

when he is a youngster he does things such as he parks cars at ball games; he cuts his classmates' hair for money—you know, these little things we all do. He saved his money and bought and trained a flock of homing pigeons. He had a postage stamp collection—all this ordinary American stuff that boys do as they are growing up.

But his life took a dramatic turn on December 7, 1941. He was an eyewitness, like Senator AKAKA—and Senator AKAKA often tells the story but DAN INOUE was an eyewitness to the bombing of Pearl Harbor. He was too young to join the military at that point, but he was not too young to serve. The way he served was he worked as a medic in the aftermath of that. I read a story about him one time and the only comment he said was he saw “a lot of blood” in those days when he worked around the clock to help people.

When he finally came of age to be able to serve, which was a few years later, he joined the Nisei 442nd Regimental Combat Team. For a lot of people, a lot of Americans, we may not appreciate exactly what or who the 442nd is, but it turns out it would become the most highly decorated unit in the history of the U.S. Army. Of course, Senator INOUE received the Medal of Honor for his service in that unit.

There is one other distinction it has. Almost all the Members were of Japanese descent. So here is this 17-, 18-year-old young man who had eyewitness accounts of very harsh treatments by Americans of Japanese Americans.

One of the things Senator INOUE did not talk a lot about is that he did some sort of goodwill tour back in the 1940s to Japanese internment camps. He came to the two in Arkansas. My understanding is maybe the members of the 442nd—I am not quite sure how it worked, but they were doing some training or whatever, maybe down in Louisiana. I am not quite sure. But nonetheless they came and they went to the two Japanese internment camps in Arkansas.

He goes on to serve in World War II with tremendous distinction. In fact, there are a few video interviews I would recommend to people that C-SPAN2 ran last night, just unbelievable, some of the stories he told about serving in the war and how it changed his life.

One of the things that I loved about him is how he carried a burden. He carried a burden of those heroic war years with him for the rest of his life. The fact that he had been so effective in war haunted him. It stayed with him, I am sure, until the day he died. I heard him talk about it a few months ago.

He also struggled and suffered with his own type of discrimination because he was a Japanese American. My generation—and certainly people younger than me—take that for granted. We don't discriminate against Japanese Americans. However, during the time

of World War II, when a lot of people had never had much experience with Asians and Asian Americans, all they knew was that they had bombed Pearl Harbor, we were at war with them, so they must all be bad.

I remember Senator INOUE told a story—in fact, it was on PBS for the series called “The War,” a Ken Burns movie, where he talked about how he lost his arm and had done his rehab and was headed out to the west coast. It is my understanding he was supposed to catch a ship and go back to Hawaii after his long rehabilitation. Well, he decided to stop in and get a haircut at a local barber shop on the west coast. I believe the barber shop was in Oakland, CA. Here was a highly decorated World War II veteran who had literally almost given his life to this country and would live the rest of his life without his right arm. When he walked in the barber shop, the barber told him bluntly: “We don't cut Jap hair.” “We don't cut Jap hair” is the kind of thing that stays with you. That is the kind of thing that made Senator INOUE so special.

I saw him meet with a young man just a few months ago who had also lost his arm. This young man lost his arm to cancer. He introduced himself to Senator INOUE and said: I have always admired you and respected you because of your disability and what you have done for other people with disabilities. DAN INOUE looked him square in the eye and said: “I don't consider it a disability.”

There again, we see his character and get a glimpse of what he was all about.

He was also the first Japanese American to be elected to Congress, the first Japanese American to be sworn in, and the first Japanese American to serve in the Senate. In fact, he was sworn into the House the very same day that Hawaii became a State.

There is a story that has circulated in the House for a decade about his swearing in. He came in at kind of a special time because he won a special election. He was in a class of one to be sworn in over there and Sam Rayburn did the normal swear-in thing. He said, without thinking: “Raise your right hand and repeat after me.” Of course, Congressman INOUE didn't have a right hand at that point; he left it in Italy while fighting for his country.

He broke several barriers, large and small, throughout his life. One of the things I loved about him was his relationship with Ted Stevens. I still remember that their desks were right across the aisle from one another. I remember them working together on all kinds of legislation. They were brothers. Their love and friendship transcended partisan divide. They were totally for the national interest. I think they set a great example for all of us and how we can work together.

They didn't always agree. If we look at their voting record, they voted opposite each other a lot of times, but they worked together and had an exemplary

relationship I think we should all follow.

We had Senator INOUE come to the Senate Prayer Breakfast a few months ago. For those who are watching at home or don't know a whole lot about the Senate, every Wednesday morning we are in session we have a Senate Prayer Breakfast. It is for Senators and former Senators only. When we come together, it is a very special time to share each other's lives and tell stories.

