CORRECTION

Congressional Record

United States of America

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 160 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, APRIL 10, 2014 No. 59

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable JOHN E. WALSH, a Senator from the State of Montana.

PRAYER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The guest chaplain, Dr. Raphael Warnock, senior pastor of Ebenezer Baptist Church of Atlanta, GA, will lead the Senate in prayer.

The guest Chaplain offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

God of love and justice, for this new day with its new possibilities, we are grateful. For the holy covenant we have with You and for the sacred covenant we have with one another as an American people, we are grateful. For the precious ideals of freedom, self-government, radical inclusion, and equal protection under the law, we are grateful. These are Your gifts. Grant that when we, the American people, especially those who serve in this the people's house, are weighed by the moral balance of history, we will be found worthy.

God, make us mindful that we might be found worthy; mindful that the moral test of government is how it treats those at the dawn of life, the children; those who are in the twilight of life, the aged; those who are in the shadows of life, the sick, the needy, the handicapped. O God, make us mindful of our inextricable connections to one another and of our sacred obligation as careful stewards of this global neighborhood we are blessed to share.

To the God who loves us into freedom, and frees us into loving, we offer this prayer. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, April 10, 2014.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable JOHN E. WALSH, a Senator from the State of Montana, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. WALSH thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

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

MINIMUM WAGE FAIRNESS ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. REID. I move to proceed to Calendar No. 354, the minimum wage legislation.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 354, S. 2223, a bill to provide for an increase in the Federal minimum wage and to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend increased expensing limitations and the treatment of certain real property as section 179 property.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following my remarks and those of the Republican leader, the time until 10:30 a.m. will be equally divided and controlled.

At 10:30 a.m. there will be a vote on the Ninth Circuit judge, whose name is Michelle Friedland. Until cloture is invoked there will be up to 30 hours of debate prior to vote on the confirmation of the nomination. So we have two votes we need to have before we leave here this week. We can have a vote at 4:00 tomorrow afternoon and the second vote would be around 7:00 or thereabouts tomorrow afternoon or tomorrow evening. We have to finish these two matters before we leave this week.

The schedule is up to—not Republicans but a few Republicans—so I would suggest the Republicans deal with their own, and we can finish this morning if we need to. We certainly could.

Mr. President, I would be happy to yield to my friend, the dignified and really superb Senator from Georgia.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia.

WELCOMING THE GUEST CHAPLAIN

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I thank the leader for the introduction and I am very pleased to introduce today the Reverend Raphael Warnock, the senior pastor of Ebenezer Baptist Church in Atlanta. He is a gifted author, a gifted and prolific preacher, and a great citizen of the great State of Georgia and the great city of Atlanta.

Following in the traditions of the King family and the preachers of Ebenezer Baptist Church, he is the fifth pastor in the history of Ebenezer to carry out the mission of Ebenezer with great humility and great ability and great love, and is a great pastor in our eyes. I am pleased to welcome him to the U.S. Senate, and I know we will all be blessed in his presence today.

I yield back.

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

46TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1968

Mr. REID. Tomorrow marks the 46th anniversary of the signing into law the Civil Rights Act of 1968, better known as the Fair Housing Act. This landmark legislation took a stand against

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

housing discrimination and gave American families a fair shot at finding housing that was suitable to their needs. It is fitting we recognize this anniversary now, especially in light of the equality legislation we have been trying to pass here in the Senate recently.

THE ECONOMIC LADDER

One of the first well-known billionaires we heard a lot of talk about on the planet was the outspoken oil tycoon J. Paul Getty. He once quipped: ''Money is like manure. You have to spread it around or it smells.''

Well, Charles and David Koch have certainly spread the money around, but it still stinks. It stinks because of what they do with their money. The Kochs are singlehandedly funding an attack on this Nation's middle class, instead of concerning themselves with narrowing the gap between the rich and the poor.

Remember, in America today the rich are getting richer, the poor are getting poorer, and the middle class is getting squeezed. The Koch brothers have a lot to do with that. They are pumping hundreds of millions of dollars into rightwing organizations. And I didn't make a mistake when I said hundreds of millions of dollars.

Instead of giving Americans a fighting chance to prosperity, the two richest brothers in the world are focused on getting Republicans elected. These Koch-funded organizations and politicians advocate only for what makes the Koch brothers richer. The two richest brothers in the world want to be richer, and it comes at the expense of the average American.

The Kochs are the classic example of two men at the top of the ladder who would pull that ladder up to make sure no one else can join them. That is exactly what the Koch brothers are trying to do to middle-class families. The only difference, of course, is that Charles and David never even scaled the ladder in the first place. They were born at the top rung. But somehow the Kochs have fooled themselves into thinking they rose to the top by their own merits. They didn't.

More importantly, the Koch brothers have decided that they want their inherited wealth, this company now they have at the top—they want to make sure this ladder that should be reachable for everyone is unreachable. They are determined to make that ladder totally unreachable for others. These billionaires do this by rigging the system even more in their favor, making sure the Kochs' interests are being represented at all costs.

As has been reported—and not by me—the Koch brothers have what some journalists are calling secret banks. Organizations serve as middlemen to fund ultraconservative scare campaigns. Through these secret banks, such as Freedom Partners and others, the multibillionaire Koch brothers pump money into radical institutions and all these rightwing organizations ultimately come to the same conclusion: America's best bet for economic prosperity is to help the Koch brothers get richer.

So what do these groups do with the funds they receive from their billionaire benefactors? Groups such as Americans for Prosperity—try that one on for size, the Americans for Prosperity—lie to the American people about ObamaCare, hoping families will not sign up for affordable health care.

Extreme organizations such as Independent Women's Forum tell women equal pay for equal work is not necessary because they say wage disparity is a myth.

The Koch-backed Manhattan Institute is another one of their shell organizations that tries to convince the country that out-of-work American families don't need unemployment benefits. Why? Because they are out of work because they are lazy.

And, of course, the Heritage Foundation uses Koch dollars to say raising the minimum wage is bad for business and will kill the economy.

It is clear that the Kochs are using these puppet organizations in their proxy war on the middle class. But Charles and David aren't just using radical rightwing groups to keep average Americans from scaling the rungs. They are using Republicans. They are spreading their money around helping Republicans get elected.

Unfortunately, the Republican Congress has shown itself to be in lockstep with the Koch brothers' radical agenda. The Republicans continue to push repeal of the Affordable Care Act. I watched the speech on the House floor yesterday, where one House Member indicated that he tried almost 60 times to repeal the bill—almost 60 times.

What did Albert Einstein say? The definition of insanity is when someone tries to do something over and over again and they get the same result. They are insane. That is Albert Einstein, not me.

They are doing this regardless of the fact that even the Koch brothers; that is, their business, Koch Industries, benefited from ObamaCare.

Remember that ladder. The Kochs already got what they needed from health care reform. They don't want other people to do the same. They have benefited from ObamaCare. I laid that out a few days ago on the Senate floor.

Senate Republicans have blocked the equal pay amendment three times—three separate Congresses. They won't even let us discuss it. All but half of Republican Senators voted against the extension of benefits for the long-term unemployed, and turned their back on their own constituents.

As for the minimum wage, my Republican colleagues have given no indication to help struggling families with the minimum wage.

The Kochs' wealth is being used to squeeze the middle class very much. As long as Charles and David Koch are at the top looking down, who cares about the little people at the bottom, in their estimation.

It is shameful that Koch money has made its way into our Nation's Capitol, our news, and our homes. It is frustrating that as Senate Democrats look across the aisle, we don't see many willing partners in defending middle-class families in Nevada and across the Nation. But we are not going to be intimidated by these Koch surrogates in the media or here in this very Chamber. We will continue to fight even harder to protect Americans from the greedy grasp of these billionaire oil barons and the wrath of their radical minions. Senate Democrats will continue to pull that ladder out from the Koch brothers' fingers so every American has a fair shot at climbing to the top.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

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

JOB CREATION

Mr. MCCONNELL. For days now Republicans have been coming to the floor to ask the Democratic majority to work with us on jobs. This is the issue Americans say they care the most about. So it is hard to see why Senate Democrats seem so allergic to various jobs ideas we have been proposing, not to mention dozens of job-creating bills already passed by the House.

Look, our constituents want us to work together to rebuild the middle class, to help create opportunities for the families struggling out there just to pay the bills. In recent days we have given our Democratic colleagues ample opportunity to do that. We have offered one innovative proposal after another, proposals that haven't had much of a problem attracting bipartisan support in the past, ideas such as reducing the tax burden on small businesses, freeing them to grow, to hire, to innovate, ideas such as approving the Keystone Pipeline, which would create thousands of jobs right away; ideas such as repealing the medical device tax which even Democrats acknowledge is killing jobs—although they haven't acted to fix it yet—and ideas such as eliminating ObamaCare's 30-hour workweek mandate, a rule that cuts people's hours against their will, that disproportionately affects women and is forcing too many Americans to look for extra work to get by.

But we go even further than just tackling the causes of joblessness. Our ideas go beyond just helping Americans secure jobs with a steady paycheck and the hope of a better future. Because we have also put forward legislation that offers Americans more choices and greater flexibility in the workforce. This is something a lot of our constituents are asking for, and we are responding to those concerns.

One bill we have proposed would let working moms and dads take more time off to strike a better work-life balance. Another bill would prohibit

union bosses from denying pay increases to an employee who works harder than her coworkers.

These are the kinds of practical, commonsense proposals our constituents sent us here to actually pass. These are the things that would make jobs more plentiful and life a lot easier for men and women across our country. For some reason Senate Democrats are blocking all of these ideas from getting a vote. Maybe it is because they are so single-mindedly focused on an election that is still 7 months away.

I mean, they have already conceded that their ''agenda'' for the rest of the year was drafted by campaign staffers. It is a stunning admission. It explains their near-total lack of interest in practical solutions to the everyday concerns of our constituents. It also explains why the only jobs that Senate Democrats seem to be interested in these days are their own.

This is a big problem. Not only does it reinforce the widespread belief that Democrats are not serious about jobs, it also reinforces a growing impression that Democrats are simply out of their depth when it comes to our economy. Think about it: Washington Democrats are well into their sixth year of trying to get the economy back on track—6 years.

Yet for many in the middle class things only seem to have gotten worse. Average household income has fallen by nearly $3,600. The number of Americans actually working in the labor force has dropped to its lowest level since the Carter era. Millions are looking for work and can't find it, and the new rules and regulations just keep on coming. They have tried all their usual liberal solutions—higher taxes, ''stimulus,'' and more regulations. They have tried all the standard stuff and it has not worked. Doing more of it won't work either.

This may be difficult for Washington Democrats to hear, but it is time they switched from their failed ideological approach. It is time for them to shelve their political games and work with us to pass practical legislation for a change—legislation that can finally rescue the middle class from so many years of economic failure.

I have laid out a number of commonsense proposals already. There is more we can do if Democrats are willing to reach across the aisle and help deliver for the American people. My constituents expect us to do that. I am sure theirs do too. Honestly, there is no reason not to do that.

I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the time until 10:30 a.m. will be equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington.

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

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

(The remarks of Mrs. MURRAY pertaining to the introduction of S. 2243 are printed in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise in support of the nomination of Michelle Friedland to the Ninth Circuit.

This nomination was approved in the Judiciary Committee on a strong bipartisan vote of 14 to 3, including support from four Republican members: Ranking Member GRASSLEY, and Senators HATCH, GRAHAM, and FLAKE. She has earned the American Bar Association's highest rating of ''well qualified.''

If she is confirmed, which I very much hope she is, it would mark the first time ever that the Ninth Circuit, the busiest circuit in the country by some measures, has its full complement of 29 active circuit judges.

Michelle Friedland earned her bachelor's degree, with honors and distinction, from Stanford University in 1994. She was Phi Beta Kappa, and became a Fulbright Scholar from 1995 to 1996, studying at Oxford.

She earned her law degree from Stanford Law School in 2000, where she was second in her class, graduated with distinction, and inducted into the Order of the Coif.

She then had two prestigious clerkships. The first was with Judge David Tatel on the DC Circuit.

She then clerked for Supreme Court Justice Sandra Day O'Connor, who attended Ms. Friedland's confirmation hearing this past November.

Although I could not attend that hearing, it said a great deal that Justice O'Connor, the first woman on the Supreme Court and a voice of great moderation and pragmatism on the Court, came to the Judiciary Committee and demonstrated her support in person for this nominee.

Ms. Friedland then served as a lecturer at Stanford Law School from 2002 to 2004 and subsequently joined the law firm Munger Tolles & Olsen, where she is now a partner.

She has represented major clients, including Berkshire Hathaway, Boeing, Abbott Laboratories, the University of California, and Solvay Pharmaceuticals. She has worked on issues including criminal defense, class action defense, tax, patent, copyright, and antitrust.

She has also done pro bono work, devoting time, for example, to the Silicon Valley Campaign for Legal Services and Equality California.

She has won the President's Pro Bono Service Award and the Wiley W. Manuel Award for Pro Bono Legal Services, both from the State Bar of California.

She also has broad support in the legal community. One letter came from 27 individuals who clerked on the Supreme Court—including for Justices Rehnquist, Scalia, and Thomas—when Ms. Friedland clerked for Justice O'Connor. They said that Friedland is ''respectful of colleagues, fair-minded to attorneys and litigants, and sharp as a tack.''

A second letter is from Kathryn Haun, who previously served in the Justice Department under Attorney General Mukasey and in the National Security Division. Today she is a Federal prosecutor in Northern California.

Ms. Haun has known Michelle Friedland since they were classmates in the same small section at Stanford Law School. Ms. Haun's letter says:

> I clerked for Supreme Court Justice Anthony Kennedy, am a member of the Federalist Society, and have always been a registered Republican. Notwithstanding our political differences, I believe [Michelle Friedland] would make an outstanding federal appellate judge if confirmed. This is because Michelle has a deep respect for legal precedent above seeking a particular result in a given case.

A third letter is from the general counsel of Cisco, Edison International, Google, Facebook, Rambus, and other companies. It speaks very highly of this nominee, and says, quote: ''All parties appearing before her, from individual litigants to small businesses to the nation's largest corporations, would be confident that she will adjudge their cases fairly and in accordance with the law.''

The Ninth Circuit is also the busiest circuit. It has over 1,470 pending appeals per panel. This is two and a half times the average of the other circuits.

It comes as no surprise, then, that it takes much longer to resolve an appeal in the Ninth Circuit than in the other circuits. Specifically, the Ninth Circuit takes 13.3 months to resolve an appeal. This is down from 17.4 months in 2011, but it is still 55 percent greater than the average in the other circuits.

Thus, it is very important for businesses, individuals, and others in all States in the Ninth Circuit that nominees to this court are promptly taken up and confirmed.

I will conclude by remarking upon what I see as a real opportunity for the Senate in the coming months.

When I was first elected to the Senate in 1992, it was called by some the Year of the Woman. Senator BOXER and I were both elected that year, as were Senator MURRAY and former Senator Carol Moseley Braun.

Yet after we were all sworn in, there were still only six women in the Senate. I became the first woman ever to sit on the Senate Judiciary Committee, after some very divisive hearings for

Justice Clarence Thomas, in which the lack of women on the Judiciary Committee became an issue.

At the time, the Federal courts were mainly the province of men appointed by the two most recent Presidents.

About 92 percent of President Reagan's confirmed judicial nominees were men. That number fell under President George H.W. Bush, but only to 81 percent. Overall, only 12.6 percent of active Federal judges were women when I was sworn in to the Senate.

Although women have been close to half of all law students for decades, even today only 53 of 164 active circuit judges—or 32 percent—are women.

Right now, there are female nominees for the Third, Ninth, Tenth, and Eleventh Circuits pending in the Senate—a total of six nominees, with four simply waiting for a floor vote. To put these numbers in perspective, there were only 6 women confirmed to the circuit courts during all 8 years of the Reagan administration.

If all six of these pending nominees are confirmed, the number of active female circuit judges would grow by over 11 percent. That is a big deal, and it is a real opportunity to increase significantly the number of women on the circuit courts.

Michelle Friedland is well qualified, she has bipartisan support, and her confirmation would give the Ninth Circuit—the busiest circuit—a full complement of 29 judges for the first time. I urge my colleagues to support her.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today, we are again voting to overcome a Republican filibuster of a highly qualified nominee for a judicial emergency vacancy on the busiest circuit court in the country. For what is already the third time this year, the majority leader has had to file cloture on one of President Obama's circuit court nominees in order to move the nomination forward. In stark contrast, the Senate confirmed 18 of President Bush's circuit nominees within a week of being reported by the Judiciary Committee.

Michelle Friedland, nominated to serve on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, is an exceptionally talented attorney, and has an exemplary record of service in the top echelons of the legal profession. She clerked on the United States Supreme Court for Justice Sandra Day O'Connor from 2001 to 2002 and on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit for Judge David Tatel from 2000 to 2001. Ms. Friedland earned her B.S. with honors and distinction from Stanford University in 1995. She studied at Oxford University from 1995 to 1996 as a Fulbright Scholar and went on to earn her J.D. with distinction from Stanford Law School in 2000.

For over a decade, Ms. Friedland has worked in private practice at Munger, Tolles & Olson LLP, where she was named partner in 2010. She has taught as an adjunct professor at the University of Virginia School Law and as a Lecturer in Law at the Stanford Law School. Ms. Friedland has experience in both the trial court and appellate levels, including the United States Supreme Court. She manages an active pro bono practice and frequently represents the University of California in constitutional litigation. She received the President's Pro Bono Service Award in 2013 from the State Bar of California, and the LGBT Award from the American Civil Liberties Union of Southern California in 2009. The American Bar Association unanimously awarded her their highest rating of ''well qualified.''

It comes as no surprise to me that Michelle Friedland's nomination has received significant support. Kathryn Haun, Assistant United States Attorney and Former Counsel to then-Attorney General Michael Mukasey, wrote to the Committee to express her support, saying ''Michelle and I fall at opposite ends of the political spectrum . . . Notwithstanding our political differences, I believe she would make an outstanding federal appellate judge . . . Michelle has a deep respect for legal precedent above seeking a particular result in a given case. She has a balance and a willingness to listen to all arguments before formulating a position on a particular issue. She displays, above all else, intellectual honesty and personal modesty that suit her exceptionally well for a federal appellate judgeship.''

Eugene Volokh, Professor of Law, at the UCLA School of Law, expressed his strong support for Ms. Friedland to the Committee, writing ''Michelle is a brilliant and extremely accomplished lawyer, who will make a superb judge. . . [She] has impressed not just those on her side of the political aisle, but conservatives as . . . well.''

General Counsel from multiple fortune 500 companies including Google, Cisco, and Facebook echo their support of Michelle Friedland, noting that ''Her career has been marked by energy, integrity, and legal excellence. She has represented a broad spectrum of clients in both the private and public sectors . . . The careful, unbiased approach she would bring to the types of issues that arise before the Ninth Circuit are critical to our nation's values and to its economic health.''

In their letter of support, 22 former Supreme Court Law Clerks to Justice O'Connor write, ''We have differing political views and differing careers, but we can all agree that Michelle would be an excellent federal appellate judge. We have . . . enjoyed her warm collegiality, her honesty and fairness, and her dedication to law above ideology. Michelle would be a tremendous addition to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, and we urge you to confirm her nomination.''

I ask unanimous consent that a list of letters of support be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my statement.

If confirmed, Michelle Friedland would increase the gender diversity on the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals. She would be the seventeenth female judge to ever sit on the Circuit. In comparison, 83 men have been appointed to the Ninth Circuit over the course of its history. Her confirmation would bring the percentage of active female judges sitting on the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals to nearly 38 percent. Her confirmation would also mark the first time, since the 29th judgeship was added in 2007, that it has had a full complement of active judges despite having the highest number of appeals filed, the highest pending appeals per panel and the highest pending appeals per active judge of any Circuit in the country.

Yet here we are, again voting to overcome a Republican filibuster of an exceptionally talented nominee to a court that desperately needs to be operating at full strength.

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

LETTERS RECEIVED IN CONNECTION WITH MICHELLE FRIEDLAND

July 26, 2013—Six Supreme Court Co-Clerks

August 26, 2013—Eugene Volokh, Professor of Law at the UCLA School of Law and conservative legal commentator

August 26, 2013—Five fellow partners at Munger, Tolles, & Olson LLP

September 4, 2013—Brian Fitzpatrick, Professor of Law at Vanderbilt Law School

September 9, 2013—Anup Malani, Professor of Law and Medicine at the University of Chicago

September 9, 2013—Edward Morrison, Professor of Law at the University of Chicago and Former Law Clerk to Justice Scalia

September 12, 2013—Kathryn Haun, Assistant United States Attorney and Former Counsel to Former Attorney General Michael Mukasey

September 23, 2013—General Counsels from multiple American companies including Google, Cisco, and Facebook

October 2, 2013—27 Supreme Court Co-Clerks

October 24, 2013—28 Former Law Students and Current Attorneys

November 4, 2013—22 former Supreme Court Law Clerks to Justice O'Connor

April 9, 2014—Nancy Duff Campbell and Marcia Greenberger, Co-Presidents of the National Women's Law Center

April 9, 2014—Wade Henderson, President and CEO, and Nancy Zirkin, Executive Vice President, Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights

CLOTURE MOTION

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative 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 nomination of Michelle T. Friedland, of California, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.

Harry Reid, Patrick J. Leahy, Debbie Stabenow, Jack Reed, Christopher A. Coons, Patty Murray, Elizabeth Warren, Richard J. Durbin, Mazie K.

Hirono, Sheldon Whitehouse, Richard Blumenthal, Barbara Boxer, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Charles E. Schumer, John D. Rockefeller IV, Bernard Sanders, Cory A. Booker.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Michelle T. Friedland, of California, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) is necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) and the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) would have voted ''nay.''

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 56, nays 41, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 106 Ex.]

YEAS—56

Baldwin	Harkin	Nelson
Begich	Heinrich	Pryor
Bennet	Heitkamp	Reed
Blumenthal	Hirono	Reid
Booker	Johnson (SD)	Rockefeller
Boxer	Kaine	Sanders
Brown	King	Schatz
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cardin	Landrieu	Shaheen
Carper	Leahy	Stabenow
Casey	Levin	Tester
Collins	Manchin	Udall (CO)
Coons	McCaskill	Udall (NM)
Donnelly	Menendez	Walsh
Durbin	Merkley	Warner
Feinstein	Mikulski	Warren
Franken	Murkowski	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Murphy	Wyden
Hagan	Murray	

NAYS—41

Alexander	Flake	Moran
Ayotte	Graham	Paul
Barrasso	Grassley	Portman
Blunt	Hatch	Risch
Boozman	Heller	Roberts
Burr	Hoeven	Rubio
Chambliss	Inhofe	Scott
Coats	Isakson	Sessions
Cochran	Johanns	Shelby
Corker	Johnson (WI)	Thune
Cornyn	Kirk	Toomey
Crapo	Lee	Vitter
Enzi	McCain	Wicker
Fischer	McConnell	

NOT VOTING—3

Coburn	Cruz	Markey

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. On this vote the ayes are 56 and the nays are 41.

The motion to invoke cloture is agreed to.

VOTE EXPLANATION

• Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I was necessarily absent from the roll call vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination of Michelle Friedland to be a U.S. Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit. Had I been present, I would have supported cloture on the nomination of Michelle Friedland.•

NOMINATION OF MICHELLE T. FRIEDLAND TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT—Resumed

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican whip.

A SHARED COMMITMENT

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I start by making an obvious point that every Member of the Senate is dedicated to helping law enforcement officials get dangerous criminals off the street and deliver justice to victims of sexual assault, every one of us.

As we mark National Crime Victims' Rights Week and National Sexual Assault Awareness Month, let's all keep that shared commitment in mind.

Ten years ago I was proud to join with my colleagues and President Bush to enact the Justice for All Act, which has made it easier for America's law enforcement agencies to protect the innocent, to identify the guilty, and to bring peace of mind to the victims of violent crime. Justice for All dramatically increased the resources available to test DNA samples from crime scenes, to improve our DNA-testing capabilities and to reduce the rape kit backlog which had become a national scandal.

The backlog was—and remains—a national scandal of the highest order, but we are beginning to make some progress. In the city of Houston, for example, a backlog that once reached 6,600 untested rape kits—one of the largest in the country—is now in the process of being completely eliminated thanks in part to the support provided from the Justice for All Act.

Just to refresh the memories of my colleagues and for those who might be listening, these rape kits consist of forensic evidence collected at crime scenes that will help by testing the DNA to identify the perpetrator and, in the process, potentially exonerate people who have been falsely accused. The DNA tests are that good and that effective. What is extraordinary about DNA testing in the field of sexual assault is that sexual assault offenders rarely commit that crime once. They are typically serial offenders. In other words, they keep at it until they are caught. As we have learned from law enforcement officials, when there is not an adult victim available, these offenders are opportunistic and they will attack children, the most vulnerable among us. So this is enormously powerful evidence that is available to law enforcement to exonerate the falsely accused, to make sure the guilty are identified with scientific precision, and to take serial offenders off the street so they can't commit other acts of violence.

Last year I joined with the senior Senator from Vermont, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, to introduce bipartisan legislation that would reauthorize the Justice for All Act and continue these beginning steps of progress. If it were up to me, we would have passed that bill a long time ago. If it were up to me, I would prefer to reauthorize the entire Justice for All Act right now—today. It has been hugely successful, and it commands strong support across party lines and across the country.

That said, it doesn't appear we are going to be able to do that today, but we do have an opportunity to take immediate action on two of the law's most critical components. Indeed, they could and should be reauthorized right now—today. I am referring, of course, to the Debbie Smith Act and the Sexual Assault Forensic Exam Program, both of which have been invaluable tools in our efforts to eliminate the rape kit backlog and to improve public safety.

Earlier this week our House colleagues passed a bill reauthorizing those provisions, and the Senate now has an opportunity to take up that more narrow House bill to reauthorize the Debbie Smith Act and the Sexual Assault Forensic Exam Program, even if we can't do the Justice for All Act today. I am hoping that colleagues here in the Chamber, and anyone who might be listening to my voice, will join us in this effort to do what we can do today to reauthorize the Debbie Smith Act and the Sexual Assault Forensic Exam Program and then, when it is possible for the Senate to act, to pass the Justice for All Act, the larger piece of legislation.

As I said, I would prefer to reauthorize the entire Justice for All Act, and I know there are many of our colleagues who share that sentiment with me. But regardless of whatever minor disagreements Members may have, we should immediately—today—reauthorize the Debbie Smith Act and the Sexual Assault Forensic Exam Program.

Again refreshing the memories of some of my colleagues, and others who may not be familiar with it, the Debbie Smith Act was named after Debbie Smith who has dedicated her life to making sure Congress keeps focused on this rape kit backlog problem and scandal. She is one of the biggest cheerleaders for this law that now bears her name. This is also the name for the portion of the law that allocates funds to the Department of Justice to use for grant programs to forensic laboratories, police departments, and other law enforcement agencies around the country that may not have the money or the expertise or the wherewithal to be able to test these rape kit backlogs.

It is not just my position that these two provisions the House has passed should be taken up and passed by the Senate and then catch up in due course with the entire Justice for All Act. It is also the position of the Rape, Abuse & Incest National Network, the National Center for Victims of Crime, and, of course, Debbie Smith herself,

and I am confident many of my colleagues have heard from her.

All of those folks support the provisions of the bigger bill. But if we can't do that today, they support the Senate's passing the provisions that have passed the House as soon as possible. We now have an opportunity today to do something to support countless victims of sexual assault during National Sexual Assault Awareness Month and National Crime Victims' Rights Week. All of these groups and individuals support the immediate reauthorization of the Debbie Smith Act.

I am proud to stand here with the heroic people who have dedicated their lives to helping address this backlog scandal of untested rape kits, and even more proud to stand with those who are willing—and spending their time and treasure—to help folks who need to heal, who need justice, and who are asking for our support. In all my years of public service, Debbie Smith is among the most inspiring people I have ever had the privilege of meeting. I sincerely hope my colleagues will keep her in mind and others like her as we move forward with this legislation.

Earlier this week, Debbie reminded me that the rape kit backlog is not just about numbers and DNA samples and scientific testing. It is about people, it is about justice, and it is about recovery. As she so eloquently put it:

> These aren't rape kits that need to be tested. These are lives that need to be given back to their owners. These are fragments of lives that have been torn apart.

I hope my colleagues will remember those words as they contemplate how we should move forward on the House provisions that have been passed, as well as the larger Justice for All Act, both of which I support. By reauthorizing the Debbie Smith Act—and later, in due course, whenever we can do it, the larger Justice for All Act—Members of Congress can continue doing our part to help people like Debbie Smith heal wounds, repair lives, and make our country a safer place.

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

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

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. I would ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

The clerk will report the nomination.

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Michelle T. Friedland, of California, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

IMMIGRATION

Mr. SESSIONS. I wish to share with my colleagues some recent developments that I believe are important on the immigration front. My office did a report and an analysis recently that pointed out that this administration, unlike what had been done historically, has been counting border apprehensions as ICE deportations from the United States. Classically, before that ICE officers—the Immigration Customs Enforcement officers—apprehended people inside the border and did removal proceedings and that was what was counted. So they have used those numbers to create the impression that a great deal more removals are occurring than actually are. That is not good. The administration should not be doing that, and it has created confusion. It is just one more example of this administration's willingness, unfortunately, to misrepresent and twist numbers to advance an agenda they believe ought to be advanced.

We are a nation of immigrants. We believe in immigration, but we believe in a lawful system of immigration. Most Americans believe the lawlessness should end and we should have a system that creates a mechanism by which people apply and they are admitted based on a fair evaluation of the people most likely to be prosperous in America and do well and contribute to the Nation and should be given priority—and we are just not doing that.

So the administration contends and says openly that we will not deport people, except those who commit serious crimes, which apparently does not include DUI's. The crimes almost always have to be a felony, it appears, in order for people to be deported, according to the administration. We will ignore the law for that company down the street in a high unemployment area which has five employees working illegally. They would not be removed. They will be allowed to stay and continue to work unlawfully, while Americans who cannot get a job are drawing unemployment insurance and other subsidies. This is happening all over America.

So getting to this fundamental point: Government is not being operated in ways that it should, conducted by a President who is charged to see that the laws of the United States are faithfully executed. He has issued prosecutorial removal policies that go beyond creating a mechanism to enforce the law but in fact wipe out the law, eliminate the law.

There has never been a requirement in the law that if someone is in the country illegally, they can stay as long as they don't get convicted of some other felony unrelated to an immigration violation. Indeed, under the policy as it is being executed, if an individual has false documents, which is a felony for an American citizen, that doesn't count as a deportable crime. It is only drug dealing or a crime of violence or robbery under the policies that we are carrying out.

They say they are faithfully executing that policy in part, deporting the individuals who are convicted of serious crimes. A study came out from CIS, Center for Immigration Studies, that found 1 in 3 criminal alien encounters last year resulted in a release. They are being released, in one form or another, and are remaining in the country.

We have so much going on that is very troubling to me. Former ICE Director John Sandweg said recently:

> If you are a run-of-the-mill immigrant here illegally, your odds of getting deported are close to zero—it's just highly unlikely to happen.

Now that is the truth. I was a Federal prosecutor. I know how the system works and I have worked with ICE officers and Border Patrol officers and prosecuted their cases. This is what the reality is, and it is not right. It should not be.

When we have the Vice President of the United States saying recently he considers the 11 million people here illegally as citizens anyway, what message does that send, colleagues, to an individual who would like to come to America permanently but has a visa to work so many months or be a student for so many months and the visa is over? What does the statement of the Vice President mean to him? It means he doesn't have to go home. All he has to do is just stay in the country. If he is in the interior and not caught at the border and came in by airplane, flew into Philadelphia or Denver, he gets to stay. As long as he doesn't get convicted of a felony, nobody is ever going to bother him. So this is an open border.

If they get past the border, get into the interior, go to St. Louis, go to Salt Lake City, go to Little Rock, Arkansas, then they can stay. That cannot be the policy of the United States of America. It cannot be the policy of a nation that expects its laws to be respected that if someone can get past the border or they can get a visa into the country and overstay, nobody will have any intention of removing them or enforcing the agreement they made or enforcing the law. I feel strongly about this issue.

People are unaware of how this is happening. I see in addition to the fanciful claims about who is being deported or removed, this was on the front page of the Washington Times today. Steven Dinan says the projections of the Washington Times show that Federal agents are '' . . . on pace this year to remove the fewest number of immigrants of President Obama's tenure.''

It goes on to say:

> That slower pace contrasts with the President's argument that he is enforcing the laws to the fullest extent possible by targeting criminals and recent border crossers.

The article goes on to say that the ICE officers are fully funded to remove at least 400,000 people, and at this rate they will be well below that figure. Why? Because it is the policy not to enforce the law. This is what is going on in this country.

On the same page there is the headline of an article that ''Sheriffs warn of violence from Mexican cartels deep into interior of U.S.''

It goes on to say:

Outmanned and outgunned, local law enforcement officers are alarmed by the drug and human trafficking, prostitution, kidnapping and money laundering that Mexican drug cartels are conducting in the U.S. far from the border.

Not just at the border but away from the border. It goes on:

U.S. sheriffs say that securing the border is a growing concern to law enforcement agencies throughout the country, not just near the U.S.-Mexico boundary.

''If we fail to secure our borders, then every sheriff in America will become a border sheriff,'' said Sam Paige, sheriff of Rockingham County, NC. ''We're only a two-day drive from the border and have already seen the death and violence that illegal crossings brings into our community.''

