

of the positive reforms and the need to actually stick to them—I am confident we can create a better economy today and leave a better future for our children tomorrow. But it is up to him, and his visit today offers a great chance to convey this message to his fellow Democrats.

TRIBUTE TO ROHIT KUMAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I would like to say a few words about my departing deputy chief of staff Rohit Kumar, who announced a few weeks back he would be leaving the Senate at the end of this week.

Many of the Members of the Senate know Rohit pretty well. He has been trolling the floor out here for a long time, telling us on the Republican side what to do and how to do it. He has been a constant presence at my side at just about every legislative battle we have had here in the Senate for the past 6½ years; actually, even before that, when he was working for Leader Frist, and I was over in the whip's office.

So many of us could recount Rohit's many talents, but as his boss it falls on me to do it, and I am happy to do it because we have been through a lot. The first thing to say about Rohit is that his mind is like a trap. He has the answer to literally every question the moment you ask him, and he has usually thought through the politics of it too. That might not sound terribly unusual, but I assure you it is rare in this business to come across somebody who combines a brilliant mind for policy and a brilliant mind for politics in one package, but that is Rohit. He is remarkable that way. It is one of the reasons he has been indispensable to me, not only in the day-to-day stuff but especially on the three major deals I helped broker with Vice President BIDEN, starting with the 2-year extension of the Bush tax cuts in late 2010, the debt limit deal we arrived at in the summer of 2011, and then, of course, the fiscal cliff agreement at the end of last year in which we locked in the Bush tax rates permanently for 99 percent of Americans. That is something we couldn't even do, by the way, when we had a Republican House, a Republican Senate, and a Republican President.

Every one of those agreements involved a lot of work, a lot of nights and weekends, and tremendous focus. We couldn't have done any of them without Rohit. Anything that ever came up in those discussions, Rohit can tell us the upsides and the downsides, where the other side was willing to go and where they weren't. He knew where all the tripwires were, and it is because of these same skills as well as his grasp of Senate rules and procedure that he has become sort of an informal adviser to the entire Republican conference over the years.

It is not at all unusual for me to walk back to Rohit's desk and see him

talking to another Senator in my office—either in person or on the phone. He knows how things work, and folks who are smart know they can call him or swing by if they want to know what is going on or what is possible or what is not on absolutely anything. A lot of other Senators will miss him every bit as much as I will.

Rohit says he was drawn to public service by the example of his parents, both of whom are doctors, and viewed their work as more of a calling than a source of income. His dad is a widely respected and well-known teacher at the university level, and his mom worked at a VA hospital.

Rohit wasn't drawn to medicine, but like his folks he wanted to make a difference, and that is what drew him to politics. He got his start by answering phones for the mayor of Dallas, and then translated that into an internship for Phil Gramm's State office after his sophomore year at Duke. After graduating in just 3 years, he took a job in Senator Gramm's Washington office as an LA, and did that for a couple of years before heading off to law school.

The plan was to become a Federal prosecutor. So he moved down to Charlottesville, stayed there for a clerkship on the Fourth Circuit, and then saw his plan go up in smoke when he called Senator Gramm for career advice. Rohit told him what he was thinking, and Senator Gramm listened. Senator Gramm then told him he thought it would be a much better idea if he came back to the Senate and worked for him instead. Senator Gramm can be pretty persuasive. Rohit agreed, and he has been here ever since.

It wasn't a straight line. About a month after Rohit got here, Gramm announced he wasn't running for reelection. Over the year that followed, Rohit impressed a lot of folks. It wasn't long before Senator Lott picked up the phone and asked him if he would join him in the leader's office. Rohit accepted, and then spent pretty much his entire time there figuring out how to get the Department of Homeland Security up and running in such a way that it wouldn't be hamstrung by union rules.

Over a holiday weekend in late 2002, he got a taste of things to come. President Bush wanted DHS approved, so Rohit and a few other key staffers had a holiday weekend to do it. They started writing the bill on a Thursday night and wrapped it up by Tuesday morning.

Rohit stuck around during the Frist years, gaining even more experience and impressing even more people—including me. When Leader Frist left at the end of 2006, I brought him onto my leadership team, and it has been one of the best hiring decisions I have ever made. As I said, he has been an extraordinary help to me and a great guy to have around. He is not only whip smart, but he has a fantastic sense of humor and work ethic like I have never seen.

I thank Rohit for his dedication and service to me and to the Senate. Since

this is the only opportunity I have ever had to do this, I want to thank Hilary for letting us have him for this long. I think she is here today. I know how supportive she has been of Rohit staying here for so long, and so I want to thank her for that and apologize for all the canceled trips and lost weekends. I know it wasn't always easy to see it in the moment, but he has made an enormous difference not just to me but our country.

I can't promise the transition will be easy. He might want to find a good 10-step BlackBerry recovery program when we finally take it away from him, but I am sure he will figure it out.

With that, I wish Rohit all the best in the future. I know he has a bright one. I understand he will be unemployed after the weekend, but I expect that won't last long.

Rohit, if you ever want to come back, we always have a place for you. Thanks, buddy.

I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

TRANSPORTATION, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2014

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 1243. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1243) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Murray (for Cardin) modified amendment No. 1760, to require the Secretary of Transportation to submit to Congress a report relating to the condition of lane miles and highway bridge deck.

Coburn amendment No. 1750, to prohibit funds from being directed to Federal employees with unpaid Federal tax liability.

Coburn amendment No. 1751, to prohibit Federal funding of union activities by Federal employees.

Coburn amendment No. 1754, to prohibit Federal funds from being used to meet the matching requirements of other Federal programs.

Murphy amendment No. 1783, to require the Secretary of Transportation to assess the impact on domestic employment of a waiver of the Buy American requirement for Federal-aid highway projects prior to issuing the waiver.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Kentucky.

AMENDMENT NO. 1739

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to call up amendment No. 1739.

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

The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. PAUL] proposes an amendment numbered 1739.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To redirect certain foreign assistance to the Government of Egypt as a result of the July 3, 2013, military coup d'état.)

At the end of title I, insert the following:
SEC. _____. (a) Congress makes the following findings:

(1) On June 30, 2012, Mohamed Morsi was elected President of Egypt in elections that were certified as free and fair by the Egyptian Presidential Election Commission and the United Nations.

(2) On July 3, 2013, the military of Egypt removed the democratically elected President of Egypt, arrested his supporters, and suspended the Constitution of Egypt. These actions fit the definition of a military coup d'état.

(3) Pursuant to section 7008 of the Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Act, 2012 (division I of Public Law 112-74; 125 Stat. 1195), the United States is legally prohibited from providing foreign assistance to any country whose duly elected head of government is deposed by a military coup d'état, or removed in such a way that the military plays a decisive role.

(4) The United States has suspended aid to countries that have undergone military coups d'état in the past, including the Ivory Coast, the Central African Republic, Thailand, Mali, Fiji, and Honduras.

(b)(1) In accordance with section 7008 of the Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Act, 2012 (division I of Public Law 112-74; 125 Stat. 1195), the United States Government, including the Department of State, shall refrain from providing to the Government of Egypt the assistance restricted under such section.

(2) In addition to the restrictions referred to in paragraph (1), the following restrictions shall be in effect with respect to United States assistance to the Government of Egypt:

(A) Deliveries of defense articles currently slated for transfer to Egyptian Ministry of Defense (MOD) and Ministry of Interior (MOI) shall be suspended until the President certifies to Congress that democratic national elections have taken place in Egypt followed by a peaceful transfer of power.

(B) Provision of defense services to Egyptian MOD and MOI shall be halted immediately until the President certifies to Congress that democratic national elections have taken place in Egypt followed by a peaceful transfer of power.

(C) Processing of draft Letters of Offer and Acceptance (LOAs) for future arms sales to Egyptian MOD and MOI entities shall be halted until the President certifies to Congress that democratic national elections have taken place in Egypt followed by a peaceful transfer of power.

(D) All costs associated with the delays in deliveries and provision of services required under subparagraphs (A) through (C) shall be borne by the Government of Egypt.

(c) Any amounts retained by the United States as a result of implementing subsection (b) shall be made available to the Secretary of Transportation to carry out ac-

tivities under the heading "BRIDGES IN CRITICAL CORRIDORS".

