prioritized placement in first responder positions such as police, firefighters, and emergency medical technicians.

Second, this bill would create conservation and resource management jobs for veterans, enlisting their help in building a stronger and more beautiful America through the restoration of our forests, parks, coasts, and public lands.

Third, the Veterans Jobs Corps Act would establish a pilot program to provide veterans with access to the Internet and computers to assist in job searches, a key bipartisan provision first introduced by my colleagues across the aisle.

Fourth, the Veterans Jobs Corps Act would especially help rural veterans find employment by granting them greater access to career specialists who can help them write résumés, prepare for interviews, and find jobs. We know all too often the amazing experience and leadership experience they have had overseas fighting for our country does not always translate the terms and the words and the ways described by the résumé into truly explaining what it is to a potential employer. That is why this skill training is so important.

This would also allow eligible veterans and spouses to enroll in the military's innovative Transition Assistance Program at sites outside military installations so they can relocate or return home in pursuit of job opportunities. This is a key benefit in my State of Minnesota, as I noted, which is very rural and also has no military bases.

The fact is, our returning veterans have battle-tested skills that are available to employers in all kinds of fields. This is something companies in my State have recognized. In fact, our business community, small and large, is already leading the way in reaching out to servicemembers before they have even begun the process of transitioning home. In April of this year, when Minnesota's 34th Infantry Division, known as the Red Bulls, was still deployed in Kuwait, representatives from several major companies in Minnesota actually flew into Kuwait to help the soldiers spruce up their résumés and prepare them for job interviews. All across Minnesota, large and small companies are targeting their recruitment efforts on returning servicemembers. This is the type of initiative we need.

In recent months, the unemployment rate for Minnesota veterans who have served since 9/11 has hit nearly 23 percent, almost double the national average for veterans of the Iraq and Afghanistan war. An unemployment rate that high among the men and women who have served and sacrificed for our Nation is unacceptable, especially when our State's unemployment rate is, in fact, at 5.8 percent.

I truly believe that with initiatives such as those launched by private sector companies in our State, with training programs such as those created by this critical legislation, we are going to turn this situation around. That is why I am calling on all my colleagues to support the Veterans Jobs Corps Act. This important bill, which is fully paid for, goes a long way in providing our returning veterans the leg up they need in transitioning to the civilian workforce.

Minnesota has always been a State that understands the debt we owe to men and women who have served and sacrificed for us. I call on all my colleagues to vote for this bill and to take a step toward fulfilling that debt. This is the least we can do for the people who have fought and died to protect

our values, freedoms, democracy, and human rights.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SESSIONS. 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. SESSIONS. Mr. President, the Veterans Jobs Corps bill, properly written, could be a positive piece of legislation. And I am not speaking about the intent of the bill, whether it can be done effectively, but as ranking Republican on the Budget Committee, I have to point out that this bill violates the budget. It violates the principles of common sense and good management, and it is the typical reason this government is on an unsustainable financial path. It is the typical reason of why we are going broke.

This bill will cost \$1 billion over 5 years in spending on a new program. It claims to be offset by new taxes and new revenue sources, but my staff has worked on it and has confirmed there is a 302(f) Budget Act point of order against this Veterans Jobs Corps Act and the managers' amendment, and I am confident that if and when it is raised, the Parliamentarian will agree. There is a budget point of order against this bill because it violates the Veterans Affairs Committee's allocation for budget authority and outlays for what was agreed to in the Budget Control Act.

There was a limit to how much we would spend on the Veterans Affairs Committee. They had a limit on the number of dollars they got. It was part of the August agreement—the Budget Control Act—of a little over a year ago this past August. This is serious. We told the American people we would raise the debt ceiling by about \$2.1 trillion but we were going to cut spending. We would immediately raise the debt ceiling and allow \$2.1 trillion more in spending, but we promised we would reduce spending over the next 10 years by that same amount. That was the agreement. The President signed it, our Democratic colleagues supported it, and it passed. The debt ceiling was raised, so the government continued to go forward. We were borrowing 40 cents of every dollar we spent in the U.S. Government. If we had not raised the amount of money we could borrow in this country, the entirety of government expenditures would have been reduced immediately by 40 percent. So that is how big a hole we are in.