Other sheriffs joined in expressing that similar concern.

We are not where we need to be. Since the President took office, interior removals have been cut nearly in half. They have dropped by 44 percent. More than half of the ICE removals since 2009 are the border apprehensions, where they just caught them at the border and sent them back. These are not interior deportations as the statistics used to be focused on. Two-thirds of all ICE removals last year were border apprehensions. So—I said ''half'' earlier—it is two-thirds of the numbers that they are counting as deportations and removal are border deportations that weren't previously counted as such.

Ninty-four percent of the people removed last year—get this—were either apprehended at the border, which is not attributable to apprehension, or were convicted of a crime while in the United States.

Do you hear that, colleagues? Ninety-four percent of the people who were removed were either people captured at the border or committing a serious crime, and even those who commit serious crimes are not deported. Most of the rest were repeat violators or fugitives.

So 99.9 percent of the 12 million illegal immigrants and visa overstays, without known crimes on their record, including those fleeing from authority, did not face removal last year. So if someone was here as a visa overstay or an illegal entrant inside the country and did not commit a crime, 99 percent of that—99.92 percent of the 12 million here were not involved or no action was taken to remove them. It just goes to show our law enforcement system is in a state of collapse. It is a deliberate plan by the President of the United States, and it is wrong. People need to be aware of it and need to stand up to it and I think the American people are beginning to do so.

This administration has effectively declared that anyone in the world who illegally gains access to the interior of the United States through a border, through an airport, through a seaport, is free to illegally remain in the United States, free to claim certain tax benefits, free to work and take jobs that unemployed Americans need. This deprives millions of Americans of their jobs, wages and represents a dramatic, breathtaking nullification of Federal law.

This law enforcement collapse is evident everywhere—872,000 aliens have been ordered removed but haven't left. So we order people removed. They get released on bail or get released in order to remove themselves or show up for removal. How many are showing up? Not many. It is called a catch and release, as has been referred to.

There are 872,000—almost 1 million—who at one time or another have been ordered removed but haven't left, and 68,000 potentially deportable aliens deemed criminal by type were released by immigration officials last year. These were people who were charged with crimes and still didn't leave.

The chief of the Border Patrol—this is the guy who runs the border effort with his team—predicted a tenfold increase in the presence of illegal youth crossing the border between 2011 and 2014. They have been told: Come on down, nothing is going to happen, and it has created more people coming, this lack of enforcement.

The Los Angeles Times reports that the number of asylum claims at the borders have increased sevenfold since 2009. Well, the administration developed a policy of stopping everything. All someone has to do is say, I am claiming asylum, and the whole process stops. Time goes by. Often the individuals who claim asylum are released on bail and then they don't leave. We don't know where they go. This is in effect a postmodern view of challenging the very idea that we are a nation-state with real borders. Attorney General Holder and Cecilia Munoz, who is the President's Assistant and Director of the Domestic Policy Council, who used to be with La Raza, described amnesty as a civil right. If you come into the country illegally, the Attorney General of the United States declares that these individuals have a civil right to amnesty. How can this possibly be? This is the chief law enforcement officer in America?

Vice President BIDEN recently said:

You know, eleven million people live in the shadows. I believe they're already American citizens . . . eleven million undocumented aliens are already Americans.

Goodness. The Vice President of the United States would make such a statement. It is stunning beyond belief. Apparently, if somebody is supposed to get on an airplane to leave this country because their visa is up and then they read the Vice President's statement, they could just say: Well, I will just stay. Why should I go back? I would rather stay now. I kind of like this place. If I go back, I will have to wait in line. I will have to compete within the system like everybody else who comes lawfully. Since I am here, I am not going to leave.

Is it any wonder we have more people staying, as the border patrol chief said?

President Obama made a series of nominations—Mr. Jeh Johnson, the head of Homeland Security, a lawyer at the Department of Defense and a political campaigner. He heads the Department of Homeland Security, which is a huge department. He can be counted on to know one thing: He is very close to the President, and he is to carry out the President's wishes. He doesn't know anything else about running a big, major law enforcement operation such as this. Mr. Perez, the former Assistant Attorney General at the Department of Justice's Civil Rights Division, was very active with the pro-amnesty group in Maryland before this. Mr. Rodriguez, who has been nominated to be the Director of USCIS—they were installed not to be good and smart law enforcement officers but to effectuate the President's agenda. You want to know the truth? That is the truth. They were put in there to carry out the agenda, not to carry out law enforcement.

The morale at Homeland Security is the lowest of any major entity in the U.S. Government. They have actually sued supervisors because they are being blocked from enforcing the law as they have taken oath to do.

I see my colleagues are here, and I will yield the floor. First, I will conclude by saying that I hope my colleagues will look at this. These facts are not disputed. This is not acceptable. It cannot be that the U.S. Government would carry on its business in this way. It is dangerous not only on immigration law but any other law that might come up in the future.

Presidents cannot, Attorneys General cannot, and Homeland Security people cannot fail to enforce plain law without creating serious damage to the great American constitutional legal system that has protected us and produced our prosperity.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

AMTRAK

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I would like to start this afternoon by thanking Chairman MURRAY for her tireless work on the Budget Committee—on which I serve—to develop and pass a bipartisan budget, a budget that sets us on a path to return to regular order.

Senator MURRAY has also been a tireless advocate for transportation and infrastructure programs, and as chair of the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee—on which I also serve—she fought tirelessly to include adequate funding for Amtrak back in the fiscal year 2014 omnibus and moving forward.

The topic I would like to take up today is the role of Amtrak in our country and our communities and its appropriate role as a central piece of

Federal transportation policy going forward.

Senator MURRAY has been a terrific advocate for investing across a wide range of transportation modalities. As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I look forward to working with her and our leading full committee chair Senator MIKULSKI to make sure we are successful in fighting ardently and steadfastly for Amtrak this year and into the future.

I come to talk on the floor today about the importance of our national passenger rail system—Amtrak—because this is not just about getting people from point A to point B. Investing in Amtrak also means creating jobs, making our whole economy more dynamic, and making America more competitive.

Amtrak is performing better and better each and every year. As the Presiding Officer knows all too well, ridership over the last decade has steadily increased. In fact, 10 of the last 11 years have seen record numbers, and last year we broke through 31.6 million riders on Amtrak. The trains are more and more crowded, but they are arriving more and more frequently on time and the quality of the train sets and the quality of the service provided by the conductors and the other folks who work for Amtrak has steadily increased.

As the value proposition of Amtrak has increased, so has ridership. Record ticket sales and other revenues have made this possible. Today Amtrak covers nearly 89 percent of the cost of operating their trains, which is by far the best of any passenger rail operation in the United States. They are, in fact, on track to cover 90 percent, through revenues, of their total operating costs in 2014. Because of this success, since 2002 Amtrak has decreased its debt by more than half.

My home State of Delaware and the Presiding Officer's home State of New Jersey are part of one of the oldest and most critical sections of our national passenger rail system, the so-called Northeast corridor, which goes from Boston to Washington. If it were its own separate economy, the Northeast corridor would produce $3 trillion a year—21 percent of our Nation's total economic output—which would make it the fifth largest economy in the world if it were on its own. But it is not. It is an integrated part of our Nation, and its passenger rail infrastructure is an integrated part of our national commitment to efficient and effective transportation.

In this region in particular, Amtrak is not a luxury; it is a fundamental and critical part of our economy and moving our community and our people forward. If Amtrak service were cut off in the region for just a day, it would cost our economy $13 million. One-third of all the jobs in the Northeast corridor—or 7 million jobs—are within 5 miles of a station.

Amtrak's impact on my home State of Delaware is particularly large because Amtrak employs over 1,000 men and women in the State of Delaware. Many of them work at two maintenance facilities—Wilmington and Bear—where they repair everything from train seats to the heavy trucks to the cars themselves. I have had a chance to visit them on a number of occasions. It is incredible to see the work ethic and capabilities of the men and women of Amtrak. These shops have been there for a long time. They have worked hard to modernize, to be relevant, and to contribute to the strengthening bottom line of Amtrak overall.

I would like to mention ''Irish'' John, who is a good friend of mine and has been a leader for the sheet metal workers for a long time. Sheet metal workers with Amtrak were one of the unions that worked with management to find ways to significantly save costs on overhaul work on Acela train sets, which resulted in Amtrak choosing not to farm out their service work and instead do a $125 million job to overhaul 20 Acela sets in-house. This is union labor, and this helps support good middle-wage jobs. This helps support good middle-class families and middle-class communities in Delaware and our region. This particular work on this Acela overhaul will last more than 3½ years and sustain dozens of jobs at our Bear repair facility.

My friend Bill, who is with the IBEW Amtrak union, is another friend who has helped me understand the critical role of the employment Amtrak provides to our whole region—not just to Delaware, not just to the Philadelphia area, but to the whole Northeast corridor.

When we talk about investing in Amtrak, we are not only investing in new options for commuters and businesses, we are talking about investing in our communities and in workers who will build and maintain the next generation of American rail. As I said, these are great, high-skilled jobs. By investing in Amtrak's present and giving them a predictable future, we will preserve and continue these important skills and these important workers and their families in our communities.

Amtrak's benefits go beyond just the immediate skilled workers and their families and the communities that benefit from them.

In Delaware, the services Amtrak provides help to keep and draw in new businesses through a ripple effect in our whole economy. Last week there was an announcement of a new company that is spinning off out of Sallie Mae that will be locating its headquarters and 120 jobs in Wilmington. They have chosen a site specifically because it is walking distance from our Amtrak station—from the Joseph R. Biden Amtrak Station in Wilmington, DE.

In Newark, the University of Delaware is building a new campus called the Science, Technology and Advanced Research—STAR—Campus, which will build partnerships between several important entities, such as the Thomas Jefferson University in Philadelphia and the Aberdeen Proving Ground in Maryland. What makes that partnership possible is the backbone of the Northeast corridor—the connection between these different cities that has made all of us stronger and better because of passenger rail.

I hope from these few examples it is clear that passenger rail is also a critical component of economic development. Passenger rail tends to link downtown urban areas and tends to be absolutely central to anchoring their revitalization, as the Presiding Officer knows so well.

Passenger rail is also critical not just in the Northeast corridor but in communities across the country that rely on it to connect with other communities and our country's major economic centers.

State-supported services have become a major source of ridership growth for Amtrak as well, with that ridership nearly doubling between 1998 and 2013.

Long-distance ridership across the great heartland of our country has also grown by roughly 20 percent without the introduction of any new services, frequencies, or equipment. In fiscal year 2013, long-distance ridership reached its highest point in 20 years.

However, we are at the proverbial crossroads—or I suppose I should say crossing—now because ridership is soaring, Amtrak is more popular than ever before, and demand will continue to grow, but we are not keeping up with the investment in infrastructure that we need to sustain this growth into the future.

For instance, right now there is nearly $6 billion in outdated, delayed investments that need to be made just in the Northeast corridor to bring it to what is called a state of good repair. I will focus on a few of the critical infrastructure needs in the Northeast corridor, but there are also needs across the country.

Baltimore is a city I traveled through this morning on my way to this Capitol on the Amtrak train. In Baltimore, Senator MIKULSKI's home State, the B&P tunnels have stayed open since 1873. Although they have undergone periodic repairs, none of them were built to be permanent. We can't be competitive if we continue to rely on tunnels that have been around since roughly the time of our own Civil War. We need to invest in modernizing this infrastructure.

Between the Presiding Officer's home State of New Jersey and the great State of New York, preliminary planning is underway on the Gateway Tunnel, which is a critical tunnel that will ease the bottleneck under the Hudson that causes delays throughout the whole region, limits the options of travelers, and ends up costing the economy more in the short and long run. We need to invest in our infrastructure.

In Delaware, we have a bottleneck around our most popular station, the Joseph R. Biden Station in Wilmington. The rail lines north and south of that station slim from three lines to two, restricting service and preventing the addition of new rail service. Thanks in part to a Federal high-speed rail grant, construction will soon be underway to add a third track to alleviate this critical chokepoint, the main one just south of the station. Without new investment, that chokepoint will continue north of the station.

And that is not to mention the hundreds of bridges and tunnels and other connection points—including the overhead centenary lines—that require repair and replacement on the Northeast corridor alone. We need to invest in our infrastructure not just in the Northeast corridor but across this whole country. We do spend a lot of time here on this floor, as we should, talking about our Nation's fiscal deficit and debt, but we should also focus on our physical deficit and debt—the delayed repair of critical pieces of infrastructure that we rely on for our economy and for our communities but that we are not focused on.

If we invest in our infrastructure today, it will employ people in repairing it and lay the groundwork for improvement of our economy over the long term. I recognize the reality that while the budget picture has improved, it is not yet as good as it should be. We are still facing real fiscal challenges.

I ride between Wilmington and Washington nearly every day on Amtrak, and our workers are responsible for repairing and retrofitting a lot of the trains on which I ride. I am impressed with their skill and the caliber of their repair work. As a rider and our State Senator, I see how critical Amtrak is to our economy, our communities, and to our country as a whole. I hope that is clear to the rest of the Members of this Chamber.

I hope that anyone watching who has appreciated the value of Amtrak's connecting power that links this country together from east to west and north to south will communicate with their Senator and convey the importance of strong and sustained investment in the Northeast corridor, yes, but across the whole reach of our country. Only by strengthening Amtrak and ensuring the vibrancy of the entire Nation's system of passenger rail can we really ensure that American rail will be there for years and generations to come.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to be allowed to speak as in morning business.

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

OBAMACARE

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I come to the floor today, as I have repeatedly since the health care law has been passed, with concerns I have and to share some information with the Senate because of my concerns that in order to help some people who did not have insurance, I am afraid we have hurt many people who did have insurance, did have care they liked. The President continued to focus on coverage, and I have more concerns, as a doctor, about people actually getting care, getting health care, the care they need from a doctor they choose at lower costs.

So I come to the floor today to talk about a new story out this morning, actually in the Huffington Post, called ''How Obamacare Leaves Some Patients Without Doctors.''

I recall how the President had said: If you like your policy, you can keep your policy. He said: If you like your doctor, you can keep your doctor. Yet we are hearing stories from all around the country of people who have found that not to be true.

I have heard the majority leader come to the floor and say in a statement that so many stories are lies, they are made up. But I will tell you that this morning, in this publication, there is a lengthy story of several patients in California who have had pain, problems, medical concerns, signed up for insurance, and, as a result, have found out they have insurance, they have coverage, but they cannot find care.

So I would like to share with the Senate today a story, and it has some of the concerns I raised during the debate and the discussion of the health care law. But the Speaker of the House at the time, NANCY PELOSI, from California—the State where this happened—said: First you have to pass it before you get to find out what is in it. Well, now people all across the country are finding out what is in it, and they are finding out they are terribly disappointed and they feel they have been sold a bill of goods and they are getting stuck with a bill, and they are finding out it is not very good for them.

The report in this morning's Huffington Post starts out:

> In January, a doctor told [Ms.] Friedlander, who was suffering from excruciating lower back pain, that she needed surgery to remove part of a severely herniated disc.

Well, she had Blue Shield insurance, as they report, through Covered California, which is California's version of ObamaCare, and she planned to use that coverage to pay for the operation. It makes sense.

This is what happened. It says:

> But when she started to call surgeons covered by Blue Shield, she ran into a roadblock. Surgeons who were covered by her insurance—

amazingly—

> operated out of hospitals no longer covered by her insurance. . . .

So if the surgeon was covered, the hospital was not or, vice versa, she could find a hospital that would cover her surgery but could not find a surgeon who was covered by her insurance that was on the staff of that hospital.

It says:

> [Ms.] Friedlander spent days on the phone, hours on hold, making dozens of calls across Southern California, trying to match a surgeon with a hospital that would both be covered. In total, she reached out to 20 [different] surgeons and five [different] hospitals.
>
> ''No one could help me. Some expressed sympathy,'' Friedlander, 40, told The Huffington Post in an email. ''They told me, 'I'm so sorry—it's all just so new. You're a victim of the changes. No one knows what they're doing.' ''

So what we have here is a victim of the Obama health care legislation because first we had to pass it before we get to find out what is in it.

> Unable to match a hospital and a surgeon that were both covered, [Ms.] Friedlander started haggling between doctors for a cash price for the surgery. She chose a surgeon who wasn't covered by her insurance but who operated in a hospital that was covered.

Because she could not, with her insurance, get both the hospital and the doctor.

> She expects her insurance to pay the hospital bill, but she had to pay her surgeon's bill herself.

All out of her own pocket.

The article goes on to report:

> . . . nationwide, about 70 percent of Obamacare plans—

About 70 percent of the plans purchased on the Obama health care law—

> offer fewer hospitals and doctors than employer-sponsored group plans or pre-ACA individual market plans, according to a study by consulting firm KcKinsey & Company released in December. This narrowed number of doctors and hospitals is what [Ms.] Friedlander encountered when trying to match a surgeon and hospital that would both be covered.

What we are hearing today is that about 70 percent of ObamaCare plans offer fewer hospitals, fewer doctors, in spite of the President's promise to the American people that if you like your doctor, you can keep your doctor; if you like your plan, you can keep your plan.

Now, Covered California says they are aware of the problem. A spokesman for the group—a senior medical adviser with the ObamaCare plan in California—says:

> We understand that some people are having trouble getting access to the doctors and hospitals they need. And we're working very hard to fix [that] as fast as we can.

Well, perhaps if people had actually read the law, understood what was in it, they would have seen this coming.

The President said your insurance premiums would drop. He said families would save $2,500 a family. But the article says:

> To make up for ACA costs and keep premiums low, Blue Shield asked its doctors

and hospitals to accept payments from the insurer at rates [well] reduced—

Reduced from what they normally got—

reduced [by] up to 30 percent.

The article goes on:

Not surprisingly, some doctors and hospitals rejected Blue Shield's reduced payment rates and decided not to re-sign contracts with the insurer. At least three major Los Angeles hospitals previously covered by Blue Shield—

And, Madam President, I will tell you, these are first-class hospitals, these are highly thought-of hospitals, hospitals with incredibly good reputations.

. . . three major Los Angeles hospitals previously covered by Blue Shield—UCLA—

The University of California-Los Angeles—

Cedars Sinai and Good Samaritan—have opted out of the insurer's new network. . . .

According to [the communications manager from Blue Shield], Blue Shield of California now has about 40 percent fewer physicians and 25 percent fewer hospitals in its network than last year.

You listen to what is happening, and they talk about the significant gaps occurring in California.

These are the concerns I hear about when I go home to Wyoming every weekend. These are the concerns I heard about this past weekend in Casper, in Douglas, in Riverton, in Thermopolis, and in Newcastle traveling around the State. People are not able to keep their insurance. They are not able to keep their doctors. It is happening all across the country, and we see this story out of California today.

The interesting part of the issue with California is that—the article goes on and they talk to an insurance agent in Sacramento who says: '' . . . people who already had insurance''—'' . . . people who already had insurance''—''especially healthy, young people, may be paying more under Covered California''—''may be paying more''; not what the President promised—''for fewer hospitals and doctors.''

That is not what the intent of the health care law was but it is what the health care law has delivered.

This is what is happening to real people, real families, all across the country. The majority leader says: false, made up, whole cloth. But I will tell you, these stories will continue to occur.

It is interesting, in today's article in the Huffington Post it says:

And when signing up for a plan, it's difficult to determine which doctors and hospitals are still covered.

They are talking about California now. The article says, quoting an insurance agent in California:

''You can sign up on Covered California and think you're totally fine, only to find out later that you're totally hosed''. . . .

This man, David Fear, goes on to say:

Specialist doctors, such as surgeons, obgyns and urologists, declined Blue Cross and Blue Shield's lower payments most frequently. Fear estimates that about two-thirds of Blue Cross and Blue Shield's specialists have opted out of the networks.

It is not just that one patient whom I talked about. There is, like Ms. Friedlander, Ruth Iorio, a 35-year-old new mother from Los Angeles. She is struggling to find the care she needs in Blue Shield's smaller network.

She signed up for Blue Shield through Covered California in November because the Covered California website listed her hospital—

The Web site, the President's Web site, the Covered California Web site—

listed her hospital, UCLA, as accepting Blue Shield. . . .

Continuing:

However, after Iorio gave birth in December, she was told that her ob-gyn at UCLA was not covered by her insurance. So she paid out of pocket.

Iorio has not been able to find a urologist for her son or an ob-gyn who is both covered by her insurance and practicing in a hospital that is covered.

The President said: You can keep your hospital, you can keep your doctor, you can keep your plan.

She's called over a dozen doctors who are covered by her insurance, and each has told her that if she or her son needs an operation in the hospitals the doctor contracts with, it won't be covered.

So even if they get a doctor who is under their plan, they cannot go to a hospital to get actually a procedure done.

As this lady says:

''My insurance is pretty useless. And I'm not fussy about what doctor I see,'' Iorio said. ''I don't know what to do. I may just drop it for myself and keep my son on it. It's really depressing.''

It is really depressing what the President and the Democrats have forced down the throat of the American people with this health care law.

The article continues:

Before joining Covered California, Iorio had an individual Blue Shield plan that was cheaper than what she now pays and that gave her wider access to doctors and hospitals.

Cheaper, wider access. Exactly what the President had promised her is exactly what this woman has lost because of the health care law.

She goes on and says:

''I'm paying $500 a month and every doctor I'm calling is saying, 'No, I can't see you,' '' she said. ''I feel like a second-class citizen.''

Is that what the President's health care law is all about: making people feel like second-class citizens, hearing from folks when they call and ask for help that, sorry, you are just a victim of the Obama health care law—a nation of more and more victims? It does seem, as you look around the country, for those who have been helped, we should not have had to hurt this many people because of a law the American people said ''we do not want'' and was forced, on single-party lines, down the throats of the American people.

This law is bad for patients. We have seen that today. It continues to be bad for providers—the nurses, the doctors, who take care of those patients—and it is terrible for taxpayers. Tax rates will continue to go up. Taxes are continuing to go up as a result of the health care law and the expenses related to it. It has failed repeatedly in dealing with the needs of the American people, who knew what they wanted in the first place, which was they wanted the care they need from a doctor they choose at lower costs. Instead, they got this.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

THOMASINA JORDAN INDIAN TRIBES OF VIRGINIA FEDERAL RECOGNITION ACT

Mr. KAINE. Madam President, I rise today to speak on behalf of S. 1074, the Thomasina Jordan Indian Tribes of Virginia Federal Recognition Act of 2013. This is a bill granting Federal recognition to six Indian tribes. The bill has recently been reported out of the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs, and I want to thank Chairman TESTER, the former chairwoman, Senator CANTWELL, and all members of the Committee for this action.

These six Indian tribes—the Chickahominy, Chickahominy Eastern Division, Upper Mattaponi, Rappahannock, Monacan, and Nansemond—are among the best known tribes in American history, but they have never received Federal recognition. Madam President, 566 tribes have received Federal recognition—the vast majority by congressional action—but these tribes have not been recognized.

The story of these tribes and why they have never been recognized is why I take the floor.

It is an amazing story but it is also a deeply tragic story. But the tragedy can be redeemed if Congress acts to correct a gross historical injustice that has deprived these tribes of their rightful place. This is about a full accounting of our past, but it is also about a fair and truthful recognition of living people who have maintained their own tribal identity, customs, and traditions against unbelievable odds for hundreds of years.

The English settlers who arrived at Jamestown in 1607 established a settlement on an island, on land that was already under the control of the Powhatan Indians. The Powhatan Indians were a confederation of numerous Eastern Algonquian Indian tribes who had organized in the Chesapeake region.

The interaction among these Powhatan Indians and these six tribes that were part of this Powhatan Confederacy and the English is known to virtually every American. The original settlement of England in the United States was on the verge of failure numerous times and had to be rescued by a commoner who was part of that group, John Smith.

Only John Smith could keep this little settlement alive. Early after the arrival of the English, John Smith was captured by the Powhatan Indians and was on the verge of being executed by

Chief Powhatan because they were unsure about what they thought of these English settlers. In this wonderful story, as he was about to be executed, Pocahontas, the daughter of Chief Powhatan, saved his life. By saving his life, that act paved the way for the survival of this very struggling colony. That colony then grew into English-speaking America, as we know, with the arrival of later groups of English at Plymouth Rock and thereafter.

That act by Pocahontas is known to virtually all Americans. Over the course of the next few decades, they went back and forth in the relationship between these tribes and the English colonists and then between these tribes and African slaves. The first Africans who came to the new world also came to Jamestown Island in 1619.

But after Pocahontas' act, it was generally a peaceful relationship. There were some times of hostility, but in treaties in the 1640s and then again in a final treaty in 1677, the Treaty of the Middle Plantation, the Powhatan Confederacy and these six tribes basically said to their English colonist neighbors: We want to live in peace with you.

Pocahontas got married to John Rolfe, an English tobacco planter. That was a seminal event in early Virginia colonial history. So by the 1680s, 75 years after the settlement of Jamestown Island, the Powhatan Confederation was no more. But these Virginia Indians continued to live and maintain their tribal identity, but they lived in complete peace with the settlers that were their neighbors. The Treaty of Middle Plantation was signed 100 hundred years before the Declaration of Independence. That peace that was made between the Indians and the settlers paved the way for modern Virginia and modern English-speaking America. It has been continuous since 1677—the peace of these tribes. The relations between Virginians and the tribes have been strong. They have endured significant adversity. Their numbers of population have dwindled from 25,000 down to about 3,000 or 4,000 enrolled tribal members today. They converted to the religion of the English settlers, Christianity. They fought as American patriots in every war this country has been in, from the Revolutionary War to the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. They faced discrimination as Indians, often kept out of schools in Virginia because of the color of their skin, because they were not deemed to be ''Caucasian'' by State leaders at the time.

But the relationship is a peaceful one, and these tribes still exist. Two tribes in Virginia have small reservations, and the other tribes own land in common. They have tribal churches, tribal cemeteries, and community centers where they still gather. There is a wonderful tradition if you are the Governor of Virginia. On the day before Thanksgiving Day every year, the Virginia tribes come to the Governor's mansion and they present to the Governor deer, turkey, fish, and gifts as a tribute to the peaceful relationship between these tribes and the Commonwealth of Virginia since 1677. It was a beautiful aspect of my time as Governor. It was something we looked forward to every year. The members of these tribes look forward to it as well. Tribal members who have moved all across the country and all across the world come home for a homecoming, and it begins at the Virginia Governor's mansion.

Now I get to the injustice. The interactions between these Indians and the first English settlers is known to everybody—that story about Pocahontas and John Smith, and then Pocahontas' wedding to John Rolfe and her moving to England and dying there. You can go to Pocahontas' grave at Gravesend, which is where the Thames River dumps into the sea. She died coming back to Virginia. The English tend her grave with reverence at a small Episcopal church in that seaside community.

This is the most archetypal story of the interaction between European settlers and the Indians who were our native inhabitants. But despite the importance of this interaction, despite the fact that the tribes have lived and maintained their existence intact since before the settlers arrived here, the tribes have never been recognized along with the 566 tribes who have.

Why? Why have they never been recognized? Well, unbelievably, the first reason they have not been recognized is: They made peace too soon. They made peace with the English. If they had waited until 1780 and made peace with the Americans, that treaty, a treaty with the Americans, would have been the basis immediately for Federal recognition. But they became peaceful too soon with their European neighbors.

Tribal recognition often begins with a treaty. But the treaties are treaties with the American government. All historians acknowledge that the treaties of 1646 and 1677 happened. There are copies of the treaties. The originals are still maintained. All acknowledge that these treaties and the Indians' decision to live in peace with their neighbors was a precondition for the modern Virginia. If there had not been peace, our history may well have been very different.

I will tell you something else. These treaties are recognized by a government, the English government. When our tribes, which have never been recognized by the United States go to visit England, they are given a royal welcome and treated as the sovereign people they are by the government with which they made a treaty in 1646 and 1677. So that was the first ''mistake'' that was made: These tribes made peace too quickly.

There is a second mistake that is in some ways even more difficult to acknowledge. Many of these tribes live in six counties in Virginia. Five of the county courthouses where all their birth, death, and marriage records were stored were burnt during the Civil War. But there were still some records that existed—some.

But in a bizarre bit of our 20th century history, Virginia passed a law, the Racial Integrity Act, in the 1920s. Under a misguided and bizarre notion of ''racial purity,'' the eugenics movement, State officials determined that you were either white or you were colored. There was no such thing as an Indian. The leader of the State Bureau of Vital Statistics, a man named Walter Plecker—this is well documented—sadly held the position of head of the Bureau of Vital Statistics from 1924 to 1967, 41 years.

Remaining records such as they were in that 41-year period, he undertook what is known in Virginia as the ''paper genocide.'' He systematically went into every remaining record he could find and recharacterized anybody who had claimed a descent and a tribal connection as an Indian to ''colored.'' Records were destroyed or altered in a very significant way.

Both of these reasons have made tribal recognition through the BIA process—the Bureau of Indian Affairs—very difficult. Of the 566 tribes that have been recognized, only about one-fifth have gone through the administrative process. That process usually requires heavy documentation.

But the treaty was with the wrong government, and the birth, death, and marriage records were destroyed because of a racist State policy and the burning of courthouses during the Civil War. These six tribes should be rewarded, not punished, for making peace with their neighbors in the 1640s and 1670s, and they should not be held back because of a horribly misguided State policy that stripped them of the means to easily demonstrate by paper what all historians acknowledge to exist—the continuous history of these tribes.

We started, in Virginia, to correct this in the 1980s. In 1983, Virginia began a process of State recognition of all of these tribes. The six tribes have all been recognized by the State in the 1980s. All tribes that are part of this bill are now recognized by Virginia.

A full effort to finally receive Federal recognition began in 1999, supported overwhelmingly by all Virginians, including the current entire Virginia congressional delegation, Democratic and Republican, House and Senate, and all 10 living Virginia Governors. Recognition bills have passed out of the House for these tribes twice. In the 112th Congress, a bill passed out of the House and then came to the Senate, and it passed out of the Senate committee, only to die because of inaction on the Senate floor.

It is my deep hope that the 113th Congress will finally see the realization of this long-held dream. We should pass this bill because it is right. These tribes exist. They still live in Virginia

and uphold their tribal traditions. They deserve to have their existence acknowledged just like the hundreds of other tribes in this country.

But there is a final reason why recognition has a very immediate importance to these Virginia tribes. If you walked 3 blocks from here down the Mall, you arrive at the National Museum of the American Indian. It is part of the Smithsonian, America's National Museum. The Smithsonian is every bit as much a part of our American Government as Congress is.

It is a marvelous museum. It tells the story of our Indian tribes and their amazing history of adversity and triumph. The Smithsonian curators recognize what Congress has failed to do. Go to the second floor. There is a permanent exhibit on the second floor of the museum. The title of the exhibit is, ''Return to a Native Place: Algonquian Peoples of Chesapeake.'' That permanent exhibit in the museum, with the plastic dioramas, highlights the Powhatan tribes that are the subject of this bill.

Here is how the museum describes the permanent exhibit dedicated to these tribes:

> Thru photos, maps, ceremonial and everyday objects, this display provides an overview of the history of the Native Peoples of the Chesapeake region from the 1600's to the present day.

So we do recognize these tribes—in a museum. We acknowledge that they are not just a part of history, but in the words of the museum display description, that the people continue to maintain their tribal identity to the present day. But while we recognize the tribes in the museum three blocks from the Capitol, we will not, we have not, and we do not yet recognize these tribes in law.

Finally, the failure to recognize these tribes in law has an unusual and very tragic consequence. It also deals with the Smithsonian. There is another department in the Smithsonian that is far out of the prying eyes of tourists on the mall. It is the warehouse of the Smithsonian where they hold remains of archaeological exhibits. They hold all kinds of remains and all kinds of artifacts from archaeological exhibits from all over the United States and all over the world.

One set of remains that the Smithsonian is holding is the bones of about 1,400 Virginia Indians that were disturbed and unburied during the course of archaeological expeditions in Virginia.

The tribes that we are talking about today, the bones of their ancestors are held in a warehouse by the Smithsonian. For years, these tribes have gone respectfully to the Smithsonian, and they have asked them: Please return to us the bones of our ancestors. We want to bury the bones of our ancestors in accord with our tribal customs. We want to rebury the bones of our ancestors in accord with the customs of Christianity, which we embraced under the tutelage of the English settlers. But the Smithsonian will not return these bones to the tribes. It seems like such a reasonable request. It seems so reasonable, but the Smithsonian will not return the bones of these tribes for one reason: They are not federally recognized. The law governing the antiquities and objects held by the Smithsonian leads the Smithsonian to conclude that they can't give these bones back for reburial unless the tribes are federally recognized.

Our great national museum recognizes the tribes in a great display behind plastic glass and talks about these tribes, but at the same time we recognize them for one purpose, we will not hand the bones back to these folks in a manner they deserve.

To conclude, it is long past time that these tribes receive the tribal recognition that hundreds of other tribes have received. It is long past time that these tribes be accorded the same respect in America—for which they fought since the Revolutionary War—that they receive in England when they go visit. It is long past time that the bones of these Powhatan ancestors be returned to Virginia so that they can be buried by their families in the only land they ever knew as home.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

RWANDA AND SYRIA

Mr. MCCAIN. Today we commemorate the 20th anniversary of the Rwandan genocide. This week, again and again, I will rise to remind my colleagues and fellow citizens of the humanity we share and appeal to their conscience about the mass atrocities the Assad regime is perpetrating in Syria.

This past Sunday the world joined Rwanda in marking 20 years since the beginning of the genocide that claimed the lives of more than 800,000 innocent men, women, and children. As we reflect on our failures to stop the genocide there, I can't help but think of the lessons we learned from Rwanda and those we didn't.