Mr. PAUL. A once great city, Detroit, lies in ruins with 50,000 feral dogs roaming the city, and abandoned houses litter the landscape. It is a bleak and forlorn future that awaits Detroit. Creditors clamor for nearly \$20 billion in debt. City employees wonder if they will be paid. There is not enough money to even replace the street lights in Detroit. God forbid that a major fire should break out.

At some level I think the President does care about Detroit, but today all I can see is the billions of dollars—the billions of American tax dollars—that he chooses to send overseas. I see the shiny new technology, America's best, going to arm people who are indifferent to us, and, at worst, hate us. The President sends billions of dollars to Egypt in the form of advanced fighter planes and tanks. Meanwhile, Detroit crumbles.

Chicago is a war zone. More people died in Chicago this year than in Afghanistan. Yet the President insists on building a \$34 million fort in Afghanistan. Hillary Clinton insists on spending \$80 million on a consulate in Afghanistan that will never be used. As Detroit decays, Chicago is a maelstrom of violence, yet no one questions sending billions of the taxpayers' dollars to Egypt, to despots, to dictators in foreign countries.

Our Nation's bridges are crumbling and few politicians from either party will question the billions of dollars that are being sent overseas while our Nation's infrastructure is crumbling. The law is very clear. Everyone here in Congress can read. They recognize that the law says when there is a military coup, the aid must end.

Today we will vote on whether they will obey the law or whether they will openly flout the law and disobey. When a military coup overturns a democratically elected government, all military aid must end; that is the law. There is no Presidential waiver. The law states unequivocally that the aid must end.

When the military coup occurred in Egypt, how did the President respond? How did Congress respond? The President and his cohorts in Congress responded by shoveling good money after bad into the failed state of Egypt. The President is intent on building nations abroad and not taking care of our Nation here at home. I propose that we take the billion dollars that is now being illegally given to Egypt and spend it at home.

We have bridges crumbling at home. Can't we fix some of our problems at home? We have had a bridge collapse this year in Washington State. We had one collapse in Minnesota a few years ago. We have a bridge in northern Kentucky that is becoming increasingly unsafe. Yet there is not enough money to repair our bridges because our politicians are sending the money overseas. It is unwise, and right now it is illegal.

Countries such as Egypt are getting billions of dollars in aid. Meanwhile, they recently let a mob advance and climb atop our Embassy and then burn our flag. I say not one penny more to these countries that allow mobs to burn our flag.

In between cashing our checks, Egypt finds time to convict 16 Americans on trumped-up political charges. Fortunately, the Americans were able to escape. If they hadn't left the country, we would have 16 Americans in prison in Egypt. Luckily these Americans were able to get out of the country.

How do these establishment politicians respond? How will the other side respond today when they get up and plead we should break the law? What will they say about Detroit? What will they say about Chicago? What will they say about the bridges in northern Kentucky that will not be built because we are sending the money to countries that are burning our flag?

I think it is unwise to send arms—particularly advanced arms—into the chaos of Egypt. I fear one day someone may arise in Egypt who says: Let's attack Israel with these planes. Let's attack Israel with these tanks. I fear these weapons we are giving to Egypt may someday be used against America and our allies.

Even the Egyptians don't want our aid. There was a Gallup poll last year which showed that 70 percent of Egyptians don't even want the money we are sending them. To understand why we have to understand that American aid doesn't go to the Egyptian people; it goes to the despots and the dictators who run the place. We have to realize that when protesters gather in Tahrir Square in Cairo by the hundreds of thousands—and even millions—why they are unhappy with America. They are unhappy with America because they are being sprayed with tear gas bought with American tax dollars, manufactured in Pennsylvania, and given to the Mubarak family or given to the military. Why are they unhappy? Foreign aid doesn't go to foreign people; it goes to foreign despots and foreign dictators. Foreign aid is more likely to buy a lavish chateau in Paris than it is to buy bread in Egypt.

We send money to Egypt and it buys private jets for the Mubarak family to fly to Europe. The Mubarak family is said to have stolen billions of dollars of American aid. Over the past 30 years, Americans have been forced to finance the Mubarak family living large. So when we see pictures of depression in Detroit, when we see abandoned housing in Detroit, when we see boarded up housing, when we see 50,000 feral dogs running through the streets of Detroit, when we see a once great country, a once great nation, a once great city lying in decay, we think of our politicians who chose to send that money to Egypt and not keep it here at home.

As the money is stolen and squandered around the world and as Detroit decays, as Chicago is overrun with violence, as Americans struggle to put

food on the table, Mubarak and his family dine on caviar and champagne. As Mubarak flew to Europe for weekends on his jet and lived the life of a king, his people rotted in jail indefinitely, without charge, without trial. They have been living under martial law for 30 years. We wonder why they are unhappy with us. We have been financing the guy who has been giving them martial law and indefinite detention without trial for 30 years. To add insult to injury, when they protest against their government, they are doused with tear gas made in our country.

Foreign aid doesn't go to foreign people; it goes to foreign despots and dictators.

The President claims he feels our pain. The President says he can feel the pain and he wants to help the middle class. But it seems as though he wants and intends to help foreign people, foreign countries more than he wants to help America. The President promised us hope and change, but the more he claims that things change, I think the more they stay the same.

I wanted to believe the President would be different. I wanted to believe he would bring change. I wanted to believe he would stand up to the arms race, to the military industrial complex; that he would stop the flow of arms to despots and dictators across the planet. But hope and change just turned out to be a slogan. In Detroit and in Chicago and in the once great cities of America, no change came. Hope and change was just a slogan. The poverty, the murders, the abysmal schools, they continue.

Where are you, Mr. President? In our hour of need in our country, why are you sending our money to people who hate us? Why are you sending arms to countries that don't like us or our allies? Why would we do that?

The President maintains he will end the war in Afghanistan, and I support him. But he insists on fighting new wars, secretly, without congressional approval, in Libya and Syria. While Detroit decays and descends into bankruptcy, the President, as did so many Republicans before him, continues to send American tax dollars overseas to countries that persecute and kill Christians. Hope and change—I guess it was just a slogan.

The law clearly states that when there is a military coup overturning elected government, the military aid must end. Even the President doesn't dispute the law. He doesn't even dispute it is a coup. He just says, I am not going to say it is not a coup or it is a coup; you can't make me. It is ridiculous to any intelligent person or country—and I wonder if anyone on the other side will stand and say it is not a coup. How do we say, when the military takes over a country and boots out a government, that it is not a coup? Only a fool or a demagog would attempt to argue that the military junta in Egypt is not a coup; that the

military takeover that actually installed the lead general as Deputy Primary Minister is somehow not a coup.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a unanimous consent request?

Mr. PAUL. Not yet.

In a remarkable bit of sophistry, the President admits the law does not mandate an end to military aid when a coup takes place—he says it does, but he says it can't make him decide, so he is not going to decide whether there was a coup. What it is, is brazen and open flouting of the law.

The President's argument reminds me of a third grader at recess. A third grader says he will not call it a coup and you can't make him. That is absurd. We passed a law. It is the law of the land. It says if a coup happens, if the military takes over or participates in a substantial way in removing an elected government, the military aid ends. We are either a nation of laws or we are not.

When the President refuses to acknowledge it is a coup or that it is not yet an acknowledged coup, he says the aid is going on indefinitely and he will go on indefinitely flouting the law.

Americans should be outraged and insulted by such blatant shirking of the law. Either we are a nation of laws or we are not. Will we obey the law?

We have the presumption to tell the world how to behave, to criticize Egypt for not obeying the rule of law—all legitimate concerns. Yet the President blithely ignores our own law. If we choose to ignore our own laws, can we, with a straight face, preach to the rest of the world about the rule of law? I think by openly flouting our own laws we take away from our ability to lead the world, we take away from our moral authority to show the right way. America has always been the leader by example. But how do we lead by example when we are not willing to obey our own laws?

There is a question: Are we a monarchy or a republic? Are we to be ruled by caprice? If we pick and choose which laws to obey, what message does that send?

I say to all Americans—Democrats, Independents, and Republicans—enough is enough. We aren't going to take it anymore. We should call our representatives and tell them enough already. Tell them to take care of our country. Tell them not one penny more to countries that are burning our flag.

I suggest today we do something historic and listen to the American people. The American people don't want good money after bad shoveled and sent overseas; they want to fix some of the problems we have at home. They want to do some Nation building here at home.