What this new bill does, with good purpose, is it spends \$1 billion more than we agreed to spend. So then what occurs? What occurs is, if a person objects to that and raises the budget point of order, the Senate has to waive it openly, publicly, before the American people. We have to say we can't

find money within our budget to spend \$1 billion more, but we are going to spend it anyway, and every penny of it either has to be borrowed or will be paid for by increased revenues somewhere. So that's what we are going to vote on. I intend to raise the Budget Point of Order.

But it is even worse than that. Some say, "Well, over 10 years we promise to raise enough money to pay for this, that over the 10-year period we will raise the \$1 billion. Don't worry about it. These tax increases and revenue enhancements will pay for it. Count on us."

I hate to say it, but it is not so. We have in this bill at least one-third the amount of money that would be spent by the jobs corps bill coming from a well-known gimmick, a manipulation of an accounting system around here that allows us to spend more money than we have, and it scores not as an expenditure but as being a proper, valid pay-for. And it is as bogus as a three-dollar bill. I say without danger of contradiction that this is a gimmick. If a private company were to do this and utilize this method to manipulate and mislead stockholders, they would have a lawsuit against the officers of the corporation. They would. It is totally bogus.

Let me explain how this is done. This has been done before. I have offered a bill called the Honest Budget Act. Senator OLYMPIA SNOWE joined me in that, and that would have eliminated a number of misleading gimmicks and fraudulent activities, including this one. Now, to explain, there is a certain corporate tax revenue we get from corporations, and the drafters of this bill cleverly got the idea that they could just accelerate the amount of money from fiscal year 2014 into fiscal year 2013. They would bring that money back into 2013 and collect it just a little bit earlier, and they could then say: We have another \$135 million in revenue in 2013, so we can spend that money, and it doesn't cost anything because we have this new money and it is paid for.

So this new Veterans Jobs Corps bill will be partially paid for. About one-third of its total cost will be paid for by collecting corporate revenue taxes sooner. But think about that, if the corporation pays its taxes a few months earlier—it pays it in fiscal year 2013—then it won't owe them in 2014, will it? If they were planning on paying them in 2014, now, they don't have to pay them in 2014. So the hole has moved from 2013 to 2014. We moved the money over here, but we won't have the revenue the next year that we would normally have had. And that is to be done over 5 years.

In the fifth year—which is where our colleagues wanted the number to fall—it shows as if we had a \$392 million total increase in revenue. The money, added up each year over 5 years, plus increases, totals \$392 million. Isn't that great? We didn't raise taxes. All we did

is call in a little money a little earlier, and we have netted \$392 million, right? Wrong. Year 6 is where the revenue doesn't come in, and in year 6 it shows that we will bring into the U.S. Treasury \$392 million less because that money was collected early in the previous year—\$392 million less in year 6. It never is a net increase to the U.S. Treasury, although it might appear to be, according to the conventions of accounting the CBO uses around here. And CBO knows this is true. They would tell anyone the same thing if they were to ask about this. They know exactly what this system is. But they follow their rules, and in the fifth year it suggests we have a \$392 million surplus from this advance collection of corporate taxes, and that is not so.

So, my colleagues, this is a problem for us. We do not need to continue down this pathway. We need to be honest with the American people. The President of the United States should be objecting to this kind of stuff. He should say: No, you can't play that game. The majority leader, Senator REID, should be saying: No, that is a manipulation. The budget chairman, Senator CONRAD, ought to say: No, it violates the Budget Act. This isn't the way to do it.

Now, the alternative bill authored by Senator BURR is an honest piece of legislation and would do much of the same thing; however, it does not violate the Budget Act and is therefore not subject to a budget point of order.

This legislation could have been crafted that way, too. But being as greedy as I guess we are, rather than having to face up to a little bit of the difficulty of finding a couple of hundred million dollars, out of \$3.7 trillion we will spend next year, we would rather manipulate it this way.

So what did we mean in August a year ago when we said we were going to cut spending by \$2.1 trillion over 10 years? Was that just a joke? Is this the kind of thing we are going to do every time a bill comes along that has some appeal to it and we wish to support? Are we not willing to stand up and pay for the legislation? Is there no waste, fraud, and abuse in this government that we couldn't work on? There certainly is.