President Obama stated in his remarks on Sunday that the Rwandan genocide was ''neither an accident nor unavoidable. . . . The genocide we remember today—and the world's failure to respond more quickly—reminds us that we always have a choice. In the face of hatred, we must remember the humanity we share. In the face of cruelty, we must choose compassion. In the face of intolerance and suffering, we must never be indifferent.'' I couldn't agree more with the President of the United States.

The United States, along with the international community, failed to take the necessary action to prevent a tragedy in Rwanda. We chose to ignore the death of hundreds of thousands of people, and in so doing we forsook our humanity. And now we are dangerously close to doing the same in Syria.

While I would like to believe that ''never again'' means something in this context, I look around the world today, and I am haunted by the fact that we simply haven't learned the fundamental lesson from Rwanda that preventing the slaughter of innocents means taking hard political action.

Nowhere is this truer than in Syria, where President Bashar Assad's regime continues its brutal assault against the Syrian people with increasing ferocity. The slaughter of innocent men, women, and children is being carried out by Syria's national army and loyal paramilitaries as a result of state policy, and the terror continues to escalate every day that Assad's crimes go unpunished.

The regime has accelerated attacks against civilians by indiscriminately dropping barbaric barrel bombs on mosques, schools, and bakeries, systematically detaining, torturing, and killing thousands of people—including hundreds of children—and starving entire neighborhoods to death. It was over 5 months ago that Secretary John Kerry wrote that ''the world must act quickly'' to stop a ''war of starvation'' being waged by Assad's regime against ''huge portions of the population.'' Yet the world did nothing, and hundreds have died of starvation—thousands—in those 5 months.

Eventually the international community responded by passing resolution 2139 through the U.N. Security Council, which ordered the regime to promptly allow unhindered humanitarian access and threatened further consequences for noncompliance. This was 2 months ago, and yet again the world did nothing to back the resolution. In fact, the U.N. humanitarian coordinator, Valerie Amos, reports that the war of starvation has worsened since its passing. The number of Syrians cut off from aid since January has grown by over 1 million people. The Syrian Government continues to prevent supplies of food from entering opposition-held areas, in direct contravention of the U.N. resolution, and it is using U.S.-provided humanitarian aid as leverage in its war against the people. Meanwhile, Iran sends 30,000 tons of food supplies to Assad's regime. While children starve throughout Syria, the government is at least well fed.

Although 800,000 people have not been slaughtered in mere months, as was the case in Rwanda, over the course of 3 years of conflict in Syria, we have witnessed 9 million people forced from their homes, with 2.5 million refugees escaping the violence in neighboring countries, and an estimated 150,000 people dead, with casualties escalating daily.

Regardless of the scale or scope, one fact is clear: The world is watching genocide in slow motion, but it seems that regardless of how many innocent men, women, and children die in Syria,

the world's conscience will not be tipped.

What is happening in Syria should be an affront to our conscience, and it should be a call to action. Each day the media floods our newspapers and television screens with some gruesome and horrific evidence of Assad's war crimes. We cannot claim ignorance as we have in the past. Yet we do nothing. It is as if watching all the suffering and simply feeling bad about it has become an adequate moral response. Conventional wisdom tells us that this is because the American public is war-weary. We are scarred by our experience in Afghanistan and Iraq and thus unwilling to get involved in another conflict in the Middle East.

This sentiment is reinforced by the President, who prides himself on having opposed the war on Iraq and getting America out of the region as quickly as possible regardless of the ramifications. He has emphasized the need to ''contain'' the conflict in Syria, calling it a ''civil war'' and neglecting the dangerous spillover effects we are already witnessing, including the destabilization of all of Syria's neighbors and the growth of an Al Qaeda safe haven in eastern Syria and western Iraq.

Following the President's lead, the American public has largely applauded his restraint and opposed greater U.S. involvement in Syria. But in so doing we have again failed the legacy of Rwanda.

Stopping the slaughter in Syria will require difficult political action, but it is not only profoundly in our national interest to act but also our moral obligation to do so. In his remarks on Sunday, President Obama said that we should be reminded of ''our obligations to our fellow man.'' As President, he is the one who should be showing to the American people why it is so vital to our national interest to carry out our moral obligations to our fellow man.

Our policy should be determined by the realities of the moment, not by today's isolationism dictated by the past. The wars in Afghanistan and Iraq have nothing to do with how we carry out our responsibilities today. Let there be no mistake; we have a responsibility to stop genocide when we see it happening, as in Syria. ''Never again'' should mean something whether or not we are paralyzed by war-weariness.

Of course we would all like to see the slaughter of Syria's innocent men, women, and children be stopped by diplomacy and through nonviolent means. We all want an end to the violence. We all want to believe that a political solution is possible. But there are only two ways to end the violence. One is for all parties to put down their weapons—something President Bashar Assad and his Iranian partners are clearly unwilling to do, as they believe a military solution is possible. So that leaves us with only one other option: to neutralize the party dedicated to the slaughter of innocents and force them to put down their guns. There are options to achieve this goal that fall far short of putting boots on the ground. We do not need to concede and allow genocide to continue or to go to war to prevent it. There are steps in between that the United States, along with our international partners, can take to stand by our international commitments and guarantees of protection.

President Assad has already shown that U.N. resolutions mean nothing to him and that he has no intention of negotiating his departure through the Geneva process. It is clear that military pressure is the only lever that will convince Assad that a political solution is in his favor. We must be ready to prove to Assad that not achieving a diplomatic solution will cost his regime dearly, and there are meaningful actions we can take to help in Syria that will not require us to rerun the war in Iraq. It is not a question of options or capabilities, it is a question of will.

There is a famous quote that states, ''All tyranny needs to gain a foothold is for people of good conscience to remain silent.'' As we sit back and place our hopes on negotiations and meaningless guarantees of protection, we watch as hundreds of innocent men, women, and children are brutally slaughtered every day; reinvigorated Al Qaeda affiliates operate with more freedom than ever before; terrorist groups loyal to Iran proliferate and threaten our allies; and the region descends into chaos and turmoil that will inevitably reverberate in the United States of America. This is the price we will pay for choosing to remain disengaged, and the consequences to U.S. national interests will be felt.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two articles. One is a Reuters story entitled ''Assad says fighting largely over by end of year,'' a statement by a former Russian Prime Minister with a quote:

> Assad's strength now lies in the fact that, unlike Yanukovich, he has practically no internal enemies. He has a consolidated, cleansed team.

The second is ''Hezbollah confident in Assad, West resigned to Syria stalemate.''

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

[From Reuters, Apr. 7, 2014]

ASSAD 'SAYS FIGHTING LARGELY OVER BY END OF YEAR'—FORMER RUSSIAN PM

(By Steve Gutterman)

MOSCOW.—President Bashar al-Assad has forecast that much of the fighting in the Syrian civil war will be over by the end of the year, a former Russian prime minister was quoted on Monday as saying.

''This is what he told me: 'This year the active phase of military action in Syria will be ended. After that we will have to shift to what we have been doing all the time—fighting terrorists','' Itar-Tass news agency quoted Sergei Stepashin as saying.

Stepashin, an ally of Russian President Vladimir Putin and former head of Russia's FSB security service, portrayed Assad as secure, in control and in ''excellent athletic shape'' after a meeting in Damascus last week.

''Tell Vladimir Vladimirovich (Putin) that I am not Yanukovich, I'm not going anywhere','' Stepashin quoted Assad as saying during their meeting, state-run news agency RIA reported.

Yanukovich fled to Russia in February after he was pushed from power by protests that followed his decision to spurn closer ties with the European Union and turn to Moscow. Russian leaders have criticised him for losing control of his country.

Stepashin suggested Assad faced no such threat and was likely to win a presidential election this year.

''There is not a shadow of a doubt that he knows what he's doing,'' RIA quoted Stepashin as saying.

''Assad's strength now lies in the fact that, unlike Yanukovich, he has practically no internal enemies. He has a consolidated, cleansed team.

''Moreover, his relatives are not bargaining and stealing from the cash register but are fighting,'' he said, appearing to draw a contrast with Yanukovich and his family.

''FIGHTING SPIRIT''

Stepashin, who served as prime minister in 1999 under President Boris Yeltsin and now heads a charitable organisation called the Imperial Orthodox Palestine Society, added that ''the fighting spirit of the Syrian army is extremely high''.

Russia has been Assad's most powerful supporter during the three-year-old conflict that activists say has killed more than 150,000 people in Syria, blocking Western and Arab efforts to drive him from power.

Russia and the United States organised peace talks that began in January between Assad's government and its foes. But no agreement was reached and a resumption appears unlikely soon, in part because of high tension between Russia and the West over Ukraine.

Russian officials say Moscow is not trying to prop up Assad and but that his exit from power cannot be a precondition for a political solution. Their assessments of his future have varied with the fortunes of his military.

Assad has lost control of large swathes of northern and eastern Syria to Islamist rebels and foreign jihadis. But his forces, backed by militant group Hezbollah and other allies, have driven rebels back from around Damascus and secured most of central Syria.

The head of Hezbollah said in an interview published on Monday Assad no longer faced a threat of being overthrown, and would stand for re-election this year.

Stepashin predicted Assad would win.

''The majority of the Syrian population will vote for him,'' Itar-Tass quoted him as saying.

[From Reuters, Apr. 9, 2014]

HEZBOLLAH CONFIDENT IN ASSAD, WEST RESIGNED TO SYRIA STALEMATE

(By Samia Nakhoul and Laila Bassam)

BEIRUT.—Bashar al-Assad's Lebanese ally Hezbollah said his Western foes must now accept he will go on ruling Syria after fighting rebels to a standstill—a ''reality'' to which his foreign enemies seem increasingly resigned.

Echoing recent bullish talk coming out of Damascus, Sheikh Naim Qassem, deputy leader of the Iranian-backed Shi'ite militia which is supporting Assad in combat, told Reuters that the president retained popular support among many of Syria's diverse religious communities and would shortly be re-elected.

''There is a practical Syrian reality that the West should deal with—not with its wishes and dreams, which proved to be false,''

Qassem said during a meeting with Reuters journalists at a Hezbollah office in the group's southern Beirut stronghold.

He said the United States and its Western allies were in disarray and lacked a coherent policy on Syria—reflecting the quandary that Western officials acknowledge they face since the pro-democracy protests they supported in 2011 became a war that has drawn al Qaeda and other militants to the rebel cause.

Syria's fractious opposition—made up of guerrillas inside the country and a largely impotent political coalition in exile—had, he said, proved incapable of providing an alternative to four decades of rule by Assad and his late father before him.

''This is why the option is clear. Either to have an understanding with Assad, to reach a result, or to keep the crisis open with President Assad having the upper hand in running the country,'' said the bearded and turbaned cleric.

Qassem's comments follow an account from another Assad ally, Russian former prime minister Sergei Stepashin, who said after meeting him last week that the Syrian leader felt secure and expected heavy fighting to end this year.

Officials said this week that preparations would begin this month for the presidential election—a move that seems to reflect a degree of optimism in the capital and which may well end with Assad claiming a popular mandate that he would use to resist U.N.-backed efforts to negotiate a transition of power.

Hezbollah chief Sheikh Hassan Nasrallah also said this week that Assad is no longer at risk and that military gains mean the danger of Syria fragmenting was also receding.

WESTERN RESIGNATION

It is a view of Assad that—quietly—seems to be gaining ground in Western capitals. Calling it bad news for Syrians, the French foreign ministry said this week: ''Maybe he will be the sole survivor of this policy of mass crimes''.

France, which last year was preparing to join U.S. military action that was eventually aborted, now rules out force and called the stalled talks on ''transition'' the ''only plan''—a view U.S. officials say is shared in Washington, notably among military chiefs who see Assad as preferable to sectarian chaos.

While rebels do not admit defeat, leaders like Badr Jamous of the Syrian National Coalition accept that without foreign intervention ''this stalemate will go on''. A U.S. official, asked about a deadlock that would leave Assad in control of much of Syria, conceded: ''This has become a drawn-out conflict.''

Assad, 48, has weathered an armed insurgency which started with protests in 2011 and descended into a civil war that has sucked in regional powers, including Shi'ite Iran and Hezbollah who back the Alawite president and Sunni states like Saudi Arabia and Qatar behind the rebels.

With Russia blocking a U.N. mandate, and voters showing no appetite for war after losses in Afghanistan and Iraq, Western governments have held back from the kind of military engagement that could have toppled the well-armed Syrian leader.

More than 150,000 people have been killed in three years, as Assad has lost the oil-producing and agricultural east and much of the north, including parts of Syria's largest city, Aleppo.

But he did not suffer the fate of other autocrats in the Arab Spring, whether the presidents of Tunisia, Egypt and Yemen or Muammar Gaddafi, the Libyan leader toppled and killed by rebels who rode into Tripoli under cover of Western air power.

Instead, he has clawed back control near Damascus, where a year ago rebels hoped for a decisive assault, and the center of the country which links the capital to the coastal stronghold of Assad's Alawite minority. His troops, backed by Hezbollah fighters, took another key town on Wednesday.

Though as much as half the country is being fought over, Assad could hope to hold at least a roughly southwestern half, including most of the built-up heartlands near the coast, and more than half of the prewar population of 23 million.

This leaves Western powers reflecting on a perceived loss of influence in the Middle East. Many now see a new strategy of ''containing'' Assad—and the fallout from a bitter war that has created millions of refugees and legions of hardened guerrillas.

''The U.S. has a stated policy of regime change, but it has never devoted the resources to effect that change,'' said Andrew Exum, a former U.S. official who worked on Middle East issues at the Pentagon. ''The de facto U.S. strategy of containment is very well suited for what is likely to be a very long war.''

''STALEMATE WILL CONTINUE''

Qassem said the United States, which backed away from military action in September after blaming Assad for gassing civilians, was hamstrung by fears over the dominance in rebel ranks of al Qaeda's Syrian branch, the Nusra Front, and another group, the Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant (ISIL).

''America is in a state of confusion. On the one hand it does not want the regime to stay and on the other it cannot control the opposition which is represented by ISIL and Nusra,'' he said.

''This is why the latest American position was to leave the situation in Syria in a state of attrition.''

President Barack Obama said last month that the United States had reached ''limits'' after the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq and questioned whether years of military engagement in Syria would produce a better outcome there.

Qassem said: ''I expect that the stalemate will continue in the Syrian crisis because of the lack of an international and regional decision to facilitate a political solution.''

U.N.-mediated talks at Geneva failed in February to bridge a gulf between Assad's government and opponents who insist that Assad must make way for a government of national unity.

Western and regional powers who support the Syrian opposition say it would be a ''parody of democracy'' to hold an election in the midst of a conflict which has displaced more than 9 million people and divided the country across frontlines.

Syria's electoral law effectively rules out participation by opponents who have fled the country in fear of Assad's police—candidates must have lived in Syria continuously for 10 years.

''My conviction is that Assad will run and will win because he has popular support in Syria from all the sects—Sunnis and secularists,'' Qassem said. ''I believe the election will take place on its due date and Assad will run and win decisively.''

Fear of hardline Islamists has undermined support for some rebels even among the 75 percent Sunni majority, and bolstered support for Assad among his fellow Alawites, and Christians.

Qassem said it was too soon to speak of Hezbollah pulling out of Syria, despite an increase in Sunni-Shi'ite tensions within Lebanon caused by the intervention across the border of a movement that is Lebanon's most accomplished military force and also holds cabinet seats in the government in Beirut.

''Until now we consider our presence in Syria necessary and fundamental,'' Qassem said.

''But when circumstances change, this will be a military and political matter that requires a new assessment.

''But if the situation stays as is and the circumstances are similar, we will remain where we should be''.

Mr. MCCAIN. I won't include it in the RECORD, but there is an interesting article that states, ''Syria's Assad secure, will seek re-election: Hezbollah leader.''

To show, I think, the very incredible naivety, there is an article in the Washington Post by Secretary Kerry entitled ''Kerry: US strike in Syria wouldn't be devastating.''

The Secretary of State says:

''It would not have had a devastating impact by which he had to recalculate, because it wasn't going to last that long,'' Kerry told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. ''Here we were going to have one or two days to degrade and send a message. . . . We came up with a better solution.''

We came up with a better solution. The President of the United States said that if Bashar Assad crossed a red line and used chemical weapons, we would act. He announced we would act. All our allies knew we were going to act. Then he took a walk with his national security adviser and said he was going to go to Congress. Meanwhile, Senator Kerry, in a bizarre, incredible act, issued a statement that any attack on Syria would be ''incredibly small.'' It is remarkable.

Finally, our conscience should be shot, but it is not. We get kind of immune to day after day after day of these various reports of the slaughter that is going on.

Look at the situation in Syria 3 years ago and look at it today: 150,000 dead, millions displaced; entry of jihadist fighters from all over the world who continue brutal bombing with barrel bombs which will slaughter innocent men, women, and children; and our Secretary of State says: Well, it wouldn't have been much if we would have struck them anyway.

This is a shameful chapter in American history, I say to my colleagues. Historians in future generations will judge us very harshly, and future generations and younger generations may have to pay the price for our inaction and our neglect of our basic human values.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 1596

Mr. MANCHIN. I thank my good friend Senator PAT TOOMEY from my neighboring State of Pennsylvania—I am from West Virginia—for working with me on this vital issue to make sure our kids remain safe in every single school across this country.

I am a father of three, a grandfather of eight, and there is nothing more important to me than protecting my children and grandchildren. The bill Senator TOOMEY and I are working on is

common sense. Our bill makes sure all employees who work with our students pass a background check to make sure they have no criminal records or an abusive history. That includes everyone from principals, teachers, secretaries, cafeteria workers and janitors—anyone who has contact with our schoolkids. This is a real problem that demands our attention and demands it now.

Since January 1, 130 teachers across America have been arrested for sexual misconduct. At this rate that is more than one teacher per day who will sexually assault a student. As a parent, as a grandparent, and as a representative of the great State of West Virginia, inaction is simply unacceptable.

There are more than 4 million teachers and school staff employed by our public school districts throughout the United States, and there are millions of additional workers who have direct access to students, including bus drivers, cafeteria workers and janitors. Yet there is no—I repeat, there is no—national background check policy in place for people who work directly with our kids every day. Even worse, not all States require checks of child abuse and neglect registries or sex offender registry checks.

A recent report by the Government Accountability Office found that five States—five States—don't even require background checks at all for applicants seeking employment in our school systems. In addition, not all States use both Federal and State sources of criminal data, such as a State law enforcement database or the FBI's interstate identification index.

Our bill would simply require mandatory background checks of a State criminal registry, the State child abuse and neglect registries, an FBI fingerprint check, and a check of the National Sex Offender Registry for existing and prospective employees.

Every child deserves to have at least one place where they feel safe and that harm cannot enter their life. For many of our kids these days that place is at school—not always in the home. This is truly a commonsense bill that aims to help protect our kids from sexual assault, predators, or any individuals who inappropriately behave in our schools.

This is a piece of legislation that is long overdue. It is not an unfunded mandate. I know some people will say that, and the reason I am saying it is not an unfunded mandate is because the people who want the employment have to pay. They have to pay for the background check if they want in the system.

I know there is a section in this legislation that says if a person has been an offender they have to be rehabilitated for 5 years—be clean, have a clean record for 5 years—before they can get in the system. I think that is common sense.

I would like for all my colleagues, if they would, to please consider this piece of legislation. Again, I appreciate the hard work of my colleague Senator PAT TOOMEY, and at this time I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HIRONO). The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. TOOMEY. Madam President, I thank my colleague from West Virginia, Senator MANCHIN, for his terrific efforts on this legislation. I also want to thank our other cosponsors, Senators MCCONNELL and INHOFE, for their support as well.

The tragic story that inspired this bill has a connection to my State of Pennsylvania and Senator MANCHIN's State of West Virginia, so it made it kind of a natural for us to work together on this. It is a terrible story indeed, and I want to summarize it because it goes to the heart of why I am here this morning.

The story begins in Delaware County, PA, where one of the schoolteachers was found to have molested several boys and raped one. Prosecutors decided there was not enough evidence to actually press charges, but the school knew what had happened. So they dismissed the teacher for this outrageous behavior. But shockingly, and somewhat disturbingly, the school also helped this teacher get a new job so they could pass him along and let him become someone else's problem. It happened the new job was in West Virginia. The Pennsylvania school even went so far as to send a letter of recommendation for this monster to get that job in West Virginia, which he did get. He became a teacher, then a school principal, and while there he raped and murdered a 12-year-old boy named Jeremy Bell in West Virginia.

Justice finally caught up with that teacher, and he is now in jail, serving a life sentence for that murder. For Jeremy Bell, unfortunately, justice came way too late. But Jeremy Bell's father decided he would not rest until he had done everything he possibly could to minimize the chance that any other child or parent would ever experience a similar tragedy. Roy Bell is Jeremy's dad. He worked with Congress to create protections for children to ensure they would not be victimized at school, and the House of Representatives responded.

In October of last year, the House unanimously passed the Protecting Students Against Sexual and Violent Predators Act. Unfortunately, there too, in a way, it was a few days too late. Jeremy Bell's dad passed away 3 days before the vote. But it passed the House, and it passed, as I said, unanimously in the House. Now we are here in the Senate with a chance to pass the same bill so it can become law.

This is a bipartisan bill. It is a bill I introduced with Senator MANCHIN. It is a bill that has other cosponsors. I know there are some folks who say: Well, let's wait, we need more time. I say we have had enough waiting. We have waited too long. Let me explain why we shouldn't wait another day.

I will start with two numbers. The first number is 130. Senator MANCHIN mentioned this number. Since January 1 of this year, 130 teachers have been arrested across America for sexual misconduct with children. That is more than one teacher every day. And these are the ones who have been caught. How many more are happening?

The stories are absolutely heartbreaking: A teacher's aide who undressed and sexually assaulted a mentally disabled boy in his care; a child whose abuse began at age 10 and only ended when at age 17 she found herself pregnant with the teacher's child; the 16-year-old raped by her instructor in a classroom closet; one teacher after another caught with images of child pornography; a special education kindergarten girl forced to go shirtless in class.

These things are unbelievable. But every day we delay, we delay rooting out one of these predators.

The other number I want to share is the number 73. According to the GAO—the Government Accountability Office—the average pedophile molests 73 children over the course of a lifetime. These predators are very devious. They are clever and they are smart. What they do is go where the potential victims are. And where are there potential victims for a pedophile? What better place than a school. So they do in fact go to schools, and from school to school and school district to school district. Every day we delay, we increase the risk a predator is moving on to the next of his 73 victims.

So what can we do? Here is what our bill does. Our bill, the Protecting Students from Sexual and Violent Predators Act, is an important first step. It would require mandatory background checks for existing and prospective employees and then require the checks be periodically repeated, the timing of which would be left to the discretion of the States. There are five States that do not require checks at all.

The bill would also check to make sure all employees or contractors who have unsupervised contact with children would be subject to this background check—not just teachers but coaches, schoolbus drivers, anyone who has unsupervised contact with the kids. There are 12 States that don't require that now.

The bill requires a more thorough background check. For instance, in Pennsylvania, there is a background check requirement. But if you have lived in the State for more than 2 years, it does not require a background check on the Federal criminal database, and yet we know these people move across State lines.

A fourth and important piece is that our bill forbids what has sadly developed its own name—passing the trash. This idea, this practice, unfortunately, of actually recommending the predator to another job in another school or another State so as to get rid of the problem and let him become someone else's

is so disturbing it is hard to imagine anyone would do this, but we know it happens. We know it happens. And a given State doesn't have the power to prevent some school district in another State from doing exactly this, as happened in the case of Jeremy Bell.

There is a list of folks who under our legislation a school would simply not be able to hire: anyone ever convicted of any violent or sexual crime against a child. I think that makes a lot of sense. There are certain felonies that would also preclude a person from ever being hired: homicide, child abuse or neglect, rape or sexual assault, and a few others. In addition, a person who was convicted in the last 5 years of a felony physical assault or battery or a felony drug-related offense would create a 5-year prohibition against hiring such a person.

The enforcement mechanism we have is withholding Federal funds, which would be the inducement for the States to adopt these requirements.

Let me stress that this bill has broad support. I mentioned before this passed the House unanimously. There was not a single objection in the House. It has bipartisan support here in the Senate. Various child advocacy groups are fully in support: the National Children's Alliance, the Children's Defense Fund, and the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children. Prosecutors and prosecutor associations—the Association of Prosecuting Attorneys and the Pennsylvania District Attorneys Association—both fully endorse this legislation. Teachers groups: the American Federation of Teachers and the Pennsylvania School Boards Association.

I forget how many former teachers in the House—I think 19 or so—all voted for this bill. I am willing to venture the overwhelming majority of the American people would support this effort to keep our kids as safe as we can.

I would also stress there is nothing radical about these proposals. In the Senate we just passed a very similar background check requirement in the child care development block grant legislation, where we insist on almost identical background checks for employees of daycares. That makes perfect sense to me. It is a good step. It is very likely to help protect children in our daycares. But why in the world would we protect the kids in daycare and not provide comparable protection for kids who have gone on to later grades?

This is a bipartisan commonsense bill that has passed the House unanimously. This is our opportunity to pass it in the Senate and send it to the President for his signature. I believe it is a moral imperative we do this to protect these kids. It didn't come soon enough for Jeremy Bell. And sadly, every day we learn there are more victims. But now is the time we can act.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the HELP Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 1596 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration. I further ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HARKIN. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, I certainly favor the goals of this legislation. The Senator will remember we passed a childcare bill that included many of the same background check provisions for childcare employees. Those provisions were negotiated between Democrats and Republicans on our committee to address issues that were raised about the implementation of any federally prescribed background checks for childcare settings.

We would like to undertake a similar process in the K–12 context to ensure any concerns raised by either side be addressed. That is what the committee process is for.

What the Senator from Pennsylvania is asking for in this bill will have an impact on nearly every public school in the country and every employee, not just teachers—not just teachers—who might have any unsupervised access to children. So that requires us to do some due diligence.

I don't want anyone to misunderstand me. I am willing to work with the Senator from Pennsylvania and others on this legislation, but I do believe we need to take a closer look at it, talking with relevant stakeholders—States, school districts, employees—about the bill and some perhaps unintended consequences of it. We were able to do that in the childcare bill, and I believe we can achieve similar success with the legislation of the Senator from Pennsylvania. I am ready and willing to engage with the Senator, his staff, and his office in that process.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, I support the Senator from Iowa and his request that this bill go to the Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee.

In the Republican Conference, we talk a lot about the importance of taking legislation through committee so it can be amended and considered through the regular order. This is certainly important legislation. All of us would agree on that.

The Senator from Pennsylvania and the Senator from West Virginia deserve a lot of credit for bringing this terrible story to our attention and proposing we address it. And I think we should. But the appropriate way to do that here, is to take it to the committee of jurisdiction to be considered in a markup, amended, and see if anyone has a better idea.

My second reason for hoping this bill goes to the HELP committee is that I have my own idea. I think this bill poses an important question to the Senate about whether we want to constitute ourselves as a national school board. That is, in fact, what we would be doing if we passed it into law.

In our country there are 100,000 public elementary and secondary schools. They all have a principal who is in charge of the employees in that school.

This bill is about determining what kind of criminal background check those school employees should have. What is the principal supposed to do? Doesn't the principal have any responsibility for this? Can the principal just say that this is the job of the United States Senate, so I don't have to worry about that?

There are 14,000 local school boards across West Virginia, Tennessee, Iowa, Pennsylvania, and all of our other States. What is the responsibility of these local school boards when it comes to determining the qualifications of their teachers or the health and safety of their students? Do the members of the local school board say: We don't have to worry about those questions too much because the U.S. Senate will determine for us what the qualifications for teaching will be or how we will keep students healthy and safe in our local public schools?

There are 50 Governors of our states. I used to be one of them, as was the distinguished Senator from West Virginia. I got pretty tired of people flying to Washington, D.C. thinking that they were the only ones who had any sense of responsibility for the public school students in Tennessee. In fact, I felt like the more Washington, D.C. intruded into Tennessee by making decisions that we should be making for ourselves, the less responsible we felt for those decisions and the less effective we were at doing our jobs.

I remember in the early 1990s there was a piece of legislation which whizzed through the Senate and the House just like this piece of legislation has been doing. It was called the Gun-Free School Zones Act, and it came after a particularly terrible shooting at a school. We still have those shootings today, and it wrenches our heart every time they happen.

So, after the shooting, the U.S. Congress said: We will fix it. The Supreme Court ruled it unconstitutional because it exceeded the authority of Congress under the commerce clause—that in effect it wasn't Washington's job; it was the job of the states and local communities to determine the issue of gun possession around schools.

I submit that the safety of our schools is the job of the parents of those schools, of the principal in that school, of the community which supports that school, of the local school board, of the supporting organizations, and of the governor and the legislature of the state. If they can pretend they can kick that responsibility up to Washington, I think that is wrong. I do

not think that is within our constitutional framework in the United States. Those responsibilities belong locally.

The Senator from Iowa and I have a terrific relationship and ideological differences on many occasions. I spent the morning debating with him about whether his proposal for early childhood education would in effect create a national school board.

He basically made the same argument that is being made here. He said: If we are going to give states money from Washington for early childhood education, we have a responsibility to define how that money is spent, including the parameters for what the teachers' salaries should be.

So if we can define what criminal background checks ought to be for school employees in Maryville, TN, public schools, we can define what the teachers' salaries ought to be in the Maryville, TN, public schools. If we can decide what the safety measures in the school ought to be, we can decide what the maximum size of classes ought to be. We can decide what the length of the school day ought to be and what kind of vision and health screenings we ought to provide. Those decisions are important for children as well. Whether the children are fed properly is important as well. Are we going to kick those decisions upstairs to the U.S. Senate and say: You set the rules for that.

Physical activity programs. The distinguished Senator from Iowa has been a champion for more physical activity his whole career here. He would like to set that as a goal from Washington. I think that is the job of a local community.

Professional development for school staff. If we make decisions about criminal background checks for staff, we can make decisions about their professional development as well.

How about academic standards and curriculum? In the State of Tennessee and in many other States there has been a near rebellion over the so-called Common Core State Standards. The important issue is about how we raise standards for children who need to learn more to succeed. But the problem is that Washington got involved with the standards, and people in our State and many other States don't like national school boards and Washington-control of public schools.

So I think we should stop and think about this. I would prefer to see the federal government in Washington act as an enabler of States and local school boards rather than a mandator.

I would like to see us take this terrific focus the Senators from Pennsylvania and West Virginia have put on the importance of criminal background checks and the safety of our children by making it easier for States and local school boards to search a State criminal registry, a State-based child abuse and neglect registry, a fingerprint-based FBI criminal history, a search of the national sex offender registry.

Forty-six States already require all public school employees to go through some form of a background check. Are we to say we know better than they do? If so, what does that say about our entire structure of public education and whether we should just tell the 14,000 local school boards in the U.S. to disband. We don't need you to make decisions about the safety of the schools in your district. We will do it in Washington. We don't need you to make decisions about academic standards and curriculum. We will do that here?

I think we in Congress should be enablers, not mandators. I think we should take this powerful focus the two Senators have put on criminal background checks for school employees, take it to the HELP committee, and put a spotlight on making it easier and more important for all 100,000 principals, all 14,000 local school boards, all 50 State Governors to do it, help parents to be aroused, and put the spotlight where the spotlight ought to be.

If they want a gun-free school zone, put the spotlight on the school and the community around it. If they want a safe school, put the spotlight on the school and the community around it. If they want to have a criminal background check system to keep predators out of schools, put the spotlight on the principal, the school board, and the community around it. That is the way to effectively do it. That is the way to respect our federalist system of government and our constitutional framework. That is the way to avoid creating a national school board.

So I look forward to working with the Senator from Iowa, the Senator from West Virginia, and the Senator from Pennsylvania. This is an important issue. I would like to see it become law. But I would like for our government in Washington to be more of an enabler of local school boards and school principals than a mandator from Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. TOOMEY. Madam President, needless to say, I am extremely disappointed that we find ourselves here at this impasse with nothing accomplished, and who knows how long it will take to get something accomplished.

I will point out that the Senate, I think just last week, voted for nearly identical background check language in the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act. We voted for this. This is the language vetted by this committee.

If it is vital to keep kids safe at a daycare—which I think it is—why isn't it just as vital to keep kids or their older siblings safe for the rest of the day? I don't think we need to go through the committee to answer that question. We have waited long enough.

This is the 16th background check bill which has been introduced in the House or the Senate since 2009, and here we have nothing on the Senate floor. The committees had 5 years to act. The committees had 5 months when they could have taken up this bill at any time, marked it up, and moved it through the process, but they didn't do this.

As far as using the committee process, I am generally a fan of going through the committee. But let's not pretend that is how we normally operate around here. There are 27 bills so far in this Congress which have received floor consideration without going through a committee at all—7 under the jurisdiction of this committee. Last Congress there were 42 bills which received floor votes without going through committee.

Let's be candid. In just the last week or so, and looking forward another week or two, we have more legislation under the jurisdiction of this committee. Whether it is paycheck fairness or a minimum wage bill, those are under the jurisdiction of this committee. They are going to be brought to the floor without having gone through the committee.

By the way, those are bills we know are going nowhere. Those are political statement bills. So is it more important to get bills that are political statements to the Senate floor than it is legislation which could actually be signed to protect kids from violent predators? This seems to me to be a very misordering of priorities.

I say to my colleague, for whom I have a great deal of respect and with whom I generally find myself in agreement, on this issue I happen to disagree with the senior Senator from Tennessee. In my view, this is not a mandate on the States.