My amendment will give our representatives a chance to vote. We are going to say: Yes, we will obey the law. We are not sending any more weapons to Egypt and we are going to take the money and we are going to build some

bridges in our country. We are going to repair some roads. We are going to work on some infrastructure here at home.

Everybody seems to say they are for it. In fact, the President has now come out and said he wants some grand bargain to take some new money and actually work on infrastructure. Mr. President, it is right here. I am offering it today.

I have another amendment that would say all foreign profit can come home at 5 percent. We can take that revenue and build new bridges. They will not even let me vote on that one. So the President's grand bargain to increase infrastructure spending—I have it. It is on the floor.

Mr. President, call the leadership of the Senate. Tell them it is on the floor and you support this; that you want infrastructure spending. I have a bill that would do precisely that. This amendment will do a little bit in that direction. Take the \$1 billion we spend in Egypt and spend it in America.

When we see the pictures on the news of what is going on in Detroit—if you live in Detroit and you are suffering through the bankruptcy of your city; if you see around you the chaos and poverty of Detroit, you call the President and say: Mr. President, why are you sending that money to Egypt? Why are you sending money overseas when our Nation is crumbling, our cities are crumbling, our infrastructure is crumbling, our bridges are crumbling? The President says: I am going to send that to Egypt. I am going to send that overseas.

This amendment will give everyone a chance to put their money where their mouth is, to say: Do you care about America? Do you care about repairing American infrastructure or do you care more about sending money to a dictatorship in Egypt? I think the choice is clear. I think, if we ask the American people, three-fourths or more of them—I think maybe nearly 100 percent of the American people—are with me. Let's spend that money at home. Let's not send that money overseas to people who hate us, to people who burn our flag. Keep it at home.

There is a finite amount of money. We can't do everything. We can't fix everything if we have to fix everybody else's problems first. Let's address some of the needs we have at home.

I encourage a "yes" vote, to vote to keep the money at home and not to send it overseas.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, regretfully, I am going to oppose this amendment. I am going to have to cover some points which my good friend from Kentucky made that I think are totally wrong.

First of all, I don't agree we need to be going up there with Federal dollars bailing out cities that are having problems. Of course, that is a decision that

is going to be made, I suppose, by a lot of people.

Also, the Senator from Kentucky talks about sending billions of dollars overseas. I agree with my colleague from Kentucky about some of the foreign aid and I would join with him but certainly not in this case. Before I tell my colleagues why, let me clarify something. There are Members of this body and people outside this body who are conservatives believing this is some kind of a conservative program to defund the military in Egypt. Let me assure my colleagues it is not. This is coming from a person who is probably—in fact, I am certain of it. I have been ranked as the most conservative Member of this body more than any other single person. So this is coming from a conservative, not from a liberal and not from a Democrat.

We have a unique situation. I wish to respond to a couple of things my friend from Kentucky said. First of all, yes, it probably fits the description of a coup. I know what the law is. The law says we can't send foreign aid after a coup. I have a bill drawn up right now that if this is determined to be a coup, it could pass the House and the Senate and be signed by the President in 1 day. So that is something that can be done. I have the best of intentions of obeying the law to the letter.

As far as the situation in Egypt, Morsi is gone. Let's face that reality. There are a lot of things we don't like about this. But I will say this: If you have any feelings at all toward our good friends, our best friends in the Middle East—that is Israel—then you cannot consider this amendment. Israel has all of the interests at stake.

It goes back to 1979, the Camp David accords. I remember that very well. The Camp David accords put together something between Israel and Egypt. But keep in mind, it is not Egypt. It is the military, the Egyptian military. They have been our friends. They have been Israel's friends for years and years—since 1979. If we turn our backs on the military now, there are others who would love to fill that vacuum.

Should they have F-16s? I am glad they have F-16s. They ought to have more F-16s. Some have been purchased and not delivered yet. They should be delivered. But if it is not going to be F-16s, if we should pass an amendment like this, you are going to find yourself with a bunch of MiG-29s coming over from Russia instead of our F-16s.

If this were 10 years ago, if this were 15 years ago, I might agree with my friend from Kentucky. But that was before we realized the threats we have in the Middle East. We have some friends in the Middle East. We have Israel. We have Jordan. We have Kuwait, U.A.E., Qatar, Saudi Arabia. If that coalition of friends in the Middle East breaks up, what can happen to us here in America? Our intelligence has said—and it is unclassified since 2007—that Iran will have the capability of a weapon and a

delivery system by 2015. If we do not have our friends in the Middle East to keep that from happening, we could pass an amendment like this, turn our backs on Israel, and that is exactly the thing that could happen.

I know a lot of people want to talk on this who are a lot more articulate than I am. But I can say from a conservative—from this conservative—we cannot do this to our friends in Israel and our other allies in the Middle East.

Mr. CORKER addressed the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Tennessee is—

Mr. CORKER. I want to go in the appropriate order. I see the chairman of the committee. I would like 5 minutes at some point. But does the Senator want to go ahead?

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, what is the parliamentary situation? I understand the opponents of this amendment have 30 minutes; is that correct?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct. The Senator from Oklahoma has used 5 minutes of the time in opposition.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Then I ask unanimous consent that as the chair of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee I control the remainder of the time.

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

The Senator from New Jersey is recognized.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I—

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator respond to a question? How is the time going to be allocated?

Mr. MENENDEZ. Yes. It is my intention to consume about 8 minutes approximately, to yield Senator MCCAIN 6 minutes, Senator GRAHAM 6 minutes, and Senator CORKER 5 minutes.

Mr. CORKER. Perfect.

Mr. MENENDEZ. That should take the remainder of our time.

Mr. President, this amendment may be good politics but it is bad policy. I appreciate the concern of the Senator from Kentucky for Detroit. He and others in this Chamber have had plenty of times to vote for America's cities, but I have not seen those votes be there.

Nothing in this amendment, notwithstanding what we heard, suggests that cutting all aid to Egypt ultimately means putting that money into the cities of America, such as Detroit. So let's not be mistaken about that.

I share many of the concerns that have been raised by my colleague today about the situation in Egypt. I believe, however, halting all military assistance to Egypt at this time is misguided and it is shortsighted. It would drastically reduce U.S. influence with both the interim government of Egypt and the military at an incredibly delicate time for Egypt and its people. And in so doing, it may in fact undermine our shared goals and desire to see elections and a democratically elected government reestablished in Egypt as quickly as possible.

It has been just a little more than 2 years since the onset of the Arab spring and a revolution in Egypt that unseated Hosni Mubarak after two decades in power. During these tumultuous 2 years, Egypt has struggled as a society with the transition to democracy that its people clearly want, and with efforts to create the economic opportunities that its people clearly need. That struggle is real and ongoing.

The demonstrations that ousted Mubarak in a clear military coup were unprecedented—until they were eclipsed by demonstrations this summer which drew as much as a third of Egypt's population of 83 million people onto its streets. That is more than 30 million people who have been emboldened by the revolution, who are united in their call for reform and democracy, and who have embraced their ability and right to peaceful protests and to demand change.

If you think about it, a comparable protest in the United States involving a third of our Nation would mean that 100 million Americans would be on the streets of the cities of America. That is the equivalent of what has been happening in Egypt.

So my point is that Egypt is changing but perhaps not as quickly as we would like and with a process that has been, not surprisingly, pretty chaotic.

Abandoning our diplomacy and engagement with Egypt—a country that sits at the heart of the Middle East—because the road that leads to change is not straight or certain would be naive. It might make us feel good, at least for a moment, but in the long run it would threaten to undermine vital national security interests and set back our values.

Making such a significant change to U.S. foreign policy—with all the potential implications for U.S. national security and for our ally Israel—should not be done in haste. It should not be done carelessly or thoughtlessly. It should not be done without a full understanding of all of the ramifications of such a change. And it certainly should not be tacked onto the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development appropriations bill. It is far too important a decision to be an afterthought to an appropriations bill. In my view, it is ill-advised to make foreign policy on the fly without due consideration of all of the consequences.

I would point out that my friend from Kentucky has introduced an identical bill that has been referred to the Foreign Relations Committee. Last Thursday the committee held its first extensive hearing on the crisis in Egypt. I can assure my friend from Kentucky that the committee will continue to work on this issue and to look at appropriate policy options through a deliberative process.

