

chaotic city. In true smalltown fashion, she knows everyone, never forgets a name or a face, and has a smile and a kind remark for everyone she sees. I have often said that Senators are merely constitutional impediments to their staff, and the same can surely be said for Ruby. Her steadfast service and collegiality are part of what makes the Senate work. Ruby, thank you for all that you have done for the Senate, and we wish you the best in retirement.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, as I have said previously, there are many people who work behind the scenes to help the Senate function. We tend to take them for granted, but we shouldn't. I would like to take this opportunity to acknowledge one such Senate staffer, Deputy Director of Doorkeepers Ruby Paone, who is retiring after more than 41 of steadfast service to the U.S. Senate and to our Nation. Everyone knows and loves Ruby, who has been here longer than any U.S. Senator currently serving, except for our esteemed colleague, the senior Senator from Vermont.

Ruby Paone, one of Lena and Wilbur Smith's five children, grew up on a farm in Bladenboro, NC, where she spent her summers pulling peanuts and harvesting tobacco. She graduated from St. Andrew's University and then came to Washington, DC. On March 17, 1975, she started working in the Senate as a card desk attendant. Then she became a reception room attendant and steadily worked her way up to her present position. Along the way, she met another Senate staffer, Marty Paone. The two of them starting dating, and then they were married in 1983. The Washington Post reported at the time:

Senator Robert Byrd paused in the debate to inform his colleagues that Ruby Grey Smith, who has worked in the Senate Reception Room for the last eight years, had married Marty Patrick Paone, a member of the floor staff of the Democratic Policy Committee. Byrd observed that with all the burdens of the Senate, the marriage shows that 'every cloud does have a silver lining.' Quick to agree with the minority leader, Majority Leader Howard Baker rose to add his congratulations, remembering that on the wedding day the press of Senate business almost interfered with the wedding hour. Sen. Howard Metzenbaum rushed out to get Mrs.

Paone to hear the words of congratulation and she was there to see the chamber burst into applause. It may have been the best thing done in that Chamber all year.

As Senator REID noted yesterday, Ruby has been here for seven different Presidential administrations, 10 consecutive inaugurations, 16 different Sergeants-at-Arms, and 383 different Senators. Ruby's husband, Marty, who currently serves as deputy assistant to the President for legislative affairs, served as the Democratic secretary longer than anyone else in the history of the Senate. He worked in the Senate for 32 years overall, so he and Ruby have devoted nearly three-quarters of a century to this institution. Is there any other family so committed to service in the U.S. Senate? I doubt it. But the family's service is not ending with Ruby's retirement, fortunately. Ruby and Marty's daughter, Stephanie, works in the Democratic cloakroom and their son, Tommy, works at the Senate appointments desk. They proudly and ably carry on the Paone family tradition of outstanding Senate service.

I believe the U.S. Senate—Senators and staff—is a big family. Like any family, we certainly have our disagreements. But I am sure we can all agree that Ruby Paone has been a cherished member of the Senate family for over four decades, and we will miss her here. But we take solace in knowing that she is leaving so she can spend more time with her most important family—her husband, Marty, and their children Alexander, Stephanie, and Tommie. We have been so fortunate to have Ruby in the Senate family for the past 41-plus years. The American people are so fortunate to have talented and dedicated public servants like Ruby and Marty and Stephanie and Tommy Paone. I know the entire Senate joins me in thanking Ruby for her service and wishing her and her family the very best.

BUDGETARY REVISIONS

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, section 251 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 establishes statutory limits on discretionary spending and allows for various adjust-

ments to those limits, while sections 302 and 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 allow the chairman of the Budget Committee to establish and make revisions to allocations, aggregates, and levels consistent with those adjustments.

On May 19, 2016, the Senate agreed to Senate amendment No. 3900, filed by Senator BLUNT. This amendment provides funding to combat the Zika virus. The amendment would increase budget authority by \$1,098 million in fiscal year 2016 and increase outlays by \$147 million and \$508 million in fiscal year 2016 and fiscal year 2017, respectively. The amendment includes language that would designate its spending as emergency pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Deficit Control Act of 1985. The inclusion of these designations makes this spending eligible for an adjustment under the Congressional Budget Act.