If a State chooses not to develop the background checks we have put into this bill, then we would withhold the ESEA funding, which is 3.5 percent of total funding. That is not insignificant. But it leaves it up to the State to decide. We think kids ought to be safe in schools. If they disagree about the background checks, OK, then they don't have to take this funding. The Supreme Court, by the way, has agreed that this does not represent coercion. It does not amount to coercion when it is on this scale.

The second point I would make in this regard is part of this legislation absolutely requires Federal legislation. As I mentioned briefly in my comments earlier, this all originated from a case where a school in one State sent a letter of recommendation to a school in another State for one of these monsters to be hired. Frankly, I don't know how the school in the State where this person ended up could have prevented that from happening. But Federal legislation can prevent that, and I think it should.

So I am deeply disappointed we are not able to move to this today. I hope we will be able to soon.

I think my colleague from West Virginia had a point he wished to make, so I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. MANCHIN. Madam President, I first thank my colleague from Pennsylvania, Senator TOOMEY. I also thank the Senator from Tennessee, for whom I also have the greatest regard for his knowledge and commitment to our children and education, to which he has dedicated his life, and also the Senator from Iowa. This is very serious and very personal to both of us. Our States have been affected. But every State has been affected.

I am not in favor of a national school board in any way, shape or form. I strongly believe in the Tenth Amendment to the Constitution and States rights. But I believe that certain standards have to be set, and we have done that before as far as on a national level.

There are five problems we have always talked about, and those five problems apply to every child in America—not just every child in West Virginia, Pennsylvania, Tennessee or Iowa but in America.

The first is every child should have a loving, caring adult in their life. Those are not always the biological parents or family. It could be you. It could be somebody next door. It could be an extended family member.

Every child should have a safe place in their life. Unfortunately, as has been said, it is not always the home. It might be the school.

Every child should have a healthy start. Nutrition—for many children across America, their breakfast, lunch, and nutrition comes from the school.

Every child should be taught to have a livable skill. Again, that is in the school. We depend upon that.

And the fifth thing—which is the hardest to teach—is that every child should grow to be a loving, caring adult, and be able to give back. That is set by us. We set the standards for that. A child will emulate what they see. If they love it and respect it, they will do it.

For us to say we don't believe raising to a Federal standard the well-being and safety of every child in a school system—guaranteeing that the person who is going to be teaching them, nurturing them, taking them to school, and feeding them has a clean background check and is not a child molester—is the least we can do. That is all we are asking for in this bill. I hope that it would get the attention it needs. Again, I am also very disappointed that we cannot move it forward, and I know that precedent has been set and has been articulated by the Senator from Pennsylvania. But I would hope that both the ranking member and the chairman of the HELP Committee would maybe reconsider and take another look at it.

Thank you, Madam President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I am willing to support holding a hearing on the bill, moving it rapidly through the HELP committee, and moving it back to the Senate floor. I will make my argument in committee or on the floor, and I may win or I may lose. But I have thought about the gun-free school zones act for more than 20 years, and I thought about it from the point of view of a parent and of a Governor.

The Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee has conservative Republicans on one side and liberal Democrats on the other. I spend most of my days on the committee trying to argue my Democratic friends out of their good ideas that they want to impose on every local school district in America. There is a moral imperative to have high academic standards for children. There is a moral imperative to have physical education for children. There is a moral imperative to have breakfast for children. There is a moral imperative to help disabled children. There is a moral imperative to do all these things. We all feel that. But just because we in Washington contribute 10 percent of the money spent on elementary and secondary education doesn't mean we should substitute our judgment for that of the local school board and the principal who is accountable to that community for the safety of each child in their school. We ought to think about that before we start assuming these responsibilities because if we pass this bill into law, leave people to think that we solved the problem, and another problem happens, then who is going to be held accountable? The local principal? The local school board? The Governor? No. Maybe the Senate will be held accountable because we took it upon ourselves to say to the parents: We have kept your child safe.

We should enable parents. We should enable schools. We should enable local school districts to create safe and effective schools with high standards. We should give parents choices of schools with effective teachers, but we shouldn't mandate it or define it from Washington. That is my argument, which I would like to be considered when we think about the extent to which we ought to say to a local school board or principal: We are going to define for you what a criminal background check should consist of for the people you hire in your schools.

I pledge to work on it as rapidly as Senator HARKIN can move it through the committee. I will make my argument, and we will come to a conclusion.

I appreciate the Senators from Pennsylvania and West Virginia putting a focus on such an important issue, and I look forward to a speedy conclusion to the debate and a passage of an appropriate bill on an important issue. I just hope it enables instead of mandates.

Thank you, Madam President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

COMMEMORATING THE BOSTON MARATHON TRAGEDY

Ms. WARREN. Madam President, 1 year ago I rose to speak in this Chamber. I rose with a heart heavy with mourning and yet filled with gratitude because 1 year ago cowards set off bombs at our beloved Boston Marathon, trying to terrorize our city, but Boston responded with courage and community.

Today I rise with a heart filled with the spirit of healing and restoration to commemorate the anniversary of the Boston Marathon bombing and celebrate the strength and character of the people of Boston.

One year ago terror knocked on Boston's door. It was not just the momentary terror of smoke and sound but the terror of uncertainty and speculation, the terror of siege and lockdown. Such terrors can break a people's spirit. They seek to do no less. But Boston was fearless.

Our first responders, our protectors and investigators, our heroes, our citizen heroes, our families, our friends, and our neighbors—we did not waiver. In that moment when all the world had its eyes upon us, we responded with a cry of defiance, not of fear.

Scripture says: ''Be brave, be strong. Let all that you do be done with love.'' In the last year we have seen what bravery and strength and love can do.

Friends and family, classmates and teachers have come together to keep alive the memories of Krystle Campbell, Lu Lingzi, Martin Richards, and Sean Collier, and to celebrate their lives and to promise they will live on in our hearts.

Investigators and prosecutors have pursued justice, impartial and fair but with righteous conviction and an unwavering sense of purpose.

Healers and neighbors, friends and family have restored life and energy to those who thought it lost and in doing so have felt their own spirits lift.

Inventors and doctors have returned a ballroom dancer to the dance floor and helped children run and play, focused not on what they have lost but on what they can do next.

Families have rejoiced with graduations and birthdays, weddings and children, with the sweetest and most hopeful moments of life.

In the last year we have found that when we are united as one community, bravery and strength and love can heal the body and restore the spirit.

One hundred years after the original Patriots' Day of 1775, an orator celebrating the anniversary of the first battles of the Revolutionary War told the people of Massachusetts that ''our common liberty is consecrated by a common sorrow.'' From time to time, as a community and as a country we are reminded of this wisdom, through the awful grace of God. Our common tragedies and sufferings unite us as one people, and that unity brings with it strength and courage and ultimately renews our commitment to liberty.

Now, with the strength of One Boston still with us, we look ahead to justice that has yet to be served, to healing that remains to be done, to a future of achievements, of celebrations, and of memories.

May God bless those we have lost. May He inspire those who survived to carry forward. May He keep our community united in bravery and strength and love. And may He always watch over the people of Boston, of Massachusetts, and of the United States of America.

Thank you, Madam 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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. MURPHY. Thank you, Madam President.

HEALTH CARE

There was a new announcement today from the Secretary of Health and Human Services that 7.5 million people have signed up for private health care through the exchanges by virtue of the Affordable Care Act. The initial estimates from CBO last fall were that in the best case about 6 million people were going to sign up. We have blown through that enrollment expectation, and still, on this floor and in committee hearings as recently as this morning, Republicans continue to criticize and critique this law with blistering attacks—not because they have data on their side, not because they have evidence on their side, but because their entire electoral strategy for the fall depends on an assault on the Affordable Care Act.

The problem is that increasingly day by day, as more information comes out about the life-changing, life-altering success of this law, there simply is not the evidence to back up the claim from the Republicans that the Affordable Care Act isn't working. In fact, the reason why a new Washington Post poll shows that for the first time more Americans support the Affordable Care Act rather than oppose it is because they know the Affordable Care Act is working. Yet my good friend Representative PAUL RYAN says that despite 7 million people signing up for the law, ''the architecture of this law is so fundamentally flawed that I think it is going to collapse under its own weight.''

One of our own colleagues said, ''I don't think the 7 million enrollment figure means anything. They are cooking the books on this.''

Conservative columnist Charles Krauthammer says that the 7.1 million enrollment figure was a ''phony number'' and that all the changes and delays must mean the majority of the law is already on its way out.

Well, that is the story Republicans are telling here in Washington, but our constituents in Democratic States and Republican States are telling a very different story.

I would like to talk about the numbers for a second because data can be pretty tricky when it gets in the way of your political argument. As one of our former colleagues from New York said—and I am paraphrasing—we are all entitled to our own opinions, but we are not entitled to our own facts.

Here we are. This is the percentage of uninsured in the United States by quarter. We start in 2008, which is essentially the beginning of the recession, and, as would be expected over the course of the recession, the number of uninsured rises from 14.5 percent to a peak of 18 percent. But guess what happens when it hits the peak. The Affordable Care Act goes into operation. The Affordable Care Act begins to be implemented, and in a very short period of time from the beginning of enrollment until the end of the first period of enrollment being March 31, the number goes from 18 percent uninsured to 15.6 uninsured. That is a remarkable decrease over a very short period of time that can only be explained by the fact that 7 million people now have access to private health care insurance, another 3 million people have access to Medicaid, and another 3 million people on top of that have access to insurance on their parents' plans.

When we look at what has happened to young people over a similar period of time, we can see the same dynamic playing out. This is the rate of uninsured of 18- to 25-year-olds in this country. Here, they are at 28 percent. I mean, how on Earth, in the most affluent, most powerful country in the world, did we ever allow for more than one-quarter of our young people to be uninsured? But we were at 28.4 percent, and when the Affordable Care Act was passed and the first provision went into effect, it allowed people who were under 26 to stay on their parents' plans.

Look. The number starts to move downward. It is a pretty consistent downward slope, moving from 28 to about 24. Then the ACA plans start, and then the number—just as in the uninsured data for the population at large—drops again from 24 down to 21. It was 28 percent at the passage of the law, and it is 21.7 percent today.

Other studies show the same. This is survey data from Gallup, which is generally the gold standard on tracking the rate of uninsured in the country. But we also have a RAND study that was done. This is a very well-known consulting study which said that from the period of September of last year until mid-March, 9.3 million people who were uninsured became insured.

So when Republicans say this data doesn't really tell you the true story because these are all people just shifting from one plan to another, that is not true. The RAND study tells us that 9.3 million people who were uninsured became insured. The RAND study also says that 7.2 million people got access to employer-based insurance who didn't have it previously. And that data doesn't even include the surge of enrollment at the end of March. The RAND study only brings us up to about mid-March.

So this is the real story. This is what the numbers and the data tell us: that people are getting access to insurance for the first time ever. The Affordable Care Act isn't just shifting people from one insurance plan to another insurance plan; it is actually having a remarkable effect on the number of insured in this country.

I am not suggesting this trend line is going to continue along that axis, but, boy, if the next couple of years looks anything like the first 6 months of Affordable Care Act plans being available to people, we are going to see a revolution in this country in terms of the number of people who are outside our health care system. Yet this week was the 52nd, 53rd, 54th vote to repeal the Affordable Care Act in the House of Representatives. The Presiding Officer and I sat through probably 40 of those votes and there is another one today.

A budget presented, again, by Representative PAUL RYAN would take away insurance from 7 million people who now have it, take away Medicaid coverage from 3 million more people who have it, would repeal a law that has provided $9 billion in savings for seniors when they are in the doughnut hole. And $9 billion is a big number and hard to comprehend. By the way, his bill would return that $9 billion to the drug industry because that is where it came from. It didn't shift money from one set of taxpayers to another set of taxpayers. The way we closed the doughnut hole was asking the drug industry to put up some money in order to help seniors.

The irony of all ironies is that the Ryan budget—while repealing all of the provisions that have provided insurance to over 10 million people and discounted health care for millions more—would keep in place the $716 billion in Medicare savings that Republicans and outside groups have hammered Democrats for supporting over the course of the last 5 years.

Over and over we have been told we are killing Medicare Advantage by asking Medicare Advantage to run their insurance plans for the same costs that Medicare charges. Yet despite all of the rhetoric, the Republican budget in the House would keep in place all of the Medicare cuts they have been running against outside of this building.

What our constituents know is that despite bumps in the road, the Affordable Care Act works. Anytime you reorder one-sixth of the American economy, you are going to have problems and you are going to have people who are going to be unhappy. The reality is that for decades we had the most expensive health care system in the

world, times two, compared to any other industrialized nation, and we were getting results that didn't measure up to the amount of money we were spending. We had 30 million people who were uninsured, rates of infant immortality and infections that were way above countries spending half as much as we did. We had to make a change. That there were 54 votes in the House of Representatives to repeal the bill, and not a single effort to replace it, tells you that it has been Democrats who have been willing to step to the plate and do the tough reform necessary to try to make changes that were 100 years overdue. The numbers don't lie in the end.

I get it that Republicans think they can win an election by continuing to hammer away at the Affordable Care Act, but there are 7½ million people who now have private health care. There are 3 million people who now have access to Medicaid. There are 3 million more young adults who can stay on their parents' plans. RAND and Gallup tell us that the number of people without insurance in this country is absolutely plummeting by the day. All of that is evidence that despite the best intentions from our Republicans to undermine the law the ACA works.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Mr. REED. Madam President, it has been 103 days since emergency unemployment insurance expired and 3 days since the Senate sent a bipartisan agreement to the House which would restore these benefits for up to 2.7 million Americans. These benefits are fully paid for and would lift the entire economy. That is why the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office has estimated that failing to renew the benefits for a full year would cost the economy 200,000 jobs. We recognize our bill is a partial restoration, not a full year. The restoration we proposed will increase jobs in the economy as attested by the CBO.

Unfortunately, it appears that the House has no intent to take up the Senate-passed agreement to restore these benefits before they leave town for 2 weeks.

That is right if the House fails to pass what the Senate has passed on a bipartisan vote—and this was a bipartisan, fiscally responsible measure—the Speaker, who says he wants job creation, will be rejecting a portion of those 200,000 new jobs projected by the Congressional Budget Office, which is headed by his own appointee.

Contrary to the criticism that our proposal does not create jobs and doesn't do anything with jobs, it does. More importantly, it restores benefits to people who are desperately looking for work in a very difficult economy, and who need these benefits to keep searching for work as well as supporting their families.

In my view, the failure to act is not defensible. Restoring these benefits is the right thing to do for job seekers and the smart thing to do for our economy. The very modest $300-a-week average benefit, which our bill restores, helps workers stay afloat and cover the necessities as they search for a job. That modest benefit gets pumped back into the economy at the local supermarket or gas station. It is just commonsense. People will get this—I hope—benefit, and they will go right along and take care of the daily needs of life. They are not in a position to stash it away—most of them—and they are not in a position to do anything else but to try to stay afloat through very difficult financial circumstances.

Unemployment remains stubbornly high in my State, and across the United States. The March employment report, while positive, showed we still have much more to do to strengthen our economic recovery, especially for the 10.5 million Americans looking for work, including 3.7 million of the long-term unemployed. Again, this benefit we propose is particularly directed at these long-term unemployed Americans.

That is why this is a critical effort in our attempts to strengthen our economy—restoring these benefits. We have never let these benefits lapse when the long-term unemployment rate is higher than 1.3 percent—and today it is nearly twice that at roughly 2.6 percent. We have acted on a bipartisan basis, on a fiscally responsible basis, on a basis that recognizes not only the needs of families but the need to help further grow our economy. Now it is time for the House to act that way—responsibly fiscally and responsibly to our neighbors and our constituents, on a bipartisan basis, to get this bill done quickly and get it to the President.

It is my hope the House of Representatives stops blocking this. This is fully paid for. It is fiscally responsible. It is a bipartisan effort. It is what every one of our constituents says we should be doing more of—responsible, thoughtful, bipartisan legislation. We have done our part in the Senate and now it is up to the House. I hope they move quickly—this week indeed—to get this relief to millions of Americans.

With that, I yield the floor and note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The Senator from Utah.

THE BUDGET

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I rise today to take a look back at the evolution of our Federal budget over the past few years, as we moved from deficits and debt not seen since the years surrounding World War II to our current budget predicament, which still involves deficits and debt that are far too high.

The Federal deficit in fiscal year 2009 was nearly 10 percent of our economy. This was due partly to efforts to battle the financial crisis and partly to ineffective and reckless spending measures like the so-called stimulus.

Since then, the deficit has fallen. From the rhetoric of the administration and its allies here in Congress, you would think that deficit reduction has been accomplished almost exclusively through spending cuts. Indeed, in an effort to demonstrate his reasonableness in calling for even more tax hikes, President Obama often touts the ''tough spending cuts'' that have taken place under his administration.

Of course, after spending ballooned in fiscal years 2009 and 2010 to almost a quarter of the size of our entire economy, it eventually had to be curtailed. With a recovering economy, along with tax hikes engineered by the administration and its allies in Congress, deficits have admittedly come down.

Unfortunately, however, as the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office has told us, the deficit reprieve will be short lived. The CBO tells us clearly that after 2015, the deficit will rise again and, as a consequence, the Federal debt remains on an unsustainable path.

As the CBO and every credible budget analyst has made clear, our fiscal path is unsustainable because our entitlements are unsustainable—that means Social Security, that means Medicare and Medicaid, and that means the Affordable Care Act.

We know those programs cannot be sustained on their current trajectories. Yet the administration and its allies refuse to do anything about it.

The Senate Democratic budget left entitlements virtually untouched. The President's budget offers little in the way of structural entitlement reforms necessary to put these programs on sound fiscal footing. In fact, with his latest budget, President Obama has even retreated on reforms that he has offered in the past.

But let's look back on how our budget has evolved over the last few years. If you listen to my friends on the other side of the aisle and their supporters, the Federal Government has significantly scaled back on spending which, they say, is responsible for almost all the changes in the Federal deficit since the outsized deficits in fiscal years 2009 and 2010.

We hear from our friends on the other side of the aisle about how they have ''slashed'' spending. We hear about ''austerity,'' as though it is something inherently evil.

For example, in June of 2013, the left-wing Center for American Progress said that ''we have enacted about $2.5 trillion in deficit reduction with about three-quarters coming from spending cuts.''

In March of this year, Vice President BIDEN's former aide Jared Bernstein wrote in the New York Times that we have generated $2.5 trillion in deficit savings, with 77 percent coming from spending cuts.

In February of this year, the Senate Budget Committee chairman wrote to her Senate Democratic colleagues that since August 2010, we have had ''$3.3 trillion in deficit reduction put in place over the last few years'' with 77 percent claimed as coming from spending reductions.

Depending on who you listen to, deficits have been reduced by $2.5 trillion or $3.3 trillion or maybe more. No matter the number, the claimed reduction stemming from spending cuts usually ends up at around 75 percent or more. That would mean that deficit reduction has been accomplished by a 3-to-1 or higher ratio of spending cuts to tax highs. Of course, all of those deficit reduction and spending reduction claims represent promises for the future.

They are measured relative to some artificial so-called budget baseline or yardstick, which can pretty much be anything that you want it to be. Pick one yardstick and you get one result. Pick a different yardstick and you get a different result. But it has been recorded that in fiscal year 2009, the Federal deficit was more than $1.4 trillion or almost 10 percent of GDP at the time.

Also on the books is that in fiscal year 2013, our most recently closed fiscal year, the deficit was around $680 billion or just over 4 percent of GDP at that time. Therefore, deficit reduction we have seen between fiscal years 2009 and 2013, which is a 4-year period, has been about $735 billion. That is not $2.5 trillion. That is not $3.3 trillion.

The larger deficit reduction numbers are derived almost entirely from future promises to reduce spending, promises that we are pretty darn sure are never going to be kept, based upon all of the past history of this country and the Democratic Party, by the way.

Once again, in terms of real actual deficit reduction, the number comes in at roughly $735 billion. Keep in mind all the rhetoric about deficit reduction consisting of 3-to-1 spending reductions to tax hikes. Well, if that is what we would have enacted, we would imagine those ratios would have been at least somehow reflected in the deficit reduction realized over the past 4 years or so.

If not, then, let's be clear that they are only promises to reduce spending, promises that the current and future Congresses can undo with the stroke of a pen. If past experience is the norm, you can count on it. You can count on undoing those promises. I have been in the Senate—this is my 38th year. I have heard countless promises to rein in spending in the future. The fraction of those promises that have ended up being kept is very small.

Promises notwithstanding, let's go back over the past 4 fiscal years and see what has happened. As I said, from fiscal year 2009 to 2013, the deficit has gone down by $735 billion. No one disputes this, certainly not my friends on the other side of the aisle, who have used this number as justification for turning their spending engine back to full throttle.

Given all that they said about spending cuts having been responsible, on a 3-to-1 basis for deficit reduction, the question becomes: Is 75 percent of the deficit reduction we have seen over the last 4 years attributable to spending cuts or austerity? The answer is not even close. The $736 billion of deficit reduction has been accomplished with $670 billion of increased revenues, and only $65 billion of spending reductions, which on a basis of around $3.5 trillion of annual spending is a reduction of below 2 percent.

I will say that again. The $735 billion of deficit reduction from fiscal year 2009 to 2013 has been accomplished by and large through higher tax revenue. Specifically, more than 91 percent of the deficit reduction has stemmed from higher taxes, and less than 9 percent from reductions in spending.

Less than 9 percent of deficit reduction stems from spending cuts is a far cry from the 75 percent or more that my friends on the other side of the aisle claim. Those claims are based on promises of future spending reductions and budget projections. Yes, those claims are based on carefully crafted budget baselines or yardsticks that my friends creatively construct. All of this is future, which we all know will never come to pass.

But if we had enacted budgetary changes aimed at reducing deficits that involved anything near a 3-to-1 ratio of spending cuts to tax increases, then you would think it would have at least started to slow up over the past 4 fiscal years. As I said, however, it is not even close. Of course, some of the revenue increases have reflected the economy recovering from the recession to its current state, which by the way remains sluggish.

But the 2013 numbers begin to reflect recent tax hikes, engineered by my friends on the other side of the aisle. Moving forward, we can expect even more revenue to be extracted from economy from tax hikes, including the higher tax rates that were passed last year in the fiscal cliff deal, along with the myriad of taxes included as part of the Affordable Care Act.

We have already seen in fiscal year 2014 through February Federal tax revenues hitting a record high for the first 5 months of the fiscal year relative to a similar period of any past fiscal year. Yet, even as the revenue gushes in, my friends on the other side of the aisle want to double down with even more tax hikes. Let's not think for a minute that their demand for higher taxes has anything to do with reining in the deficit or reducing our debts.

Instead, the proposals from Democrats are for even more spending, more redistribution, and an even more bigger government. The President's recent budget is exhibit No. 1. Of course, you will not hear it being called ''inefficient and wasteful government spending.'' No, you will hear about investments. You will not hear the term ''redistribution.'' No, you will hear about the wonderfully egalitarian goal of fairness, as judged by the norms of Democrats.

You will not hear about big government controlling an outsized and increasing share of economic activity in our country. No, you will hear about how virtually every private sector company in virtually every sector of the economy acts abusively or out of greed, without regard for others, in search of tax loopholes to exploit to the detriment of the middle class.

Once again, it is clear from the budget data already in the books over the past 4 fiscal years that the vast majority of deficit reduction, more than 91 percent of it, has come from increased revenue extracted from the private sector. Less than 9 percent has come from any kind of spending restraint. Those are facts. Those are the numbers on the books. Those data do not depend on CBO projections. They do not depend on picking a baseline. They do not rely on budget assumptions.

What these numbers tell us is that virtually none of the so-called austerity or slashed spending that my friends on the other side of the aisle have pretended to endure have occurred in the real world.

As we continue to hear from my friends on the other side of the aisle about how our budget challenge has faded away, and about the trillions and trillions of deficit reduction that has been accomplished through spending cuts, let's keep in mind our recent track record. That record is clear.

I will say it again just to make sure the point is not lost on anyone.

The spending restraint we have seen since the outside spending sprees in fiscal years 2009 and 2010 has been minor. The vast majority of deficit reduction we have seen to date, more than 91 percent of it has resulted from increased revenue. The past 4 fiscal years have shown no evidence of the ongoing promises of 3-to-1 spending cuts to tax hikes.

We do not need to increase taxes yet again. We have already done that. We do not need to declare deficit and debt victory and turn the speeding spigots back on to maximum flow. Our fiscal challenge remains where it has been for some time now. We have unsustainable growth in our entitlement spending and we need to discuss and enact structural reforms to our entitlement programs in order to put them and our fiscal position on a more sustainable course.

Democrats, of course, have other ideas. For instance, take a look at page 33 of the President's budget. The document discusses the future unsustainable deficits and debt and alludes to a large tax increase that is undefined. Here is what it says, ''Even with reforms to Medicare and other entitlements and tough choices . . . we will need additional revenue to maintain our commitments to seniors.''

As I said, my friends on the other side never tire of asking for more money from our American people—never tire of it. For example, both the President's budget and the budget proposed by Senate Democrats last year envisioned revenue increases of over $1 trillion. That apparently is their answer to the entitlement question—not reforms, not structural changes, but ''additional revenues.''

If you are going to try to fix our entitlement problems entirely on the revenue side of the ledger, it is going to take far more revenue than what my friends on the other side of the aisle have previously proposed. If that is the route they want to go, they should at least be honest with the American people about where the revenue will come from and who will be paying for it. The American people deserve to know. I think it is about time our friends on the other side explained it to them. Do not count on that.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FLAKE. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

CUBA

Mr. FLAKE. Madam President, we heard news a week or so ago that the U.S. Government, through the Agency for International Development, was conducting a program in Cuba titled ZunZuneo.

It was an attempt to set up a kind of alternative twitter account, and the intent was certainly noble—to increase access of ordinary Cubans to information that would help and assist them.

I have no issue with programs such as this. I think overall they are good. The more we can have people have Internet access and meaningful content is good, but I and many others do have an issue with the Agency for International Development—USAID—undertaking this program.

USAID's mission is to help with humanitarian needs and to promote democratic development around the world. It need not, should not, engage in covert—or in their case they are saying it wasn't covert, they are calling it discreet. Either way, it casts suspicion on other activities that USAID is undertaking around the world.

USAID is in some very tough places around the world—delivering supplies into South Sudan, for example. We work with the people in Syria—not within the country but just outside the country. We work in many dangerous parts of the world, and the last thing we need is suspicion cast on USAID where people think it is an arm of the CIA. It just shouldn't be done. I think USAID does great work around the world and shouldn't involve itself with work of this type.

With regard to Cuba itself, as I said, I think our goal should be to make sure that Cubans are better informed, that we have increased contact, and that we have more American influence there.

That could be most easily forwarded by simply allowing Americans to travel to Cuba. It is the only country in the world where we have a policy that you have to get a specific license—where only certain classes of people are allowed to go there. That simply makes no sense at all.

If our goal is to make sure that Cuban people are aware of what is going on in the world, that they get real information outside of the government sources—the government in Cuba denies Cuban people the ability to get good, meaningful information—we ought to be all about making sure they have access to that, but the best way to do that is simply allowing Americans to travel there. We do that with other repressive regimes around the world.

It has been said—I think Freedom House has Iran as the only government that is more restrictive, more authoritarian, and more repressive than the Cuban regime. Yet we allow Americans to travel to Iran. In Iran, the Iranian Government may restrict who may come in—as will the Cuban Government, I am sure, once we lift our travel ban there. But that ought to be their province. I have often said if someone is going to limit my travel, it should be a Communist government, not my government.

As we review this program and as we talk about it in the coming weeks—we had a hearing this morning with the head of USAID testifying about it—I hope we simply keep in mind the best way to help the Cuban people to have access to information and to have contact with Americans, to be subject to American influence, freedom, and economic opportunity, is to allow Americans to travel freely there. That would do more than any program we could install, any program administered by USAID, the State Department, the CIA or anybody else—just allow Americans to travel to Cuba.

Mr. DURBIN. Would the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FLAKE. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. DURBIN. I will make a statement in the nature of a question since we discussed this this morning. We had a lengthy discussion in the Foreign Relations Committee about this twitter project, whatever it was, and whether it was wise—and I think it was the consensus of our committee—that if it opens up Cuban people to other ideas and more information, it is a positive thing.

You and I discussed afterward the fact that there are other things we can do. I think you just alluded specifically to them on the floor, and I wanted to associate myself with your thinking on this and hope that after some 50-years-plus, some fresh thinking on our foreign policy in terms of Cuba may lead to what we ultimately want, and that is giving the Cuban people an opportunity to be part of a real democracy and have real freedoms. Isn't that right?

Mr. FLAKE. It is. I thank the Senator.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

QUORUM CALL

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll and the following Senators entered the Chamber and answered to their names:

[Quorum No. 1 Ex.]

Carper	Hirono	Walsh
Durbin	Reid	Warren
Flake	Tester	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is not present.

The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I move to instruct the Sergeant at Arms to request the presence of absent Senators, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT).

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

The result was announced—yeas 55, nays 37, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 107 Ex.]

YEAS—55

Baldwin	Casey	Heinrich
Begich	Coons	Heitkamp
Bennet	Donnelly	Heller
Blumenthal	Durbin	Hirono
Booker	Feinstein	Johnson (SD)
Brown	Franken	Kaine
Cantwell	Gillibrand	King
Cardin	Hagan	Klobuchar
Carper	Harkin	Landrieu

Leahy	Pryor	Tester
Levin	Reed	Udall (CO)
Manchin	Reid	Udall (NM)
McCaskill	Rockefeller	Walsh
Menendez	Sanders	Warner
Merkley	Schatz	Warren
Mikulski	Schumer	Whitehouse
Murphy	Shaheen	Wyden
Murray	Shelby	
Nelson	Stabenow	

NAYS—37

Alexander	Flake	Paul
Ayotte	Graham	Portman
Barrasso	Grassley	Risch
Boozman	Hatch	Roberts
Chambliss	Inhofe	Rubio
Coats	Isakson	Scott
Cochran	Johanns	Sessions
Collins	Johnson (WI)	Thune
Corker	Kirk	Toomey
Cornyn	Lee	Vitter
Crapo	McCain	Wicker
Enzi	McConnell	
Fischer	Murkowski	

NOT VOTING—8

Blunt	Coburn	Markey
Boxer	Cruz	Moran
Burr	Hoeven	

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. REID. We are here this afternoon because Republicans are holding the confirmation of two important nominations. Earlier today the Senate voted to invoke cloture on Michelle Friedland to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals. So the only question is, when will she be made a Federal judge in the Ninth Circuit.

There are some who say that 30 hours should run. They can speak for themselves why they insist on doing so. There is no question it is not to debate the nomination. It is just to do nothing, to stand around here and do nothing.

Few, if any, Senators have come to the floor to express any reason to oppose this good woman. She was nominated 9 months ago by President Obama. So it is time to confirm this well-qualified nominee. Enough stalling has taken place.

She graduated second in her class at Stanford University Law School. She clerked for Sandra Day O'Connor in the Supreme Court. She has been a partner in a prominent law firm.

The Ninth Circuit is the busiest circuit in the entire country. The Senate confirmed 18 of President Bush's circuit court nominees within a week of being reported out of committee. This woman, as I already indicated, was 13 months ago. We have 30 other judicial nominees pending on the calendar. We have 85 vacancies on the Federal courts. There is no reason to delay this nomination.

There is no reason to delay the nomination of David Weil to lead the Wage and Hour Division of the Department of Labor. He is a Boston University professor, a Harvard University researcher.

I am sure it is a little difficult for people watching this to understand why Republicans are demanding that we waste time, because that is all it is. But I guess the American people have become accustomed to wasting time. That is what they have tried to do for 5 years. We have wasted time because of issues such as this. The staff has to be here. We have wasted so much time that we could be working on important issues.

The Republicans have come to the floor saying: We want amendments. The reason we don't deal with that kind of stuff is because we spend so much time on this. We have wasted thousands of hours during the 5 years, and that is very unfortunate. The Republicans are stalling so much.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST

I ask unanimous consent that the time until 4:00 today be equally divided and controlled in the usual form; that at 4:00 p.m. all postcloture time be yielded back and the Senate proceed to vote, with no intervening action or debate, on Calendar No. 574; further, following disposition of the nomination, the Senate proceed to vote on cloture for Executive Calendar No. 623; if cloture is invoked, all postcloture time will be yielded back and the Senate will proceed to vote on confirmation of the nomination; that if confirmed, the motion 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 statements related to the nomination be printed in the RECORD, the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. GRASSLEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Reserving the right to object, and I would offer an alternative; but before I do that, I wish to say to my colleagues in the U.S. Senate that, first of all, there is controversy about this nominee. Let's make that clear. And second, the majority leader said maybe the people of this country don't really understand what is going on.

They understand what is going on. We are working under the rules that the majority changed by ignoring the rules of the U.S. Senate in November. So as the majority leader knows, we have not yielded back postcloture time on judicial nominations since the so-called nuclear option was triggered last November.

We have followed the rules of the U.S. Senate for regular order on all judges before the Senate in the last 5 months, just exactly the way the rules were changed in November. So there is 30 hours of postcloture debate on this nomination.

Therefore, I would ask the consent request be modified so that the vote on confirmation would occur at 5:30 p.m., Monday, April 28, when we return from the April recess. This would allow the Senate to process the pending cloture nomination on the wage and hour nominee this afternoon and set that confirmation vote also for Monday, when we return on April 28. That is the alternative I offer to the majority.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the majority leader so modify his request?