We need time to determine whether the process underway in Egypt will meet the demands of the Egyptian people and lead back to democracy or if

the military leadership will dig in further and thereby invoke restrictions in U.S. law with respect to assistance. Our patience is not unlimited and our assistance is not without limitations. The administration is already actively reviewing U.S. assistance.

The delivery of four new F-16 aircraft that was to occur last week was halted by the administration, clearly sensitive to the situation. At the end of the day we should allow for flexibility to deal with this delicate situation as events dictate, not precipitate an unwanted response with a knee-jerk reaction rather than deliberative reflection. The administration has a process to make its decisions.

I would say this is about—as I listen to the Senator from Kentucky—far more than Egypt. He basically opposes all foreign assistance abroad. The reality is that foreign assistance abroad has worked for the national interests and security of the United States. It has saved millions of lives through PEPFAR against AIDS and HIV. It has helped strengthen democracies. It has helped create democracies. It has helped create open markets for American products and services. As a matter of fact, these sales to Egypt—about \$1.2 billion—are largely from the manufacture of equipment here in the United States that creates jobs here at home and then ultimately gets used in Egypt.

We need a more nuanced approach, one that speaks to both our values and our interests, and one which provides the President with the flexibility needed to conduct delicate and discriminating policy in a challenging and chaotic environment.

A quick end to aid at this time—meat-cleaver approach, when a scalpel is needed—is simply ill-advised.

Last week Ambassador Dennis Ross, whose reputation and experience as a diplomat, Presidential adviser on the Middle East, and author, has made him one of the Nation's most respected foreign policy minds on both sides of the aisle, told the Foreign Relations Committee it is imperative that America "stay in the game." We cannot and should not pull out now. Ending aid to Egypt would only cause Egyptians to shut the United States out of discussions and disregard our advice. Ambassador Ross also said that such an action could be the only thing to unite all Egyptians across the entire political spectrum against the United States—against the United States. In fact, that opinion was shared by the majority panelists who feared our inability to influence events in Egypt if we were to step out of the game.

In the interim, as we further assess the situation, our response and our policy must be carefully calibrated to press for the democratic reforms that the Egyptian people have demanded and—simultaneously—support U.S. national security interests in the region.

U.S. assistance to Egypt has, for decades, helped support the Camp David

Accords. It also supports our security interests in countering trafficking of weapons and people into the Sinai, and in antiterrorism cooperation with the United States.

In recent weeks, Egypt's military has launched a major crackdown on terrorist activity and extremists in the Sinai Peninsula, carrying out arrests and attempting to seal smuggling tunnels connecting the Sinai to Gaza. U.S. cooperation is essential to the continuation of these activities.

Let me conclude by saying, at the end of the day, Egyptian leaders and the Egyptian military must show that they are committed to an inclusive political process, credible democratic elections, and democratic governance that protects the rights of religious minorities, women, civil society leaders, and a diversity of political parties.

That includes, from my perspective, vacating the June 4 verdicts for the 43 individuals convicted in the politically motivated trial of nongovernmental organization workers, including 16 Americans, and permitting civil society organizations to reopen their offices and operate freely. It also clearly means an immediate cessation of arrests and use of force against peaceful protestors.

Steps that exacerbate the divide in Egyptian society, including the use of force against protestors and arrests and harassment of pro-Morsi and Muslim Brotherhood leaders, serve only to deepen the chasm and forestall reconciliation.

The only way forward to a pluralistic, vibrant, and stable democracy lies in the inclusion of all political parties and groups, as long as they are committed to a democratic process and to peaceful change.

The United States has to move cautiously, not precipitously, in this delicate situation. The Paul amendment is not the answer when it comes to our future relationship with Egypt. The future of that relationship will be determined by our actions in the coming weeks.

Whether we will have a stable and willing partner on crucial matters of security, combating terrorism, trafficking of weapons and persons into the Sinai, and support for peace in the Middle East is up to us or we can stand aside and hope for the best. I think abandoning Egypt is a particularly poor choice. That is why I oppose the amendment and urge my colleagues to do the same.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have a couple unanimous consent requests. I would also say this: This is an important debate, and I ask unanimous consent that—on the floor now we have CORKER, we have MCCAIN and GRAHAM—I ask unanimous consent that if they use more than the allotted time here they be allowed to use that, and whatever time goes over that allotted time we have in the existing order would also be given to Senator PAUL.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 1 p.m. today, the Senate proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 201, Todd Jones, to be Director of ATF; that there be 1 hour for debate equally divided in the usual form prior to a vote on cloture on the nomination; that if cloture is invoked, all postcloture time be deemed expired and the Senate proceed to vote on the confirmation, with no intervening action or debate, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to the nomination; that any related statements be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that upon disposition of the Paul amendment, the Senate recess until 1 p.m. today; further, that the filing deadline for first-degree amendments to S. 1243, the transportation bill, be 1:30 p.m. today; finally, that when the Senate resumes legislative session following consideration of the Jones nomination, the Senate proceed to a period of morning business for 1 hour equally divided between the two leaders or their designees, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each, with the exception of Senator INHOFE, who is to be recognized for up to 30 minutes; that following the period of morning business, the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the Power nomination under the previous order.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, what this means is we will vote on the Paul amendment, give or take, in a half-hour, at around 11 o'clock, or shortly thereafter, whatever time the order allows, and we will then recess until 1 p.m. Then we will have the debate on the Jones nomination from 1 p.m. to 2 p.m., then the cloture vote at 2 p.m. If cloture is invoked, we will immediately vote on confirmation. We could have two votes at 2 p.m. We will have morning business from around 2:45 p.m. to 3:45 p.m., and then the Power nomination—to be U.N. Ambassador—debate from about 3:45 p.m. to 5:45 p.m., and then the vote on confirmation at around 5:45 p.m.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. I yield to the distinguished ranking member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator CORKER.

Mr. CORKER. I will be brief. I know that time may be extended. But let me

start by saying I understand how citizens across our country are frustrated. Our country has gone through financial distress. We have economic issues that are impacting people of all walks of life. I know as they look at what is happening around the world, there is frustration, generally speaking, with issues relative to foreign aid. I understand that.

I also understand we are a nation of laws. We have had an event in Egypt which is going to cause us to have to deal with that. I think we can deal with that in due time and live up to the laws of this Nation. I also understand, though, that we are the greatest Nation on the face of the Earth. One of the reasons we are the greatest Nation is because of the values we extend around the world and the fact that we have been a voice of calm.

We have been a country that has tried to continue to engender peace. I know the Senator from Kentucky and I share Fort Campbell, a place where some of our most outstanding fighting men and women are based. I know the Senator understands that much of what we do with foreign aid is to try to keep those men and women off the battlefield and in training. We do that to try to keep peace and to keep those men and women who protect our country from having to go to war.

The distinguished Senator from New Jersey just talked about the importance of Egypt. From the very beginning, when this all began just within the last month or 6 weeks, I have believed that the administration, candidly, has handled this well; that our Nation should be the voice of calmness. We should try to be the steady hand that allows this transition to occur in the right way.

At the same time, we should push them toward democracy. I think that is exactly what we are doing. We have had a debate throughout this week in our lunch sessions among Republicans. I know the Senator from Kentucky has made it clear that the poll numbers indicate we should cut off foreign aid. I want to say that we have tremendous responsibilities as Senators. One of the responsibilities we have, no doubt, is to represent our citizens.

On the other hand, we know that sometimes we understand that we should sell to the citizens the reasons that we do the things we do on this floor. I think most people in this body understand that just on a THUD bill, having an amendment that cuts off aid to Egypt is not a thoughtful process as it relates to foreign aid.

My appeal today is really not to my friends on the other side of the aisle, although I am sure some of them are contemplating what to do. But my appeal is to my friends on this side of the aisle. I have talked to many of them in private. I think many of them know this is terrible public policy.

No doubt, without us explaining to the American people why we should not jerk the rug out from under Egypt

as they go through this transition; no doubt, without us sharing the importance of that, the American people are going to look at aid to Egypt and see what is happening there and say: No, let's take that money and let's do something else. I think most people on this side of the aisle understand that is terrible public policy. I think most people on this side of the aisle want to stand and to be thoughtful Senators and do not want to have a poll-tested foreign policy.

