

bottom line. The vast majority of Americans, men and women, agree with that statement. That is true of every major religion from the polling data I have seen.

Frankly, I don't understand this Republican Party. First, they made war on the Hispanic community, one of the fastest growing segments in America on immigration, and now they are making a war on the majority of America, women. While not every woman feels the way we do, the vast majority of women do. So I don't get it.

Then to take an amendment such as that from my friend from Missouri and expand it even further and say, if someone owns a McDonald's, they can decide to not provide contraceptive services—the real reason might be because they don't want to pay extra or other reasons that are not religiously based—I don't get it.

I hope we do have a vote on the Blunt amendment because I think the American people would not be for that amendment on an overwhelming basis. The more they learn about it, the more that happens, and that is why the tide is moving in that direction.

I wish to thank my colleagues for allowing me to say a few words on that issue.

FURMAN NOMINATION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I rise in support of Jesse Furman, who is a nominee for the District Court in the Southern District.

I have had the good fortune to present to the President more than 13 nominees for the Federal bench, every one of them is incredibly accomplished. Each represents the best of the bar that the State of New York has to offer. I believe in excellence, moderation, and diversity, which are the three standards I use. But on the standard of excellence, Jesse is no exception to my standard of excellence. In fact, he doesn't just meet it, he shatters it. He is one of the most brilliant lawyers in the country. He is amazing. The fact that he wants to serve our Federal Government on the bench is a tribute to us all. It is a tribute to our country and to him.

How about moderation? This is the issue I wish to speak most to my colleagues about. Who was his protégé in many ways? Judge Mukasey. He worked for Judge Mukasey as a clerk and then as attorney general. A lot of people on this side of the aisle, including myself, have real differences with Judge Mukasey, but if we cannot support Jesse Furman for the nomination, then we cannot support anybody because this nomination could have come from a Democrat, it could have come from a Republican, it could have come from a conservative, it could have come from a liberal. He is truly a mainstream thinker, and so this vote will be indicative. Because if Jesse Furman cannot achieve cloture, then our system is so paralyzed we better go

back to the drawing board because it will mean no district court judge can be approved, none.

So I would ask Senators on both sides of the aisle to support him. I know we have a number of our Republican colleagues who have said they might support him, and I hope they will. We had a good vote in the Judiciary Committee on Jesse Furman. Again, he is truly excellent, endorsed by his former clerks on the Supreme Court, including those who clerked for Justices Rehnquist, Thomas, O'Connor, Kennedy, and Scalia.

John Podhoretz, a conservative columnist, wrote that Furman should be confirmed because he is "terrifically knowledgeable, entirely respectful of views that differ from his, and utterly without an axe to grind." That is why he passed without discussion out of the Judiciary Committee without dissent.

Please, colleagues, a vote for Furman will show that we can come together certainly on a judge of such moderation. A vote against him will say the system is irreparably broken.

I thank the Chair.

I yield the floor.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

MOVING AHEAD FOR PROGRESS IN THE 21ST CENTURY ACT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 1813, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1813) to reauthorize Federal-aid highway and highway safety construction programs, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Reid amendment No. 1633, of a perfecting nature.

Reid amendment No. 1634 (to amendment No. 1633), to change the enactment date.

Reid motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Environment and Public Works, with instructions, Reid amendment No. 1635, to change the enactment date.

Reid amendment No. 1636 (to the instructions) amendment No. 1635), of a perfecting nature.

Reid amendment No. 1637 (to amendment No. 1636), of a perfecting nature.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Texas.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I rise to urge my colleagues to vote no on cloture on Senator REID's amendment No. 1633 to the highway bill. The bill we are getting ready to vote on puts the other titles into the highway bill from the Commerce Committee, Finance Committee, and Banking Committee.

I am going to object on the grounds that the Commerce Committee title is not the title that should be included in this bill. What happened is that there was a partisan amendment that was

added to a markup very late that the minority had not had a chance to work out before it went to the markup. We thought it wasn't going on the markup, but it did go on the markup before we were able to have the input and work it in a better way, which has been our usual position in the Commerce Committee.

The bill would create an unfunded, unlimited discretionary grant program that has divided the transportation community. It will add a new Assistant Secretary for Freight Planning and Development and a whole new office in the Department of Transportation. This is a part of the bill that certainly none of the Republicans can support, and it caused a party-line vote in the Commerce Committee.

Additionally, the bill that will be before us contains provisions that would create two new programs within the Research and Innovative Technology Administration that would cost taxpayers \$28 million annually to administer, and the CBO estimates the underlying bill would cost \$615 million for 10 years including these two new programs. That would be about double what the levels are for this program in today's terms. So the next 10 years would have been at \$318 million if we had kept it at static levels, which we are doing in most other parts of the highway bill. Instead, the bill we are voting on today would more than double that to \$615 million over the next 10 years for RITA.

We don't have to have this kind of partisan effort on the bill. Our Commerce Committee has been very good at bipartisan work. I see the Senator from California on the floor who has worked in a bipartisan way with the Senator from Oklahoma on the underlying bill. But the Commerce bill that came out was not bipartisan.