Mr. REID. I reserve my right to object.

Madam President, obviously this is not a dissertation on logic, because if it were, why in the world would we want to waste 30 hours doing nothing? And that is what we are doing, 30 hours.

I know my friend from Iowa has been on the Judiciary Committee a long time. I appreciate all he has done, but it is apparent the only reason the Senator from Iowa expresses delay is for delay itself, no other reason.

Now, I may have missed it. There could have been someone talking about what a bad person she is or why she is not qualified, but I must have missed that. I heard little, if any, opposition. In fact, I have heard none for this nominee. I have heard only obstruction for obstruction's sake, delay for delay's sake.

This has been going on for 5 years. It appears that the Senator wishes his caucus to be the caucus that ''just says no,'' and that is what they did here.

So, Madam President, I object to the modification.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the original request?

Mr. GRASSLEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Reserving the right to object, and I will object, but to remind everybody, when the majority leader says that nothing is being done on judges, we have confirmed 233 judges and only disapproved the 2; so don't ever try to sell the American people on the idea that the Senate is not doing its work on getting judges approved.

I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The majority leader.

Mr. REID. As I indicated, this is something without logic. We have had a lot of judges approved after wasting hundreds of hours of time doing nothing. We have judges reported out of the Judiciary Committee unanimously, led by our good friend, the senior Senator from Vermont, the chairman of the Committee, who does such an admirable job. They were reported out unanimously, and they stall—the Republicans stall, delay, obstruct, and then we have a vote here and it passes very easily. Their only purpose for the delaying is for delay's sake. They are obstructing this as they have obstructed everything over the last 5 years.

I know people complain about the rule change that was made. Where would we be in this country without having changed that rule?

I got a letter today from Secretary of Defense Chuck Hagel, outlining nine important people in the Department of Defense who need to be confirmed. Most of the positions have been without anybody there for more than a

year. We have numerous ambassadors to important countries around the world, and they are not being confirmed because they are being stalled. Why? Why could we not have these people go do their work? They have been nominated. Countries all over the world are without ambassadors from the United States. Where would we be if we had not changed that rule?

Now we are slogging through these nominations. It is kind of slow because of the inordinate amount of time that we are caused to eat up. But the longer my friend from Iowa talks, the more reason there is that maybe we should have changed the rules more than we did.

So, unless something changes, we will have a vote tomorrow at 5:00 p.m. We will have three votes here tomorrow at 5:00 p.m. on Friday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I think it is important to put all of this in context. My good friend, the majority leader, broke his word last year when he said we had settled the issue of what the rules were going to be for the Senate for this Congress. He then broke the Senate rules in order to change the Senate rules, setting a very unfortunate precedent, and continues to abuse the Senate rules by using the device called filling the tree to prevent Members of the Senate, from his party and from our party, from even offering alternatives.

Despite this heavyhanded behavior, he expects the minority to simply expedite consideration of, in the case of the matter we are discussing, a lifetime appointment. As Senator GRASSLEY has pointed out, we are simply exercising our rights under the rules of the Senate. I might say many of these nominees would have been confirmed last December had we not experienced this event perpetrated by the majority in a heavyhanded attempt to alter the balance, to change the nature of the Senate with a simple majority. It was an unfortunate decision, but those kinds of decisions have consequences. And all we have done here is exercise, as Senator GRASSLEY pointed out, the rights that Senators have under the rules of the Senate. If the majority leader doesn't like the way the Senate is working, I would recommend that he change his behavior.

You know, we don't have a rules problem. We have a behavior problem.

We have had a couple of examples of trying to edge back to normal here, where we brought up a bill that was actually open for amendments, and amendments were processed from Members on both sides. But it seems of late we are back to the old Senate. All we are about is scoring partisan points and denying Members the opportunity to offer amendments.

I think most Members on both sides of the aisle came here to be Senators, which involves having your committee work taken seriously and having the opportunity to offer amendments taken seriously. This body—when it was at its peak and operating the way it should under Members of majorities of both parties—has been a more civil place in which rights were respected.

The Senator from Iowa—the ranking member of the Judiciary Committee—is pointing out that we are simply exercising our rights under the rules of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. WARREN). The majority leader.

Mr. REID. I am a patient man. At least I try to be. For my friend to come here and have the audacity to talk about my breaking my word—the trouble with that statement is that the whole Senate is here to see what happened.

He said something and I said something. What he said was that we are not going to have all of these filibusters on motions to proceed.

For the viewing audience, we wasted so much time just trying to get on a bill. It is not that easy. You have to file something in the Senate, and then you have to wait a day to get on the bill. If they object—and they object hundreds of times—it takes 2 days to get on the bill. Then we vote, wait 30 hours, and then we are only on the bill. To get off the bill, we have to go through that process all over again, and we have done that hundreds of times.

There have been more filibusters on President Obama's judicial nominations than in the entire history of the country for other Presidents. We have been a country for a long time—roughly 240 years. There have been more filibusters for President Obama in the course of 5 years than for the previous 235 years.

I went to New York and had the good fortune to watch a wonderful play—''All the Way''—about LBJ. That good man—during the time he was majority leader for 6 years—had to overcome one filibuster.

As the majority leader in the Senate—because of the performance we have had over here—I had to overcome over 500 filibusters. This is for the country. It is not for me. We have been stymied on everything we have tried to do—everything.

We know—it is public record now—that 3 days after Obama was elected the first time, a meeting was held here in Washington, and it has been written up all over the place. Karl Rove called the meeting with others. They made the decision that their goal was to make sure this man never got reelected. To the credit of the Republican leader, he said: Our goal is to make sure he is never reelected.

Well, Obama surprised everybody—except us—and was overwhelmingly elected by the American people.

They also said in that same meeting: The way we are going to stop him from being reelected is to object to everything, and that is what they have done. It is unprecedented in the history of our great Republic.

I have been here a while. I know how people used to work together, but you can't work together if one side says no to everything. Once in a while we have had the good fortune to be able to piece together some work with the Republicans. It is getting harder and harder to do, but we have been able to get it done a few times.

They have wasted the time of the American people. If there is an objection to this woman, then come to the floor and talk about what is wrong with her. She attended one of the finest law schools in America. A battle goes on every year, whether it is Harvard, Yale or Stanford, and they flip back and forth. It doesn't matter. She is a very fine academic. She clerked for one of the finest Supreme Court justices we have had in the history of the country—by the way, a Republican.

What is wrong with her? What do we gain by holding this up? The country gains nothing. As I have indicated, we have about 140 nominations that are being held up over here. My friend, the Republican leader, said: Hey, listen, we would have approved them all in December anyway. Please. Who in the world thinks that there is a bit of creditability to that?

I say to everybody that I am sorry. In 25 hours, I guess, we can come here to vote on these people. All we need is a majority, and that is the way it is. I am so sorry for the inconvenience to everyone, but the Republicans know that for them it is pretty easy. They can just walk out of here. They don't have to be here, but we do because it is our burden to run the country. They can walk away and take their little trips and go home. We are not going to be able to do that. We have to vote and approve these two people.

We have a very good judge we need to approve. We have somebody for the Wage and Hour Division at the Department of Labor. That job has been vacant for a long, long time.

Again, I am sorry for the inconvenience to Members, but we have an obligation. We have been elected to be Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I have just a couple of brief observations that are relevant to the point. No. 1, we have approved more judges at this point for President Obama than President Bush had approved at the same time in his Presidency.

No. 2, the majority leader has a curious definition of filibuster. The reason the majority leader has had difficulty getting onto bills is because as soon as we get on bills, there are no amendments allowed. Once you get past the motion to proceed—I would say to the people who may be listening and are not as deeply steeped in Senate rules—there is a 2-step process. You vote to get on a bill, and then you are on the bill.

What happens is that once we get on the bill, the majority leader has made

it impossible for Members of his party or ours to offer amendments more often than the last six leaders combined. In other words, he gets to decide whether anybody's amendments are considered—either on his side or our side. That is what has degraded the Senate. That is what has turned the Senate into looking more like the House. In fact, I am told of late that the House has voted on more amendments than the Senate. The assistant majority leader used to say—and he was quite right at the time—if you want to have a chance to vote, come to the Senate; that is what the Senate is about. That is not what it has been about in recent times.

All that is really required to get the Senate back to normal is for the one Member of the Senate who has the right of prior recognition and the right to set the agenda to open the Senate and let Members of both parties offer amendments.

When we used to be in the majority, I would tell our Members that the price of being in the majority is you have to give the minority their votes. It is an unpleasant experience for us, but that is the way the Senate operates, and that is the way you move a bill to completion.

There were a couple of times this year when it looked like we were going to get back to normal. I still hope it is not too late for that. It would be in the best interests of the institution and the best interest of both the majority and minority to begin to restore the institution to the way it used to operate.

Mr. REID addressed the Chair.

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I believe I have the floor.

Do I have the floor?

Mr. REID. I have the floor. The Senator yielded the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader had not yet yielded the floor.

Mr. REID. I apologize.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, if the Senator would yield for a question.

Mr. McCONNELL. I am happy to yield for a question.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, the majority leader said that there is urgent work the Senate needs to turn to, which is why we ought to amend the ordinary rules of the Senate which call for a 30-hour postcloture period.

I ask the distinguished Republican leader if he is aware of any urgent work that the majority leader has planned for us to turn to that would be a reason to expedite this particular nomination?

Mr. McCONNELL. I am sure the majority leader will announce at some point what we are going to do next, but I am not quite sure what that is at this particular point.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, if the Senator will yield for another question, I ask the distinguished Republican leader if he is aware—and I am confident he is—that the majority leader and other leaders of his party had a press conference last week, I believe it was, announcing their agenda from this point through the election in November, which involved issues such as the vote we had yesterday, the vote on the increase in the minimum wage, the vote on extending long-term unemployment, and the like. I believe there was a quote in the article—if the Senator will remember like I do—that basically said: We are not interested in legislating. We are just basically interested in posturing and politics to help distract the American people from the unpopularity of this President's policies and this party's policies.

Does the Senator remember something to that effect?

Mr. McCONNELL. I do. The Senator from Texas is entirely correct. There was a rather candid admission at a press conference that the whole agenda was basically crafted by the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee and that getting an outcome was sort of irrelevant. It was mainly about scoring political points for the fall election here on the floor of the Senate.

If that is one of the urgent items the majority leader has in mind that would somehow be prevented if we had a vote on this judge on the Monday after the recess, it is perplexing to reach the conclusion that this is a matter of great urgency for the American people if there is no interest whatsoever in getting an outcome.

Mr. McCONNELL. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I have heard my friend the Republican leader come to the floor often and say: Why don't we work on Fridays? Most people work on Fridays. I want to make sure I am right, but I have not seen or heard a single Republican come to the floor and say a single word about the nominee of the Ninth Circuit—positive or negative. They have not said a single word.

A lot of words are being thrown about here—posturing. I wonder if somebody who is a long-term unemployed worker, someone who has been out of work a long time—I will give a profile of someone. Not everybody fits this description. Let's take the example of somebody who is 55 years old and was laid off because of the recession and can't find a job because he or she is overqualified, overeducated—lots of different issues as to why they can't find work.

We decided that it was important that they get an unemployment benefit extension. About 2 million people agree with that for sure because they are the ones who lost those benefits. I don't think that is posturing. We voted on that, and it passed here. I think we had to have five cloture votes to get there. But because of some very strong-willed Republicans, we were able to do that, and I admire those five who joined with us. They didn't want to do it by name. They said something we did yesterday. That something that we did yesterday said that if a woman works the same job that a man works, that woman should be paid the same as a man.

Is that posturing? I don't think so. My daughter doesn't think so and my granddaughters don't think so. They think it is pretty fair. More than half of the people who are going to college now are women. Over half of the people in medical school and law school are women. Shouldn't they be paid the same as men? Is that posturing? I don't think so.

Again, there is diversion and distraction from the issue at hand. They wanted to offer amendments, and one was a 350-page amendment that covered everything. In fact, I said it even included the kitchen sink. They are not serious about this. They only want to move from what we are trying to do.

Do we have anything urgent to do when we get back? If we didn't have to go through all of this nonsense—and that is what it is—we would be voting today on minimum wage. That vote would help 1 million people get out of poverty and 26 million people would get a raise.

Why did we pick the number of $10.10 an hour? Because that gets people out of poverty. It is really important that we understand that this is part of the mantra of the program that Karl Rove and others decided they would do 5 years or more ago, and that is to oppose everything that President Obama has done.

You cannot talk about what went on before because never in the history of our great Republic have we had a party—a minority party—determined to do nothing in the hope that it will get them the majority in November. We will find out if their noble experiment works; that is, oppose everything and people will like us a lot. I don't think that is going to work. We are here to do the work of the American people. Is it right that we have more than 100 people who are being held up for no reason other than they want to make sure that if we have somebody who is going to be a circuit court judge, we have to file cloture—that is 2 days—and then we have 30 hours, and then we have—simply moving to a piece of legislation, we waste a week getting to it because of their obstruction and delay. So it is unfortunate.

My friends talk about all the great things they have done. I will tell my colleagues the great things they have done. I can give lots of examples. We tried to do a highway bill—a highway bill—which is important for this country. We have a deficit in infrastructure of $3 trillion. It wasn't much better a couple of years ago. So we brought that bill to the floor, and we had this great amendment process. They wanted to debate amendments. What did they do? They wanted to stop women from getting contraceptives. That held up things for a month—a month—before they finally got some sense and withdrew that.

The Republicans made a decision a little more than 5 years ago to oppose

everything President Obama wanted or tried to do, and they have stuck with that. It has not been good for the country, and we have situations just like we have here.

(Mr. SCHATZ assumed the Chair.)

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, would the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. REID. Sure.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, the majority leader says there is important work for the Senate to do, and I can think of one urgent thing we could do today if the majority leader would consent.

The House has passed the reauthorization of the Debbie Smith Act.

To remind colleagues, this is money Congress appropriated to the Department of Justice for grants to local law enforcement agencies and forensic labs to test unprocessed rape kits. This is a national scandal, the number of unprocessed rape kits which have prevented law enforcement from identifying a serial perpetrator of sexual assault, many sometimes not just involving adults but also children.

The House has passed the reauthorization of that bill. All it takes is for the majority leader and the Senate to consent to take up that bill today and pass it to get it to the President's desk.

I think that, perhaps, is the most important and most urgent thing we could be doing right now. So I ask the majority leader if he would consent to taking up that bill and passing it in the Senate right now.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the committee, of which I am almost certain my friend is a member—the Judiciary Committee; is that right?

Mr. CORNYN. I am on the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. REID. He is also a former supreme court justice of Texas.

They have reported the bill out of the Judiciary Committee, and my friend was part of that reporting situation. Part of what they reported out has the Debbie Smith language in it, but it has more stuff in it than just that. So I would be happy to take a look at that. We can talk to the chair of the committee and the ranking member, who is on the floor here today, and if they would be willing to separate this stuff here and have it rather than what was reported out of the committee—they can take a look at this. Senator LEAHY was on the floor. He is not here now, but I would be happy to take a look at that.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, if I may ask one more question of the majority leader, one final question.

Mr. REID. I am sorry, I didn't hear that.

Mr. CORNYN. Will the majority leader yield for one last question?

Mr. REID. Yes. But before doing that, I have just been informed that this bill that was reported out of the committee on which the senior Senator from Texas serves—we have cleared it on our side. If they want to clear it today, we will get this out today. All they have to do is clear it on their side. We have cleared it.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, if I could ask the majority leader through the Chair, there is the Justice for All Act which, as the leader points out, includes things other than the Debbie Smith Act, which has not cleared the Senate, which, if it did clear the Senate, would include the Debbie Smith Act. That would be a positive development.

There is a separate bill—if the Justice for All Act is not cleared, there is a separate bill which would reauthorize the Debbie Smith Act which has passed the House. So we could take up just the Debbie Smith reauthorization that the House has passed and get that done today, which I would urge the majority leader to consider, if we can't clear the larger bill, the Justice For All Act. But, frankly, I would be happy with either one. But if we could just do the Debbie Smith Act today, I think we could call that great progress and a great win for justice and for some of these people who have been waiting too long for the law enforcement community to be able to identify the perpetrators and get these folks off the street.

Mr. REID. The bill that 55 Senators have cleared over here is a bill to protect crime victims' rights, to eliminate the substantial backlog of DNA samples collected from crime scenes and convicted offenders, to improve and expand the DNA testing capacity of Federal, State, and local crime laboratories, to increase research and development of new DNA testing technologies, to develop new training programs regarding the collection and use of DNA evidence, to provide postconviction testing of DNA evidence to exonerate the innocent, to improve the performance of counsel in State capital cases, and for other purposes. We will pass that right now. We are happy to do it.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, if I may respond to the majority leader, the bill he is referring to is the Justice for All Act, which I support. But there has been some reason why that bill has not come to the floor and received floor time. I am worried that if we wait to pass that, we will delay the passage of the Debbie Smith Act, which is a component of that act, which we could take up, having passed the House, and we could take that up today and then deal with the Justice for All Act in due course.

So I ask the majority leader if he would grant unanimous consent to take up and pass the House-passed reauthorization of the Debbie Smith Act, and I ask unanimous consent to that effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. This is what we deal with here. We have a piece of legislation that has been reported out of the committee. It has been cleared by the Democrats here in the Senate, and the Republicans are now saying: Well, we like that, but we don't want to do it that way; let's do it some other way.

The point is the committee met and reviewed the House legislation and decided they wanted to do more than what the House did. I think we should go forward with what the committee says.

I hear my friend the Republican leader and other Republican Senators say: Let's have the committees do their work.

They have done their work. We approved their work. We are ready to pass this right now, which includes the Debbie Smith language but does a lot more.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I asked the distinguished ranking member of the Judiciary Committee to remind me what the challenge is with the Justice for All Act. We have a Member on our side who is unfortunately not here today because of medical concerns who has concerns about that bill, so we cannot pass that bill by unanimous consent over that Senator's objection. What we can pass is the Debbie Smith Act, which is a piece of this. There is no objection to that, that I know of. Then we could get this rape kit issue addressed today, while we take up the concerns of the absent Senator, who is necessarily not here because of medical issues, when he returns and when the Senate returns.

So I would reiterate my unanimous consent request that the Senate take up and pass by unanimous consent the House-passed Debbie Smith Act.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, more diversion and delay. The Judiciary Committee took what the House did, reviewed it, and said: We can do better.

It is here on the floor right now. Now they are saying: Even though the Judiciary Committee did it—and we are being told all the time to let the committees do their work—we don't like what they did. Let them do something else.

The Debbie Smith Act is important, but the Justice for All Act is a lot better than that. Why don't we approve that?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. Yes, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, the majority leader thinks this is a zero sum game. This could be a win-win. Debbie Smith, whom I have met and I daresay virtually every Member of this body knows, is a passionate advocate for this cause, hence the naming of this statute, this law, on her behalf. She recognized that these unprocessed rape kits are a national scandal and that people like her who had been victims of sexual assault needed help from the Federal Government to help provide funds to local law enforcement agencies to test and process these kits so as

to identify the perpetrators and get them off the street.

So what Debbie Smith has asked me and I daresay the majority leader and all of us to do is to take up this piece of the bill. We can do that, and I think we will have done a good thing today. If we can't take up the Justice for All Act because of other concerns people have—this shouldn't be a zero sum game. We could pass the Debbie Smith Act today, and then we could take up the Justice for All Act when we return following the recess. It doesn't have to be a zero sum game.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. This has been cleared on this side for more than 2 weeks—more than 2 weeks. This is what is going on in the Senate. The Republicans basically oppose everything. That is what they decided they were going to do, and they do it. And they come back and say: We reported this out of the committee.

I read what is in it. It is a very good piece of legislation. But they said: We don't like that. Let's forget about the committee process and do something with what the House did.

We have a committee structure here that I have tried to follow. I admire the work done by Senator LEAHY. He led this piece of legislation out of his committee. I accept it and I approve it, as do all other 54 Democratic Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 15 minutes.

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

DIGITAL ACCOUNTABILITY AND TRANSPARENCY ACT OF 2013

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I originally was going to engage in a colloquy with Senator PORTMAN on a very important piece of legislation that we, Senator COBURN, and Senator CARPER, were working on for 2 years, and he will come back.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 337, S. 994.

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

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 994) to expand the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 to increase accountability and transparency in Federal spending, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported substitute amendment be withdrawn; the Carper substitute amendment, which is at the desk, be considered; the Carper amendment at the desk be agreed to; the Carper substitute, as amended, be agreed to; and the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed, with no intervening action or debate.

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

The amendment (No. 2970) in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

(The amendment is printed in the RECORD of Wednesday, April 9, 2014, under ''Text of Amendments.'')

The amendment (No. 2971) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To allow the Secretary of Defense to request an extension to report financial and payment information data)

On page 9, strike lines 17 through 21 and insert the following:

''(2) AGENCIES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), not later than 2 years after the date on which the guidance under paragraph (1) is issued, each Federal agency shall report financial and payment information data in accordance with the data standards established under subsection (a).

''(B) NONINTERFERENCE WITH AUDITABILITY OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Upon request by the Secretary of Defense, the Director may grant an extension of the deadline under subparagraph (A) to the Department of Defense for a period of not more than 6 months to report financial and payment information data in accordance with the data standards established under subsection (a).

''(ii) LIMITATION.—The Director may not grant more than 3 extensions to the Secretary of Defense under clause (i).

''(iii) NOTIFICATION.—The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall notify the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives of—

''(I) each grant of an extension under clause (i); and

''(II) the reasons for granting such an extension.

The bill (S. 994), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 994

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Digital Accountability and Transparency Act of 2014'' or the ''DATA Act''.

SEC. 2. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this Act are to—

(1) expand the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 (31 U.S.C. 6101 note) by disclosing direct Federal agency expenditures and linking Federal contract, loan, and grant spending information to programs of Federal agencies to enable taxpayers and policy makers to track Federal spending more effectively;

(2) establish Government-wide data standards for financial data and provide consistent, reliable, and searchable Government-wide spending data that is displayed accurately for taxpayers and policy makers on USASpending.gov (or a successor system that displays the data);

(3) simplify reporting for entities receiving Federal funds by streamlining reporting requirements and reducing compliance costs while improving transparency;

(4) improve the quality of data submitted to USASpending.gov by holding Federal agencies accountable for the completeness and accuracy of the data submitted; and

(5) apply approaches developed by the Recovery Accountability and Transparency Board to spending across the Federal Government.

SEC. 3. AMENDMENTS TO THE FEDERAL FUNDING ACCOUNTABILITY AND TRANSPARENCY ACT OF 2006.

The Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 (31 U.S.C. 6101 note) is amended—

(1) in section 2—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''this section'' and inserting ''this Act'';

(ii) by redesignating paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) as paragraphs (2), (4), and (7), respectively;

(iii) by inserting before paragraph (2), as so redesignated, the following:

''(1) DIRECTOR.—The term 'Director' means the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.'';

(iv) by inserting after paragraph (2), as so redesignated, the following:

''(3) FEDERAL AGENCY.—The term 'Federal agency' has the meaning given the term 'Executive agency' under section 105 of title 5, United States Code.'';

(v) by inserting after paragraph (4), as so redesignated, the following:

''(5) OBJECT CLASS.—The term 'object class' means the category assigned for purposes of the annual budget of the President submitted under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, to the type of property or services purchased by the Federal Government.

''(6) PROGRAM ACTIVITY.—The term 'program activity' has the meaning given that term under section 1115(h) of title 31, United States Code.''; and

(vi) by adding at the end the following:

''(8) SECRETARY.—The term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of the Treasury.'';

(B) in subsection (b)—

(i) in paragraph (3), by striking ''of the Office of Management and Budget''; and

(ii) in paragraph (4), by striking ''of the Office of Management and Budget'';

(C) in subsection (c)—

(i) in paragraph (4), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(ii) in paragraph (5), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

''(6) shall have the ability to aggregate data for the categories described in paragraphs (1) through (5) without double-counting data; and

''(7) shall ensure that all information published under this section is available—

''(A) in machine-readable and open formats;

''(B) to be downloaded in bulk; and

''(C) to the extent practicable, for automated processing.'';

(D) in subsection (d)—

(i) in paragraph (1)(A), by striking ''of the Office of Management and Budget'';

(ii) in paragraph (2)—

(I) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''of the Office of Management and Budget''; and

(II) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''of the Office of Management and Budget'';

(E) in subsection (e), by striking ''of the Office of Management and Budget''; and

(F) in subsection (g)—

(i) in paragraph (1), by striking ''of the Office of Management and Budget''; and

(ii) in paragraph (3), by striking ''of the Office of Management and Budget''; and

(2) by striking sections 3 and 4 and inserting the following:

"SEC. 3. FULL DISCLOSURE OF FEDERAL FUNDS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of the Digital Accountability and Transparency Act of 2014, and monthly when practicable but not less than quarterly thereafter, the Secretary, in consultation with the Director, shall ensure that the information in subsection (b) is posted on the website established under section 2.

''(b) INFORMATION TO BE POSTED.—For any funds made available to or expended by a Federal agency or component of a Federal agency, the information to be posted shall include—

''(1) for each appropriations account, including an expired or unexpired appropriations account, the amount—

''(A) of budget authority appropriated;

''(B) that is obligated;

''(C) of unobligated balances; and

''(D) of any other budgetary resources;

''(2) from which accounts and in what amount—

''(A) appropriations are obligated for each program activity; and

''(B) outlays are made for each program activity;

''(3) from which accounts and in what amount—

''(A) appropriations are obligated for each object class; and

''(B) outlays are made for each object class; and

''(4) for each program activity, the amount—

''(A) obligated for each object class; and

''(B) of outlays made for each object class.

"SEC. 4. DATA STANDARDS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—

''(1) ESTABLISHMENT OF STANDARDS.—The Secretary and the Director, in consultation with the heads of Federal agencies, shall establish Government-wide financial data standards for any Federal funds made available to or expended by Federal agencies and entities receiving Federal funds.

''(2) DATA ELEMENTS.—The financial data standards established under paragraph (1) shall include common data elements for financial and payment information required to be reported by Federal agencies and entities receiving Federal funds.

''(b) REQUIREMENTS.—The data standards established under subsection (a) shall, to the extent reasonable and practicable—

''(1) incorporate widely accepted common data elements, such as those developed and maintained by—

''(A) an international voluntary consensus standards body;

''(B) Federal agencies with authority over contracting and financial assistance; and

''(C) accounting standards organizations;

''(2) incorporate a widely accepted, nonproprietary, searchable, platform-independent computer-readable format;

''(3) include unique identifiers for Federal awards and entities receiving Federal awards that can be consistently applied Government-wide;

''(4) be consistent with and implement applicable accounting principles;

''(5) be capable of being continually upgraded as necessary;

''(6) produce consistent and comparable data, including across program activities; and

''(7) establish a standard method of conveying the reporting period, reporting entity, unit of measure, and other associated attributes.

''(c) DEADLINES.—

''(1) GUIDANCE.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Digital Accountability and Transparency Act of 2014, the Director and the Secretary shall issue guidance to Federal agencies on the data standards established under subsection (a).

''(2) AGENCIES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), not later than 2 years after the date on which the guidance under paragraph (1) is issued, each Federal agency shall report financial and payment information data in accordance with the data standards established under subsection (a).

''(B) NONINTERFERENCE WITH AUDITABILITY OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Upon request by the Secretary of Defense, the Director may grant an extension of the deadline under subparagraph (A) to the Department of Defense for a period of not more than 6 months to report financial and payment information data in accordance with the data standards established under subsection (a).

''(ii) LIMITATION.—The Director may not grant more than 3 extensions to the Secretary of Defense under clause (i).

''(iii) NOTIFICATION.—The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall notify the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives of—

''(I) each grant of an extension under clause (i); and

''(II) the reasons for granting such an extension.

''(3) WEBSITE.—Not later than 3 years after the date on which the guidance under paragraph (1) is issued, the Director and the Secretary shall ensure that the data standards established under subsection (a) are applied to the data made available on the website established under section 2.

''(d) CONSULTATION.—The Director and the Secretary shall consult with public and private stakeholders in establishing data standards under this section.

"SEC. 5. SIMPLIFYING FEDERAL AWARD REPORTING.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director, in consultation with relevant Federal agencies, recipients of Federal awards, including State and local governments, and institutions of higher education (as defined in section 102 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1002)), shall review the information required to be reported by recipients of Federal awards to identify—

''(1) common reporting elements across the Federal Government;

''(2) unnecessary duplication in financial reporting; and

''(3) unnecessarily burdensome reporting requirements for recipients of Federal awards.

''(b) PILOT PROGRAM.—

''(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Digital Accountability and Transparency Act of 2014, the Director, or a Federal agency designated by the Director, shall establish a pilot program (in this section referred to as the 'pilot program') with the participation of appropriate Federal agencies to facilitate the development of recommendations for—

''(A) standardized reporting elements across the Federal Government;

''(B) the elimination of unnecessary duplication in financial reporting; and

''(C) the reduction of compliance costs for recipients of Federal awards.

''(2) REQUIREMENTS.—The pilot program shall—

''(A) include a combination of Federal contracts, grants, and subawards, the aggregate value of which is not less than $1,000,000,000 and not more than $2,000,000,000;

''(B) include a diverse group of recipients of Federal awards; and

''(C) to the extent practicable, include recipients who receive Federal awards from multiple programs across multiple agencies.

''(3) DATA COLLECTION.—The pilot program shall include data collected during a 12-month reporting cycle.

''(4) REPORTING AND EVALUATION REQUIREMENTS.—Each recipient of a Federal award participating in the pilot program shall submit to the Office of Management and Budget or the Federal agency designated under paragraph (1), as appropriate, any requested reports of the selected Federal awards.

''(5) TERMINATION.—The pilot program shall terminate on the date that is 2 years after the date on which the pilot program is established.

''(6) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 90 days after the date on which the pilot program terminates under paragraph (5), the Director shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Committee on the Budget of the Senate and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform and the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives a report on the pilot program, which shall include—

''(A) a description of the data collected under the pilot program, the usefulness of the data provided, and the cost to collect the data from recipients; and

''(B) a discussion of any legislative action required and recommendations for—

''(i) consolidating aspects of Federal financial reporting to reduce the costs to recipients of Federal awards;

''(ii) automating aspects of Federal financial reporting to increase efficiency and reduce the costs to recipients of Federal awards;

''(iii) simplifying the reporting requirements for recipients of Federal awards; and

''(iv) improving financial transparency.

''(7) GOVERNMENT-WIDE IMPLEMENTATION.—Not later than 1 year after the date on which the Director submits the report under paragraph (6), the Director shall issue guidance to the heads of Federal agencies as to how the Government-wide financial data standards established under section 4(a) shall be applied to the information required to be reported by entities receiving Federal awards to—

''(A) reduce the burden of complying with reporting requirements; and

''(B) simplify the reporting process, including by reducing duplicative reports.

"SEC. 6. ACCOUNTABILITY FOR FEDERAL FUNDING.

''(a) INSPECTOR GENERAL REPORTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In accordance with paragraph (2), the Inspector General of each Federal agency, in consultation with the Comptroller General of the United States, shall—

''(A) review a statistically valid sampling of the spending data submitted under this Act by the Federal agency; and

''(B) submit to Congress and make publically available a report assessing the completeness, timeliness, quality, and accuracy of the data sampled and the implementation and use of data standards by the Federal agency.

''(2) DEADLINES.—

''(A) FIRST REPORT.—Not later than 18 months after the date on which the Director and the Secretary issue guidance to Federal agencies under section 4(c)(1), the Inspector General of each Federal agency shall submit and make publically available a report as described in paragraph (1).

''(B) SUBSEQUENT REPORTS.—On the same date as the Inspector General of each Federal agency submits the second and fourth reports under sections 3521(f) and 9105(a)(3) of

title 31, United States Code, that are submitted after the report under subparagraph (A), the Inspector General shall submit and make publically available a report as described in paragraph (1). The report submitted under this subparagraph may be submitted as a part of the report submitted under section 3521(f) or 9105(a)(3) of title 31, United States Code.

''(b) COMPTROLLER GENERAL REPORTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In accordance with paragraph (2) and after a review of the reports submitted under subsection (a), the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress and make publically available a report assessing and comparing the data completeness, timeliness, quality, and accuracy of the data submitted under this Act by Federal agencies and the implementation and use of data standards by Federal agencies.

''(2) DEADLINES.—Not later than 30 months after the date on which the Director and the Secretary issue guidance to Federal agencies under section 4(c)(1), and every 2 years thereafter until the date that is 4 years after the date on which the first report is submitted under this subsection, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit and make publically available a report as described in paragraph (1).

''(c) RECOVERY ACCOUNTABILITY AND TRANSPARENCY BOARD DATA ANALYSIS CENTER.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may establish a data analysis center or expand an existing service to provide data, analytic tools, and data management techniques to support—

''(A) the prevention and reduction of improper payments by Federal agencies; and

''(B) improving efficiency and transparency in Federal spending.

''(2) DATA AVAILABILITY.—The Secretary shall enter into memoranda of understanding with Federal agencies, including Inspectors General and Federal law enforcement agencies—

''(A) under which the Secretary may provide data from the data analysis center for—

''(i) the purposes set forth under paragraph (1);

''(ii) the identification, prevention, and reduction of waste, fraud, and abuse relating to Federal spending; and

''(iii) use in the conduct of criminal and other investigations; and

''(B) which may require the Federal agency, Inspector General, or Federal law enforcement agency to provide reimbursement to the Secretary for the reasonable cost of carrying out the agreement.

