

MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3623, a bill to extend the authorizations of appropriations for certain national heritage areas, and for other purposes.

S. 3635

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3635, a bill to provide incentives for States to invest in practices and technology that are designed to expedite voting at the polls and to simplify voter registration.

S. CON. RES. 62

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 62, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that our current tax incentives for retirement savings provide important benefits to Americans to help plan for a financially secure retirement.

S. RES. 613

At the request of Mr. LIEBERMAN, the names of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) and the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 613, a resolution urging the governments of Europe and the European Union to designate Hizballah as a terrorist organization and impose sanctions, and urging the President to provide information about Hizballah to the European allies of the United States and to support to the Government of Bulgaria in investigating the July 18, 2012, terrorist attack in Burgas.

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 613, supra.

S. RES. 618

At the request of Mr. LEVIN, the names of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. LUGAR), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) and the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 618, a resolution observing the 100th birthday of civil rights icon Rosa Parks and commemorating her legacy.

AMENDMENT NO. 3344

At the request of Mr. BINGAMAN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. AKAKA) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3344 proposed to H.R. 1, a bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense and the other departments and agencies of the Government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3349

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3349 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1, a bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense and the other departments and agencies of the Government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3367

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 3367 proposed to H.R. 1, a bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense and the other departments and agencies of the Government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3381

At the request of Mr. CONRAD, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3381 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1, a bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense and the other departments and agencies of the Government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. KERRY (for himself, Mrs. GILLIBRAND and Mr. LAUTENBERG):

S. 3691. A bill to minimize the economic and social costs resulting from losses of life, property, well-being, business activity, and economic growth associated with extreme weather events by ensuring that the United States is more resilient to the impacts of extreme weather events in the short- and long-term, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, today I am introducing the STRONG Act of 2012, or the Strengthening The Resilience of Our National on the Ground Act. This legislation will build upon existing extreme weather resiliency efforts to provide State and local actors with the tools and information they need to help prepare, plan for, and more quickly recover from extreme weather events. Hurricane Sandy has shown us that extreme weather remains a major challenge for our Nation.

Recently, extreme weather events have battered the nation, resulting in record-high losses for 2011 and more broken records in 2012. In the past 30 years, there have been more than 130 extreme weather events in the United States that generated at least \$1 billion in devastating damages. Most recently, Hurricane Sandy resulted in more than 100 deaths, the evacuation of hundreds of thousands of people, power outages affecting more than 8.5 million homes, massive flooding, gasoline shortages, and a crippled regional energy and transportation infrastructure. Extreme weather ravaged every region of the United States this year, with drought conditions in more than 60 percent of the contiguous United States; deadly floods; destructive wildfires on more than nine million acres across 37 States; and deadly heat waves.

By building stronger communities, we can reduce the serious economic and human costs of extreme weather over the short and long term. For every \$1 spent now on disaster preparedness and resilience-building, we could avoid at least \$4 in future losses. We need to make our Nation stronger and more resilient against extreme weather or face an increasingly more expensive and deadly future.

The STRONG Act of 2012 will use existing Federal resources to help reduce future losses of life, property, and well-being. It will also help limit declines in regional economic growth due to disasters. Specifically, it directs the Federal Government to create a more comprehensive approach to planning for and supporting resiliency efforts due to extreme weather. The bill directs the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy to chair a high-level interagency working group to assess Federal agencies' activities related to extreme weather resilience across key sectors, such as agriculture, water management, infrastructure, public health, and national security. It develops a plan to better support State, local, and private and public sector resiliency efforts in the short and long-term, including establishing a public clearinghouse of information. The bill emphasizes State, local, and private sector involvement; a Federal advisory group composed of private and public representatives will play a key consultative role throughout the process, as will an advisory group composed of State, local, and tribal representatives. It also complements and builds upon recent activities by my colleagues and the White House in the Federal response to the devastation of Hurricane Sandy.

I believe that by better understanding and planning, we can reduce the serious economic and human costs of extreme weather on our communities. The events of 2012 and years past have clearly demonstrated the need for better and more efficient governance before disaster strikes again.

A number of organizations are supportive of this bill, including the U.S. Conference of Mayors, the National Association of Counties, the National Emergency Management Association, the National Weather Association, and the American Planning Association.

I am pleased that Senators GILLIBRAND and LAUTENBERG are original cosponsors of this legislation. I look forward to building upon a strong foundation and improving our extreme weather resiliency efforts. It is our responsibility to protect our citizens and help minimize future loss and damage. I ask all Senators to support this legislation.

By Mr. LIEBERMAN (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. MURRAY, and Mrs. BOXER):

S. 3696. A bill to provide for the admission of the State of New Columbia into the Union; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I rise to introduce the New Columbia Admissions Act that will create a 51st State from the populated portions of Washington, D.C., giving these more than 600,000 disenfranchised Americans the voice they deserve in our national government. The United States is the only democracy in the world that denies voting representation to the people who live in its capital city. It is long past time to end this unjust and embarrassing distinction.

I am not the only Senator who feels this way—Senators DURBIN, BOXER, and MURRAY join me in cosponsoring this bill today. My friend Senator Inouye had planned to cosponsor this bill as he was a strong supporter of the District's right to have congressional representation.

Under this bill, there would still be Federal district called Washington, D.C., which would be under the control of Congress as the Constitution mandates. But it would be a smaller area encompassing the White House, the Capitol, the Supreme Court and the National Mall, where few people actually live. The rest of the current District of Columbia—diverse business districts and residential neighborhoods that are home to more than half a million U.S. citizens—would become a new State.