We are going to have plenty of time to debate this issue in September. I think all of us know a lot is going to be happening during the recess. We have two Senators who are traveling to Egypt over the weekend to look at what is occurring there. I am going to be in the area in a few weeks.

It seems to me, as the greatest Nation on the face of the Earth, instead of having some poll-tested amendment that may play well in the short term, what we should do as Senators is be thoughtful, understand the greatness of this Nation, understand the millions of lives and livelihoods that are at stake in us being a calm hand in Egypt, understanding the impact that this is going to have on people all around the world and certainly our standing in the world, but our continued ability to help promote human rights, promote democracy, promote peace, promote calm.

So I would just urge the Senators on our side of the aisle, we have these things that come up, and we certainly have groups who come forth. I think all of us understand that is a big vote. This is a vote that says a lot about who we are as Senators. This is a vote that gives us an opportunity to step away from those short-term, hot, poll-tested amendments that have nothing to do with furthering the greatness of this Nation.

I would urge everybody in this body to stand, to be Senators, and to do what we know is the right thing to do; that is, to be calm, to address this issue as we should in the right way this September when all of us have more information to deal with this issue.

I thank the Presiding Officer for the opportunity to speak. I hope this body will rise and conduct themselves as the Senate should on issues of this importance. I thank the chairman for the time.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HIRONO). The Senator from New Jersey, Mr. MENENDEZ, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, let me just say briefly that I have gotten a lot of calls about Egypt as well. Look, I understand it. We look at what is happening over there, we look at some of the wild things that are happening in the streets, certainly tragedies as well. We see the oppression of religious minorities, and we wonder: Why do we continue to give aid to a country that does that? I think that is a very important question.

I think the problem we face is we in this place are sometimes put into a position between two absolutes, when there are other options available to us. The choice before us is not to cut off aid to Egypt or to continue aid to Egypt. I think the opportunity we have now is to restructure aid to Egypt in a way that furthers our national interest.

What is our national interest in Egypt? Our national interest is to have a secular, stable, democratic government that provides security so their economy can grow, a government that lives up to the Camp David Accords, that cooperates in counterterrorism, that prevents discrimination to religious minorities. Our foreign aid should be restructured—not simply canceled but restructured—so that it fits and fills that aim that we have for that country and for our national security interests in that country. That means we should restructure our foreign aid, not simply eliminate it but go back to the Egyptians and say: If you want to continue to get foreign aid from the United States, you are going to have to show measurable improvement on these four things: You are going to show us how you are protecting religious minorities; you are going to have to show us how you are advancing toward democracy and stability. You are going to have to show how you are doing these things. That needs to be measured. If they stop doing it, the aid stops coming.

I would also say regarding restructuring the aid that the aid should be geared toward what they need. They probably do not need that many for more F-16s. What they need is more capacity building for internal security. What they need is more capacity building to live up to the Camp David Accords. That is what they need. Our aid should be aimed toward that.

I also think it is a mistake to just say we are eliminating aid completely because if we eliminate aid completely, we lose leverage. They are still going to buy weapons. They will just not get them from us and our influence will be diminished.

So I think there is a third way. I think what has happened in Egypt is a unique opportunity to restructure—not to cancel but to restructure—and reframe our relationship with Egypt. If they do certain things, they will continue to get aid. If they move toward certain goals that are in our national interest, they will continue to get aid. They will continue to get aid that helps them meet these goals, not simply anything they ask for.

This is the opportunity we have now. This should be done in a thoughtful and careful way. I hope that is the direction the body will move. I think to simply cancel aid without putting these other conditions in place is a missed opportunity from which we should not walk away.

So I would say to our colleagues, let's not simply cut off aid. Let's take

the time to work so that we can restructure aid with Egypt in a way that furthers our national security interests: a secular, democratic government that lives up to the Camp David Accords, that cooperates in counterterrorism, that respects religious minorities, and that provides the internal security they need to create the economic growth they need so that they can be stable now and in the future and be a partner of ours.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the period for morning business following the consideration of the Jones nomination be extended by 40 minutes, with the additional time being equally divided between the two leaders or their designees, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each, with the exception of Senator INHOFE for 30 minutes and Senator MCCAIN for 20 minutes.

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

The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. GRAHAM. I thank the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. First, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Florida. Now is the time to be creative with our assistance to Egypt to try to change things while there is still hope of things changing in a positive direction.

I certainly understand. Why should we be selling F-16s to people who behave this way? The administration has put on hold the four F-16s that were due to be delivered to Egypt, trying to find out what is going to happen next. That makes sense to me. But why are we selling weapons to Egypt? It is because if we do not, someone else will. I want them to have F-16s and come to our pilot training bases. I want Egyptian officers to come to our military training academies. I want a relationship with the Egyptian military that can be beneficial to our national security interests. I want the people who build F-16s in America to get the business from Egypt to get some of our money back.

If they buy MIGs or Mirages we lose that. It is not a question of if they are going to buy fighter planes; it is a question of who they are going to buy them from. We have every right to withhold sales. We have every right to put them on hold temporarily. But to just sever this relationship now would be a huge mistake.

In fairness to Senator PAUL, he says we would resume aid once they get their act together and move back toward democracy. I think that is something worth noting. That is an understanding on his part that he is looking for an outcome that we can be more supportive of. The difference I have is

that if we cut off aid now, then I cannot tell you the consequences of what that would mean in terms of moving in the direction we would all like.

Unintended consequences to the decision jump out pretty clearly in my mind, and most of them are bad. Is it a coup? It certainly looks like one. It certainly sounds like one. But at the end of the day, if we are moving toward democracy and the military steps back and democratically elected leaders take over, I think that is the goal for all of us.

I wish we did not live in a world like we do. I wish things were easier. I wish the Arab Spring had been more successful. But the one thing I can say is that what happens in Egypt really does matter to us. If the largest country in the Arab world, the heart of the Arab world, Egypt, becomes a failed state, I promise you it will affect our national security interests for decades to come. It would be a nightmare for Israel, and it would take the whole region down a path that would be at best chaotic.

Can we prevent a failed state in Egypt? I think we can. I don't know for sure what is going to happen, but I do know this: If America does not try, if we do not stay engaged and shape history rather than observe it, we will pay a heavy price as a nation. So part of this amendment takes money that would be going to the Egyptian military and puts it on projects in the United States. I think one is a bridge in Kentucky. I have no doubt that there is a need for bridges in Kentucky and South Carolina. I would love to get my port deepened.

But to the people of Kentucky and to the people of South Carolina, if we stop the 1 percent of our budget—it is \$50 billion. That is no small sum. But if we cancelled it all out and just left \$3 billion for Israel—it seems everybody likes that idea. If we had \$3 billion to spend on affecting the world, is that smart?

How much of the debt would be retired if we canceled all foreign aid and brought it back into the United States? Not a whole lot. But here is what I believe would happen. If America withdrew our foreign assistance, a lot of bad things would happen to us. Having a say, having influence in a world that is increasingly dangerous seems to me to be a good idea. I am tired of having to resort to the military as the only solution to affect things.

The people in Egypt, the government particularly, wants a relationship with us. They have to earn it, as Senator RUBIO said. But to cut off our relationship with Egypt at this critical time, I think, would be extremely ill-advised, and the consequences to the people of Kentucky and South Carolina and every other State in the Union would be significant.

To my colleagues, when you cast your vote today about pausing, not terminating aid, but trying to reconstruct aid, I don't know how that fits in a 30-second sound bite. It is probably easier

to explain the "no" vote than it is a "yes" vote. But I do know this: Your country would be well served if you decide today to pause and wait to find out the right answer in Egypt.

I do know this: If Egypt goes, the entire region blows up. The biggest fear I have is radical Islamists are closer to getting nuclear weapons and chemical weapons than any time in my lifetime. If Egypt becomes a failed state, that is one more problem for us to have to deal with, rather than focusing on the Iranian efforts to march toward a nuclear weapon.

Radical Islam has not forgotten about us. The question for us is have we forgotten about radical Islam. If we wish to stop this march in the Middle East of radical Islam getting stronger and stronger and stronger, let's try to hang on to our relationship with Egypt. If it becomes a failed state, and the Sinai becomes one of the great safe havens for terrorist groups—and the Egyptian Army, to their credit, is now involved with the Sinai—the cataclysmic effect of a failed state in Egypt would be the biggest boost to radical Islam I could think of. It would do a lot of damage to our national security and our best friend in the region, Israel.

