

(C) the continuation of humanitarian and development efforts between the Government of the United States and the Government of Haiti, the Haitian Diaspora, and international actors who support the goal of a better future for Haiti.

MEASURE READ THE FIRST
TIME—S. 192

Mr. BEGICH. Madam President, I understand that S. 192, introduced earlier today by Senator DEMINT, is at the desk and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 192) to repeal the job-killing health care law and health care-related provisions in the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010.

Mr. BEGICH. Madam President, I now ask for its second reading and object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The bill will be read the second time on the next legislative day.

APPOINTMENTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, pursuant to the provisions of section 201(a)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, have appointed Dr. Douglas W. Elmendorf as Director of the Congressional Budget Office for the term expiring January 3, 2015.

The Chair, on behalf of the Republican leader, pursuant to Public Law 111-25, announces the appointment of the following individual to serve as a member of the Ronald Reagan Centennial Commission for the life of the commission: The Honorable ORRIN HATCH of Utah vice Robert Bennett.

Mr. BEGICH. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

JUDGE JOHN ROLL

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I heard this morning the tributes that were made by Senator JOHN MCCAIN and Senator JOHN KYL about the role that was played by the very heroic judge who lost his life in the tragedy that took place in Tucson.

Shortly after the tragedy, the offices of Senators MCCAIN and KYL reached out to my committee—the committee on which I am ranking member and Senator BOXER is chairman. They talked about how they would go about honoring Judge John Roll by naming the new courthouse that will be constructed in Yuma, AZ, after him.

Many of us have come to know the work of Judge Roll after his tragic, heroic death in the recent shooting where he died protecting Ron Barber, Congresswoman GIFFORDS' district director, and sacrificing himself. My office knew about him before, about Judge Roll's work on behalf of the judicial system in Arizona.

Judge Roll contacted my committee staff last year, after a GAO report criticizing the way Arizona was utilizing their courthouse space. This is a letter from Judge Roll to us:

On behalf of the district of Arizona, I strongly disagree with many of the conclusions in the report, particularly as they relate to Arizona and its attempts to cope with an ever-burgeoning criminal caseload largely arising from border enforcement.

He hoped his response to the report would be helpful to us. It was. We have learned that the problems they have in Arizona on the border are something they have never experienced before. It has put their judicial system into real problems, and consequently this judge was taking a leadership role in reaching out to us to let us know that GAO report was not accurate.

We have had a chance to talk with both Senator MCCAIN and Senator KYL. I sat down with Senator BOXER, who is the chairman of our committee, and talked about what we might be able to do in a very expeditious way. I believe the decision to name the Yuma, AZ, courthouse after Judge Roll is a fitting tribute to a man who served his State with distinction.

The courthouse is a new courthouse, government construction, to help alleviate some of the overcrowding going on in Arizona right now, primarily because of the problems that exist on the border.

I do not know of any time in the years I have been here that a bill has been introduced and then discharged the same day. We all feel strongly enough that this needs to be handled in this way. It is the very least we can do.

Judge Roll was highly regarded by his colleagues and clearly took his judgeship seriously, doing more than simply deciding cases and going home. He was an active advocate for the judicial system in Arizona. I believe we would have had this courthouse named after him upon his retirement had his life not been tragically taken.

Today Senators MCCAIN and KYL introduced S. 188, and I am happy to announce that Senator BOXER and I have discharged S. 188 to the floor on this same day. Anything else I do not think would have been appropriate.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WHITEHOUSE). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MERKLEY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

HEALTH CARE

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. President, I come to the floor pretty regularly to read letters from Ohioans, from people in my State, about things in their lives that are important to them. I think in this institution we—all of us, myself included—too often forget the pain of so many people at home who have lost jobs, who have lost hopes, who have lost health care.

I think often about—as I know the Senator from Oregon does—how difficult it would be for a parent to explain to their son or daughter: I lost my job and we lost our health insurance and now we may have to move.

Nobody has worked harder in the Senate than the Presiding Officer from Oregon on fixing HAMP and reforming some of the programs that can help people stay in their homes. I appreciate the work the Presiding Officer does.

My letters today are from people all over Ohio about health insurance. It was a long fight to be able to take on the insurance companies and basically say to the insurance companies: You are not going to run this health care system the way you have, excluding people with preexisting conditions, denying claims after they have turned in their insurance after they have been sick, dealing with all the problems people have.

