

this approach. This undermines the moral authority of the United States. It is the wrong thing to do.

I wish to give a couple historical examples.

Toward the end of World War II, Heinrich Himmler, who was No. 2 in charge—but after Hitler committed suicide was No. 1 in charge—of Nazi Germany reached out to the Allied commander, General Eisenhower, and wanted to start negotiating with him: If he could be allowed to live, they might negotiate some sort of settlement. Eisenhower completely ignored it and treated him like the war criminal he was. Can you imagine if we would have started negotiating with Himmler at that time?

Let me give some more recent examples. What about Serbian leader Karadzic, the so-called “Butcher of Bosnia,” accused of slaughtering hundreds of thousands of innocent people? The State Department did not say: If you are a little less bad and don’t kill quite as many people, we will start negotiating with you. They didn’t say that. They put a \$5 million reward out to anybody who gave us information leading to his capture, and he currently resides in a prison in The Hague.

What about Charles Taylor, the “Butcher of Liberia,” who ran on an election slogan—listen to this: “He killed my pa, he killed my ma, but I will vote for him.” That was his election slogan. Taylor was directly involved in coordinating and supporting unthinkable atrocities over many years and, after ceding power, was indicted for war crimes and crimes against humanity.

Here is an indicted war criminal. Did we say to him: OK. Mr. Taylor, if you start not killing as many people, we will negotiate with you? Of course not. What the Congress did was offered and passed legislation giving a \$2 million reward for Taylor’s capture, and he now sits in a prison in The Hague.

It would be unthinkable for us, in those circumstances, to say: OK. We will start negotiating with these indicted war criminals, butchers of their own people, and we are going to start working with you because you are going to act a little less bad. Yet that is what we are talking about with President Bashir, an indicted war criminal, conducting a genocide in Darfur that we have declared.

We have had hundreds of thousands of people across America going to rallies to save Darfur, and now we are talking about a carrot-and-stick approach with him?

I say no. I say we cannot do this, and if we do this in this circumstance, what about future genocidal regimes? What about future indicted war criminals? Is there any standard upon which the United States can or will stand at those points in time or could we, at that point in time, if we do this in this particular case?

I am all for getting some form of movement on the north-south agree-

ment so the south can vote next year and will probably vote to secede and form its own country in the south. I think that is prudent and wise, after many years of civil war and the negotiations that took place to get a north-south agreement. But I do not at all think you can trade that for us negotiating with this indicted war criminal.

I urge my colleagues not to support this effort on behalf of the administration to engage a genocidal regime in Khartoum.

I appreciate my colleagues’ attention. I yield the floor.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, what is the pending business before the Senate?

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION EXTENSION ACT OF 2009—MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 30 minutes of debate prior to a vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to H.R. 3548, with the time equally divided and controlled between the leaders or their designees.

Mr. BAUCUS. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, the unemployment rate is now 9.8 percent. Before long economists expect it to top 10 percent. That means nearly 15 million Americans have lost their jobs—15 million. That is 15 million people looking for work. About 5 million people have been looking for work for more than 6 months. There are about 3 million job openings. That is 15 million people chasing 3 million jobs.

We are in what folks call the “Great Recession.” Real people are facing real hardships every day. On September 15 of this year, the Finance Committee held a hearing on unemployment insurance benefits and where we would go from there. Senators discussed the effects of the current condition on beneficiaries, the business community, and the State unemployment systems. We considered proposals to support unemployed workers through the continuing recession.

A recent edition of the Federal Reserve’s Beige Book reported that the economy is still stabilizing. Unfortunately, the labor market still remains weak. Companies are being cautious about adding permanent staff. Instead, they are asking more from their existing staff.

We need to continue our work to create jobs, and we also need to help our neighbors who are looking for work. That is what we did in the Recovery

Act. We need to act on behalf of unemployed Americans and their communities. In helping our unemployed neighbors, we also can help to keep open the neighborhood grocery store and the neighborhood gas station. That is how unemployment insurance benefits not just people who are unemployed but helps communities.

In helping our unemployed neighbors, we also help to keep houses out of foreclosure. In helping our unemployed neighbors, we also help our economy and ourselves.

The House of Representatives passed a bill to give an additional 13 weeks of benefits to unemployed people in States with unemployment rates of 8½ percent or more. That is what the House did. I commend our colleagues in the House for their rapid response. But Leader REID and I want to make sure all Americans who have exhausted their benefits during these tough times get help.

