

First, we have added several cosponsors to S. Res. 123, which is the earmark disclosure rule. They are Senators ENSIGN, ENZI, MARTINEZ, COBURN, MCCASKILL, and CORNYN. I thank them for their support. Some of these Senators request earmarks, while others do not. But they all support earmark disclosure, and they all support this rule as it is written right now.

We have also added a couple cosponsors to S. Res. 260, the rule that would stop the adding of earmarks in secret conference committees. They are Senators ALLARD and CORNYN. I thank them for their support. A select few Members of Congress and their staffs should not be adding hidden earmarks to bills in the middle of the night when no one has the opportunity to review them and debate their merits. That is very bad practice, and it must end.

There was also an important editorial last Tuesday in the Roll Call newspaper that supports our efforts to protect earmark reform. I will read a couple of excerpts:

Senate Democratic leaders are resisting [Senator DEMINT's] move and are insisting on going to conference on the ethics bill, although they have yet to explain why already agreed-upon earmark rules can't be adopted immediately.

We don't oppose earmarks in principle. . . . But as events last year amply demonstrated, earmarks can be a source of rotten corruption. Full disclosure is crucial, and the Senate ought to institute it forthwith.

We think that on the merits Senate leaders should accede to DeMint so disclosure of spending requests is not delayed until President Bush signs an ethics reform measure that still has not even gone to a House-Senate conference.

Mr. President, the blogging community is watching what we are doing here. Countless bloggers, including The Corner on National Review Online, Instapundit.com, MichelleMalkin.com, the Sunlight Foundation, Porkbusters.com, RedState.com, and many others, have weighed in on the need for the Senate to implement these earmark transparency rules now. I thank them for paying attention to this debate and working to hold us all accountable.

Finally, we have received letters of support from several important taxpayer watchdog groups, including Americans for Prosperity and Citizens Against Government Waste. These groups know how important earmark reform is, and they believe it should be implemented immediately.

These rules need to be adopted immediately. They should not be allowed to go to conference with the House where they can be changed at will. They need to be enacted now before a single appropriations bill comes to the Senate floor.

It has been 180 days since they were unanimously adopted by the Senate. I have asked consent to enact these rules four times, but the other side has blocked them each and every time. Today needs to be the day that this obstruction stops. Today needs to be the

day we end the earmark business as usual in the Senate.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST—
S. RES. 123, S. RES. 260, AND H.R.
2316

Mr. DEMINT. With that, I will now propound a unanimous-consent request that would enact the earmark transparency rules and request that we go to conference with the House on the total ethics bill.

I ask unanimous consent that the Rules Committee be discharged from further consideration and the Senate now proceed to S. Res. 123 and S. Res. 260, the earmark disclosure resolutions, all en bloc; that the resolutions be agreed to and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table.

I further ask that the Senate then proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 2316, the House-passed ethics and lobbying reform bill; that all after the enacting clause be stricken and the text of S. 1, as passed by the Senate, be inserted in lieu thereof; that the bill be read the third time, passed, and the Senate insist on its amendment, request a conference with the House, and the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees at a ratio of 4 to 3.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, on behalf of the leadership, I do object.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. President, obviously, I am very disappointed that we continue to obstruct ethics reform and earmark reform.

With that, I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST—
S. 163

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to Calendar No. 139, S. 163; that the committee-reported amendment be withdrawn, and I have a substitute amendment at the desk; that the Bond amendment to the substitute amendment be considered and agreed to, the substitute amendment, as amended, be agreed to, the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that the bill, as amended, be read the third time; that the Senate then proceed to the consideration of H.R. 1361, the House companion, which is at the desk; that all after the enacting clause be stricken and the text of S. 163, as amended, be inserted in lieu thereof; that the bill be read the third time, passed, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table; that the Senate insist on its amendment and request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses; that the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees, with the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship appointed as

conferees; that S. 163 be returned to the calendar, and the above occurring without intervening action or debate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. DEMINT. On behalf of the Senator from Oklahoma, I object.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, let me speak for a minute about this legislation. I understand Senator DEMINT's need to object on behalf of the Senator from Oklahoma. This is legislation that has broad—I do mean broad—bipartisan support. It was passed out of the Small Business and Entrepreneurship Committee on a unanimous vote. It now represents a very broad compromise worked on with the administration and with all of the members of the committee, both Republican and Democrat.

I will review very quickly what this bill does. As everybody knows, when Katrina hit, we had a terrible time getting small business assistance to the countless thousands of small businesses that were impacted, not only in New Orleans but in Baton Rouge and across into Mississippi, Alabama, and elsewhere, where there were many services being provided by other folks. A lot of small businesses were impacted.

We learned there was not an adequate capacity within the Small Business Administration to deliver this kind of assistance in a rapid way. So we have worked now, after a series of hearings and over the course of 2 years, to pull together the Small Business Disaster Response and Loan Improvement Act. It does a number of things.

It creates a new elevated level of disaster declaration, referred to as catastrophic national disaster. That triggers nationwide economic injury disaster loans for adversely affected small businesses.

In addition, it requires the SBA to create an expedited disaster assistance business loan program to provide businesses with expedited access to short-term money.

A lot of the businesses in New Orleans could have survived and might have survived or chosen to try to if there had been some bridge money or available working capital. But the absence of it forced a lot of them to close their doors. If we can provide assistance in a timely fashion, obviously subject to the administration's approval—and there is discretion in the bill—we would have the ability to do a better job.

In addition, there are improvements to the existing loan program which have been written in the bill. There is improved agency coordination and marketing. It directs the SBA to coordinate with FEMA in a more effective way. It directs the SBA to create a proactive marketing plan to make the public aware of the disaster response services.