The business model for health insurance in this country too often has been the insurance companies hire a bunch of bureaucrats to keep people from buying insurance—the preexisting condition exclusion—and then hire a bunch of people on the other end, when someone gets sick and turns in their insurance claims, to try to deny them their claims. I understand insurance companies do that. I do not even blame insurance companies because they are all competing with one another. They may have to do that. But the fact is, it does not work for our health care system.

That is what we fixed last year, and that is what Ohioans understand. I guess I—I do not want to say “resent,” but in some ways I do resent when I see conservative Washington politicians, who, for 20 or 25 years, have had taxpayer-financed health insurance for them and their families, and now they want to vote—in the House of Representatives, and some do here—to take away benefits for senior citizens or take away benefits for small businesses or young people who have a preexisting condition or others.

I will not take too long, but I wish to read three or four stories or maybe a handful more than that.

Laura—I will only mention first names. These are letters from people in Ohio who have written me. Laura, from Dayton, in Montgomery County in southwest Ohio, writes:

My youngest nephew has juvenile diabetes and he just started college in-state. Due to the new health care law, he will be able to stay on my older sister's health care insurance plan when he graduates from college.

My third oldest nephew can now go back on my second oldest sister's insurance plan.

It appears [that some in Congress care] more about money than the American people. Please fight for me so I won't have to worry about losing my health insurance plan if I get seriously ill in the future.

This story comes from Christine in Medina County, up close to where I live. It is a county south of Cleveland. She writes:

My name is Christine and I want to tell you the story of Carol . . . my mom. . . .

Nine years ago, my father was downsized. His position of over 40 years was eliminated and so was my parents' health coverage. My father was only a few months shy of retirement so Medicare was available to him and my mom was on COBRA. My mom's employer of over 20 years had just recently shut its doors and while she found work through a temp agency, it was only part-time and she didn't qualify for benefits.

A few months later my mom was diagnosed with Non-Hodgkin's Lymphoma and Emphysema.

Fortunately, her life was not in immediate danger and their lives were coasting along until her COBRA ran out.

COBRA is a plan you pay a lot of money for. Actually, you pay the employer's and the employee's side—yours and the employer's—to get coverage for up to 18 months after you lose your job and your insurance.

Christine writes:

. . . have you ever tried to find healthcare coverage for someone with a history of cancer and emphysema? I can, so from personal experience, it's infuriating, but I was able to find it. It would . . . cost her \$1,400 per month—

Mr. President, \$1,400 per month— with a \$4,000 deductible per year.

That means she would pay insurance—\$1,400 a month. She would not be able to collect on any of her bills until she had already paid an additional \$4,000 out of her pocket.

This was more than my parents were bringing home each month so needless to say whatever savings and retirement they had was used up quickly. What other option did [they] have?

During this time, my mom's health deteriorated. She required chemo and several hospital stays due to her lung collapsing. . . . I remember sitting with her in the hospital and listening to how worried she was about how she was going to pay [her] bill.

As if these kinds of illnesses are not bad enough in the stress it causes to a family, the anxiety it causes to a family, on top of that, they just wonder: What do we do about insurance? We know people get sicker and recover more slowly when they have that kind of anxiety about paying the bills.

My parents are good people. My dad is a veteran. They worked their entire lives and sacrificed to give me and my older sisters a better life than they had. They were fortunate to have 3 tireless advocates always looking out for them. Not everyone has that.

She then goes on:

State and Federal programs are what helped my parents. Without them, I honestly don't know where they'd be today.

My hope is that you'll remember my mom and everyone like her. Their lives are depending on it.

She says: State and Federal programs are what helped my mother.

This whole attitude of let's repeal the health care bill and then get the government out of it, and letting individuals take care of themselves is the American way—no, it is not. The American way is Medicare, is Medicaid, is Social Security, is private enterprise, is individualism, is helping one another, is a spirit of community in our communities. It is all that, and it is not get government out of our lives. They are against Social Security and they are against Medicare. Those are not the American values I was raised with and most people I know were raised with.

Michael from Twinsburg, north of Akron, in northeast Ohio, writes:

. . . my 22 year old son—a college student—was kicked off my insurance plan because of his age last year. It now costs \$460 a month to insure him.

In January, he will be added back to my policy and it will cost nothing. There is no additional charge to add my son. This is due to the health insurance legislation.

Please [talk about] these good things. Most people do not know this and other good things.

Keep in mind, as I read these, this kind of benefit that goes to Michael's son. If the people in this body and in the other body—the people in the House of Representatives who actually voted to repeal the health care bill—if they have their way—and these are mostly people who they themselves are getting taxpayer-financed health insurance—they want to deny to Michael and his son, they want to deny those kinds of benefits we have voted for, while they, at the same time, are getting taxpayer-financed health insurance. I guess one word would be hypocritical, another would be callous, another would be cold. I do not understand that way of thinking from some of my colleagues.