Today we are joined by Senator REED of Rhode Island, Senator SHAHEEN, Senator DODD, and a total of 38 Senators in all in offering an amendment to the House bill. Our amendment would give 14 additional weeks of benefits to unemployed people who exhaust their benefits no matter what State they live in—14 additional weeks of benefits for everyone. Our amendment would also give 6 additional weeks of benefits on top of that to unemployed people who exhaust their benefits in States with 8½ percent unemployment or more. So 14 weeks to all States, and then an additional 6 weeks in those States where unemployment is 8½ percent or more.

The total cost of our package is \$2.4 billion and paid for with an extension of the Federal unemployment tax, or FUTA, until June 30, 2011.

Today we have a chance to lend support to unemployed Americans. In so doing, we have a chance to help our economy and ourselves. But first we have to proceed to the bill. I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation and vote for the motion to invoke cloture.

Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New Hampshire, Mrs. SHAHEEN, who is one of the main co-sponsors of the amendment. She is the real strong advocate of getting this legislation passed and a strong advocate for the people of her State, and I deeply appreciate her work.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I thank Senator BAUCUS for his very kind remarks and for his leadership to do something to help those workers who are unemployed across this country who are losing their benefits and don’t know where to turn.

As Senator BAUCUS has said, the Senate is about to vote on a motion to advance the Unemployment Compensation Extension Act. I am disappointed that we still haven’t been able to pass this extension, but this evening we can

vote to overcome a procedural hurdle and take an important step forward.

As Senator BAUCUS has said, this is critical legislation that will help nearly 2 million jobless Americans who are about to have the safety net pulled out from under them. The bill provides 14 additional weeks of unemployment insurance to jobless workers in all 50 States, and in those States where unemployment is the highest, they would receive an additional 6 weeks.

For 3 weeks, this critical legislation has been delayed for nothing more than political reasons. In that time, more than 100,000 Americans have exhausted their unemployment benefits. The American people should be outraged about these delays. I hope today those in opposition will end their obstruction, will stop the political games, and will help us pass this bill to stimulate our economy and help those Americans who, through no fault of their own, can't find a job.

I am confident that when we finally get to the vote, this extension will garner the broad bipartisan support it deserves. That is because unemployment isn't a New England problem or a Montana problem or a southern problem. It isn't a Republican, an Independent, or a Democratic problem. It is a hardship that hits every community in every State in every part of our country.

I recently visited an unemployment office in Manchester, NH, and I heard from people who, despite their best efforts, are unable to find a job. They want to get back to work, but they face one of the worst job markets since the Great Depression. I want to share this afternoon a couple of stories I heard from unemployed workers and those who have called my office pleading for help.

Carry-Ann is a 39-year-old single mother from Concord. She wrote that she has been out of a job for more than a year, and she has been relying on unemployment to support her two teenagers and to pay the mortgage. Carry-Ann qualified for a job training program, and she has been training for a career in health care.

That is appropriate, given the other debate that is going on in this body.

She has been training for that career in health care because she knows that is a sector that needs workers. But if her unemployment runs out, she wrote, she will lose her home and she will have to relocate, which means she would not be able to finish her job training program and will lose the prospects of getting a good new job.

Carry-Ann isn't asking for a handout. She is trying to gain self-sufficiency for herself and for her family by getting educated and gaining the skills she needs to build a career. But she will be unable to do so unless we pass this extension.

Richard is a 43-year-old from Somersworth, NH, one town over from where I live in the southern part of the State. He explained that he has been looking for work for over a year. He

has been using his unemployment benefits to support his family. Richard used to have a management job, and at interviews he has been told time after time that he is overqualified and he would not be considered. Employers think he will leave their job as soon as better opportunities open.

But Richard has a family to support today and his benefits are going to run out soon. He is like many Americans looking for work right now. If we do nothing, he could lose his credit, his car, and his home.

Extending unemployment benefits will help Richard and Carry-Ann and their families and tens of thousands of others like them across this country. It will help them weather this storm.

As I have said many times, when we extend unemployment, we are not just helping jobless workers, we are also helping the businesses that provide the goods and services that unemployed workers need. People collecting unemployment spend their benefits immediately on necessities to keep their families going, which means these dollars get into communities almost as soon as the check arrives.

Economists say, dollar for dollar, extending unemployment benefits is one of the most cost-effective actions we can take to stimulate the economy. Passing this extension of unemployment benefits is the right choice for unemployed workers and for our communities.

Mr. President, this extension is long overdue. We owe it to those Americans who are out of work to pass this extension.

I yield the floor.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, if Senator SHAHEEN wishes to take more time, I am more than willing to extend it to her.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. I have finished, but I thank my colleague very much, and I yield the floor.