As a result, I am increasing the budgetary aggregate for fiscal year 2016 by \$1,098 million in budget authority and \$147 million in outlays. I am increasing the budgetary aggregate for fiscal year 2017 by \$508 million in outlays. Further, I am revising the budget authority and outlay allocations to the Appropriations Committee by \$1,098 million in revised nonsecurity budget authority and \$147 million in outlays for fiscal year 2016 and by \$508 million in outlays in fiscal year 2017.

I ask unanimous consent that the accompanying tables, which provide details about the adjustment, be printed in the RECORD.

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

REVISION TO BUDGETARY AGGREGATES

(Pursuant to Section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and S. Con. Res. 11, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2016)

	\$s in millions	2016
Current Spending Aggregates:		
Budget Authority		3,069,829
Outlays		3,091,246
Adjustments:		
Budget Authority		1,098
Outlays		147
Revised Spending Aggregates:		
Budget Authority		3,070,927
Outlays		3,091,393

REVISION TO SPENDING ALLOCATION TO THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016

(Pursuant to Sections 302 and 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974)

	\$s in millions	2016
Current Allocation*:		
Revised Security Discretionary Budget Authority		548,091
Revised Nonsecurity Category Discretionary Budget Authority		527,857
General Purpose Outlays		1,173,067
Adjustments:		
Revised Security Discretionary Budget Authority		0
Revised Nonsecurity Category Discretionary Budget Authority		1,098
General Purpose Outlays		147
Revised Allocation*:		
Revised Security Discretionary Budget Authority		548,091
Revised Nonsecurity Category Discretionary Budget Authority		528,955
General Purpose Outlays		1,173,214

* Excludes amounts designated for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to Section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

Memorandum: Above Adjustments by Designation	Program Integrity	Disaster Relief	Emergency	Total
Revised Security Discretionary Budget Authority	0	0	0	0
Revised Nonsecurity Category Discretionary Budget Authority	0	0	1,098	1,098
General Purpose Outlays	0	0	147	147

REVISION TO BUDGETARY AGGREGATES

(Pursuant to Section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and Section 102 of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2015)

\$s in millions	2017
Current Spending Aggregates:	
Budget Authority	3,212,350
Outlays	3,219,192

REVISION TO BUDGETARY AGGREGATES—Continued

(Pursuant to Section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and Section 102 of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2015)

\$s in millions	2017
Adjustments:	
Budget Authority	0
Outlays	508

REVISION TO BUDGETARY AGGREGATES—Continued

(Pursuant to Section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and Section 102 of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2015)

\$s in millions	2017
Revised Spending Aggregates:	
Budget Authority	3,212,350
Outlays	3,219,700

REVISION TO SPENDING ALLOCATION TO THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2017

(Pursuant to Sections 302 and 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974)

\$s in millions	2017
Current Allocation:	
Revised Security Discretionary Budget Authority	551,068
Revised Nonsecurity Category Discretionary Budget Authority	518,531
General Purpose Outlays	1,181,801
Adjustments:	
Revised Security Discretionary Budget Authority	0
Revised Nonsecurity Category Discretionary Budget Authority	0
General Purpose Outlays	508
Revised Allocation:	
Revised Security Discretionary Budget Authority	551,068
Revised Nonsecurity Category Discretionary Budget Authority	518,531
General Purpose Outlays	1,182,309
Memorandum: Detail of Adjustments Made Above	
	OCO Program Integrity Disaster Relief Emergency Total
Revised Security Discretionary Budget Authority	0 0 0 0 0
Revised Nonsecurity Category Discretionary Budget Authority	0 0 0 0 0
General Purpose Outlays	0 0 0 508 508

FRANK R. LAUTENBERG CHEMICAL SAFETY FOR THE 21ST CENTURY BILL

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, the following information is in response to an article entered into the record by Senator BOXER of California earlier today.