Steve from Groveport, in Franklin County, Columbus, the center of the State, writes:

I believe the new health care law is one of the greatest things ever done for the middle class. . . .

I am so tired of hearing that [many in] this country [are] against it. Every poll I've seen shows it's split . . . down the middle. The other side . . . has got to be heard!

Steve wrote this a couple weeks ago. I think what we have seen has changed, as people learn more about these benefits. For instance, come January 1, every senior in America can go to the doctor and get, without copays and deductibles, a physical or can get a mammography test or can get screened for osteoporosis or can get colorectal screening.

Seniors also, in the so-called doughnut hole, where they continue to pay a premium but do not get a benefit—under the Bush-constructed health care bill, there is this huge hole that costs people a lot of money—because of the health care bill, because it is law, because the Senator from Oregon and I and others voted for it and the Presi-

dent signed it, those seniors now will see their drug costs during that period cut entirely in half, not taxpayer-subsidized cut in half but the drug companies giving up half of what they were paid.

This is from Donald in Hardin County, northwest of Columbus:

I know firsthand that the lack of necessary medical and dental services for children and students of all ages has created a serious impediment to the learning process. Families with access to a regular source of medical care are more likely to keep the entire family healthy and create a better learning environment within the home.

The health care reforms you helped pass are vital to the nation's economic recovery and a crucial ingredient for great public schools. . . . Moreover, passage of this reform was a moral imperative. . . .

Donald, in addition to what he writes about young people—there is an effort in the Ohio legislature where I believe 30 Republican legislators have legislation to cancel or eliminate universal all-day kindergarten—as if cutting back on children of that age, when children's brains are developing, and they are growing and maturing, especially at those crucial ages of 3, 4, 5, 6 years old—to pull the rug out from under them makes absolutely no sense.

The last letter I will read is from Rachael, who lives in Cincinnati, in southwest Ohio:

I simply wanted to thank you for the Pre-Existing Condition Insurance Plan. It is . . . very important . . . to me.

Your support for health care reform is greatly appreciated. Health insurance for my pre-existing condition will become one less thing I need to worry about. Thank you, thank you, thank you!

I can now concentrate solely on finding a job to replace the one I lost in January. . . .

Again, I hear people say—I have heard this for years. President Bush said it a few times, others have said it: Everybody in this country gets health care. If something is wrong, you go to the hospital, you go to the emergency room.

Well, the emergency room does not take care of you if you have chronic asthma, the emergency room does not take care of you if you have cancer. The emergency room will take care of you if you go in with a heart attack, but the emergency room does not take care of you if you need preventive care to keep you out of the hospital, to make you less likely to have that heart attack.

I read these letters about health insurance. I don't want to debate health insurance legislation anymore. I don't think we need to talk about this. We have passed the law. We have made things better. We have given people who have insurance better insurance now because of these consumer protections. People without insurance now will get assistance. People who have insurance and were about to get thrown off can keep it now.

We need to focus on the real problems in this country that we haven't addressed well enough, one of which is job creation. I am hopeful my colleagues will back off this whole idea of

let's keep debating health insurance and let's keep relitigating this and let's keep rediscussing it and let's try to repeal it. Instead, we can fix some things, as the President said last night, make some minor changes in it. But let's go back to what we need to do: create jobs in this country and help manufacturing.

My State is the third largest manufacturing State in the country. We need to do a lot to make sure that as we innovate, as we do the best innovation in the world and do the best research and development, that those jobs stay in the United States and don't get outsourced. That is our mission, to make sure these jobs are created here.

I yield the floor and suggest 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. In my capacity as a Senator from Oregon, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS SUBJECT TO THE CALL OF THE CHAIR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In my capacity as a Senator from Oregon, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:45 p.m., recessed subject to the call of the Chair and reassembled at 8:25 p.m. when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mrs. HAGAN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that at a time to be determined by the majority leader, after consultation with the Republican leader, the Senate proceed to the consideration of the following resolutions en bloc:

A Wyden-Grassley-McCaskill resolution relative to secret holds, which is at the desk; a Udall of Colorado resolution regarding waiving the reading of an amendment, which is at the desk; S. Res. 8, Senator HARKIN; S. Res. 10, Senator UDALL of New Mexico with a substitute amendment, which is at the desk; and S. Res. 21, Senator MERKLEY, with a substitute amendment, which is at the desk; that there be up to 8 hours of debate, equally divided between the two leaders or their designees, for the purpose of debating these resolutions concurrently; that upon the use or yielding back of time, the substitute amendment to S. Res. 10 be agreed to and the substitute amendment to S. Res. 21 be agreed to; the Senate then proceed to vote in relation to the resolutions in the order listed above with no intervening action or debate; that

the following resolutions be subject to a 60-vote threshold for adoption: Wyden-Grassley-McCaskill resolution and Udall of Colorado resolution; that the following remaining resolutions be subject to a threshold of two-thirds of those voting for adoption: S. Res. 8; S. Res. 10, as amended; and S. Res. 21, as amended; that there be no amendments, motions or points of order in order to any of these resolutions prior to the vote in relation to the resolution, except for the substitute amendments to S. Res. 10 and S. Res. 21 listed above; further, that if a resolution fails to achieve the listed threshold for adoption, it be returned to its previous status.

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

Mr. REID. Madam President, I have had a number of conversations this evening with my counterpart, the Republican leader. We on this side have a caucus scheduled for tomorrow at 12:30 and so do the Republicans. These votes are all going to occur after we finish our caucuses anyway, so there are going to be no votes in the morning. The debate will start in the morning. We are going to come in at 10 o'clock. There will be no morning business. It has been suggested we come in at 10:30 because of the inclement weather, and that is fine. There will be no morning business in the morning, and then we will vote immediately on these matters set forth in this agreement.

The weather reports are that the Sun is going to be shining. Tomorrow it will be cold, and we know the streets are bad. But as I have indicated, we are not going to have the votes until tomorrow afternoon, so we hope it will all work out. Senator MCCONNELL and I will visit this issue again if anything untoward happens. We know it would be better if we didn't have this bad weather, but we are not all fortunate enough to live in southern Nevada. Sometimes bad weather does come. That being the case, we have been out of session now for several weeks. We have this organizational stuff that we have to get out of the way so we can start having matters referred out of the committees. So as inconvenient as it is for everyone, we need to move forward.

BOMBING OF SAINTS CHURCH

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, shortly after midnight Mass during the early hours of New Year's Day, a heinous suicide bombing attack at the Saints Church in Alexandria, Egypt, killed 21 innocent worshippers and injured dozens of others.

My condolences go out to the families of the victims and to the Coptic community. This was a devastating loss for the Christian community in Egypt and Christian communities around the world, including in my home State of Illinois.

I urge the Egyptian government to work swiftly and within the rule of law

to bring those responsible for this heinous crime to justice.

The Obama administration already has offered U.S. law enforcement assistance, which I encourage Egypt to accept—particularly in light of findings that indicate al-Qaida or other international terrorism networks were involved.

Unfortunately, this bombing attack is not an isolated incident in Egypt. Just about one year ago, three men armed with automatic weapons killed six Christian churchgoers as they emerged from a Christmas Mass service in the Egyptian town of Naga Hammadi, along with one Muslim off-duty police officer.

While I commend the Egyptian government's quick arrest and ongoing prosecution of the four suspects in that case, the fact that these incidents of violence against their own Christian community have continued in Egypt is very worrying.

Coptic Christians have been practicing their faith in Egypt since antiquity. Egypt is home to some of the oldest Christian schools in the world, where students have been taught theology and the text of the Bible. Coptic Christians are an important part of Egyptian society and make up approximately ten percent of Egypt's population. Protecting them and other religious minorities from acts of violence should be a top priority for the Egyptian government.

The New Year's bombing in Egypt is, unfortunately, also part of a disturbing pattern of violence against religious minorities in the Middle East.

For example, on October 31, 2010, Our Lady of Salvation Church in Iraq was the victim of a vicious attack by an al-Qaida affiliate, where over 50 innocent lives were taken.

Such despicable acts of aggression should not be tolerated. They force minority communities, who deserve greater protection, to live in fear of random acts of violence.

Such violence and discrimination cause members of minority communities to become refugees in their own country or to seek refuge in other countries. The ability of religious minorities to worship freely and safely should be a basic tenet of any modern society.

It is incumbent on Egypt, as a leader in the Middle East, to promote an atmosphere of tolerance where members of all religions are given an equal opportunity to thrive and participate in the life of the country.

Earlier, Senator WHITEHOUSE joined me in a letter to President Mubarak expressing our concern for the protection of minority communities in Egypt, including the lack of representation that Coptic Christians have in government as well as the government's failure to fully prosecute those responsible for acts of violence against Coptic Christians in the past.

We are concerned that the current situation may embolden extremists