This is completely in accord with the principles and mandates of the Constitution and our Founding Fathers. Indeed, I think it is worth remembering why our Founding Fathers created a Federal district in the first place.

After the Revolutionary War, Philadelphia, PA, was the capital of the government formed by the Articles of Confederation. That Congress met in what we now know as Independence Hall in Philadelphia.

In 1783, a mob of Revolutionary War veterans besieged Independence Hall, demanding promised payments for their service during the war. Congress asked the governor of Pennsylvania, John Dickinson, to call out the militia to defend the capital, but he sided with the veterans and refused.

Congress had to flee to Princeton, NJ.

This failure of a state government to protect the national government became a major concern of the Constitutional Convention in 1787 and it was decided the Constitution must create a Federal district that could be controlled and protected by the new Federal government.

But Article One, Section Eight of the Constitution, which created the Federal district, did not order a particular location. It only said only that it may not exceed "10 miles square"—or 100 square miles.

The Residence Act of 1790 gave President Washington authority to pick the final site of the capital, and the site of the current Washington D.C. was chosen as a result of a compromise between Thomas Jefferson and Alexander Hamilton.

When John Adams moved into the White House in 1800, Washington, D.C. had a population of just 3,210 people—in a Nation of roughly 5 million. Even then the founders were concerned about voting rights for residents of the new capital. In the early days before the capital was fully established, its residents were allowed to vote in Maryland or Virginia. There were proposals to guarantee their suffrage going forward but unfortunately they did not get enacted amid the press to establish the new government. Certainly, though, it would have been unimaginable to the founders that a population of more than half a million in our capital city should be disenfranchised in the national legislature.

Yet that is the current reality. Now we are a Nation of more than 300 million and Washington, D.C. is a thriving community of 618,000 people. That's more people than Wyoming has and about the same as Vermont and North Dakota have, which, of course, have full representation in Congress. According to the U.S. Census, Washington, D.C. is growing faster than all 50 States. Demographers expect it will only get bigger in the years to come because much of that growth has been with young people who want to raise families in the District.

The District of Columbia already functions as a state in many respects—indeed the Federal Government treats it as a State for purposes of most Federal programs.

More important, the residents of the District of Columbia have all the responsibilities of U.S. citizenship. They pay more Federal income tax per capita than residents of any state; D.C. residents and businesses send on average \$20 billion to the Federal treasury each year. D.C. residents must serve on Federal juries and male residents must register for Selective Service. More than 190,000 D.C. residents have served in the military in wartime and about 1,700 have died for our country in the wars of the last century alone. All this occurred while the District's residents were denied voting representation in Congress.

The current inequity has even been noted by international bodies, including the United Nations Human Rights Commission, as a possible violation of international human rights accords.

It is long past time to give these American citizens who have chosen Washington as their home full participation in our democracy. People who live in D.C. are, of course, as American as people who live throughout our country—teachers, firefighters, doctors, janitors, parents, children, veterans, retirees. Why do their contributions to our democracy—financial and otherwise—merit rights and representation any less than those of their fellow citizens in the 50 states?

In sum, nothing in the Constitution prevents Congress from ceding this territory to a new State. There will still be a Federal district under Congress-

sional control and protected by Federal authorities.

The voters of this new state will have the same rights we give voters in every other State, including those seven small states with populations under 1 million. If the idea seems strange, remember that many also once could not imagine full voting rights for women or racial minorities. It is the nature of civil rights that the disenfranchised must fight to gain acceptance of rights that, in retrospect, seem morally compelled and beyond question. We must right this injustice toward the residents of the District just as Congress historically has righted other voting injustices that stretched back to the very founding of the Nation.

I will soon leave Congress after having had the great privilege of serving here for 24 years. Securing full voting rights for the 600,000 Americans who live in the District of Columbia is unfinished business, not just for me, but for the United States of America.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 625—RECOGNIZING THE JANUARY 12, 2013, OPENING OF THE UNITED STATES FREEDOM PAVILION: THE BOEING CENTER AT THE NATIONAL WORLD WAR II MUSEUM IN NEW ORLEANS, LOUISIANA, AND SUPPORTING PLANS FOR OTHER EDUCATIONAL PAVILIONS AND INITIATIVES

Ms. LANDRIEU (for herself and Mr. VITTER) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 625

Whereas historians Stephen E. Ambrose and Gordon H. "Nick" Mueller, among others, founded the National D-Day Museum on June 6, 2000;

Whereas section 8134(c) of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act of 2004 (Public Law 108-87; 117 Stat. 1105) designated the National D-Day Museum as "America's National World War II Museum";

Whereas the National World War II Museum advances the mission of educating the public about the experience of the United States in World War II, covering all branches of the Armed Forces and the Merchant Marine, and documenting and highlighting activities on both the battlefield and home front;

Whereas the exhibits and programs of the National World War II Museum portray why the War occurred, how the War was won, and what the War means today, and celebrate the spirit of the United States and enduring values displayed during the War;

Whereas the National World War II Museum emphasizes the diverse nature of the war effort of the United States, reflecting the contributions of women, African-Americans, Japanese-Americans, Hispanic-Americans, Native Americans, and other groups that have been neglected in many accounts of World War II;

Whereas the 12,000 landing craft designed and built by Higgins Industries in New Orleans made amphibious invasions possible and