I have a letter from our APAC. I asked them to comment on this. They state:

Dear Senators Menendez and Corker:

We are writing to express our concerns over the Paul amendment to the Transportation/HUD Appropriations bill that would eliminate military assistance and sales to Egypt. We do not support cutting off all assistance to Egypt at this time, as we believe it could increase the instability in Egypt and undermine important U.S. interests and negatively impact our Israeli ally.

As you know, Egypt is the largest Arab state in the Middle East and has played a vital role in advancing key U.S. interests in that region. Citing just two examples, the government of Egypt has maintained the peace with Israel and is taking important steps to address the instability in the Sinai. Events in Egypt are rapidly evolving, and we believe that for now the United States should avoid taking any precipitous actions against Egypt such as cutting off all assistance. We look forward to continuing to work with you on these critical issues.

One final thought: Maybe one day I will agree with Senator PAUL in saying we have to sever our ties with the Egyptian military and the Egyptian people. Maybe one day I will come and cosponsor the Senator's amendment or maybe come up with one of my own.

I can tell you if that day ever comes, it will be one of the saddest days of my life because that would mean Egypt is gone. If Egypt is gone, all hell is going to break loose.

Mr. MENENDEZ. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Arizona, a member of the committee, Mr. MCCAIN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. May I ask the time situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Arizona has unlimited time.

Mr. McCAIN. Does the Senator from Kentucky wish to respond?

Mr. PAUL. Go ahead.

Mr. McCAIN. Madam President, I think it is important in the context of this amendment on the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development bill that we put into focus what this amendment is really affecting. It is affecting the most important nation in the Arab world, the heart and soul of the Arab world, Egypt. All countries in the Middle East are important, but Egypt is the most important.

In Egypt today there are demonstrations, there are scores of people being killed, hundreds being wounded. This Friday, only 2 days from now, after prayers, there are predictions that there could be even more carnage that will take place as a result of the pro-Morsi people taking to the streets of Cairo and other cities throughout Egypt.

I think we ought to consider this amendment in the context of what is happening in arguably the most important nation in the Arab world. Should we ask ourselves that at this point without adequate hearings, without adequate discussion, without input from the administration, as well as the oversight responsibilities by the Foreign Relations Committee, the Appropriations Committee, the Armed Services Committee, all of whom, chairmen and ranking members, are opposed to this amendment?

First, I caution against a rush to judgment on this issue. It requires, frankly, more than 1 hour equally divided of debate on the floor of the Senate.

I would also like to point out this amendment is part of a larger debate that has been going on in the Republican Party for well over a century. Prior to World War I, there was the isolationist wing of our party. After World War I in the 1930s, there were the America Firsters. After World War II, there was the Eisenhower wing of our party and the Taft wing. The debate has gone on for the heart and soul of the Republican Party.

This debate and this amendment that is posed by my friend from Kentucky is part of that overall debate as to what the role of the United States should be in the world. Should we take our money from Egypt and give it to build a bridge in Kentucky? Should we take our foreign aid and cut it to the point to where we no longer have influence in these countries throughout the world and spend it on much needed projects that are the result of a very ailing and still serious recession in which we still remain?

I think the vote on this amendment has even larger implications than that of whether we should cut off all assistance to Egypt. By the way, my friends, I don't think it is an accident that APAC, our friends there who represent the interests of the State of Israel, have opposed this amendment. If there is further upheaval in the Sinai, and if

there is a collapse of the rule of law in Egypt, I don't think there is any doubt that the threat to Israel is dramatically increased.

I made it clear, and so has my friend from South Carolina, that it was a coup. It was a coup and our law calls for that. But that is an implementation of a law that needs to be done in a way that is in consultation with the Foreign Relations Committee, the Appropriations Committee, and, in fact, all Members of the Senate.

I think it is important for us to send a message to Egypt that we are not abandoning them, but what we are doing is trying to caution them to try to modify their behavior, to tell General Aziz that he has to have an inclusive government, he has to allow the Muslim Brotherhood to partake in the upcoming elections, and the Muslim Brotherhood has to be told that they have to renounce violence.

Right now Egypt is spiraling down into a situation of chaos, which I can promise my colleagues will sooner or later pose a threat to our vital national security interests. The most important nation in the Arab world descending into chaos is going to be a threat to the United States of America.

I urge my colleagues—and I urge my friend from Kentucky, with respect—to realize this amendment would send the wrong message at the wrong time. It may be coincidental, but this Friday is going to be an important day in Egypt. Should we be sending the message to the Egyptians: OK, you are on your own?

Yes, other countries in the region are contributing enormously to the Egyptians without conditions. But the support or condemnation of the United States of America, the best, most free, and still most influential Nation in the world, is of vital importance. At this time, I think it would be a terrific mistake for the United States to send the message to Egypt: You are on your own.

I hope we understand that it is not about U.S. foreign assistance; it is about what serves our interests and our values. This, my friends, is a debate that we need to have over the weeks, months, and years ahead in, probably, one of the best places to have that debate.

I urge my colleagues, no matter how they feel about assistance to Egypt, that we are committed. I urge them to appreciate that we are committed to a long debate about this issue.

I have confidence in the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee that we will be addressing this issue seriously. The Senator from Kentucky is a member and would certainly take part.

I urge my colleagues to understand that an amendment on the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development-led appropriations bill is not the venue. We need to have this debate not only about Egypt but America's role in the world. I look forward to joining him, but today is not the day to take a

step that could have repercussions over time that will damage the vital national security interests of the United States.

I urge my colleagues to vote to table the Paul amendment.

I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. PAUL. This is exactly, precisely the time it should come up because on the infrastructure bill that we are looking at, this gives Americans the chance to show great contrast. Do you want to do nation building overseas or do you want to do nation building at home? Do you want to spend billions of dollars in Egypt or would you rather build some roads at home?

I think it provides a perfect contrast. In fact, there couldn't be a better place to have a discussion on this issue.

We always hear a lot of empty thoughts and empty promises: Oh, we will do this in committee. We will do this.

They don't want this debate. I have been fighting tooth and nail against Members of my own party to get to this debate, to bring it to the floor, to bring it to the American people.

Let's be very clear about what the amendment does. It halts military aid until they have an election. It is just obeying the law.

Let's be very clear. Maybe we should do a summary of what their arguments are. This is a summary of their arguments: They love sending American money overseas so much that they don't mind breaking the law. I didn't hear one of them explain how they are going to adhere to the law. The law says military aid ends when there is a coup. The President says you can't make him say there is a coup. There probably is a coup, but he is never going to say it, and he is never going to adjudicate it. Who is going to adjudicate whether there is a coup?

This is about temporarily halting aid. Some people rise and say: Oh, we will be closed out, and they will buy their weapons someplace else. They don't have any money. We give them the money to buy our weapons.

Some have said they want to promote democracy. Well, there is an exemption. You can spend as much money on democracy promotion.

Mr. McCAIN. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. PAUL. Not now.

The thing is, we have to understand what this is about. We have to understand this is about a temporary halting of buying weapons. People say: Well, if we don't give them planes, we don't pay them to buy our planes, they will think we don't like them. They will go to war with Israel and everything will be so much worse.

They have hundreds of F-16s. They have thousands of tanks. I am precisely worried about them using them against Israel when there is chaos and blood running in the streets, when there are millions of people protesting.

Do you think it is a good time to send more weapons? Do you think it is a good time to send more weapons when millions of people are in the streets?

What happens if these weapons are used against Israel? The canard of bringing the letter—it always happens. Someone brings in a letter. I have spoken to many people who love, respect, and have a great deal of admiration for Israel. I admire our relationship and alliance and am very proud of the fact that we stand together on so many issues. To bring it up and say the people who are against this don't care about Israel is just a canard.

I think this precisely—continuing to arm an unstable government in Egypt—could well be to Israel's harm. This is precisely why I bring this amendment forward.

Also, it needs to be clear for the record that everyone who has come forward together to send more of your money overseas, to send good money after bad, every one of them was for sending it to the Muslim Brotherhood. We hear them talking about Islamic jihadists and how they are worried about them. No, they are not. They were for funding the Islamic jihadists. They were for funding the Muslim Brotherhood just months ago.