Mr. BAUCUS. I thank the Senator very much.

I say to my colleagues that now is a good time to speak on extending unemployment insurance, now that we are on the motion to proceed. We will vote fairly quickly, but if Senators do want to come over to express their views, now is the time to do so.

Pending the arrival of Senators, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and I ask unanimous consent that the time during the quorum call be equally divided between both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I ask the Presiding Officer, how much time is remaining on each side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 7 minutes for each side.

Mr. BAUCUS. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota as much time as he wishes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Montana.

The issue before us is very simple. When you have a severe economic downturn of the type we have had, a very deep recession, that is when you try to employ the economic stabilizers that help people who lose their jobs—unemployment insurance. The extension of unemployment insurance has almost always been nearly automatic because everyone understands the urgency of doing it. When many additional people have been unemployed for lengthy periods of time, you try to reach out and help.

The cloture vote tonight is on a motion to proceed, and it so demonstrates the dysfunction of the Senate these days. The motion to proceed is filibustered by the other side when we are trying to help some folks who have lost their jobs. Many have lost hope during a steep economic decline. We can't even get cooperation on a motion to proceed to try to address the extension of unemployment benefits. It is pretty unbelievable to me.

Last fall, I watched some of the same folks who were objecting to that rush to the starting line to see if we couldn't give hundreds of billions of dollars to the biggest financial firms in the country that ran this economy into the ditch—let's give them a lot of money. But you know what, not when it comes to helping the folks at the bottom, those who have lost their jobs.

By the way, last month 263,000 Americans lost their jobs; last month—263,000. Just pick one out of 263,000 and think of somebody coming home from work and saying: Honey, I have lost my job; to say to their husband or wife: I have lost my job. It wasn't because I did a bad job, it was because they cut back at the plant or the office, so now I am unemployed. It was not their fault. The question is, What do we do when this happens? Normally when this happens, we extend unemployment benefits to those who are facing very difficult times.

This is the steepest, deepest economic decline since the 1930s. This country has been in very serious economic trouble for some long while now. It nearly fell off a cliff last October. So this action now should be almost automatic. But nothing, even common sense, is automatic around here because we are now struggling, at the end of today, a Tuesday, to get a cloture vote on a motion to proceed to do something that everybody knows we have a responsibility to do. It is almost unbelievable.

I want to say how frustrating it is that we do not get any cooperation on anything to move forward things that are of an urgent nature. I suppose this is not urgent, perhaps, unless you are

unemployed and trying to figure out: How do we get the money to eat? How do we get the money to pay rent? How do we get the money to provide the funding for the kids to go to school? It is probably not urgent for people who are not in that situation, but if you are in that situation during a very severe economic downturn, this is urgent. We need to extend these benefits.

My colleague from Montana and his committee have worked on this and brought it to the floor. It would have been nice if they had gotten just a little cooperation so we would not have to go through this, file a cloture motion, wait 2 days for it to ripen, then 30 hours postcloture. What is the deal? I don't understand at all. Dig your heels in when it comes to trying to help the folks who need help the most and say the sky is the limit when it comes time to help those who have the most? That turns logic on its head, in my judgment.

My hope is that at 6 o'clock tonight when we vote, we will have the 60 votes. We should never have been put in the position to have to try to break a filibuster on a motion to proceed. We are not even on the bill; it is a motion to proceed to the bill. What an unbelievable lack of cooperation on something that is so essential during a steep economic downturn, to help those whose jobs have been washed away, who desperately need help for themselves and their families. That is what we are trying to do.

I hope that perhaps following the disposition of this—and I hope we will get this done—we will get some additional cooperation on things that really matter.

I appreciate the time given me by the Senator from Montana.

I yield the floor.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum and ask consent that the time be equally charged to both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. SHAHEEN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BAUCUS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 174, H.R. 3548, the Unemployment Compensation Extension Act of 2009.

Harry Reid, Patty Murray, Mark Udall, Roland W. Burris, Mark Begich, Byron L. Dorgan, Frank R. Lautenberg, Amy Klobuchar, Bill Nelson, Jack Reed, Carl Levin, Jeff Bingaman, Bernard Sanders, Sherrod Brown, Sheldon Whitehouse, Barbara Boxer, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Richard J. Durbin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call is waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to H.R. 3548, the Unemployment Compensation Extension Act of 2009, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 87, nays 13, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 329 Leg.]