''(3) TRANSFER.—Upon the establishment of a data analysis center or the expansion of a service under paragraph (1), and on or before the date on which the Recovery Accountability and Transparency Board terminates, and in addition to any other transfer that the Director determines is necessary under section 1531 of title 31, United States Code, there are transferred to the Department of the Treasury all assets identified by the Secretary that support the operations and activities of the Recovery Operations Center of the Recovery Accountability and Transparency Board relating to the detection of waste, fraud, and abuse in the use of Federal funds that are in existence on the day before the transfer.

''SEC. 7. CLASSIFIED AND PROTECTED INFORMATION.

''Nothing in this Act shall require the disclosure to the public of—

''(1) information that would be exempt from disclosure under section 552 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the 'Freedom of Information Act'); or

''(2) information protected under section 552a of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the 'Privacy Act of 1974'), or section 6103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

''SEC. 8. NO PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION.

''Nothing in this Act shall be construed to create a private right of action for enforcement of any provision of this Act.''.

SEC. 4. EXECUTIVE AGENCY ACCOUNTING AND OTHER FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT REPORTS AND PLANS.

Section 3512(a)(1) of title 31, United States Code, is amended by inserting ''and make available on the website described under section 1122'' after ''appropriate committees of Congress''.

SEC. 5. DEBT COLLECTION IMPROVEMENT.

Section 3716(c)(6) of title 31, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting ''(A)'' before ''Any Federal agency'';

(2) in subparagraph (A), as so designated, by striking ''180 days'' and inserting ''120 days''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(B) The Secretary of the Treasury shall notify Congress of any instance in which an agency fails to notify the Secretary as required under subparagraph (A).''.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, after the last exchange, I would point out that the Senate now has acted on a very important piece of legislation that has been 2 years in the works, that actually does reflect the ability for us to come together in a bipartisan consensus. So I rise today to discuss the Digital Accountability and Transparency Act—or DATA Act—an important bill that makes sure taxpayers and policymakers can track every dollar the Federal Government spends.

It is pretty unbelievable that in this day and age, we don't have an easily accessible Web site for tracking every Federal tax dollar. Believe it or not, we do not. Instead, we have an incomplete and thoroughly confusing structure of financial reporting which most people can't understand.

I have served in business. I have served as Governor of the Commonwealth of Virginia. So I have done business accounting and State government accounting. There is nothing like Federal Government accounting and the lack of standards and transparency.

Our taxpayers deserve to know where their money goes, and it is our obligation to share that information in a clear and direct way. Today, Senator PORTMAN and I, originally, along with Senator COBURN and Senator CARPER, rise—and now that the Senate has acted, we are actually taking a giant step to correct that problem and to make sure taxpayers actually get the transparency they deserve.

Since the Federal Government spends more than $3.7 trillion each year, with more than $1 trillion in awards, accurately tracking these funds in a consistent way can definitely be a big job. But the data collected by the budget shops, the accountants, the procurement officers, the grant makers should be combined and reconciled and then presented in a relevant, user-friendly, and transparent way. The various systems should be able to work together based on consistent financial standards so that policymakers and the public can track the full cycle of Federal spending. In a word, the public should be able to ''Wikipedia'' where and how the Federal Government spends its money, and quite honestly, that is what the DATA Act will do.

The DATA Act will make four important improvements that I want to quickly highlight.

First, it creates transparency for all Federal funds. The DATA Act will expand the current site of usaspending.gov to include spending data for all Federal funds by appropriation, Federal agency, program, function, as well as maintain the current reporting for Federal awards like contracts, grants, and loans.

Second—and this is a giant step forward; we are not going to get all the way there—we are starting down this path of setting government-wide financial data standards. We closely monitored the efforts to increase transparency for the Recovery Act funds a few years back, and one reason—even for folks who did not like the Recovery Act—that oversight was successful is because they had consistent standards for reporting the data. Our taxpayers were able to see where the funds and projects were located in their communities.

So the DATA Act requires the Department of the Treasury to establish government-wide financial data standards for Federal agencies so that every term reported is consistent across the Federal Government. This should clearly improve the quality of data.

Too often we see an item appear in one area as a grant and in another area as an expenditure. Trying to sort through what's what is virtually impossible. This part of the DATA Act will help clear that up.

Third, so we do not simply layer on additional reporting requirements without greater accountability, it actually reduces recipient reporting requirements. The DATA Act requires OMB to review the established reporting requirements for contracts, grants, and loans to reduce compliance costs based on these new financial data standards.

I have long been concerned—and I know many of my colleagues on both side of the aisle—about the compliance costs for recipients of Federal funds. Too often a grantee has to report not once or twice but sometimes up to a half dozen times the exact same information. We have seen this in Virginia with many of our universities, such as UVA, where they actually have to report multiple times the same information to multiple agencies.

If all this redundancy were streamlined, recipients such as the University of Virginia or the University of Tennessee could actually direct more money to programs and less to administrative costs.

Fourth, it improves data quality. Under the DATA Act, the inspectors general at each agency will be required

to provide a report every 2 years on the quality and accuracy of the financial data provided to usaspending.gov. The GAO will create a government-wide report on data quality and accuracy. Too often the data that is reported at this point does not meet appropriate standards.

We must have a reliable system in place to track Federal funds and compare spending across Federal agencies to get the best value for taxpayers and reduce duplication.

In fact, in the GAO's annual report on duplication released this week, it highlighted the need for better data and specifically called out the limitations. GAO described a ''lack of reliable budget and performance information and a comprehensive list of federal programs'' as one of the biggest challenges in addressing duplication.

I know many of the Members, when I started talking about data standards and better accountability, headed for the exists. I recognize this is not a topic that necessarily excites folks. But I see my colleague, the Senator from Tennessee, on the floor—a former Governor, as was I. If we are going to get better value for our taxpayers, we have to start with good data, we have to start with a better ability to monitor that data and follow it.

In a world where people can Google all kinds of information, we ought to be able to follow the money in terms of where our taxpayer dollars head. We ought to make sure the recipients of those taxpayer grants can report that information in a single, consistent, and clear way. Policymakers and taxpayers should be able to assess the value of the dollars we invest in these programs.

This has been a long and winding path. As a relatively new Member of the Senate—and I hear some of the debates about some of the old days in the Senate—I am not sure I was here in the old days. But this is a case where, after a 2-year period, working with Members of the House—Chairman ISSA and Ranking Member CUMMINGS in the House—and working in the Senate with Senator CARPER and Senator COBURN—Senator COBURN who is out today for health reasons—and my colleague who joined with me in pushing this bill from day one, Senator PORTMAN—who, if time allows, will get back from a speech to add his comments as well—I would like to thank these Members.

I would also like to thank all of the Senate cosponsors for their support of the DATA Act, including members of our Budget Committee, the Government Performance Task Force that I chair.

I would like to thank in particular Senators COONS, WHITEHOUSE, AYOTTE, JOHNSON, and our Budget Committee Chairman PATTY MURRAY, and my staff, Amy Edwards, and all the others who have been relentless on working this through with other committees and the administration to make sure we got this bill done.

So while we may not have resolved all the issues of the day, today the Senate acted in a unanimous, bipartisan way to actually provide better value for taxpayers, more transparency, and less bureaucracy. I would say for a Thursday afternoon—with all the other discussion going on—work well done.

With that, I yield the floor.

NOMINATION OF MICHELLE T. FRIEDLAND TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from North Carolina and I be allowed to engage in a colloquy for 20 minutes, and following that the Senator from Iowa be recognized.

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

STUDENT ATHLETES

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, the Senator from North Carolina and I were both involved in intercollegiate athletics. He was a scholarship athlete at Wake Forest University and I was a nonscholarship track person at Vanderbilt University several years before that.

We are here today to make a few comments on the recent ruling by a regional director of the National Labor Relations Board that defines student athletes as employees of the university. It affects only private universities for now—not the University of Tennessee. But it would affect Wake Forest, where the Senator from North Carolina was an outstanding football player, and it would affect Vanderbilt, where I attended.

I guess our message to the NCAA and intercollegiate athletes is: We hope they will understand the opinion of one regional director of the National Labor Relations Board is not the opinion of the entire Federal Government. That is the message I would like to deliver.

I would refer back—and then I will go to the Senator from North Carolina—to 25 years ago, when I was the president of the University of Tennessee, and I was asked to serve on the Knight Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics. It was headed by the president of North Carolina, Bill Friday, and the head of Notre Dame, Father Hesburgh—a pretty distinguished group of individuals from around the country—to take a look at intercollegiate athletics.

The major conclusion they came to was that presidents need to assert more institutional control over athletics. But here is something that this group of university presidents and others emphasized. They said:

> We reject the argument that the only realistic solution to the problem [of intercollegiate athletics]—

And there have always been some—

> is to drop the student-athlete concept, put athletes on the payroll, and reduce or even eliminate their responsibilities as students.

> Such a scheme has nothing to do with education, the purpose for which colleges and universities exist. Scholarship athletes are already paid in the most meaningful way possible: with a free education. The idea of intercollegiate athletics is that the teams represent their institutions as true members of the student body, not as hired hands. Surely American higher education has the ability to devise a better solution to the problems of intercollegiate athletics than making professionals out of the players, which is no solution at all but rather an unacceptable surrender to despair.

This was the Knight Commission 25 years ago.

I would ask the Senator from North Carolina, does he not think that while there may be some issues with intercollegiate athletics—and we could talk about what some of those are—that unionization of intercollegiate athletics is not the solution to the problem?

Mr. BURR. Let me say to my good friend, the Senator from Tennessee—who not only was a walk-on track member at Vanderbilt, but was the president of the University of Tennessee, the Governor of Tennessee, the Secretary of Education, and now is a Senator—his credentials allow him to say whatever he wants to on this issue with a degree of knowledge.

It was Teddy Roosevelt who identified the challenge of college football, and through his attempt to get Harvard and Yale and a couple of other universities to address the risk, the NCAA was created.

The amazing thing to Senator ALEXANDER and myself is that we have this governing body today that by all practical observations has done a great job of regulating college sports. It is the reason we have fabulous playoffs. It is the reason we have integrity in the scholarship system. But, more importantly, it is the reason we have top-quality athletes who go into these schools, where less than 1 percent become pros. Ninety-nine percent of them are reliant on a great education for a fabulous outcome in life. To do anything that changes the balance of what they have been able to create is ludicrous and I think what troubles me, and I think it troubles Senator ALEXANDER.

These are not some misguided college football players. This is the United Steelworkers. Let me say that again because I do not think people understand it. This is the United Steelworkers who have put up the money so that these players from Northwestern would go to the NLRB and say: We want to unionize at Northwestern University. Well, on the face of it, it creates a great inequity between public and private schools, where we have a governing body that tries to make this process as equitable as it can.

But let me make this point: If you want to drive the rest of the schools out of major sports, then do this. Only 10 percent of our Nation's athletic programs make money. That means 90 percent of them lose in the athletic department. But for the quality of life of

all students, not just athletes, they continue and their alumni continue to subsidize it.

I agree with my good friend from Tennessee. This would be a huge mistake, and it is time for those players at Northwestern to think about more than those individuals who have fronted them the money to bring this case.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I thank the Senator from North Carolina.

The question should be obvious: What does a student at Wake Forest or Vanderbilt or—and we are using the private universities, again, because those are the only ones affected by this decision for now—but if you are at Vanderbilt University, according to the vice chancellor, the total scholarship could be nearly $60,000. That is the value each year of your athletic scholarship. Times four—so you are up to one-quarter of a million dollars.

The College Board says—roughly estimates—that a college degree adds $1 million to your earnings during a lifetime.

So the idea that student athletes do not get anything in return for their playing a sport is financially wrong. And just speaking as one individual who had the privilege to participate for 2 years as a student athlete without getting anything—I had scholarships, but they were not athletic scholarships—the discipline, the memories, the competition, the chance to be in the Southeastern Conference Tournament—that is very important to me. It was then, just as athletics always is. It is a rare privilege to participate in intercollegiate athletics.

The presidents have looked at the problems of intercollegiate athletics. And there are some. But people forget—and I know the Senator from North Carolina is aware of this. But let's say you are at Vanderbilt and you have a $58,000 scholarship—tuition, room and board but your total costs are over $60,000 and let's say you come from a poor family that has no money and you are put in the embarrassing position of not having walking-around money, money to go out and get a hamburger, or whatever you want to do.

Forty percent of student athletes in America also have a Pell grant similar to 40 percent of all students in America have a Pell grant, and the Pell grant can be, on average, $3,600. So that is $300 a month that could be added.

Now, perhaps there are other issues that ought to be addressed. But I wonder if the Senator from North Carolina would speak more about one thing he talked about. I imagine Florida State, the University of Tennessee, Stanford, maybe Wake Forest—they will all be fine with a more expensive athletic program. But what is going to happen to the smaller schools? What is going to happen to the minor sports? What is going to happen to the title IX women's sports if for some reason a union forces universities to have a much more expensive athletic program for a few sports?

Mr. BURR. Well, let me say to my good friend from Tennessee, I will quote the words of Wake Forest President Nathan Hatch, a former provost at Notre Dame, in an editorial he wrote in the Wall Street Journal just this week.

He says:

> To call student-athletes employees is an affront to those players who are taking full advantage of the opportunity to get an education. Do we really want to signal to society and high-school students that making money is the reason to play a sport in college, as opposed to getting an education that will provide a lifetime benefit?

President Patrick Harker, president of the University of Delaware, in the same article said:

> Turning student athletes into salaried employees would endanger the existence of varsity sports on many college campuses. Only about 10 percent of Division I college sports programs turn a profit, and most of them, like our $28 million athletic program at the University of Delaware, lose money. Changing scholarship dollars into salary would almost certainly increase the amount schools have to spend on sports, since earnings are taxed and scholarships are not. In order just to match the value of a scholarship, the university would have to spend more.

At Wake Forest, let me say, today a scholarship is worth $45,600 in tuition in fees, $15,152 in room and board, $1,100 in books. I will say to my good friend from Tennessee, I am not sure if there is still $15 of laundry money a month that exists under a scholarship. That is what it was when I was there. I daresay I hope it is more than that today because I do not think you can do laundry for $15 a month.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I wonder if I can ask the Senator to reflect a little bit on some of the practical consequences of a student athlete suddenly finding himself thought of as an employee of the university. I wonder, for example, would the employee of the university, the quarterback or whatever position he plays, have to pay taxes on his income? I would think so.

I was thinking about the recent changes in Federal labor law that allow for micro-unions. Almost any little group can petition the National Labor Relations Board, under the Obama administration's views, to become a union. I wonder if quarterbacks would become a micro-union. They would say: We are more important. Look at the NFL. They get paid a lot more. We want a bigger scholarship than others.

I wondered about five-star recruits. Let's say there is a terrific defensive back—as I am sure Senator BURR was when he was in high school. He had five stars from all the recruiting services. Would the private schools who are unionized go out and compete to see who could pay the highest compensation to the five-star recruits, a lot less to the walk-on, maybe less for a three-star. What are the practical consequences of a student athlete suddenly finding himself defined as an employee of the university under the National Labor Relations Act?

Mr. BURR. Let me say to my good friend, as one who remembers August practices in the South—hottest time of the year, three practices a day—the first thing I would bargain out for all players is that I would have to get my ankles taped at 4:30 in the morning, that I would have to go all day and most of the night, and that I could not take that tape off until 8:30 after three practices.

I would negotiate away the smell of dead grass in August, a memory every college football player, as a matter of fact every football player, has of that dead grass in summer practice in hot weather.

I plead with those who play today: Do you truly believe you can form a team if in fact you have individuals who negotiate individual things for themselves? If quarterbacks negotiate they cannot be hit, how good is the club? But where is the team? If individuals find that it is advantageous to them because they are stars and they can negotiate it, where have we lost the sense of team sports?

The Senator from Tennessee mentioned this to begin with: College sports is a lot about the experience. It builds character. It builds integrity. It builds drive. It builds resilience. It is not the only thing in life that does it, but to me, for many individuals, for many young men and women, this is the most effective way for them to become leaders. I might say it is very much the style of our training in the military. As we raise those young officers, they go through a very regimented training.

Imagine what it would be like if we allowed the military to collectively bargain. Let me tell you, none of us would feel safe at night because we don't know exactly what they have gone through. Today we feel safe because we know they have all gone through the same thing.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I think our time is coming toward a close, but we have about 5 minutes left. Then we will be looking forward to the comments of the Senator from Iowa. We thank him for his courtesy in allowing us to go ahead.

I guess the message—I particularly enjoyed hearing the Senator from North Carolina. The message today is directed at two groups. One is to the NCAA, which is to say, do not think that the attitude of one Regional Director of the National Labor Relations Board reflects the view of the U.S. Government. It does not. The other is to the student athletes. Think about the value of the opportunity you have.

Here are two former student athletes of varying talents who benefited enormously from that. There are many others who would say the same. The university does not owe us anything. We owe the university—at least that is the way I feel about it—for the privilege of competing, for the privilege of attending. If I had a scholarship, that would have been even better—just the privilege of participating.

To the NCAA, the members of the NCAA have talked about issues such as should we provide more expense money for athletes. I mentioned earlier that 40 percent of them have Pell grants which can go up to $5,600 a year in addition to their $55,000 or $60,000 of football scholarships. So think about that. That was considered by the NCAA and voted down because the small schools said: It will hurt us. Women's programs said: We will have to drop women's programs.

So this is more complicated than it would seem at first. What about health care? Of course, a student athlete can be covered by his parents' health care insurance. Under the Affordable Care Act, I am sure many on the other side would be quick to say, they would always be able to be insured for any sort of preexisting condition, but these are issues that can be properly looked at by the NCAA.

Unionization, in my opinion, would destroy intercollegiate athletics as we know it. I think we should look back to the opinion of the Knight Commission, headed by Bill Friday of North Carolina and Ted Hesburgh of Notre Dame, and reaffirm that the student athlete is not a professional, not a hired hand. He or she is a student. One percent of the athletes in this country—there may be problems to solve, but the universities and the NCAA can address those problems. Unionization is not the way to do it.

Mr. BURR. I just wanted to address one last thing; that is, the claim that this case was all about health care. The Senator from Tennessee has pointed out as well the options that we have today. But let me speak from a firsthand experience: a college athlete, four operations—two knees, an elbow, a finger. Probably the only record I hold at Wake Forest is the total number of inches of scars on my body. Because of modern medicine, that record will not be broken because they do not do surgery that way anymore.

But I think it is best summed up by our current Secretary of Education, Arne Duncan, when he said this:

> When sports are done right, when priorities are in order, there is no better place to teach invaluable life lessons than on a playing field or court. . . . Discipline, selflessness, resilience, passion, courage, those are all on display in the NCAA.

Why would we do anything to risk that? Not only do I believe this is risky, I think just a consideration of it is enough to make us—or should make us reject this quickly, not embrace it.

I thank my colleague from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I thank my colleague from North Carolina.

I thank the Senator from Iowa for his courtesy in allowing us to go ahead.

Some 50 years ago, I had the opportunity to compete in track and field for Vanderbilt University. Unlike my colleague from North Carolina, who as a fine defensive back at Wake Forest University, there was no athletic scholarship available for me. But I was fortunate enough to be a member of a record setting team.

Twenty-five years ago, while I was president of the University of Tennessee, I was asked to serve on the Knight Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics. The Knight Commission was created in October 1989 in response to a series of scandals in college sports. After 18 months of careful study, our 22-member commission issued a report called ''Keeping the Faith with the Student-Athlete: A New Model for Intercollegiate Athletics.''

Our central recommendation was that college presidents needed to exercise stronger control of their athletics programs to ensure their academic and financial integrity. And our guiding principle in making that recommendation was that athletes are students first, not professionals. We wrote:

> We reject the argument that the only realistic solution to the problem is to drop the student-athlete concept, put athletes on the payroll, and reduce or even eliminate their responsibilities as students.
>
> Such a scheme has nothing to do with education, the purpose for which colleges and universities exist. Scholarship athletes are already paid in the most meaningful way possible: with a free education. The idea of intercollegiate athletics is that the teams represent their institutions as true members of the student body, not as hired hands. Surely American higher education has the ability to devise a better solution to the problems of intercollegiate athletics than making professionals out of the players, which is no solution at all but rather an unacceptable surrender to despair.

The Knight Commission's perspective on student athletes could not be more different to the perspective in the recent decision, issued by a regional director of the National Labor Relations Board in Chicago, to treat athletes as employees and permit them to form a union.

Student athletes are found throughout all levels and at all types of colleges—small through large, but those that receive athletic scholarships are only at division I and II schools. Division III schools are not allowed to award athletic scholarships.

For the purposes of the NLRB decision, we are talking about an even smaller subset of athletes—scholarship athletes at private institutions like Notre Dame, Vanderbilt, and Stanford. For example, as a non-scholarship athlete at Vanderbilt, I would not have been able to unionize. Senator BURR, on the other hand was given a scholarship to play defensive back at Wake Forest. He would be allowed to unionize.

In 2011, there were roughly 25 million undergraduate students; 9 million Pell recipients, which is approximately 36 percent of undergraduate students. In addition, there were 177,000 scholarship athletes enrolled in bachelor programs at public and private institutions. This is approximately 1.7 percent of all students in bachelor's programs. Of those, 71,000 received Pell Grants, approximately 40 percent of scholarship athletes. The number of scholarship athletes at private institutions enrolled in a bachelor's program was 104,000, approximately 4.2 percent of private students in bachelor's programs. Of those, 43,700 received Pell Grants, approximately 42 percent of private scholarship athletes.

The total number of division I and II schools is 662 of which 283 are private institutions. In division I the total is 350 with 119 of them being private, while the division II total is 312 with 164 private.

Athletic scholarships are limited to only tuition and fees, room and board, and required course-related books. At Vanderbilt the total scholarship could be as much as $58,520 which is a combination of $42,768 for tuition, $14,382 for room and board, and $1,370 for books. At Stanford the total scholarship could be as much as $59,240 which is a combination of $44,184 for tuition, $13,631 for room and board, and $1,425 for books.

Contrast that with the University of Tennessee where the scholarship total could be up to $21,900 consisting of $11,194 for in-state tuition, $9,170 for room and board, and $1,536 for books.

Scholarship athletes may also combine other sources of financial aid, namely Federal or State need-based aid or earned entitlements, in order to cover the full cost of attendance. These include, Pell Grants, Supplemental Education Opportunity Grants, work-study, State grants based on need using Federal need calculations such as Tennessee's HOPE Scholarship and veterans programs such GI Bill or post 9/11 GI Bill.

Athletic scholarships are awarded in most cases by the athletic department which encourages an athlete to complete the federal application. If an athlete is determined to have a need, then the financial aid office awards the need-based aid, Federal, State, or both. A student athlete is restricted to the institutional cost of attendance when combining other aid with their scholarship, unless they are using their Pell Grant or a veterans benefit. Thus a student athlete with need could receive a full scholarship covering all costs and receive additional funds.

Only 1 percent of student athletes will ever play professional sports. For the remainder, their college degree is the primary benefit of participating in college sports. According to the College Board, the value of a college degree is $1 million over an individual's lifetime. As a former student athlete, who wasn't on scholarship, I can speak from experience that the value of college athletics goes beyond the money. It can enrich every aspect of our education, teaching lessons and developing habits that will pay dividends no matter what a student pursues in life.

Unfortunately, the problems the Northwestern football players are concerned with are not unique to Northwestern and they are not new. These problems include: the NCAA does not

currently allow a full-ride athletic scholarship to cover the actual full cost of attendance; Other expenses include: transportation costs; health fees; student activity and recreation fees and personal expenses allowable under Federal financial aid rules.

For example, a full-ride scholarship at Vanderbilt University is worth $58,520 but the full cost of attendance is calculated by the school to be $62,320. The difference must be made up by the student.

For some student athletes, the lingering effects and potential disabilities will be felt for many years after their playing days are over. Some students are asking for long term medical coverage to help them cover costs of treating these injuries. Schools could provide for some form of additional medical coverage.

While playing sports has certain inherent risks, we do know more now than ever before about how injuries can be avoided. Better protections from injury—football concerns with concussions. Schools can take, and some are taking, steps to improve the safety of their student athletes.

Some students are asking for help to finish their education even when athletic eligibility has run out.

There is money available to address these concerns and take care of our student athletes without unions.

The NCAA and the member universities do need to reform their rules and guidance; and they will.

Earlier this week we spoke to David Williams, Vanderbilt University's athletic director, who had this to say:

> The NCAA and its member universities have the authority and the responsibility to correct the flaws that exist in the system today, many of which are mentioned by the student athletes at Northwestern University. The question is do we have the will to do so. I believe we do and that we will.

Mark Emmert the President of the NCAA, quoted in a recent Meet the Press interview said:

> We have twice now had the board of the N.C.A.A. pass an allowance to allow schools to provide a couple of thousand dollars in what we call ''miscellaneous expense'' allowances. . . . The board's in favor of it. The membership, the more than a thousand colleges and universities that are out there, the 350 of them that are in division one had voted that down. We're in the middle right now of reconsidering all that. I have every reason that that's going to be in place sometime this coming year.

What would actually happen if college sports teams were unionized? Well, David Williams, Vanderbilt's athletic director, said:

> The decision by the NLRB regional board has the power to change the structure, dynamics and maybe the effectiveness of college athletics. It may ultimately end college athletics as we know it today.

I agree with this statement. And think those who support turning college athletes into employees and unionize them should consider the potential consequences. One potential consequence relates to taxes. This recent decision, in essence, may require the entire scholarship to be treated as compensation thus making the whole amount taxable.

Another consequence of potential collegiate unionization relates to labor. One of the most commonly thought of traits when a union represents a workforce is the right to strike. Section 13 of the National Labor Relations Act, NLRA, expressly provides the right of employees to strike, with some exceptions. If a unionized college baseball team doesn't like the coaches' decision to switch practice times, they could decide to walk off the field right before the first pitch is thrown, and call a strike.

The NLRA requires the union and employer to bargain over wages, hours, and other conditions of employment. If a football team joins a union, will the union negotiate different compensation amounts depending on the player's position or contribution to the team? For example, a five star quarterback in high school could decide to attend Notre Dame, because the players' union promises to negotiate a larger scholarship package for him, but the one star, offensive lineman may only get the bare minimum. This could lead to a team and its union making value judgments based on the on-field contributions of a player.

What about when a coach decides to change the offensive scheme from a pro-style offense to the wish-bone. A union wide receiver might have a grievance because this could effect the ''condition of employment,'' in that his role on the team could be diminished. Under the NLRA, a decision like that would have to be bargained for. A coach could not unilaterally change the playbook without approval of the union.

But let's say that a wide receiver decides to go directly to the coach to discuss his grievance about switching offensive schemes. Under the act, that conversation will not be a one-on-one between the coach and the player. Instead, a union representative has the right to be present at that meeting. And instead of resolving the issue internally, the Federal government through the NLRB, or possibly the Federal courts could have the final say.

The current NLRB has struck down several employee conduct policies and handbooks, because they violate an employee's section 7 right to ''concerted activity'' under the NLRA. Will the NLRB now turn its attention to and interfere with the player conduct policies that schools require of their players?

The NLRB issued a 2011 decision in Specialty Healthcare, that permitted unions to organize, multiple, small groups of employees within a single workplace, known as ''micro-unions.'' It is conceivable that every different position on the football team could decide to have their own bargaining unit. The quarterbacks in one unit, the lineman in another unit, and the linebackers in another, etc. The university would then have to separately bargain with multiple different unions, all with different demands.

Universities require its athletes to maintain a 2.0 grade point average, GPA, to keep an athletic scholarship. Would the NLRA consider a minimum grade point average as a condition of employment under the law that must be bargained for? Schools and players' unions could bargain a lower GPA.

What if a coach benches the star point guard, who is a union member, on the basketball team, and replaced him with a non-scholarship, walk-on point guard? Could the team be accused of retaliating against a union player in violation of the NLRA? Under the NLRA it is unlawful to discharge, discipline or otherwise discriminate against an employee for engaging in protected concerted activities. If that star player could show that the benching came after he had been discussing a team related issue with his fellow teammates it would be considered retaliation.

The bottom line, is that importing the sometimes head-scratching rulings of the NLRB into a competitive, team atmosphere is recipe for disaster.

Do they now hire athletes and not worry if they are students? Mark Emmert, NCAA President, said:

> To unionize them, you have to say, These are employees. If you're going to do that, it completely changes the relationship. I don't know why you'd want them to be students. If they're employees and they're playing basketball for you, don't let calculus get in the way.

Yesterday, the Senate voted against cloture on the Paycheck Fairness Act. This is a bill that would amend the Equal Pay Act to make it easier to sue for pay discrimination based on gender by limiting an important employer defense.

Under the bill, the employer would have to prove any difference in pay would be job-related and consistent with a business necessity; If these student athletes are now considered ''employees'' under the eyes of a regional director in Chicago, they would theoretically be entitled to protection under statutes like the Equal Pay Act; And if the Paycheck Fairness Act were to become law, it is conceivable universities could be liable for any differences in compensation that they provide the football team, versus the women's soccer team;

Then there is the effect on smaller schools. Big schools with big budgets may have the ability to negotiate with a union for better benefits for their student athletes. If a football union at Notre Dame negotiates for higher compensation that may set a standard the school must match for other athletes as well. I imagine that there is enough money coming into the Notre Dame or Stanford athletic departments to allow them to adjust to the realities of unionized college athletics.

But what about smaller schools? They will have to make cuts somewhere. If they preserve their football

program, it will likely be at the cost of other sports.

Another consideration that must be taken into account are public universities versus private universities. Because the NLRB regional director's decision only applies to private universities, it creates a different set of rules for private universities than for public universities.

The private schools with athlete unions may ultimately be forced to negotiate salaries or other benefits that violate NCAA rules; to continue competing, they would have to set up their own conference or association. The departure of schools from the NCAA to this new, union friendly association, would fracture the foundations of collegiate sports.

And what about possible title IX implications? As title IX was enforced related to college athletics, institutions made difficult choices to eliminate many athletic programs. Title IX is focused on improving equal access to education. If athletes are employees, then it is unclear how the requirements and protections of title IX will apply to them.

Due to the current limited nature of the ruling, if football players' compensation are considered salaries and not scholarships, then would one of the possible effects be a reduction in the number of women's scholarships that title IX requires the university to offer? Or would title IX require that any new benefits received by a football team under their collective bargaining be shared equitably with the women's sports at the university?

With limited resources and title IX requiring both proportional opportunity for athletes and pay, the recent decision may result in further reductions of athletic programs and opportunities on college campuses.

The Knight Commission's executive director, Amy Privette Perko, recently wrote in the New York Times that:

> The commission supports many of the benefits being sought for college athletes by groups like the College Athletes Players Association, but unions are not needed to guarantee those benefits. Colleges can enact proposals long recommended by the commission for colleges to restore the educational role of athletics and improve athletes' experiences.

I continue to believe that athletes are students first, not professionals. Some of the concerns raised by these college athletes are legitimate but unions are not the solution. They can and should be addressed by the schools and the NCAA.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTIONS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, 25 years ago today the Whistleblower Protection Act of 1989 was signed into law. To mark that anniversary, I come to the floor to discuss some of the history that led to that legislation, the lessons learned over the past 25 years, and the work that still needs to be done to protect whistleblowers.

I emphasize that last part because there still needs to be a lot of work done to protect whistleblowers. The Whistleblower Protection Act was the result of years of effort to protect Federal employees from retaliation. Eleven years before it became law in 1989, Congress tried to protect whistleblowers as part of the Civil Service Reform Act of 1978.

I was then in the House of Representatives. There I met a person named Ernie Fitzgerald, who had blown the whistle on the Lockheed C–5 aircraft program going $2.3 billion over budget. Ernie was fired by the Air Force for doing that, and as he used to say: He was fired for the act of ''committing truth.''

When the Nixon tapes became public after Watergate, they revealed President Nixon personally telling his Chief of Staff to get rid of that SOB. That is how a famous whistleblower who pointed out the waste of $2.3 billion was treated.

The Civil Service Commission did not reinstate Ernie until 12 years later. In the meantime, he was instrumental in helping get the Civil Service Reform Act of 1978 passed. Yet it soon became very clear that law did not do enough to protect whistleblowers. In the early 1980s, the percentage of employees who did not report government wrongdoing due to fear of retaliation nearly doubled.

Some whistleblowers still had the courage to come forward. In the spring of 1983, I became aware of a document in the Defense Department known as the Spinney report. The report exposed the unrealistic assumptions being used by the Pentagon in its defense budgeting. Those unrealistic assumptions were the basis for add-ons later on so defense contractors could bid up the cost. It was written by Chuck Spinney, a civilian analyst in the Defense Department's Program Evaluation Office.

I asked to meet with Chuck Spinney but was stonewalled by the Pentagon. When I threatened a subpoena, we finally got them to agree to a Friday afternoon hearing in March 1983. The Pentagon hoped the hearing would get buried in the end-of-the-week news cycle. Instead, on Monday morning the newsstands featured a painting of Chuck Spinney on the front cover of Time magazine.

It labeled him as ''a Pentagon Maverick.'' I called him what he ought to be called, the ''conscience of the Pentagon.'' The country owes a debt of gratitude to people such as Ernie Fitzgerald and Chuck Spinney. It takes real guts to put your career on the line, to expose waste and fraud, and to put the taxpayers ahead of Washington bureaucrats.