I have had this vote before. I voted to cut off aid to the Muslim Brotherhood also. I have produced an amendment. They all voted against it then because we were going to do this on a more rational, reasonable pace someday, somewhere, in some fictitious committee. No, we are not. They want the money to continue. It doesn't go to the Egyptian people. It doesn't buy good will. It buys ill will. Do you know what the money is spent on? Tanks. Tanks roll over people in protest.

I have no love lost for the Muslim Brotherhood, but they have disappeared them. We are going to be giving money to the military that is disappearing people. No one has heard from President Morsi. Most people think he was actually elected in a fair election. I don't agree with radical Islam. I don't think he would be a good President for any country. I wouldn't give him any money. But we are going to give money to people who make people disappear?

Does anybody remember the Soviet Union? These same people stand and say how bad it is the Soviet Union makes someone disappear. I am absolutely with them. I support that. It is terrible. That is what the military in Egypt is doing—making people disappear. Most of the members of the government haven't been seen in days, maybe weeks. We have no idea where they are.

Once again, let me be clear. I have no sympathy for them. I don't want to give them money either. But all these people who want to fund the military, they all want to fund the Muslim Brotherhood. The only thing consistent about their argument is sending your money to other people.

There is a finite amount of money. Detroit lays in ruins, Chicago is full of violence, and there are bridges everywhere. Don't let them paint this that I have some special thing in Kentucky. There are no earmarks. There is no special money going to Kentucky. This is going into the Transportation bill for the whole country.

There is actually nothing in here special for Chicago or Detroit, but I point it out that we have problems at home. Maybe we should do some nation building here at home.

The other side will falsely say: Oh, you want isolationism. You want to disengage from the world. Hogwash. I want to be involved. I am for being involved with Egypt. I am for trade. I am for international and global interaction and diplomacy and all those things. But do you think you are making the world a better place by sending a few more F-16s and tanks and tear gas to Egypt? Do you think that is somehow making the world a safer place? No.

If I thought the foreign aid was going to do something good, I might be for it. Mubarak and his family fly on private jets, dine on caviar and champagne. Your money is more likely to buy a chateau in Paris for the Mubarak family than it is to buy bread for the people of Egypt.

They say: Oh, well, the Egyptian people will not like us anymore if we don't give them money. Seventy percent of the Egyptian people have said they do not want our money. It doesn't go to them. The people, by the millions, are rioting in Cairo. By the hundreds of thousands they are rioting in Tahrir Square. They are not rioting for American aid. They are rioting for us to quit giving aid to the despots who rule them.

Mubarak ruled for 30-some-odd years. He ruled by martial law. He made people disappear also. What about human rights? What about dignity? What about trials they just recently—the Muslim Brotherhood—tried 16 Americans in absentia. If they were there, they would have put them in jail. Yet all these same people are afraid to take away money.

How do you think leverage would best work? How would we have leverage? Maybe if we withheld some aid, we would have leverage. But if you give them everything they want all the time, any time, do you think they are going to do something differently? They say the definition of insanity is doing the same thing over and over and expecting a different response. We have given the aid for 30-some-odd years.

We gave a dictator in the Congo—Mobutu—aid for years and years. They called his wife Gucci Mobutu. Why? Because she would take a Louis Vuitton bag, full of about \$1 million in cash, to Paris and spend it in a weekend—your money, our money, spent on lavish homes. Mobutu had seven palaces. I think Mubarak has six or seven palaces. They steal the money. It doesn't

buy the good will of the people. It actually buys ill will. It does completely the opposite of everything they say it does. It does completely the opposite.

So there is a disagreement on this. But the one thing there is not a disagreement on is that it is against the law. The Republican Party maintains: Oh, we are for the rule of law, and we proudly beat our chest all the time and say to Democrats: Oh, you don't want the rule of law; the President disobeys the rule of law. Guess what. This time many Democrats and Republicans will flout the rule of law because the rule of law says military aid ends when you have a coup. It doesn't say you can wait around until it is convenient for you and maybe you can parcel out the aid in different ways. It doesn't say that. It says military aid ends until there is an election. It is very clear about this.

So the argument is about whether you believe in the rule of law. If you do, there is no question you have to vote for this amendment because this amendment simply restates the law. I am not even creating the law. I am just restating the law that says aid ends and it resumes when there is an election.

So those who say he is against all aid, don't listen to him, he is against all aid, that is not what this amendment does. This amendment enforces the law that actually every one of these men and women voted for. They voted for this law. It has been on the books 30-some-odd years, and the law says that aid ends when you have a military coup. So they are all going to vote to bypass a law they have all supported. Every one of them supported this law.

This isn't some extreme position of no aid; this is a position of temporarily halting it. It is their plan, but it is not convenient now to obey the law they passed.

This is an important debate. It is not about doing things to harm Israel; it is about doing things that, actually, I think would be beneficial to Israel. It is not about ending all aid; it is about obeying the law. It shouldn't be about whether aid is good or bad. I think there are a lot of bad things and unintended consequences that come from the aid, but it is not about that. It is about whether we are going to obey the law.

I say think long and hard about this. Some say they are going to do something more important than what their people at home want, and they are very proud they are going to stand against the will of the people. Three-fourths of Republicans, three-fourths of Democrats, and three-fourths of Independents or higher think it is a bad idea to be sending good money after bad overseas. We do have problems at home and this could go toward fixing them.

Some say it is only 1 percent. Foreign aid is only 1 percent. Guess what. If you cut 1 percent of the budget each year, the budget balances within about

5 years. It is called the penny plan. Many on my side have actually endorsed this plan. So 1 percent isn't an insignificant amount of money, and it is not working. It is doing the wrong thing.

So I urge a "yes" vote on the amendment.

I retain the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DONNELLY). The Senator from New Jersey. Mr. MENENDEZ. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes.

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

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, this has been a robust debate. Listening to my friend and colleague from Kentucky, I appreciate his views, but I strongly disagree with him. Above all, let's say what it is and what it is not about. This is not about Mubarak and chateaus. Mubarak is gone. The Egyptian people decided that. He is gone. It is not about Mobutu or anybody else. You can conflate anything you want and throw it up against the wall, but this is a question of whether we will continue to pursue our own national interest and national security in Egypt, in the Middle East.

This is, in fact, about democracy. It is about the 30 million who were protesting in the streets of Egypt, whom Senator PAUL referred to. But their call is not for us to leave; their call is for us to engage with them. As the experts in this field who gave testimony before the committee said, the one uniting thing among all elements of Egyptian society we could do is cut off all aid. It would unite in what? Against us.

This is about making sure we have a stable Middle East. It is not a canard to suggest that Israel's security is at stake, because when you have hundreds of tunnels in the Sinai being used by extremists to send weapons into Gaza to attack Israel, it is about their security. I think no one knows better about their security than the State of Israel itself knows about their security.

It is not a canard. It is a fundamental element of whether we are going to have an ally that can be safe and secure. It is a fundamental element of whether we are going to have the ability to affect the outcome in Egypt in a way that will create stability and peace. It is a fundamental element of whether we have to send soldiers abroad versus keeping them here at home. Because when there is peace and stability, we ultimately do not have to engage with our military in pursuit of our national interest and security.

When terrorists cannot organize in Egypt, we are safer at home in the United States. So let's not cut off all aid to Egypt in a transportation, housing, and urban development bill when, in fact, our vital national interests are at stake. There is plenty of opportunity to help America's cities. I was a mayor. No one wants to help America's cities more. You will get to do that if you vote for the THUD bill, if you put

your vote up. But this is not a way to achieve that.

Mr. MCCAIN. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MENENDEZ. I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Ronald Reagan used to say facts are stubborn things. The Senator from Kentucky just said Egypt has no money. Isn't it a fact the Gulf countries and the Saudis have just given them \$13 billion?

Mr. MENENDEZ. Absolutely.

Mr. MCCAIN. Again, isn't the question whether the Senator from Kentucky knows what is better for Israel or Israel knows what is better for Israel? The fact is, AIPAC and the Israelis are adamantly opposed to this amendment; isn't that correct?

Mr. MENENDEZ. It is true they are opposed, and I would assume Israel, a sovereign state, knows what its security interests are better than anybody else.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. What is the status of time right now? I think we should bring this to a close soon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time remaining is under the control of the Senator from Kentucky, and he has 2 minutes remaining.