YEAS—87

Akaka	Feinstein	Merkley
Alexander	Franken	Mikulski
Baucus	Gillibrand	Murkowski
Bayh	Grassley	Murray
Begich	Gregg	Nelson (NE)
Bennet	Hagan	Nelson (FL)
Bennett	Harkin	Pryor
Bingaman	Hutchison	Reed
Boxer	Inouye	Reid
Brown	Isakson	Risch
Brownback	Johnson	Roberts
Burr	Kaufman	Rockefeller
Burris	Kerry	Sanders
Byrd	Kirk	Schumer
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Cardin	Kohl	Shelby
Carper	Kyl	Snowe
Casey	Landrieu	Specter
Chambliss	Lautenberg	Stabenow
Cochran	Leahy	Tester
Collins	LeMieux	Thune
Conrad	Levin	Udall (CO)
Corker	Lieberman	Udall (NM)
Crapo	Lincoln	Voinovich
Dodd	Lugar	Warner
Dorgan	McCain	Webb
Durbin	McCaskill	Whitehouse
Ensign	McConnell	Wicker
Feingold	Menendez	Wyden

NAYS—13

Barrasso	DeMint	Johanns
Bond	Enzi	Sessions
Bunning	Graham	Vitter
Coburn	Hatch	
Cornyn	Inhofe	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 87, the nays are 13.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. Madam President, I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CASEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

PENSION FUNDING

Mr. CASEY. Madam President, we are in the midst of a terrible economic recession. Over the course of the last year, we have lost millions of jobs. In Pennsylvania, for example, by com-

parison, the unemployment rate percentage is lower than a lot of States, but in many parts of our State it is at a historic high, or at least a 15-year high. What that means in Pennsylvania is that we have just about a half a million people out of work, even though some States have a much higher percent in their unemployment rate. So we have a half million people out of work.

The fact that we just had this vote on unemployment insurance is vitally important. It helps us meet a real need across the country. So we have an economic crisis. People are living through the loss of a job, the loss of a home, or both—in some ways, the loss of their hopes and their dreams. Unfortunately, even as we get through this, even as we begin to recover, and even as we are dealing with a longer term challenge to our economy, which is health care—which is one of the reasons I think we have to pass a bill this year—there are other threats we have to bear in mind. One of them involves not just businesses but, by extension, workers and families. I speak of the funding of pension plans.

A lot of businesses across the country—a lot of workers have come to Washington to remind us that this pension issue is a looming problem for a lot of businesses. I happen to be a member of the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee, and that is one of the issues we must deal with, and I think we will be dealing with, in the near term.

Millions of Americans, not just throughout our history our recent history but especially now, rely upon any kind of retirement vehicle, and one of those, of course, is a good pension plan. We need to give people in the twilight of their life the kind of security that comes with a pension plan. We also have to make sure workers have that same peace of mind as they make their way through this very difficult economy.

In 2006, the Pension Protection Act was passed by Congress. The main purpose of that act was to strengthen pension plans by implementing tougher funding rules. Most of the rules under the act took effect in 2008, and at that time the stock market was in turmoil. The combination of stronger pension funding rules in a chaotic stock market caused almost all pension plans to sustain a net loss, in essence.

I wish to turn to one chart that depicts that. One study released by Mercer stated that the combined loss for pension plans totaled \$469 billion for 2008. We can see the differential from 2007 where there was an overfunding of some \$60 billion. So in 2007, \$60 billion up; the next year lost over \$400 billion, down; to be exact, \$469 billion in terms of where we were in 2007 versus where we were at the end of 2008. Based upon this loss, pension plans have a funding deficit, a differential of \$409 billion—\$409 billion in 2008. In 2009, the pension funding deficit is expected to increase

yet again despite recent recoveries in the stock market.

We have to do what we must to strengthen our economy and to give our workers and their families and our businesses some peace of mind. That might be the best way to describe it. So this is more than just a looming crisis, more than just a problem in the near term, it is a problem we have to deal with right now, in the next couple of months.

Recently, the House Ways and Means Committee held a hearing that focused on pension funding relief. They gave an example at the hearing. NCR Corporation, a 125-year-old global technology company, testimony at this hearing provided a specific example of how company pension plans have been affected. NCR, this global technology company, had a pension plan that was 110 percent funded as of January 1, 2008.

So at the beginning of 2008, they were funded at 110 percent. They were in good shape, for the most part. The funding status, as those in the business know, is based on the amount of assets compared to the amount of liabilities. By January 1, 2009, just 1 year later, this same company, due to unprecedented losses in the market, had its funding percentage drop to 75 percent. So in 1 year, this company goes from 110 up of funding to 75 percent, a huge loss.