It was a treat to have DAN INOUE. I believe he lived in Rockville, so it was hard for him to get here so he didn't make it that often, but he came when he could. I have been here 10 years, and I have been going to the prayer breakfast almost that long. He is the only speaker I have seen in the Senate Prayer Breakfast who got a standing ovation before he spoke and a standing ovation after he spoke. That is the kind of Senator and man he was. He had this spirit that oozed from him. No matter what situation he was in, other people respected him so much.

This last story I will tell is one of my favorite stories about him. When he won his reelection back in 2010—I didn't see it, but I heard this—at the podium that night while accepting his election for his ninth term, he announces that he is going to run for his tenth term in 2016. That is part of that indomitable spirit that we will all miss so much about Senator INOUE.

With that, I want to thank my colleagues for all the wonderful things they have said about Senator INOUE. I want to lift up his family in prayer. He has a fantastic, wonderful staff, and I know everyone in Hawaii is mourning the loss of this great man.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

DISASTER RELIEF

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I rise to respond to some of the comments I heard from my colleagues with reference to the Hurricane Sandy emergency supplemental. Hopefully I can give all of our colleagues—who will be casting a vote here at some point—an understanding as to why we hold a different view than some of the comments that have been made.

One of those comments I will generally put under the rubric we can wait and do something small. Various comments have been referenced in that respect. Some seem to be questioning whether this emergency is worthy of a robust Federal response. They say the cost to help families rebuild and recover is too much and should be reduced. I have heard that in this emergency it is not necessary, and unlike many other similar emergencies in the past, we should do something smaller and wait to do the rest later.

I think those who suggest or make that argument don't seem to understand that a piecemeal recovery is a

failed recovery. We cannot rebuild half of a bridge unless we know the entirety of the money that is necessary is committed, like the Mantoloking Bridge in New Jersey, which I have shown many pictures of. We cannot hire a contractor to ultimately replace an entire sewage treatment system that had enormous amounts of sewage dispersing directly into the Hudson River because it was overcome if we only have half of the funding. We cannot hire a contractor to rebuild half a home or restore half of a community unless we know the money is there and that they can depend upon it in order to finish the project. We need the money in place to rebuild entire projects and entire areas to ensure that families and businesses devastated by the storm can recover.

Right now there are literally tens of thousands of small business owners trying to decide whether to reopen or pack it in. They are in a limbo. They are waiting to see what we, their Federal Government, do to respond to their tragedy. They are making decisions in their lives, their businesses, and everyone who is hired by those businesses. They are frozen and waiting to make those decisions based on whether the government is going to offer them a small business loan at low rates that are competitive with the marketplace and have longer term payments. Will they give them a grant toward rebuilding? What type of other benefits will they be able to derive in order to make a determination of whether they can open their business again? Having just a sense that there is only some emergent money and not the moneys to be able to do that doesn't allow them to open their business. It doesn't allow them to make that decision, and it freezes them in time.

The same thing is true for the person who, as winter is biting in the Northeast, faces the challenges of deciding what they might get from the government as it relates to rebuilding their home. Should they go forth or not? It is as if some of our colleagues don't believe when we describe this tragedy—and I welcome any one of our colleagues who wants to visit us in New Jersey to come with me to see the breadth, depth, and scope of our devastation. I have already taken a number of Members who were willing to go.

I ask my colleagues: Do you think Governor Christie is making this up? Do you think this fiscal hawk of the Republican Party is looking for Federal aid that is not desperately needed? Do you think we made up these photos of the damage? I can assure everyone we did not.

This is a picture taken just at one small part of the Jersey shore. If I could have a continuum that would bring us around this Chamber, it would look exactly like this. This is Ortley Beach. It shows blocks and blocks of homes that have been totally destroyed. It is an image that can be seen up and down the New Jersey coast.

Here is another example in Union Beach. It is half a home, but that whole community was significantly devastated. If we were to see this community, there would be rows and rows of houses reduced to rubble. I think that is the reality of what we have as a continuation of those neighborhoods in Union Beach.

I was talking to the mayor today—as part of a group of mayors—about their challenges, and this is an example of what he is facing throughout his community.

The storm damage is real and the Governor's request for funding is actually \$20 billion higher than the supplemental we are debating. It is significant that it is \$20 billion higher than the amount we are debating. These requests were scrubbed by OMB from the Governor's original request and gone over with a fine-tooth comb by the Appropriations Committee. Everything in this bill, whether it is about Sandy or something else, is about declared disasters. Now is the time to come to our neighbors' help.

Secondly, there are those who come to the floor and say they are upset about the Army Corps element of this disaster bill and that the budget in this bill is too rigorous. They say that planning and rebuilding for the future is a waste, and that we can have another legislative opportunity to deal with the future. I would submit to those Members who very much care about fiscal responsibility that it is neither efficient, effective, nor fiscally responsible. What should we do, have the Army Corps go back to exactly what existed before? In many cases, what existed before did not sustain those communities, did not withhold the consequence of the surge, and created enormous losses.