The Hearst News article in question was published in the San Francisco Chronicle and implies that the chemical industry drafted S. 697, the Frank R. Lautenberg Chemical Safety for the 21st Century Act. This implication is false.

The bill authors, including myself, wrote this bill. Drafts of the bill were circulated to many interested stakeholders throughout the drafting process and returned with comments. This process took over 3 years, and drafts were circulated each step of the way. Reforming the Toxic Substances Control Act was a very involved and transparent process.

Environmental groups, trial lawyers, industry, State officials, and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency were consulted at many stages throughout the process.

All of their input is reflected in the bill in various provisions, often the same ones. This is major comprehensive legislation that has received wide bipartisan support.

The New York Times looked into the allegation that the chemical industry wrote the bill. Their lead reporter, Eric Lipton, wrote on March 17: "Lots of players, including enviros, submitted drafts with proposed changes."

Again, many drafts of this bill were shared by a variety of Senate offices with many stakeholders in a very engaged process over 3 years.

It is disappointing that I must refute this allegation in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, but it is important to get the facts straight when explaining the legislative history of TSCA reform.

(At the request of Mr. REID, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

TRUCK DRIVERS' WORKING HOURS RULE

• Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I rise to speak on an amendment I filed last week to the Transportation appropriations bill. The bill passed the Senate last week. I did not offer my amendment for a vote, but it has been willfully mischaracterized by an industry campaign, so I wanted to take a few minutes to explain it.

My amendment, Blumenthal amendment No. 4002, would improve the safety of our roads. America depends on truck drivers to move our goods around; truckers and the trucking industry perform a vital service. But truckers who work too many hours in a week, like any other drivers who spend too much time behind the wheel, get tired and can't drive safely. So since the Franklin D. Roosevelt administration, there have been limits placed on the number of hours they can work in a week.

In 2003, President Bush raised the limit from 60 hours on duty in a 7-day week, where it had been for decades, to 82 hours in a 7-day week. This increased truck drivers' fatigue. So in 2013, President Obama sought to make some changes, bringing the limit back down to 70 hours and ensuring that drivers could rest when the body needs it most: at night.

The Obama administration's rule was based on sound science, thousands of comments, and, most importantly, a prioritization of safety over profits, but it was opposed by many trucking companies, who were accustomed to working their drivers to the max, regardless of the consequences for other drivers on the road.

Over the past few years, in a process I will not describe in detail here, the trucking industry succeeded in gutting the new rule, not through legislation in the Commerce Committee, which has both the jurisdiction and the expertise, but through the appropriations proc-

ess. Language on appropriations bills suspended the rule and required cumbersome studies before it could return.

The bill before us continues this trend, including language to make it clear that the Bush administration rules will return after the study, and it enshrines a statutory cap on truck drivers' working hours, one that will be extremely difficult to change even in the face of new data or scientific evidence.

This is terrible precedent. It encourages truck drivers to put in nearly double an average work week behind the wheel of an 80,000-pound big rig, the last place in the world we want someone who is falling asleep.

My amendment would let us go back to the rules that existed in 2013, rather than this mess, masquerading as a solution. It would give us the opportunity to debate this issue fully and to put aside the counterproductive language in this appropriations bill.

However, while I am not pushing for a vote on this amendment, it is supported by the ranking member of the Commerce committee, Senator NELSON, and my Commerce colleagues, Senators MARKEY and BOOKER. Unfortunately, due to a campaign of misinformation, it has become controversial. And I believe the underlying measure, including critical funding to fight the Zika virus, must not be delayed.

But I am pushing for a commitment from my colleagues to work with me in conference and, in the long-term, to find a solution. Four thousand people die a year in truck crashes, and countless truck drivers report nodding off behind the wheel. This is something we have a duty to address. •

MEMORIAL DAY

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, as chairman of the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee, I proudly wish to recognize the 1 percent of Americans who