In the mid-1980s, we dusted off an old Civil War-era measure known as the False Claims Act, as a way to encourage whistleblowers to come forward and report fraud. We amended that Civil War law in 1986 to create the modern False Claims Act, which has resulted in over $40 billion in taxpayers' money being recovered for the Federal Treasury. We made sure when we passed it that it contained very strong whistleblower protections. Those provisions helped to build up support for whistleblowing.

People such as Chuck Spinney and Ernie Fitzgerald helped capture the public imagination and showed what whistleblowers could accomplish.

However, that didn't mean the executive branch stopped trying to silence whistleblowers. For example, in the spring of 1987 the Department of Defense asked Ernie to sign a nondisclosure form. It would have prohibited him from giving out classifiable—as opposed to classified—classifiable information without prior written authorization. That, of course, would have prevented those of us in Congress from getting that information so we couldn't do our oversight work.

Further, the term ''classifiable'' didn't only cover currently classified information, it also covered any information that could later be classified.

The governmentwide nondisclosure form arguably violated the Lloyd-LaFollette Act of 1912. That law states that ''the right of employees . . . to furnish information to . . . Congress . . . may not be interfered with or denied.''

Just to make sure, I added the so-called anti-gag appropriations rider that passed Congress in December 1987. That rider, the anti-gag rider, said that no money could be used to enforce any nondisclosure agreements that interferes with the right of individuals to provide information to Congress. It remained in every appropriations bill until 2013. I then worked to get that language into statute in 2012 through the passage of the Whistleblower Protection Enhancement Act.

By the time of the first anti-gag rider in 1987, there was widespread recognition that all Federal employees ought to be protected if they disclosed waste and fraud to the Congress or for a lot of other reasons as well.

Meanwhile, I had also worked with Senator LEVIN of Michigan to coauthor what we called the Whistleblower Protection Act. It was introduced in February 1987. There were hearings on our bill in the summer of 1987 and the spring of 1988. It proceeded to pass the Senate by voice vote in August. Then the House unanimously did that in October. After reconciling the differences, we sent the bill to the White House. However, President Reagan failed to sign it. That meant we had to start all over again in the next Congress.

We didn't let President Reagan's inaction—because that was a pocket veto—stand in the way. Senator LEVIN and I moved forward again. When we reintroduced the bill in January 1989, I came to the floor to make the following statement:

> We're back with this legislation in the 101st Congress, and this time, we're going to make it stick.

Congress passed this bill last fall after extensive discussions with members of the Reagan administration.

But in spite of the compromise we worked out, this bill fell victim to President Reagan's pocket veto.

Whistleblowers are a very important part of government operations. By exposing waste, fraud, and abuse, they work to keep government honest and efficient. And for their loyalty, they are often penalized—they get fired, demoted, and harassed. . . . Under the current system, the vast majority of employees choose not to disclose the wrongdoing they see. They are afraid of reprisals and the result is a gross waste of taxpayers' dollars.

Government employers should not be allowed to cover up their misdeeds by creating such a hostile environment.

That is the end of the quote from the statement I made on the introduction of that bill in January 1989.

Once again, the bill passed the Senate and the House without opposition. Working with George H.W. Bush, this time we got the President to sign it. On April 10, 1989, the Whistleblower Protection Act became law.

We left part of the work undone 25 years ago. The Civil Service Reform Act of 1978 had exceptions for the FBI, the CIA, the NSA, and other parts of the intelligence community. The Whistleblower Protection Act left employees of those agencies unprotected, and so have the laws that followed it. I am very pleased that the preconferenced intelligence authorization bill released today will remedy that for the intelligence community.

Back in 2012 I championed the addition of intelligence whistleblower protections to the Whistleblower Protection Enhancement Act. The provisions I authored prohibited various forms of retaliation, including changing an employee's access to classified information. Working closely with the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, we got that language into the bill that passed the Senate by unanimous consent May 8, 2012. However, it was not included in the bill the House passed on September 28, 2012.

Prior to the differences being reconciled on October 10, 2012, President Obama issued Presidential Policy Directive 19. It provided certain limited protections for whistleblowers with access to classified information. Yet that Executive order by President Obama was weaker than the provisions I had authored in the Whistleblower Protection Enhancement Act. Unfortunately, President Obama's actions undercut support for those provisions by suggesting that statutory protection was now necessary. The final law that passed in November left intelligence whistleblowers at the mercy of the Presidential directive.

Now, much of the language I had championed is in the Intelligence authorization bill currently under consideration. It is certainly a step up from Presidential Policy Directive 19. Making any protections statutory is very significant. The bill also has better substantive protections than the Presidential directive.

It does still have some gray areas, I am sorry to say. It leaves some of the policy and procedure development to the discretion of the executive branch, and that is a mistake we know exists because we had a similar thing happen with the FBI because in 1989 the protections of the Whistleblower Protection Act didn't apply to the FBI. That turned out to be a big mistake.

Yet that law did require the Attorney General to implement regulations for FBI whistleblowers consistent with those in the Whistleblower Protection Act. However, it soon became clear that was a little like putting the fox in charge of the henhouse. The Justice Department and the FBI simply ignored that part of the law for nearly 10 years. Not until 1997 did the Attorney General finally implement regulations for whistleblowers at the FBI.

The Justice Department was pushed into finally issuing those regulations by an FBI employee by the name of Dr. Fred Whitehurst. Dr. Whitehurst was considered by the FBI to be its leading forensic explosive expert in the 1990s.

What I am about to show you is that by being a good, patriotic American and blowing the whistle when something is wrong, you can ruin yourself professionally.

Shortly after the Whistleblower Protection Act was passed in 1989, Dr. Whitehurst disclosed major problems with the FBI crime lab. From 1990 to 1995 he wrote close to 250 letters to the Justice Department inspector general about these problems. In other words, he tried to be loyal to the agency he was in and work within that agency to expose wrongdoing but didn't get very far.

In January 1996 he formally requested that the President implement regulations as required by the Whistleblower Protection Act. Only after Fred was suspended in 1997 did the White House finally issue such a memo to the Attorney General. It instructed the Attorney General to create a process for FBI whistleblowers as directed by the Whistleblower Protection Act. Fred Whitehurst's case dragged on for another year until the FBI finally agreed to settle with him in February 1998. He got more than a $1 million settlement out of that just because he was trying to do the right thing. But he got his badge and his gun taken away from him, and he was, in a sense, ridiculed for doing what a patriotic American ought to do.

Fred Whitehurst is not alone in the FBI as far as people having problems. Over the years, others—such as Mike German, Bassem Youssef, Jane Turner, and Robert Kobus—have blown the whistle from within the FBI. Even after the inspector general issued findings in their favor, several had to navigate a never-ending Kafkaesque internal appeals process. It seemed designed to grind down these patriotic Americans into submission through years of inaction.

Now history has started to repeat itself. As Congress was passing the Whistleblower Protection Enhancement Act in 2012, President Obama issued Presidential Policy Directive 19. He tasked Attorney General Holder with reevaluating the same FBI whistleblower procedures that Fred Whitehurst helped get in place in 1997. The Attorney General was given 6 months to report back.

When the Attorney General didn't report back and didn't issue that report at the 6-month mark, I asked the Government Accountability Office to do its own independent evaluation of the FBI whistleblower protections.

Now 18 months after the President's directive, Attorney General Holder still hasn't released his report. This is a person appointed by the President of the United States, directed by the President of the United States to do something in 6 months, presumably loyal to the President of the United States, and he isn't doing what the Chief Executive of our great country told him to do.

Potential whistleblowers should not have to wait a decade, as they did with the first set of regulations. It appears that the Justice Department is simply sitting on its hands once again.

The example of the FBI should be instructive. Unlike the Whistleblower Protection Act, the Intelligence authorization bill is much more detailed about the protections Congress intends. It puts a time limit on how long the intelligence community has to create their procedures, giving them 6 months. However, remember that is exactly the same amount of time President Obama gave Attorney General Holder to come up with regulations, and it still hasn't happened 18 months later. Congress needs to be vigilant about getting both the intelligence community and the Attorney General to act.

In the meantime, the FBI fiercely resists any efforts at congressional oversight, especially on whistleblower matters. For example, 4 months ago I sent a letter to the FBI requesting its training materials on the insider threat program. When we just want copies of training materials, would that be difficult for a bureaucracy to present to a Member of Congress?

That program happened to be announced by the Obama administration in October of 2011. It was intended to train Federal employees to watch out for insider threats among their colleagues. Public news reports indicated that this program might not do enough to distinguish between true insider threats and legitimate whistleblowers. I relayed these concerns in my letter. I also asked for copies of the training materials. I said I wanted to examine whether they adequately distinguished between insider threats and whistleblowers so it didn't become a damper on whistleblowing.

In response, an FBI legislative affairs official told my staff that a briefing might be the best way to answer my questions. It was scheduled for last

week. Staff of both Chairman LEAHY and myself attended. The FBI brought the head of their insider threat program. Yet the FBI didn't bring the insider threat training materials as we had requested. However, the head of the insider threat program told the staff of both Senator LEAHY and myself there was no need to worry about whistleblower communications.

They are telling me that at a time when we have decades of history of whistleblowers being treated like skunks at a picnic? This gentleman said whistleblowers had to register in order to be protected and the insider threat program would know to avoid these people.

I have never heard of whistleblowers ever being required to ''register,'' in order to be protected. The idea of such a requirement should be pretty alarming to all Americans. We are talking about patriotic Americans wanting to make sure the government does what the law says it should do and spend money the way Congress intended it be spent. They have to register to be protected just because they are a patriotic American? The reason they can't do that is because sometimes confidentiality is the best protection a whistleblower has.

Unfortunately, neither my staff nor Chairman LEAHY's staff was able to learn more because after only 10 minutes—only 10 minutes—in the office and into the briefing, the FBI got up and abruptly walked out.

It might be one thing to walk out on Republican staff, but they walked out on the staff of a Democratic chairman of one of the most powerful committees in the U.S. Senate as well—Chairman LEAHY's staff.

FBI officials simply refused to discuss any whistleblower implications in its insider threat program and left the room. These are clearly not the actions of an agency that is genuinely open to whistleblowers or whistleblower protection.

Like the FBI, the intelligence community has to confront the same issue of distinguishing a true insider threat from legitimate whistleblowers. This issue will be impacted by title V of the current Intelligence authorization bill, which includes language about continuous monitoring of security clearance holders.

Director of National Intelligence James Clapper seems to have talked about such procedures when he appeared before the Senate Armed Services Committee on February 11 of this year. In his testimony he said this:

> We are going to proliferate deployment of auditing and monitoring capabilities to enhance our insider threat detection. We're going to need to change our security clearance process to a system of continuous evaluation. . . . What we need is . . . a system of continuous evaluation, where we have a way of—

Now, get this.

> —monitoring their behavior, both their electronic behaviors on the job as well as off the job, to see if there is a potential clearance issue.

Director Clapper's testimony gives me major pause, as I hope it does my colleagues. It sounds as though this type of monitoring would likely capture the activity of whistleblowers communicating with Congress.

To be clear, I believe the Federal Government is within its right in monitoring employee activity on worker computers. That applies all the more in the intelligence community. However, as I testified before the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee recently, there are areas where the executive branch should be very cautious.

The House oversight committee held a hearing on electronic monitoring that the U.S. Food and Drug Administration had done of certain whistleblowers in that agency. This monitoring was not limited to work-related activity. The Food and Drug Administration allows its employees to check personal email accounts at work. As a result, the FDA's whistleblower monitoring captured personal email account passwords. It also captured attorney-client communications and confidential communications to Congress and the Office of Special Counsel.

Some of these communications are legally protected. If an agency captures such communications as a result of monitoring, it needs to think about how to handle them very differently; otherwise, it would be the ideal tool to identify and retaliate against whistleblowers. Without precautions, that kind of monitoring could effectively shut down legitimate whistleblower communications.

It wouldn't surprise me, considering the culture of some of these agencies, that is exactly what they want to do, because there is a great deal of peer pressure to go along to get along within these agencies. Whistleblowers, as I said, are kind of like a skunk at a picnic.

There could be safeguards, however. For example, whistleblower communications could be segregated from other communications. Access could be limited to only certain personnel rather than all of the upper management. In any case, whistleblowing disclosures to Congress or the special counsel can't just be routed back to the official accused of wrongdoing.

As the 1990 Executive order made clear, whistleblowing is a Federal employee's duty. It should be considered part of their official responsibilities and something they can do on work time. However, that doesn't mean they aren't allowed to make their protected disclosures confidentially to protect against the usual retaliation. A Federal employee has every right to make protected disclosures anonymously, whether at work or off the job.

Every Member of this body should realize that without some safeguards there is a chance their communications with whistleblowers may be viewed by the executive branch.

These same considerations apply to the intelligence community. The potential problems are heightened if electronic monitoring extends off the job, such as Director Clapper mentioned in the quote I gave. We have to balance detailing insider threats with letting whistleblowers know their legitimate whistleblower communications are protected.

With continuous monitoring in place, any whistleblower would understand their communications with the inspector general or Congress would likely be seen by their agency and punishment could follow. They might perhaps even be seen by those they believe are responsible for waste, fraud, or abuse, and punishment to follow. That leaves the whistleblower open to retaliation.

Even with the protections of this bill, we should all understand it is difficult to prevent retaliation because it is so indigenous in the culture of most government agencies. It requires a lengthy process for an individual to try to prove the retaliation and get any remedy. It is far better, where possible, to take precautions that prevent the likelihood of retaliation even occurring; otherwise, it will make it virtually impossible for there even to be such a thing as an intelligence community whistleblower. Fraud and waste would then go unreported. No one would dare take the risk.

To return to the theme I started with, whistleblowers need protection from retaliation today just as much as they did 25 years ago when the Whistleblower Protection Act was passed on April 10 of that year. I have always said whistleblowers are too often treated like a skunk at a picnic. You have now heard it for the third time. You can't say it too many times. I have seen too many of them retaliated against.

However, 25 years after the Whistleblower Protection Act, the data on whistleblowing is in, and the debate on whether to protect whistleblowers is over. There is widespread public recognition that whistleblowers perform a very valuable public service.

Earlier this year PricewaterhouseCoopers found that 31 percent of serious fraud globally was detected by whistleblowing systems or other tipoffs. According to a 2012 report from another organization, that number is even higher when looking just in the United States, with 51 percent of the fraud tips coming from a company's own employees.

In 2013, of U.S. workers who had observed misconduct and blown the whistle, 40 percent said the existence of whistleblower protection had made them more likely to report misconduct.

Whistleblowers are particularly vital in government, where bureaucrats only seem to work overtime when it comes to resisting transparency and accountability.

A year and a half after the Whistleblower Protection Act, President Bush

issued Executive Order 1990 that said all Federal employees ''shall disclose waste, fraud, abuse and corruption to appropriate authorities.'' That should have changed the entire culture of these agencies that are antiwhistleblower, but it hasn't. But that is what the directive says.

Federal employees are still under obligations this very day. They are fulfilling a civic duty when they blow the whistle.

I encouraged President Reagan and every President after him that we should have a Rose Garden ceremony honoring whistleblowers. If you do that, it sends a signal from the highest level of the U.S. Government to the lowest level of the U.S. Government that whistleblowing is patriotic. Unfortunately, there isn't a single President who has taken me up on my suggestion.

Further, while the Obama administration promised to be the most transparent in history, it has, instead, cracked down on whistleblowers as never before.

Last week, the Supreme Court denied a petition to hear an appeal from a case named Kaplan v. Conyers. The Obama administration's position in that case, if allowed to stand, means untold numbers of Federal employees may lose some of the very same appeal rights we tried to strengthen in the Whistleblower Protection Act. There could be half or more of the Federal employees impacted. Such a situation would undo 130 years of protection for civil servants dating back to the Pendleton Civil Service Reform Act of 1883.

We all remember that President Obama promised to ensure that whistleblowers have full access to the courts and due process. However, his administration has pursued the exact opposite goal here. That ought to be unacceptable to all of us.

I think it is important to send a loud and clear signal that waste, fraud, and abuse won't be tolerated in government, and that is why I am pleased to announce I will officially be forming a whistleblower protection caucus at the beginning of the 114th Congress. Until then, I will be talking to my colleagues and encouraging them to join me as we start putting together an agenda for that caucus in a new Congress.

As we celebrate the 25th anniversary of this very important bill called the Whistleblower Protection Act, we should all recognize whistleblowers for the sacrifices they make. Those who fight waste, fraud, and abuse in the government should be lauded for patriotism. Whistleblower protections are only worth anything if they are enforced.

Just because we have passed good laws does not mean we can stop paying attention to the issue. There must be vigilance and oversight by the Congress.

The best protection for a whistleblower is a culture of understanding and respecting the right to blow the whistle. I hope this whistleblower caucus will send the message that Congress expects that kind of culture.

I call on my colleagues to help me make sure whistleblowers continue to receive the kind of protection they need and deserve.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. UDALL of New Mexico). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

STOP IDENTITY THEFT ACT OF 2013

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I rise today to urge my colleagues to pass the Stopping Tax Offenders and Prosecuting Identity Theft Act of 2013. With tax day coming upon us on Tuesday, the time is now to pass this bipartisan legislation.

I worked on the STOP Identity Theft Act to address the growing problems of tax identity theft and to protect taxpayers against fraud. From the beginning this bill has been bipartisan. Senator SESSIONS is the lead Republican on this bill, and in fact recently this bill passed the Senate Judiciary Committee on a vote of 18–0. Given the number of members on the committee with very different views on issues, that is an accomplishment and shows what a pressing problem this is.

I think people will be pretty shocked, as you will be, Mr. President, when you hear these numbers. Criminals are increasingly filing false tax returns using stolen identity information in order to claim victims' refunds. You might think that would be a rare incident, but as a former law enforcement person, as the attorney general for the State of New Mexico, I think you know anything can happen. This is a problem where more than anything is happening.

In 2012 alone, identity thieves filed 1.8 million fraudulent tax returns, almost double the number confirmed in 2011. The numbers and the documents in these cases may be forged, but the dollars behind them are real, because in 2012 there was another 1.1 million fraudulent tax returns that slipped through the cracks, and our U.S. Treasury paid out $3.6 billion in the fraudulent returns—$3.6 billion. That is the number coming from the IRS. That is your taxpayer dollars going down the drain to people who are actually stealing taxpayers' identities, putting them on returns, filing returns, and getting back the money.

When criminals file these tax returns, it is not just the Treasury that loses out. Everyday people are the real victims here, because when someone else uses your identity, when someone else fakes your identity, people are then forced to wait months and sometimes even years before receiving their actual refund.

So what is going on? Well, we are having double refunds, right? First they go to the thief. This is happening millions of times. Then the real taxpayer says: Wait a minute, where is my refund, and files a return. The government has to check this out and figure out the first one and they then pay twice. This is what is happening in the United States of America.

In 2012, Alan Stender, a retired businessman from the 5,000-person town of Circle Pines, MN, was working to file his taxes on time just as people are doing right now. After completing all the forms and sending in his tax returns, Alan heard from the IRS that there was a major problem. So he gets it done on time and files the return and finds out from the IRS there is a problem. Someone had stolen his identity and used his personal information to fraudulently file his taxes and steal his tax return.

Just last week 25 people were arrested in Florida for using thousands of stolen identities to claim $36 million in fraudulent tax refunds. This included the arrest of a middle school food service worker who sold the identities of more than 400 students, if you can believe it. Those victims are just kids, and criminals are stealing their identities to file fake returns.

Are you ready for this one? Attorney General Eric Holder recently revealed that he was a victim of tax return identity theft. This came out this week. Two young adults used his name, his date of birth, and Social Security number to file a fraudulent tax return. They got caught. They were prosecuted. But if you can imagine that this can happen to the Attorney General of the United States—at least we got action there—think about some guy in Circle Pines, MN, who has it happen. As I said, it is happening over a million times every year, from a retired man in Minnesota to middle school students in Florida, to the Attorney General of the United States. It is clear that identity theft can happen to anyone.

We also know this crime can victimize our most vulnerable citizens, victims such as seniors living on fixed incomes or people with disabilities who depend on tax returns to make ends meet and cannot financially manage having their tax returns stolen. There is a lot at stake here and action is needed. That is why I put forward the bipartisan legislation a few years back with Republican Senator JEFF SESSIONS of Alabama, to take on this problem and crack down on the criminals committing this crime. There was also significant bipartisan work in the House last year. A very similar bill was passed in the House that did the same thing, passed bipartisan bills in the House of Representatives. It happened. And the Senate now, as we know, passed it 18–0 out of the Judiciary Committee.

This critical legislation will take important steps to streamline law enforcement resources and strengthen

penalties for tax identity theft. The STOP Identity Theft Act will direct the Justice Department to dedicate additional resources to address tax identity theft. It also directs the Department to focus on parts of the country with especially high rates of tax return identity theft and to boost protections for vulnerable populations such as seniors, minors, and veterans.

We also urge the Justice Department to cooperate fully and coordinate investigations with State and local law enforcement organizations.

Identity thieves have become more creative and have expanded from stealing identities of individuals to stealing that of businesses and organizations. My bill recognizes this change and broadens the definitions of tax identity theft to include businesses, nonprofits, and other similar organizations. This is important because once a company or an organization's tax information is stolen, it can be used to create fraudulent tax returns and claim false refunds.

Finally, we need to crack down on the criminals committing this crime. This bill would strengthen tax identity theft penalties by raising the maximum jail sentences from 15 to 20 years. I believe this bill goes a long way in helping law enforcement use their resources more efficiently and effectively and it is time to bring it to the floor.

In recent weeks we have made significant progress, as I said, by passing the bill out of the Senate Judiciary Committee unanimously on an 18–0 vote. It doesn't happen often. I thank all of my colleagues on the committee and all of my friends across the aisle for joining with us to vote for this bill. After a long discussion we had amendments. We got this bill. Every single member of the Judiciary Committee voted for this bill, including Senator CRUZ, Senator SCHUMER, Senator FEINSTEIN, and Senator HATCH. It was a unanimous 18–0 vote.

Now I want to bring this bill to the full Senate. I would love to get this done before tax day. I know there is a holdup on the other side of the aisle, and it is time for people to understand that this is a bill that passed the House of Representatives, it passed on an 18–0 vote out of Judiciary, and we simply need to get this done.

When the Attorney General of the United States of America is having his identity stolen and his identity is used to file fake tax returns, we have a problem. We have a problem that involves a lot of money. We have a problem that involves 1.8 million fraudulent tax returns in 2012 alone, double the number in 2011. We have a problem that also involves a lot of money. We have a problem that involves $3.6 billion in 1 year alone in 2012, paid out by the U.S. Government. What do you think taxpayers think when they hear that, that $3.6 billion went to thieves and we have a bill that passed out of the Judiciary Committee 18–0? I would want someone explaining why they are holding up this bill.

It is time to get this bill done. I would love to see it happen before we go back to our home State so I can explain it to my constituents, and I hope our colleagues on the other side of the aisle will work with us. Because with tax season upon us, it is time to pass this bipartisan legislation, to crack down on identity thieves and protect the hard-earned tax dollars of innocent Americans. The time to do it is now.

I again thank Senator JEFF SESSIONS for being the Republican on this bill, and I thank all my colleagues for passing it through the committee. I thank the House for getting it done over there. It is now the time to pass it in the Senate.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PORTMAN. I would ask unanimous consent that the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. PORTMAN. I wish to speak as if in morning business.

THE DATA ACT

Mr. President, I was not able to be here earlier on the Senate floor when my colleague Senator WARNER got unanimous consent to pass the DATA Act. This is the Digital Accountability and Transparency Act, something we have been working on over the last couple of years.

It is a good bill, and it is about good government and I am glad we were able to pass it this afternoon in the Senate. I now hope it will go to the House for passage and get to the President's desk, because it will help to give all the taxpayers a better view into our government.

Specifically, it improves Federal financial transparency and data quality, both of which are going to help identify and illuminate the ways we spend—certainly something we should be focused on with the huge deficits and all the pressure we are facing.

It will also ease the compliance burden with the people working in the Federal Government and recipients of Federal funds. At the same time it improves the data that they send to the Federal Government. It is a win/win for the taxpayer, for the government, at getting at the issue of waste, fraud, and abuse.

It is an issue that transcends party lines. I want to thank my friend Senator COBURN because he has been a leader in the Governmental Affairs Committee and also the chairman of the committee, Senator TOM CARPER. Without their help, Senator WARNER and I would not have been able to get this bill to the floor today. We also have a number of other cosponsors on a bipartisan basis.

We all know that the Federal Government spends a lot of money—over $3 trillion a year. The goal is to know more about how that money is spent so we can ensure it is being spent on the right things. This legislation, the DATA Act, picks up on lessons we learned about how to make it more accountable and more transparent so taxpayers have a better understanding of how the money is being used. This has to do with grants and contracts. I think it is something that is going to help ensure that we are not just spending the money right but also eliminating fraud and abuse that we otherwise would not find.

I first got involved in this issue when I was at the Office of Management and Budget. I supported it and then was tasked with implementing a 2006 bill that was introduced by Senator COBURN and Senator Obama at the time. It was called the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act, FFATA—an unfortunate acronym in my view.

FFATA worked in the sense that it led to something which is called usaspending.gov. Back then a lot of Federal agencies thought this could not be done; that we wouldn't be able to improve our transparency up to the standards that were established in FFATA, and we proved them wrong, thanks to a lot of hard work by a lot of folks in the agencies and at the Office of Management and Budget where I served as Director. It ended up with the ability of taxpayers to get a wealth of information online, again, about Federal grants and Federal contracts so they could better understand how their tax dollars were spent.

It was a good start. It also helped us learn some lessons about how to improve fiscal data quality and transparency even more. We learned that the usaspending.gov can be more comprehensive, more accurate, more reliable, and more timely.

By the way, if you have not gone on this Web site, usaspending.gov, I recommend it. If we pass this legislation, you will like it even more because the data you will be seeing will be more understandable, will be more uniform across the agencies, and will enable us all, as taxpayers, to get a better view into the government.

What does it do? First, it makes it easier to compare spending across the Federal agencies by requiring establishment of these governmentwide standards, such as financial data standards, which is very difficult to do, as I learned when I was at the Office of Management and Budget. It sounds easy, but it is hard and it pays off. It promotes consistency and reliability in data. Second, it strengthens the Federal financial transparency by reforming and significantly improving the Web site itself. It requires more frequent updates—quarterly financial updates of spending by each Federal agency on their programs and at the object class-level basis. It is basically more

specific data and more up-to-date so it refreshes the Web site more to make it more useful.

Third, it empowers the inspector general and the GAO to hold agencies accountable. I think putting the inspectors general into this is a good idea because it has another level of accountability. This will make them more accountable for completeness, timeliness, quality, and accuracy of the data they are submitting to the usaspending.gov. This is new and will make the Web site work even better.

Fourth, it simplifies the reporting requirements by recipients of Federal funds, eliminating unnecessary duplication and burdensome regulations. It basically streamlines what people have to provide to the Federal Government. This will actually make it easier for us to understand what is going on with these contractors, again, as taxpayers doing oversight, but it also makes it easier to do business with the Federal Government. It makes it less complicated for them and gives more transparency for taxpayers, so it is another good aspect of this legislation.

I think each of these reforms will enhance Federal financial accountability in real ways by allowing citizens to track government spending better, allowing agencies to more easily identify improper payments and unnecessary spending.

We have a big issue around here with spending. We spend more than we take in every year to the tune of hundreds of billions of dollars. We have a debt that is at least $17 trillion. It is time to make sure we are not wasting money that could be applied to that debt or it could pay for programs that are a top priority. This bipartisan legislation will help us get there.

I am very pleased we were able to get it passed today. Again, I will be working hard with Senator WARNER and others to ensure that we get this through the House and to the President's desk for signature so we can indeed begin to help all of us as citizens have a better view into our Federal Government.

I yield the floor and 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. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. 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.

TRIBUTE TO PETER MUNK

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I rise today to honor the more than 30 years of hard work and leadership Mr. Peter Munk has demonstrated as the founder and chairman of the board of Barrick Gold Corporation.

Since Barrick Gold was established in 1983, Mr. Munk has worked to make Barrick one of the world's largest gold mining companies, with projects reaching four continents. In 1986, Mr. Munk bet on Nevada, bringing Barrick to the Silver State with the acquisition of the Goldstrike mine located on the Carlin Trend in Eureka County. Nevada has since become the largest source of gold in the United States, producing more than 75 percent of the gold mined throughout the country. Even today, the Goldstrike mine is one of Barrick's most productive properties. Two of Barrick's 5 core gold mines are located in Nevada, and the company continues to operate 7 mines throughout the State, employing more than 4,200 people.

Mr. Munk has shared his many successes and accomplishments with the communities in which he works and lives, and through his philanthropy, he has demonstrated his dedication to education and health. He created the Peter Munk Charitable Foundation in 1992 and has made significant donations to his alma mater, the University of Toronto, which is home to the Munk School of Global Affairs. Additionally, the premier Peter Munk Cardiac Centre was constructed at the University Health Network in Toronto as a product of his generous contributions.

Under Mr. Munk's strong leadership, Barrick Gold has given back to the many communities surrounding Barrick mining operations, and the company has helped provide added support for local economic, health, and social development. In Nevada, much needed school supplies, college scholarships, and large community projects have been funded with the support of Barrick Gold. The company has also implemented strict controls to help reduce the impacts of mining on the environment and contributed to wildlife restoration and improvement projects to enhance Nevada's native plants and species habitats. For instance, in 2012, Barrick partnered with Federal and State land managers to restore vital greater sage-grouse habitat that had been scarred and damaged by a devastating wildfire.

Mr. Munk has made a significant impact on the State of Nevada and has established a lasting legacy on the international mining industry. His influence has been recognized by the Canadian Business Hall of Fame and the Canadian Mining Hall of Fame, and he was honored with one of Canada's highest honors for a private citizen when he was made a Companion of the Order of Canada. Additionally, Mr. Munk was the first Canadian to be awarded the Woodrow Wilson Award for Corporate Citizenship in 2002 and received the Queen Elizabeth II Diamond Jubilee Medal in 2012.

As Mr. Munk steps down from his role as chairman of the board of Barrick Gold Corporation, I congratulate him on his many years of success and wish him all the best in his future endeavors.

JUSTICE FOR ALL ACT

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, this week marks the 30th annual National Crime Victims' Rights Week. It is a time to recognize victims of crime and their families and to acknowledge the efforts to help them recover and rebuild their lives in the wake of tragedy. It is also a time to ask what more we can do to help serve victims of crime and improve our criminal justice system. We have an opportunity this week to pass a bill that will not just pay lipservice to crime victims but actually impact and improve their lives. It is time to pass the Justice for All Act.

The Justice for All Act is a bipartisan bill that Senator CORNYN and I introduced nearly 1 year ago to improve the quality of justice in this country. It was approved by the Judiciary Committee in October by a unanimous voice vote, and it cleared the Democratic side of the hotline on March 27. However, it still has not passed the Senate because Senate Republicans object. For reasons that have not been explained, Republicans have failed to consent to passing this commonsense bill. This is no way to treat victims of crime, especially during a week when we seek to honor them.

The Justice for All Act reauthorizes the Debbie Smith DNA Backlog Reduction Act, which has provided significant funding to reduce the backlog of untested rape kits so that victims need not live in fear while kits languish in storage. That program is named after Debbie Smith, who waited years for her rape kit to be tested. Although delayed for years, that rape kit test ultimately enabled the perpetrator to be caught. She and her husband Rob have worked tirelessly to ensure that others will not have the same experience. I thank Debbie and Rob for their continuing help on this extremely important cause.

The Justice for All Act reauthorization establishes safeguards to prevent wrongful convictions and enhances protections and legal rights for crime victims. It is supported by experts in the field and law enforcement, including the National Center for Victims of Crime, the National Center of Police Organizations, and the National District Attorneys Associations. Yet even during Crime Victims' Week, which coincides with Sexual Assault Awareness and Prevention Month, Senate Republicans have not yet shown a willingness to clear the important reauthorization.

Senator CORNYN was on the floor just last week and earlier today expressing his commitment to getting this passed and signed into law. I urge him to lead

his caucus to get it through the Senate. He and I both know that a unanimous voice vote in the Judiciary Committee is uncommon and happens on only the most uncontroversial and uniformly applauded bills. This is one of those bills, and we need to pass this today.

Senator MCCONNELL is also a cosponsor of this bill. This effort has been bipartisan from the beginning, and I am proud that we have the minority leader and the minority whip helping to lead this effort. Despite the support of the Senate Republican leadership, the bill nonetheless remains stalled. Perhaps it is because the House Republican leadership would rather pass a much narrower bill. I trust that the Senate will stand up for all victims who deserve justice, just as we did when the Senate passed an inclusive Violence Against Women Act reauthorization last year.

Our bipartisan Senate legislation strengthens the Kirk Bloodsworth Post-Conviction DNA Testing Grant Program, one of the key programs created in the Innocence Protection Act. Kirk Bloodsworth was a young man just out of the Marines when he was sentenced to death for a heinous crime that he did not commit. He was the first death row inmate in the United States to be exonerated through the use of DNA evidence.

Since the Justice for All Act was first enacted in 2004, we continue to see cases in which people are found to be innocent after spending years in jail.

Thomas Haynesworth was exonerated in 2011 after spending 27 years in prison for crimes he did not commit, thanks to a grant provided by the Justice for All Act. He was accused of rape in 1984 and wrongfully convicted, and the real perpetrator in this case went on to rape more than a dozen women.

It is an outrage when an innocent person is punished, and this injustice is compounded when the true perpetrator remains on the streets, able to commit more crimes. We are all less safe when the system gets it wrong.