We have worked hard with Senator ROCKEFELLER and we have informed all of our Members on both sides to get a consensus, and we got one. We got a consensus that would have taken the Freight Act part of it that set policies for new freight studies—we did that. That part would be in the compromise bill. It keeps the funding in line with current levels in the Research and Innovative Transportation Administration. But those compromise provisions that Senator ROCKEFELLER and all of our staffs of the whole committee worked on are not in the bill we are voting on today.

We worked together relating to the importation of motor vehicles and equipment in the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration reauthorization bill. It would stop unsafe equipment from entering our ports. We worked hard to put forward language that provides inspectors the right tools while at the same time minimizing unnecessary costs and burdens on equipment manufacturers. Again, the modifications are in the bill that we agreed to with the majority in the Commerce Committee, but they are not in the bill

that came out of the committee and the bill that is on the floor today.

The first package of reported bills did not contain a rail title at all. So if the bill that is before us today is accepted and cloture is invoked, we will have a Senate highway bill that does not have a rail provision. We will go to conference without a Senate position on a rail provision, which the House has.

Senator ROCKEFELLER and I have worked together on this rail part. We have worked with all of the stakeholders in the rail industry as well as Amtrak, and we have come forward with a bill the Republicans support and most of the Democrats support on the committee. It will lead to better rail planning at the Department of Transportation, and it will enhance rail economic regulation on the Surface Transportation Board. The rail title would also allow the commuter and freight rails to apply for extensions for implementation of positive train control on an as-needed basis, and it directs the DOT to use the 2015 route map to implement positive train control, as Congress intended when it passed its law in 2008.

All of these important policy gains will be lost if we adopt the cloture vote today. I hope my colleagues will vote no on cloture so we can put the provisions that have been agreed to on a bipartisan basis in the bill so that the Commerce title will reflect the full Commerce Committee, rather than what came out that had not been fully vetted and is not the position of the full Commerce Committee, with Republicans and Democrats together. I hope we will have that chance to put the new version together that would include the compromises that have been made on a bipartisan basis.

Mrs. BOXER. Would the Senator yield? And I ask unanimous consent that she have an additional 60 seconds.

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

Mrs. HUTCHISON. I am happy to yield.

Mrs. BOXER. I just wanted to make the point that I think Senator HUTCHISON has been probably one of the most productive members of the Commerce Committee I have ever seen. I have been on that committee for a very long time. Her relationship with Senator ROCKEFELLER is stellar. I too believe she makes a point when she says they have continued to work together since the bill was reported out and they have come to agreement.

So I guess my question is, as someone who has given flesh, blood, sweat, and tears on this highway bill, knowing that we have a couple of these bumps in the road, should we not invoke cloture today—I personally hope we do, and we can fix the bill, but if we don't—and if Senator ROCKEFELLER and Senator HUTCHISON are able to take their work and put that in as a substitute, would my friend be back on

board here working toward completion of this bill?

Mrs. HUTCHISON. If I understand the question of the Senator from California, if we can substitute at some point the compromise language in the Commerce title, I am going to be absolutely supportive of this bill because I trust Senator ROCKEFELLER. We have worked together. We have both given. He doesn't like parts of this bill, I don't like parts of it, but we have given.

I would say the Senator from California has done a stellar job with the Senator from Oklahoma on the underlying bill. Oh my gosh, what a complicated bill. The Senator from California is the chairman, the ranking member is from Oklahoma, and they have worked for the good of America on this bill. The Banking Committee has a bipartisan title. I believe there is a compromise coming forward in the Finance Committee. I am not familiar with that, but I know the compromise title of the Commerce Committee has been worked through fully with everybody on board, and it will be acceptable, I believe, to the whole Senate.

So I think we are just a little premature today. I think we need to stop cloture. I think we need to make the changes that are required, and I think this bill will sail in the future.

Mrs. BOXER. I thank the Senator.

CLOTURE MOTION

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, pursuant to rule XXII, the clerk will report the motion to invoke cloture.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the Reid amendment No. 1633 to S. 1813, a bill to reauthorize Federal-aid highway and highway safety construction programs, and for other purposes.

Harry Reid, John D. Rockefeller IV, Kay R. Hagan, Patrick J. Leahy, Patty Murray, Sheldon Whitehouse, Richard Blumenthal, Herb Kohl, Ben Nelson, Jeff Bingaman, Jeanne Shaheen, Barbara A. Mikulski, Jack Reed, Max Baucus, Frank R. Lautenberg, Robert Menendez, Maria Cantwell.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on amendment No. 1633, offered by the Senator from Nevada, Mr. REID, to S. 1813, a bill to reauthorize Federal-aid highway and highway safety construction programs, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. BINGAMAN) is necessarily absent.

Mr. KYL. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK), the Senator from

Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS), and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER).

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 54, nays 42, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 20 Leg.]

YEAS—54

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

NAYS—42

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

NOT VOTING—4

Bingaman	Roberts
Kirk	Vitter

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. On this vote, the yeas are 54, the nays are 42. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

Under the previous order, the motion to recommit and amendment No. 1633 are withdrawn.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF JESSE M. FURMAN TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Jesse M. Furman, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the cloture motion on this nomination is withdrawn.

There is now 2 minutes equally divided prior to a vote on the nomination.

The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I appreciate the fact that the filibuster has