This is what it means in terms of dollars. The percentages only tell part of the story. Prior to the market loss, this company, NCR Corporation, expected to make payments totaling \$200 million over a 7-year period. That is what they could see down the road: \$200 million over that period. Instead, that payment has increased to \$1.5 billion—\$1.5 billion looking out ahead of them instead of \$200 million. So \$200 million becomes \$1.5 billion, and that is what we are going to see unless Congress provides some relief.

We have heard from countless companies across Pennsylvania and across the country that are in the same situation as this one example, the NCR company. The companies are not requesting a bailout. Let me say that again: They are not requesting a bailout. The companies are not requesting the American taxpayer to assist directly. The companies are simply asking Congress to extend the time period of recognizing the losses incurred during the market downturn.

In 2009—I will point to another study—Watson Wyatt reported that there would be \$32 billion in payments to fund pension plans in America. Without any relief from Congress in 2010, that amount will increase to over \$90 billion and increase to \$146 billion in 2011. So we go from, in 2009, \$32 billion, to 2010, and it keeps going up until we get to 2011, just 2 years from now, \$146 billion to pension plans in America.

American companies that are already struggling to break even today will have to decide between funding their

pension plans and cutting jobs. In order to avoid losing more jobs, at a time when the national unemployment rate is 9.8 percent, Congress should act swiftly to extend the amortization period for recognizing certain losses in pension plan assets, including other temporary provisions that will provide funding relief. Any relief should apply to single- and multiemployer pension plans.

As companies recover from the economic recession, we should not discourage economic growth by requiring a pension payment that will require companies to cut jobs. Instead, Congress should provide targeted relief—targeted relief—that will enable companies to spread out the losses over an extended period of time, which will allow capital to be invested in activities that will promote growth.

Ultimately, the intention of any pension funding relief legislation is to ensure the survival of the pension plan system. The American people have a right to expect that pension plans be stable and secure for their future. In Congress, we should work to implement any legislation that provides a healthy pension system just in the same way we provide security with a reformed health care system. In exchange for ensuring a good pension, a secure pension, and a better health care system—that is what we are saying to the American workers and to American businesses—it is important that we be very honest with people, with our workers.

We are going to say to our workers: We want you to compete in a world economy; we want you to go out and get more education; we want you to enhance your skill level; we want you to have a broader-based skill level so that when the economy takes a turn or market forces lead to a change in the industry that you are employed in or lead to a change in our economy, you will have the skill and the knowledge and the training and the education to be able to adjust.

So we encourage people all the time to get more education. We encourage people all the time to enhance their skill level. But we will be more successful in achieving that goal and we will be more honest with workers if we can say to them: You don't have to worry as much as you used to about your pension or about health care.

That should be a large part of the bargain, a large part of the agreement we make with our workers and our businesses because, if we are going to compete in a world economy, if we are going to have a highly skilled workforce that does that for us over time, we cannot say to people: Go out and improve your skills, go out and get more education, but we are not sure we can help you with your retirement security or your health care security. We can't ask them to do three things at one time. We can't ask them to go to work every day and worry about whether they are going to have health

care coverage or worry about whether their kids are going to be covered or worry about whether there is going to be a preexisting condition that will bar them from treatment or coverage.

We can't allow a situation to persist where we say to them: Go to work every day and continue to improve your skills and maybe get more education, but we are not sure we can help you on health care and, by the way, your pension plan might be at risk in the future; it may not be there for you when you retire.

We have to do something in a very strategic and focused way to take away some of that worry on health care and on pension and retirement security. If we do that, if we lessen that anxiety for people, I believe we are going to have a much more successful strategy as it relates to telling people and encouraging our workers to get more education, to get a heightened degree of training. If we do that, we are going to have a much stronger long-term economy. But we can't ask people to do it all themselves—to bear the burden of health care, to bear the burden of retirement security, and to bear the full burden of their education, their training, and their skill development.

So that is why this pension issue, even in the midst of a health care debate, is so critically important.

Madam President, I yield the floor and note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. UDALL of Colorado). Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

PASSAGE OF THE MATTHEW SHEPARD HATE CRIMES PREVENTION ACT

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, tomorrow afternoon President Obama will sign the Matthew Shepard and James Byrd, Jr. Hate Crimes Prevention Act into law. I commend the President for acting so quickly on this critical civil rights measure. Its protections are long overdue. Last week, when the Senate was about to consider the Department of Defense authorization conference report, I spoke in strong support of its provisions including the hate crimes measure. At that time, I requested my entire statement be included in the RECORD. Unfortunately, my entire statement did not make it