We lost over 40 lives. The storm affected over 300,000 homes—30,000 permanently gone.

It seems to me, if we want to be smart fiscally, planning for the future means rebuilding well and rebuilding smart. It means rebuilding in a way that protects us from future storms.

We learned a lot from this superstorm. We know Army Corps coastal defenses work. Where we had them in place, the damage was minimal; where we didn't, there was more devastation, there was more damage, there was more destruction, and more recovery costs.

Stockton College did a study of the Army Corps beach engineering projects before and after the storm, and what it found was unambiguous. Where the Army Corps was able to complete a beach engineering project recently, the dunes helped and damage to communities behind the project was manageable.

Here is a picture taken at Surf City, NJ, right after the storm. This beach received beach engineering in 2007 as part of the Army Corps Long Beach Island Shore Protection Project, and my colleagues can see that despite damage

being done to the dune, the dune held and saved lives, saved property, and saved money.

Alternatively, the pictures of Union Beach, which I previously referred to—it is a working-class town that couldn't afford the local match for the Army Corps project, and as my colleagues can see, we have an entirely devastated neighborhood. So we see the fundamental difference: Engineered beaches by the Army Corps, minimal destruction: Those that weren't engineered, maximum destruction; costs, and consequences. Rebuilding the defenses only to the standard that existed before the storm will just give us more of the same in the next storm. If we don't do things differently, we shouldn't expect a different outcome.

In this photo, we also see the homes destroyed by the storm surge. Yes, we can help these homeowners rebuild, but if we don't rebuild smarter, better, and with stronger coastal protections, we will be paying again after the next storm, both in terms of human suffering and Federal funds. The storm crews with the Army Corps of Engineers, academic studies, and local community officials have been telling us for years that beach engineering works. It protects lives. It protects properties. It saves us money in the long run.

Time is of the essence. The severe storm damage caused by Sandy has left New Jersey defenseless. As we enter what is our most vulnerable storm season—the winter Nor'easters—we don't need a Superstorm Sandy to have major consequences all the way up and down the communities throughout New Jersey.

Right now, the Jersey shore is similar to a person with a weak immune system. The storm has destroyed our defenses, and that is why we need to rebuild them quickly. If we don't, a relatively mild storm can cause catastrophic damage.

This is a challenge to us right now—right now. Suggesting the Army Corps budget is not one we need right now and it can wait—these communities can't wait. These communities can't wait. In fact, it will be far more costly to us.

I think we have close to anywhere between \$750 million and \$1 billion in Army Corps of Engineers projects that have been approved—passed and been approved—but they have not had the funding. So when we add those that would ensure we don't end up like Ortley Beach and that we can recover those like Ortley Beach that have been battered and shattered, then I think it makes critical sense.

Finally, I know there are some who suggest mitigation is not worthy of this disaster. I think I have made the case, in the case of the Army Corps, although the Army Corps is not the only form of mitigation. Mitigation means rebuilding smarter and stronger. Whether it is through a flexible CDBG account that will allow the hardening

of our electrical grid or elevating homes or via traditional Army Corps or FEMA programs, mitigation has long been a part of supplemental appropriations.

In the gulf coast, we spent \$16 billion building a world-class storm protection system in Louisiana—\$16 billion. In Alabama and Texas, we used CDBG funding to raise homes and improve infrastructure. So much of the public infrastructure in our region that was damaged as a result of the superstorm is eligible for reimbursement from FEMA. There is no disputing that.

The Stafford Act has now been the law of the land for many years, and it says the Federal Government will assume the cost of repairs to critical infrastructure after an event such as Sandy. These communities, when we talk to mayors in Little Ferry and Moonachie—not the Jersey Shore but northern New Jersey and other places that were dramatically hit—when I was visiting them soon after the storm, one mayor said to me, Mayor Vaccaro, I lost my police department, my fire department, and city hall is underwater.

They need to be protecting their citizens. They need to be able to fully depend upon the resources to get back their public safety efforts. It does not make good fiscal sense for Congress to pay to fix our broken infrastructure, which we are legally required to do, without looking to protect our investment and prevent similar costly damage in the future. To me, that makes a lot more fiscal sense at the end of the day. So we will look forward to coming back to the floor again and again as we deal with these issues, but I hope our colleagues understand the urgency of now.

Final point. After Katrina, in 10 days the Congress passed two emergency supplementals that totaled a little over \$62 billion for Louisiana, Alabama, Mississippi. It has been 6 weeks—6 weeks, not 10 days, 6 weeks—since the storm hit New Jersey, New York, and the Northeast, and there hasn't been any action. The urgency of now is incredibly important and the urgency of doing this robustly is incredibly important to the recovery of a region that is so important to the economic engine of this country.