The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, several points have been made about whether we should engage with Egypt. Absolutely, we should. But the Egyptian people don't see it as engagement when the engagement is at the end of a truncheon, when the engagement is tear gas bought with American money and then sprayed on them. They do not quite understand that as engagement. So buying arms—American tanks and American tear gas—to be used for crowd control isn't exactly what the Egyptian people have in mind as far as engagement.

With regard to Israel, there is no unified statement from the nation of Israel saying they are for this. I have had both private and public discussions with the leaders of Israel, and to tell you the truth, without naming individuals, I can tell you they are not too excited about sending more arms to Egypt. So for someone to come to the floor and say they speak for the nation of Israel, they speak for all people who love Israel in our country, is false.

There are probably 20 different groups in our country that support the nation of Israel and support them as our ally. I speak to them all the time. I visit with them daily and weekly in our office. So what I can tell you is if you talk to the people, to the grassroots and not to the so-called leadership, you will find a much different story. Because I would promise you—let me speak to the entire crowd at an AIPAC meeting and we will see whether they like sending more weapons to

the Muslim Brotherhood or more weapons to Egypt. I think you will find a resounding no.

This amendment is ultimately about the law, and I hope my colleagues will remember that if they vote against this amendment they are flouting the law, they are voting to disobey the law, they are voting against the rule of law, and they are actually voting against a law they have all voted for.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I think most Members of the body realize the THUD bill is not the place to address major foreign policy. I think all understand that in September it is the plan of this body to deal with the legal issues regarding foreign aid to Egypt, so I move to table the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 86, nays 13, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 195 Leg.]

YEAS—86

Alexander	Franken	Murphy
Ayotte	Gillibrand	Murray
Baldwin	Graham	Nelson
Baucus	Hagan	Portman
Begich	Harkin	Pryor
Bennet	Hatch	Reed
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Reid
Blunt	Hirono	Roberts
Boozman	Hoeven	Rockefeller
Boxer	Inhofe	Rubio
Brown	Isakson	Sanders
Burr	Johanns	Schatz
Cantwell	Johnson (SD)	Schumer
Cardin	Johnson (WI)	Schumer
Carper	Kaine	Scott
Casey	King	Sessions
Chambliss	Kirk	Shaheen
Chiesa	Klobuchar	Shelby
Coats	Landrieu	Stabenow
Cochran	Leahy	Tester
Collins	Levin	Toomey
Coons	Manchin	Udall (CO)
Corker	Markey	Udall (NM)
Cornyn	McCain	Vitter
Donnelly	McCaskill	Warner
Durbin	Menendez	Warren
Feinstein	Merkley	Whitehouse
Fischer	Mikulski	Wicker
Flake	Murkowski	Wyden

NAYS—13

Barrasso	Grassley	Paul
Coburn	Heller	Risch
Crapo	Lee	Thune
Cruz	McConnell	
Enzi	Moran	

NOT VOTING—1

Heitkamp

The motion was agreed to.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote and lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 1 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 11:39 a.m., recessed until 1 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Ms. BALDWIN).

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF BYRON TODD JONES TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE BUREAU OF ALCOHOL, TOBACCO, FIREARMS, AND EXPLOSIVES

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

Nomination of Byron Todd Jones, of Minnesota, to be Director of the Bureau of Tobacco, Alcohol, Firearms, and Explosives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 1 hour of debate on the nomination equally divided in the usual form. If no one yields time, time will be charged equally to both sides.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as if in morning business.

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

(The remarks of Mr. HOEVEN pertaining to the submission of S. Con. Res. 21 are printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

Mr. HOEVEN. With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

NASA AUTHORIZATION

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Madam President, we passed the NASA authorization bill out of the Commerce Committee yesterday. Sadly, I must report that it is the first time the NASA bill has been a partisan vote that I can ever remember. NASA—this little program that is such a can-do agency—has always been not only bipartisan, but it has been nonpartisan.

There was actually no real disagreement with the content, the policies set in the NASA authorization bill. It is very similar to what the Appropriations Committee indeed has already passed out of the full Appropriations Committee. But, sadly, there is an insistence that this artificial budget limitation, which is like a meat cleaver cutting across the board—some would describe it as a guillotine coming down across programs willy-nilly—cutting

programs such as the National Institutes of Health and all of the medical research that is going on and, indeed, a broadly embraced bipartisan program such as our space program.

So the vote was 13 to 12—specifically along partisan lines—not because of the content, not because of the policy, but because of the funding level. In the bill that passed, we had the NASA authorization for appropriations at the level provided in the budget resolution that passed the Senate—\$18.1 billion. That is about level funding for NASA, this little agency that is trying to do so much. However, our Republican friends wanted it cut to \$16.8 billion, and some spoke favorably toward the House bill that has it cut back to \$16.6 billion.

If we cut \$1.5 billion out of this little agency, it can't do what it is attempting to do to get us ready to go to Mars in the decade of the 2030s and in the meantime to get our human-rated rockets in the commercial sector so we can send our astronauts to and from the international space station where six human beings are doing research right now. The multiplicity of science projects, the planetary exploration that is going on, and the aeronautics research that is going on—all of that is within this little agency.

My hope is that as we get further along in the fiscal year, we are going to hit some grand design, some grand bargain, some great bipartisan agreement on funding that maybe will include tax reform but that will then allow us to operate with common sense instead of some artificial budgetary mechanism called sequester.

Yesterday it was stated that indeed the NASA authorization bill violated the Budget Control Act of 2011. I tried to explain in the committee that it did not. As a matter of fact, the Budget Control Act is an overall level on compressing appropriations. It has no effect on the authorization for appropriations. That is where we set policy, and then we leave it up to the Appropriations Committee to set the actual funding.

So I am happy to say that we made the step that we needed to make. We have the bill proceeding now out of the committee. I am sad to say that for the first time ever this broadly based, wildly popular, not only bipartisan but nonpartisan program, called America's space program, has come out of the committee with a partisan vote.

Let's turn this around, and let's not have this excessive partisanship and this ideological rigidity that is gripping this country's politics. Let's not have that infect our Nation's space program.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 15 minutes on the Todd nomination.

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

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I come to the floor to ask my colleagues to vote against cloture on the nomination, and here are my reasons for asking that of my colleagues.

Earlier this week I outlined my general objection to the Senate proceeding to a final vote on the confirmation of Mr. B. Todd Jones, the nominee to be Director of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms. As I explained, the Senate should not be voting on a nomination when there is an open investigation.

In this case the Office of Special Counsel is investigating Mr. Jones in a complaint that he retaliated against a whistleblower in the U.S. Attorney's Office for the District of Minnesota.

Because of the way this nomination was handled in committee, I was able to conduct only a limited investigation. But what I found should give all of us pause—real pause—on this nomination because it gives me concern about Mr. Jones's leadership ability and raises doubts about whether he should be promoted to head this office.

According to both the whistleblowing assistant U.S. attorney and the former head of the FBI in Minnesota, relationships with Federal, State, and local authorities deteriorated significantly under Jones's leadership. The problems primarily involved agencies that worked drug cases and violent crime.

Mr. Jones addressed the issue in a meeting with criminal prosecutors in his office. According to the whistleblower, following that meeting, Mr. Jones came to the whistleblower's office and asked for his candid opinion of what could be done about the problem.

The whistleblower gave Jones his candid opinion, and a few weeks later he put it in writing what he had told Jones during this meeting. His e-mail to Jones included allegations of mismanagement by one of his supervisors, the head of the Narcotics and Violent Crime Unit.

The very next day, that supervisor called that whistleblower on the carpet and, according to the whistleblower, interrogated him about his work in search of a pretext to discipline him.

Failing to find a substantive reason to discipline him, his supervisors then suspended him for 5 days for his demeanor during the meeting. Now, based on what we know at this point, it certainly looks like retaliation, and it helps explain why the Office of Special Counsel believed these allegations merited further investigation. Remember, only about 10 percent, 1 in 10 of these types of allegations is selected for investigation by the Special Counsel.

To be fair, we do not know the full story. The Office of Special Counsel has not finished its investigation into the matter. But this fact remains: There is an open investigation of serious allegations of whistleblower retaliation, and because that investigation remains open, this body—the Senate of the United States—should have the full information about the nominee, and it