This government is mismanaged, it is out of control, and the Chief Executive spends his days getting on an airplane going somewhere to make a speech. What we need is somebody in the shop managing the taxpayers' money. And when Congress tries to play these gimmicks, we need a President that says, No. That is what this country needs. Until we get that, we are never going to bring spending under control.

What do my President and my Democratic colleagues in the Senate say? Send more money. We can't cut anything. We have no ability to find savings. We need more money, American people. Send more to Washington, private sector. It doesn't make a whole lot of difference in an economic sense

where it comes from. It is all a further drain out of the private sector, so the public sector can spread the money around and maybe solicit some votes in the process.

This is how we got into this fix. I am concerned about it. I do not think we should go forward with the legislation as drafted. Perhaps some compromise can be reached. Senator BURR has worked hard on it. Maybe our Democratic colleagues can get together and put up a veterans jobs bill that is honestly paid for. I know they could. And if it is worth it and we can find ways to make the tough choices that we are paid to do and set priorities, and help veterans find jobs through some sort of mechanism such as this, then let's do it. But let's pay for it, and let's don't use these gimmicks. Let's don't go about it in a way that misleads the American people about how much the legislation is truly costing.

I feel strongly about it. I am getting frustrated about it. It is always: Well, it is just a few hundred million here and a few hundred million there, and the bill needs to pass, and don't raise these problems now, we are slowing down the machine, we have a lot of things to do. It doesn't look as if we are so busy right now, but people think we have things to do and they don't want to have to wrestle with the minutiae of a few hundred million dollars a year. But we should do that. If we do that every day and if we stay within the budget amount we agreed to last August, we will have made some improvement in the overall debt course of America.

To make clear, the Budget Control Act agreement called for a reduction of \$2.1 trillion in spending over 10 years. During that time, we were projected to spend \$47 trillion. So the net reduction would be from \$47 trillion to \$45 trillion. Surely the Republic is not going to sink into the ocean if we reduce our spending from \$47 trillion to \$45 trillion. Surely we can find that. It is not enough. We need to do about three times that much at a minimum, and we can do that, too. This is still a substantial increase in spending. This is not a cut in spending over 10 years. At the current rate of spending, we spend about \$37 trillion. So we are going from \$47 trillion to \$45 trillion over 10 years instead of \$37 trillion over 10 years. It is still a major increase in spending over 10 years, but we are told that is impossible; all we can possibly do is \$2.1 trillion in reductions.

The President was claiming credit for reaching this agreement, but the budget he submitted this year wiped out the entire \$2.1 trillion. It wiped out the entire sequester and raised taxes by \$1.5 trillion in increased spending and about \$1.8 trillion in increased taxes; no cuts at all under his budget; actually a spending increase over the trajectory we were already on, which is an unsustainable trajectory.

I know I am being frank about this. Some can say this is a political argu-

ment. Well, we are in a political season, and I believe what I have said is accurate. I believe what I have said is true. I believe a budget point of order lies against this bill because it spends more than the Veterans' Affairs is allocated to spend, and we need to vote on it. It is this kind of breaking the budget and spending more than we agreed that has helped put us in this fix, and we need somebody to help bring order out of chaos.

We are on an unsustainable path. This Nation is on the wrong track. We are on the track to decline and debt and financial crisis, not the road to prosperity. We cannot continue in this path.

Erskine Bowles and Senator Simpson before the Budget Committee told us that we have never faced in this country a more predictable debt crisis. That was their joint statement, "never faced a more predictable financial crisis." What they told us was: We are on an unsustainable path. If we stay on this path, we will have some sort of debt crisis, another 2008 or 2007 recession caused by a financial bubble. And for the U.S. Government, what a disaster that would be if, as we are struggling to get people back to work and get the economy on the rise, we have a financial crisis again putting us back into recession. We need to avoid that. We have got to be mature and honest about our money. We have got to get our debt under control.

This bill violates the deemed allocations included in the Budget Control Act. It violates sound principles of financial policy. It contains a major gimmick, really a bogus allocation of over \$300 million that claims to exist that does not exist at all. We need to fix that.

Mr. President, I appreciate the opportunity to share these remarks.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RECESS

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 5:54 p.m., recessed until 8:46 p.m., and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. MERKLEY).

VETERANS JOBS CORPS ACT OF 2012—MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having expired, the question is on agreeing to the motion.

Mr. REID. I ask for the yeas and nays.