TRIBUTE TO DR. JAMES RAMSEY

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to my good friend and an extraordinary leader of my hometown of Louisville, KY: Dr. James Ramsey, the president of the University of Louisville. President Ramsey celebrated a milestone for the University of Louisville recently when it was announced that UofL was unanimously welcomed into the Atlantic Coast Conference.

The ACC has a great history, a proud athletic tradition, and is home to some truly astonishing academic schools. Thanks to Jim's work as president over the last decade, the University of Lou-

isville is able to stand toe to toe with any of them, in any of those categories.

Dr. Ramsey is the 17th president of the university, and has held that post since 2002. In his 10 years at the helm, he has worked every day to make UofL one of the very best metropolitan research universities in the country. It is safe to say, he is succeeding.

Since 2002, the quality of UofL's freshman class has improved every year, with the average incoming freshman ACT score rising from 23.2 in 2002 to 24.7 in 2011. The graduation rate has increased nearly 60 percent, and the number of doctoral degrees awarded by the school has more than doubled since 2002.

UofL students are also winning national acclaim and prestigious academic honors. In 2009, UofL produced its fourth Rhodes Scholar, who was also the first woman from UofL to win the award.

In 2010 and 2011, 14 UofL students won coveted Fulbright scholarships, placing UofL among the nation's top 20 Fulbright-producing institutions each year. Since 2003, 68 UofL students have received Fulbright scholarships, which is more than all other Kentucky schools combined.

President Ramsey has created a university culture that is focused on research and innovation. This approach has already led to major milestones in health care, business, and the environment. The Chronicle of Higher Education lists the University of Louisville as the fourth fastest growing research university in the country.

UofL's research funding has doubled from a decade ago, and UofL is one of the country's fastest growing research universities in National Institutes of Health funding.

UofL has also strengthened its ties with the city of Louisville in such a way that this school is an invaluable asset, not just to its students, faculty, and alumni, but to all members of the community. UofL has been a major player in the award-winning Partnership for a Green City with Jefferson County Public Schools and Louisville Metro government.

It has also launched a Signature Partnership Initiative to improve education, health care, social services, and economic opportunity in the city. The school is also reaching out to men and women in the Armed Forces, signing education, training, and research agreements with Fort Knox and the Kentucky National Guard.

All of these accomplishments in the last decade have transformed the University of Louisville from a fine local institution to a superb global one—one able to compete with any school in the quality of its students and the caliber of its research. Exciting things are happening at the university, and we have Jim Ramsey to thank.

I want to salute Dr. Ramsey and congratulate him on his superb leadership of the school I am proud to call my alma mater. He and his wife Jane are

fixtures of the community, and Elaine and I are honored to call them friends.

I certainly hope Jim will be at the helm of UofL for a long time to come. I will always look forward to working with him on ways to better the school and the city that we both love.

BUDGETARY REVISIONS

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I previously filed committee allocations and budgetary aggregates pursuant to section 106 of the Budget Control Act of 2011 and, on June 29, I revised some of those levels pursuant to the Budget Control Act. Today, I am further adjusting those levels, specifically the allocation to the Committee on Appropriations for fiscal year 2013 and the budgetary aggregates for fiscal year 2013.

Section 101 of the Budget Control Act allows for various adjustments to the statutory limits on discretionary spending, while section 106(d) allows the chairman of the Budget Committee to make revisions to allocations, aggregates, and levels consistent with those adjustments. The Committee on Appropriations reported two bills that are eligible for an adjustment under the Budget Control Act:

One, the Department of Defense Appropriations Act for 2013 includes \$93.297 billion in budget authority that is designated as funding for Overseas Contingency Operations/the Global War on Terrorism. That funding is estimated to result in \$50.697 billion in outlays in 2013.

Two, the fiscal year 2013 disaster assistance supplemental includes \$55.957 billion in budget authority that is designated as funding either for a disaster, \$5.379 billion, or an emergency (\$50.578 billion). In total, that funding is estimated to result in \$8.974 billion in outlays in 2013.

In addition, I am making corrections to the June 29, 2012, adjustment by removing the off-budget portion of the program integrity funding previously provided for continuing disability reviews and redeterminations.

Consequently, I am revising the budgetary aggregates for 2013 by a total of \$148.840 billion in budget authority and \$59.302 billion in outlays. I am also revising the budget authority and outlay allocations to the Appropriations Committee by \$93.409 billion in security budget authority, \$55.845 billion in nonsecurity budget authority, and \$59.671 in total outlays.

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

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

BUDGETARY AGGREGATES—PURSUANT TO SECTION 106(B)(2)(C) OF THE BUDGET CONTROL ACT OF 2011 AND SECTION 311 OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT OF 1974

	\$s in millions	
	2012	2013
Current Spending Aggregates:		
Budget Authority	3,075,731	2,837,275