This bill also provides funding for the Paul Coverdell Forensic Science Improvement Grant Program, which assists laboratories in performing the many forensic tests that are essential to solving crimes and prosecuting offenders.

I cannot imagine why is there an objection to supporting scientific testing and improving the reliability of criminal convictions. Every American, including crime victims, is better served when our justice system has the resources it needs to operate effectively. If there is a person in the Senate who objects, I ask them to come forward and explain that to me and to the American people. I would welcome that debate.

The hotline on this bipartisan Justice for All Act reauthorization has been running on the Republican side since March 31, and I have not heard one substantive argument against the merits of this bill. Police officers, prosecutors, and crime victims agree on the necessity of this bill. Why can't we?

The Justice for All Act takes important steps to ensure that all criminal defendants, including those who cannot afford a lawyer, receive effective representation. Our justice system, including successful prosecution, depends upon effective representation on both sides.

This is not a time for delay. This is a time for leadership. The stakes are too high and crime victims are depending on us to do the right thing. I urge all Senators, and particularly those in the Republican caucus, to clear this bill today.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, on April 4, 2014, I was unavoidably absent from the following votes as a result of memorial events related to the tragic deaths of Lieutenant Eddie Walsh and Firefighter Mike Kennedy in Boston on March 26, 2014—rollcall votes No. 97 and 98. Had I been present, I would have voted ''no'' on vote No. 97, on the motion to table Reid Amendment No. 2878 to H.R. 3979; and ''yes'' on vote No. 98, on the motion to table the appeal of the appeal of the ruling of the chair that a third degree amendment was not in order.

WAR CRIMES IN SYRIA

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I wish to discuss the ongoing crisis in Syria. Last month marked the 3-year anniversary since the brutal conflict began. According to the United Nations Security Council Resolution 2139, which was unanimously accepted in February of this year, the conflict has resulted in the death of over 140,000 people in Syria, including at least 10,000 children. UNICEF reports that Syria is among the most dangerous places on Earth to be a child, pointing to high child casualty rates, brutalizing and traumatic violence, deteriorating access to education, and health concerns. The number of children suffering in Syria more than doubled in the third year of the conflict.

The crisis is only getting worse. Hundreds of thousands of Syrian civilians are under fire by government and opposition forces in violation of internationally accepted Laws of Armed Conflict. These war crimes are truly devastating, and to escape the violence, millions of refugees have flooded into neighboring Turkey, Lebanon and Jordan, while thousands more remain internally displaced inside Syria Last year I visited the Kilis refugee camp in Turkey which is currently sheltering more than 14,000 Syrian refugees. I witnessed first-hand the remarkable bravery of the Syrian refugee population. Many of these families relocated several times within Syria before ultimately making the heart-wrenching decision to leave their country in order to seek food, medical attention, and safety outside of Syria.

The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees has registered more than 2.6 million Syrian refugees with women and children making up more than 80 percent of the refugee population. By the end of this year, the United Nations estimates that the number of refugees could increase to 4 million.

That is why I am a cosponsor of the Syria Humanitarian Resolution of 2014, which urges all parties in Syria to allow for and facilitate immediate, unfettered access to humanitarian aid throughout the Syrian Arab Republic. This legislation calls for the safety, security, independence, and impartiality of humanitarian workers and demands freedom of movement to deliver aid.

I remain deeply concerned by the instability of the entire region, as violence spills over into neighboring countries such as Turkey, Jordan, Lebanon, and Israel.

Director of National Intelligence James Clapper has testified that, ''In Syria, the ongoing civil war will probably heighten regional and sectarian tensions.'' The influx of Syrian refugees to Lebanon, Jordan, Turkey and Iraq is putting a strain on those countries' resources.

The United Nations Independent International Commission of Inquiry on the Syrian Arab Republic reports that pro-government forces have murdered, tortured, assaulted, and raped civilians in Syria. Anti-government groups have also engaged in murder, execution without due process, torture, hostage-taking, and shelling of civilian neighborhoods.

But nowhere is the brutality of this war more evident than in the events of August 21, 2013, when the Syrian Army, under the direction of President Assad, launched a chemical weapons attack in the Damascus suburbs. This attack left over 1,400 innocent Syrian civilians dead—many of whom were children.

Assad's criminal use of chemical weapons against his own people is morally reprehensible and violates internationally accepted rules of war. The international community cannot stand by and allow the murder of innocent men, women, and children to go unchallenged. We must bring Assad and all other perpetrators of gross human rights violations in the Syrian conflict to justice.

It is clear that we must take action. Last week I introduced, the Syrian War Crimes Accountability Act of 2014, S. 2209 along with Senators RUBIO and KAINE.

My bill strongly condemns the ongoing violence, the use of chemical weapons, the targeting of civilian populations, and the systematic gross human rights violations carried out by both the Syrian government and opposition forces.

My legislation requires the Secretary of State to provide Congress with a description of violations of internationally recognized human rights abuses

and crimes against humanity committed during the conflict in Syria. Finally, the bill requires the Secretary to report to Congress on efforts by the Department of State and USAID to ensure accountability for these violations and provide a review of the facts concerning any prosecution in the case of Syrian crimes that could be defined under universal jurisdiction.

This Monday marked the 20th anniversary of the genocide in Rwanda. Unfortunately, we have not learned the lessons of the past. We must do better to not only see that sort of atrocities never again occur under our watch, but to ensure that the perpetrators of such heinous crimes are held accountable for their actions.

Ignoring the crisis in Syria is both morally wrong and counterproductive to our National security and that of our allies. War tactics employed in Syria by government and some opposition forces fly in the face of the rules of war. For the sake of our National security interests and regional stability, we cannot turn a blind eye to these heinous acts.

I strongly believe that there are times when the international community must come together to end atrocities, protect innocent lives from crimes against humanity and hold accountable the groups that perpetrate them.

The Syrian War Crimes Accountability Act of 2014 sends a strong message to the international community that the United States is firmly committed to bringing all perpetrators of international crimes in Syria to justice. I urge my Senate colleagues to join me in supporting this important legislation.

NATIONAL CONGENITAL DIAPHRAGMATIC HERNIA AWARENESS MONTH

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I wish to discuss S. Res. 414. I am pleased the Senate has unanimously declared April as National Congenital Diaphragmatic Hernia Awareness Month for the second consecutive year. I thank my friend and able colleague, Senator BEN CARDIN of Maryland, for joining me in this legislation. This resolution is very important to me and my family, as my grandson, Jim Beau, is a CDH survivor.

CDH is a birth defect that occurs when the fetal diaphragm fails to fully develop. The lungs develop at the same time as the diaphragm and the digestive system. When a diaphragmatic hernia occurs, the abdominal organs move into and develop in the chest instead of remaining in the abdomen. With the heart, lungs, and abdominal organs all taking up space in the chest, the lungs do not have space to develop properly. This may cause the lungs to be small and underdeveloped.

A diaphragmatic hernia is a life-threatening condition. When the lungs do not develop properly during pregnancy, it can be difficult for the baby to breathe after birth or the baby is unable to take in enough oxygen to stay healthy.

CDH will normally be diagnosed by a prenatal ultrasound, as early as the 16th week of pregnancy. If undiagnosed before birth, the baby may be born in a facility that is not equipped to treat its compromised system because many CDH babies will need to be placed on a heart-lung bypass machine, which is not available in many hospitals. All babies born with CDH will need to be cared for in a neonatal intensive care unit, NICU, and most will need extracorporeal membrane oxygenation, ECMO.

Babies born with CDH will have difficulty breathing as their lungs are often too small, biochemically and structurally immature. As a result, the babies are intubated as soon as they are born, and parents are often unable to hold their babies for weeks or even months at a time.

Most diaphragmatic hernias are repaired with surgery 1 to 5 days after birth, usually with a GORE-TEX patch. The abdominal organs that have migrated into the chest are put back where they are supposed to be and the hole in the diaphragm is closed, hopefully allowing the affected lungs to expand. Hospitalization often ranges from 3 weeks to 10 weeks following the procedure, depending on the severity of the condition.

Survivors often have difficulty feeding, some require a second surgery to control reflux, others require a feeding tube, and a few will reherniate and require additional repair.

Awareness, good prenatal care, early diagnosis, and skilled treatment are the keys to a greater survival rate in these babies. That is why this resolution is so important.

Within the last year, researchers identified a specific gene that may contribute to CDH. The research found that an abnormality in a gene, Ndst1, could lead to the development of CDH. This study was conducted on mice, so more research is needed to determine the role of this gene in humans. However, it certainly is a step in the right direction toward identifying the cause of this defect.

Congenital diaphragmatic hernia is a birth defect that occurs in 1 out of every 3,817 live births worldwide. The CDC estimates that CDH affects 1,088 babies in the U.S. each year.

Every 10 minutes a baby is born with CDH, adding up to more than 600,000 babies with CDH since just 2000. CDH is a severe, sometimes fatal defect that occurs nearly as often as cystic fibrosis and spina bifida. Yet, most people have never heard of CDH. The cause of CDH is unknown. Most cases of diaphragmatic hernia are believed to be multifactorial in origin, meaning both genetic and environmental are involved. It is thought that multiple genes from both parents, as well as a number of environmental factors that scientists do not yet fully understand, contribute to the development of a diaphragmatic hernia.

Up to 20 percent of cases of CDH have a genetic cause due to a chromosome defect or genetic syndrome. According to the CDC, babies born with CDH experience a high mortality rate ranging from 20 percent to 60 percent depending on the severity of the defect and the treatments available at delivery. The mortality rate has remained stable since 1999.

Approximately 40 percent of babies born with CDH will have other birth defects in addition to CDH. The most common is a congenital heart defect.

Babies born with CDH today have a better chance of survival due to early detection and research on treatment options. Researchers are making great progress to determine the cause of this birth defect and to identify optimal treatment methods for babies born with CDH.

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's National Center on Birth Defects and Developmental Disabilities, NCBDDD and the National Birth Defects Prevention Network, NBDPN, collaborate to identify risk factors for birth defects and to assess the effect of these birth defects on children, families, and the healthcare system. NBDPN investigators are currently working to examine risk factors for CDH and predictors of long-term survival for infants born with CDH, with analysis planned in 2014 and publication anticipated by 2015.

In addition, investigators at the National Birth Defects Prevention Study, NBDPS, have proposed conducting specific research to better understand risk factors for CDH, as well as factors that predict improved survival rates for infants born with CDH.

In fiscal year 2013, NIH funded approximately $2,560,000 in CDH research.

The Developmental Biology and Structural Variations Branch, DBSVB, at the NIH is currently supporting a collaboration between basic scientists who study CDH and clinicians who work with CDH patients and their families by working with the Massachusetts General Hospital and the Children's Hospital of Boston. The researchers then use the genetic information and biological samples obtained from patients and their families to identify specific genes that could be involved in the defect.

In 2009, my grandson Jim Beau was diagnosed with CDH during my daughter Mary Abigail's 34th week of pregnancy. At that time, no one in my family had heard of CDH before. Fortunately, she was referred to Dr. David Kays at Shands Children's Hospital in Gainesville, FL, who is a premier surgeon and expert on CDH.

Jim Beau was born on November 30, 2009. My daughter and her husband Paul heard their son cry out twice after he was born, right before they intubated him, but they were not allowed to hold him.

The doctors let his little lungs get strong before they did the surgery to

correct the hernia when he was 4 days old.

It turned out that the hole in the hernia was large. His intestines, spleen and one kidney were up in his chest. The skilled surgeon was able to close the hole and properly arrange the organs. Thankfully, Jim Beau did not have to go on a heart/lung bypass machine, but he was on a ventilator for 12 days and on oxygen for 36 days. In total, he was in the NICU for 43 days before he was able to go home.

He is now a healthy, high-spirited 4-year-old and a delight to be around.

Fortunately for my family and thousands of similar families across the United States, a number of physicians are doing incredible work to combat CDH. The CDH survival rate at Shands Children's Hospital in Gainesville, FL, where my grandson was treated, is one of those fine centers. The survival rate of CDH babies born at Shands is between 80 percent and 90 percent.

Dr. David Kays, the head physician and who performed my grandson's surgeries, uses gentle ventilation therapy as opposed to hyperventilation. Gentle ventilation therapy is less aggressive and therefore protects the underdeveloped lungs.

Dr. Kays published a paper in the Annals of Surgery in October 2013 regarding his work with CDH babies. He and his colleagues reviewed 208 CDH patients to analyze the impact of the timing of the hernia repair on babies born with CDH. This study found that those with more severe CDH may benefit from repair before ECMO, while those with a less severe hernia have higher survival rates and reduced need of ECMO if the repair surgery is delayed at least 48 hours after birth, as was the case with Jim Beau. This conclusion is a vital step in the development of a risk-specific treatment strategy for management of CDH. The final line of Dr. Kays' paper should be noted:

> [T]he survival attained in this large and inclusive series of patients with CDH should be reassuring to physicians and parents faced with a new prenatal diagnosis of CDH.

My family was very lucky that Jim Beau's defect was caught before he was born, and that he was in the right place to receive excellent care for his CDH.

The resolution Senator CARDIN and I introduced is important because it will bring awareness to this birth defect, and this awareness will save lives. Although hundreds of thousands of babies have been diagnosed with this defect, the causes are still unknown and more research is needed. Every year more is learned and there are more successes. We are making good progress and we must continue our efforts.

I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting this legislation to bring awareness to CDH.

TAIWAN RELATIONS ACT 35TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, I wish to celebrate the 35th anniversary of the enactment of the Taiwan Relations Act, TRA, which has served as a tangible symbol of the unbreakable friendship between the United States and Taiwan. Today, the partnership between our two countries is stronger than ever.

The 1979 Taiwan Relations Act provides the framework for our official engagements with Taiwan, which marked the end of our official diplomatic ties. For 35 years the TRA has facilitated a partnership committed to facilitating trade, investment, security cooperation, and promoting regional security.

The bilateral achievements made through the TRA have allowed our citizens to create innovative and lasting advancements to the world economy. Today, Taiwan stands as our 12th largest trading partner, and in 2013, the United States and Taiwan traded over $63 billion in goods and services. This bilateral relationship has supported thousands of jobs in both countries, and we must remain committed to the mutual gains this collaboration can provide.

I applaud our West Virginia businesses that have recognized the potential of the Taiwanese economy and exported over $41 million in commodities, high-tech goods, and services to Taiwan last year. We must build on this strong foundation while helping Taiwan meet its needs for foreign sources of energy. I will continue to seek opportunities for further trade integration with Taiwan and shared economic prosperity.

I look forward to working hand-in-hand with our friends in Taiwan to ensure the next generation of American leaders can stand where I stand today, 35 years from now, and celebrate several more decades of peaceful and vibrant collaboration.

ARMENIAN GENOCIDE ANNIVERSARY

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, the Armenian genocide is sometimes called the ''forgotten genocide.'' But every April, we come together to remember and commemorate the Armenian genocide and to declare that we will never forget.

In order to prevent future genocides, we must clearly acknowledge and remember those of the past. For many years the Congress has had before it a resolution which clearly affirms the factual reality that the Armenian genocide did occur. I was a strong and vocal supporter of the genocide resolution for my entire tenure in the House, and I am proud to have joined Senator MENENDEZ and Senator KIRK in introducing the Armenian genocide resolution in the Senate.

This is the 99th anniversary of the Armenian genocide, yet the suffering will continue for Armenians and non-Armenians alike as long as the world allows denial to exist and prevail. It is long overdue for the United States to join the many other nations that have formally recognized the Armenian genocide.

That is why today's passage by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee of the genocide resolution in advance of the 99th anniversary is so historic. I was proud to vote for this important resolution today in committee, and I will keep fighting to ensure its passage by the full Senate. I will continue to work with the Armenian-American community to build a prosperous and bright future for the Armenian people.

We must continue to stand with our ally Armenia to address the challenges they face. Armenia is confronted with blockades by Turkey and Azerbaijan—one of the longest lasting blockades in modern history. The United States must provide increased assistance to Armenia, work to promote trade with Armenia, and work to reestablish the Turkish Government's commitment to normalized relations. And the United States should work to facilitate a closer relationship between Armenia and Europe.

The Armenian people are true survivors. Despite repeated invasions, loss of land, and the loss of between one-half and three-quarters of their population in the genocide, the people of Armenia have prevailed.

We have a shared responsibility to ensure that the Armenian people are able to build their own independent and prosperous future. Together we can continue to build an Armenia that is respected and honored by its allies and neighbors. But for this to happen, there needs to be universal acknowledgement of the horror that was the Armenian genocide.

TRIBUTE TO MARION LOOMIS

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, after 38 years with the Wyoming Mining Association, Marion Loomis is retiring.

Marion started his career in the early 1970s with the State of Wyoming's Department of Economic Planning and Development as an economic development geologist. In one of his first jobs, he ran the fuel allocation office during the Arab oil embargo in 1973. In 1976, he joined the Wyoming Mining Association and was made executive director in 1991. His vast knowledge and experience are tremendous assets to the State and its people, and we are grateful for his service.

In Wyoming, we have adopted the Code of the West as our official State code of ethics. Marion Loomis personifies the code. This list of ten ideals every man and woman should live by perfectly describes Marion's personal—and professional—demeanor. Marion Loomis takes quiet pride in his work. With his advocacy, Wyoming has seen exponential growth in the coal industry. When he began, Wyoming produced 8 million tons of coal annually. Today, around 400 million tons of Wyoming coal are mined and shipped nationwide—and worldwide.

Marion has never been one to boast or brag. Instead, he lets his accomplishments speak for themselves. In the past 40 years, Wyoming's production of trona has grown from 1 mine that produced 300,000 tons per year to 4 mines which produce over 10 million tons annually. When he speaks, people listen. They know that his opinions reflect a lifetime of study and are tough, balanced, and fair.

Throughout his career, Marion Loomis has been a champion for Wyoming energy. He was a steadfast leader for the Wyoming Mining Association during several boom and bust cycles in energy development. The State's uranium production is a prime example. He witnessed a booming industry stagnate in the 1990s. Today, it has emerged again as a valuable resource. Marion has always promoted Wyoming as a key player in our Nation's quest for energy independence. He truly does ride for the brand, and his leadership is inspiring.

Marion retired from the Wyoming Mining Association earlier this month. He will be missed, but he has left both the association and the industry stronger, thanks to his dedication and hard work. In the days ahead, Marion plans to fish the streams of Wyoming's Bighorn Mountains, where he and his wife have a cabin. I cannot think of a more fitting reward for a job—and a career—well done.

NATIONAL HEALTHCARE DECISIONS DAY

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I wish to recognize National Healthcare Decisions Day, which is next Wednesday, April 16, a day to educate the public about advance care planning and encourage them to have conversations with loved ones to plan for end-of-life decisions. I am pleased that over 50 organizations—representing health providers, communities of faith, the legal community, and the public sector—in Florida are participating in the day's events.

This issue has been important to me throughout my career, and as the chairman of the Senate's Special Committee on Aging, I had the opportunity to chair a hearing on end-of-life care last June. We found that polls show most Americans would like to talk about their advanced care needs, but they do not know how or with whom to have these conversations. In fact, only about 20 percent of Americans have executed an advanced directive, in part due to a lack of knowledge about planning.

Our hearing also touched on some commonsense solutions that individuals have used to broach this topic with their loved ones. For example, Aging with Dignity, an organization based in my home State of Florida, has created a simple resource called Five Wishes that is focused on things that are meaningful for patients and families, rather than a system of advance care planning dictated exclusively by the terms of doctors and lawyers. Five Wishes takes into account personal, emotional, and spiritual needs as well as medical wishes. With a straightforward, easy-to-complete questionnaire, Five Wishes takes end-of-life decision-making out of the emergency room and into the living room.

There are also areas where the Federal Government could help alleviate some of the barriers individuals face in trying to complete an advance directive. We know many people could use the assistance of a trusted health care provider in completing an advance directive. In 2010, the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services—CMS—included advance care planning as a reimbursable item as part of the annual wellness visit for Medicare beneficiaries under the Affordable Care Act. Unfortunately, just a short time later, CMS reversed itself and removed this service as reimbursable. I hope this decision is revisited.

At the same time, there are efforts at the State level. For example, in Florida, a consortium of health care providers, faith-based groups, and the legal profession are collaborating to establish the Physician Orders for Life-Sustaining Treatment program to ensure that advance directives are honored.

It is my hope Congress will support the goals of National Healthcare Decisions Day. Advance care planning is a desired health service and should be a normal part of health care. Advance care planning can empower individuals and allow adults to voice their medical treatment preferences. Together, we can ensure Americans' wishes for medical care at the end of their lives are respected and achieved.

MEDICARE PHYSICIAN PAYMENT SYSTEM

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, recently the Senate failed to permanently repeal the current system of automatic payment cuts for physicians who treat Medicare patients and to replace it with a more sensible system for reimbursing physicians. Instead, the Senate voted—yet again—to pass a short-term patch to this broken system, which postponed these payment cuts for one more year.

After talking with Medicare providers in my State, I decided to oppose this legislation since it provides only a bandaid for a wholly broken system. I believe that an enduring solution is possible and absolutely necessary, and I will continue to fight for a more sustainable replacement that rewards physicians for the high-quality care they deliver.

Minnesota is No. 1 in the Nation when it comes to the quality of the health care that we provide. If our system of reimbursement could reward providers for their efficiency and quality—rather than the quantity of the services they administer—we could improve the value of the care that our seniors receive while rewarding providers who keep patients healthy. We can do that by overhauling the Medicare physician payment formula and implementing a system that rewards health care value over volume, and there has never been a better moment to do that than now. Over the past 10 years, Congress has spent $150 billion on short-term fixes; the Congressional Budget Office estimated earlier this year that the cost of permanently repealing the formula and replacing it with a more sustainable program now would be even lower than that total so far. For the first time since the passage of our current formula, there was bipartisan, bicameral legislation to fully repeal the Medicare physician payment formula and replace it with a payment system that would better reward physicians for providing high-value care.

We have a unique opportunity to permanently solve this problem. Temporary patches—like the one just passed—only perpetuate the instability created by the annual threat of payment reductions. This instability is bad for patients and bad for providers. Take, for example, the young physician from Rogers, MN who recently called my office to discuss how proposed payment cuts would affect his practice and his future. As a father and a new surgeon, this doctor described the challenges of paying off high levels of debt and starting a new practice in a time of financial uncertainty. Temporary fixes will not help this young doctor to establish a practice and provide the best possible care to his patients. Stopgap measures fail to address the underlying problem with the way Medicare pays for physician services, and I am tired of postponing good policies that help support high-quality providers in Minnesota.

It is clear that now is time to permanently repeal and replace the Medicare physician payment formula. That is why I did not support the legislation to temporarily patch our provider payment system and why I am committed to working towards a permanent solution that would put in place a payment system to reward high-value care.

My goal is to make sure that Medicare beneficiaries, now and in the future, have access to high-quality, affordable health care services. To achieve this, Medicare must be on sound financial footing and be prepared to meet the needs of an aging baby boomer generation.

Replacing Medicare's broken system of provider payments with a system to promote high-value care is a critical step in this direction. I remain committed to helping to take this step.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to an invaluable member of my staff on the Select Committee on Intelligence, Andrew Kerr. Andrew has been a familiar face around the committee for the last 7 years, but he will leave us shortly to return to the State Department. I am

honored to have the opportunity to thank Andrew for his service on the committee, and I want to publicly note my appreciation for his outstanding work.

Since becoming the vice chairman of the committee in 2011, I have often looked to Andrew for guidance and counsel on intelligence and counterterrorism matters. Despite the successes or shortcomings of the intelligence community, Andrew has always provided grounded and dependable advice. He has also done extensive oversight work designed to reduce excessive spending and encourage efficiency in the intelligence community.

Andrew is a dedicated public servant and I am sure the State Department is happy to have him return. His presence will be missed on the committee and in the Senate, but I want to wish him well as he returns to the Executive branch. Thanks Andrew, for a job well done.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

SOUTH ANCHORAGE HIGH SCHOOL

• Mr. BEGICH. Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to South Anchorage High School as they celebrate their 10th anniversary.

Since opening 10 years ago, the South Anchorage High School Wolverines have excelled both academically and interscholastically by preparing students for higher education and job training. In addition to a full complement of advanced placement classes for students, the Wolverines also annually achieve one of the highest graduation rates in the state at 88 percent. These academic achievements are a testament to the knowledgeable teachers, hard-working students, and supportive parents that call the south Anchorage area home.

Along with their academic achievements, South Anchorage has also been very successful in interscholastic athletic events. With over eight State championships in various sports over the past few years, South High School's students have shown they can excel in the classroom and on the field.

On behalf of a grateful nation, I join my colleagues today in recognizing South Anchorage High School on their 10th anniversary and wish them continued growth and success.•

TRIBUTE TO JOHN T. WATTS

• Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I wish to honor John T. Watts. Tommy, as he is known to his friends and colleagues, is a friend of mine. I know he is so proud of his three children, six grandchildren, and five great-grandchildren. It is notable that his daughter Kimberly is married to former U.S. Congressman Zach Wamp.

A native of Old Hickory, TN, Tommy moved to my hometown of Chattanooga, TN, at the age of 10. After graduating from Red Bank High School, he attended Tennessee Tech University. He returned to Chattanooga and began working for Southern Champion Tray in 1976.

During his 38 years of service to Southern Champion Tray, Tommy served in a variety of capacities, including as a plant supervisor and most recently, as structural design manager. Winning numerous design awards in the paper and box industry, his designs can be found in local companies such as Chattanooga Bakery and Top Flight. He distinguished himself within the company by being the only employee to work in all three company locations—two in Chattanooga and one in Mansfield, TX. I wish him and his family all the best as he finishes his impressive career at the end of this month.•

REMEMBERING VAL OGDEN

• Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I would like to pay tribute to a strong community leader, dedicated public servant, and advocate from the State of Washington, Val Ogden.

Val was a longtime friend and I would not be where I am today without her support.

She was a community advocate, in the truest and strongest sense of the word, and she was a champion for women and children.

She was a member of the Washington State House of Representatives, serving as speaker pro tempore.

Val was a leader for her community, securing funding for Washington State University Vancouver. She was a strong Democrat and very active in the Clark County Democratic Party. Val served as the executive director of the Clark County YWCA.

But you can't talk about Val without talking about her husband of 67 years, Dan. They were a team and were always working together to make their community a better place to live.

Val was also a very dedicated mother and grandmother. Along with Dan, she is survived by three children: Dan, Janeth and Patti, six grandchildren, and six great-grandchildren.

She will be missed by many but her legacy and leadership lives on.

Mr. President, I would like to ask my colleagues to join me in paying homage to Val Ogden. She lived a full life and our thoughts are with her loved ones at this time of great loss.•

BUTTERNUT MOUNTAIN FARM

• Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I wish to bring to your attention to a remarkable Vermont family.

The Marvin family has an incredible family tie to Vermont and to one of the State's best known products—maple syrup. David Marvin founded Butternut Mountain Farm in 1972 on land his father purchased in Johnson, VT., in the 1950s.

David Marvin has a strong and enduring commitment to an iconic Vermont industry. Through careful stewardship, and with the help of his wife Lucy, he has built a company renowned for quality maple products.

The family produced maple syrup, grew Christmas trees and consulted on timber management. Today, David's children, Ira and Emma, are integral to the operation, which includes more than 80 employees, maple syrup from 300 Vermont farms, and a 75,000 square-foot facility in Morrisville, VT. Butternut Mountain Farm is more than just a producer of maple syrup; it has also become an effective marketer of a treasured product of Vermont.

The family and the company have been recognized for their success. Just a decade after the company's founding, for example, Butternut Mountain Farm was named Vermont State Tree Farm of the Year and National Tree Farm of the Year by the American Forest Institute.

The Marvins are encouraging a culture of conservation. Their Morrisville operation is increasingly relying on renewable energies and energy efficiency. The family has also developed a pay structure that seeks to reward employees with flexible hours, to help reduce commuting costs, and a fair wage.

It is also worth noting that the Marvin family's business plays a crucial role in supporting the jobs of countless Vermonters throughout the state who produce maple syrup which is bottled by Butternut Mountain Farm.•

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 1:15 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, without amendment:

S. 2195. An act to deny admission to the United States to any representative to the United Nations who has been found to have been engaged in espionage activities or a terrorist activity against the United States and poses a threat to United States national security interests.

The message also announced that the House agreed to the following concurrent resolution, without amendment:

S. Con. Res. 35. Concurrent resolution providing for a conditional adjournment or recess of the Senate and an adjournment of the House of Representatives.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 3:41 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY) had signed the following enrolled bill:

S. 2195. An act to deny admission to the United States to any representative to the United Nations who has been found to have been engaged in espionage activities or a terrorist activity against the United States and poses a threat to United States national security interests.

The enrolled bill was subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, April 10, 2014, she had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bill:

S. 2195. An act to deny admission to the United States to any representative to the United Nations who has been found to have been engaged in espionage activities or a terrorist activity against the United States and poses a threat to United States national security interests.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC–5293. A communication from the Associate Administrator of the Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Watermelon Research and Promotion Plan; Importer Membership Requirements'' (Docket No. AMS–FV–11–0031) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 9, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–5294. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Special Operations and Low Intensity Conflict), Performing the Duties of the Under Secretary of Defense (Policy), Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the training of the U.S. Special Operations Forces with friendly foreign forces during fiscal year 2013; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–5295. A communication from the Associate Director for Regulatory Affairs, Office of Foreign Assets Control, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Syrian Sanctions Regulations'' (31 CFR Part 542) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 8, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–5296. A communication from the General Counsel, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Standard for Soft Infant and Toddler Carriers'' ((16 CFR Part 1112 and 16 CFR Part 1226) (Docket No. CPSC–2013–0014)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 9, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5297. A communication from the Acting General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Generator Verification Reliability Standards'' (Docket No. RM13–16–000) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 9, 2014; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–5298. A communication from the Director, Equal Employment Opportunities and Diversity Programs, National Archives and Records Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Administration's fiscal year 2013 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5299. A communication from the Acting Chairman of the National Endowment for the Arts, transmitting, pursuant to law, the fiscal year 2013 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act); to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5300. A communication from the Associate Commissioner, National Indian Gaming Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's fiscal year 2013 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5301. A communication from the Director of the Federal Housing Finance Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Agency's fiscal year 2013 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act); to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5302. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20–304, ''Belmont Park Designation and Establishment Act of 2014''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5303. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20–305, ''Marijuana Possession Decriminalization Amendment Act of 2014''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5304. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20–306, ''DC Promise Establishment Act of 2014''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5305. A joint communication from the Acting Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness) and the Chief of Staff of the Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the activities of the Extremity Trauma and Amputation Center of Excellence during fiscal year 2013; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC–5306. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Syria that was declared in Executive Order 13338 of May 11, 2004; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–5307. A communication from the Assistant to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Enhanced Prudential Standards for Bank Holding Companies and Foreign Banking Organizations'' (RIN7100–AD86) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 9, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–5308. A communication from the Chief of the Broadband Division, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of the Commission's Rules with Regard to Commercial Operations in the 1695–1710 MHz, 1755–1780 MHz, and 2155–2180 MHz Bands'' ((GN Docket No. 13–185) (FCC 14–31)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 10, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5309. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of the Commission's Rules Related to Retransmission Consent, Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking'' (MB Docket No. 10–71, FCC 14–29) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 10, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5310. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''General Site Suitability Criteria for Nuclear Power Stations'' (Regulatory Guide 4.7, Revision 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 10, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–5311. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Response Strategies for Potential Aircraft Threats'' (Regulatory Guide 1.214, Revision 1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 10, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–5312. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Rollovers to Qualified Plans'' (Rev. Rul. 2014–9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 8, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–5313. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Health Insurance Providers Fee; Procedural and Administrative Guidance'' (Notice 2014–24) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 10, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–5314. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the United States-People's Republic of China Science and Technology Agreement of 1979; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–5315. A communication from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Administration's fiscal year 2013 report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act); to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5316. A communication from the General Counsel, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, three (3) reports relative to vacancies in the Office of Management and Budget, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 10, 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5317. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department of Transportation's fiscal year 2013 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation

Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act); to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petition or memorial was laid before the Senate and was referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM–223. A resolution adopted by the Legislature of Rockland County, New York urging the United States House of Representatives to pass H.R. 2510—Helping Veterans Exposed to Toxic Chemicals Act; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Ms. LANDRIEU, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, without amendment:

H.R. 507. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain land inholdings owned by the United States to the Pascua Yaqui Tribe of Arizona, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113–148).

H.R. 862. A bill to authorize the conveyance of two small parcels of land within the boundaries of the Coconino National Forest containing private improvements that were developed based upon the reliance of the landowners in an erroneous survey conducted in May 1960 (Rept. No. 113–149).

H.R. 876. A bill to authorize the continued use of certain water diversions located on National Forest System land in the Frank Church-River of No Return Wilderness and the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness in the State of Idaho, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113–150).

H.R. 1158. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to continue stocking fish in certain lakes in the North Cascades National Park, Ross Lake National Recreation Area, and Lake Chelan National Recreation Area (Rept. No. 113–151).

By Mr. SCHUMER, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1728. A bill to amend the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act to improve ballot accessibility to uniformed services voters and overseas voters, and for other purposes.

By Mr. SCHUMER, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

S. 1937. A bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to require States to develop contingency plans to address unexpected emergencies or natural disasters that may threaten to disrupt the administration of an election for Federal office, and for other purposes.

S. 1947. A bill to rename the Government Printing Office the Government Publishing Office, and for other purposes.

S. 2197. A bill to repeal certain requirements regarding newspaper advertising of Senate stationery contracts.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, for the Committee on Foreign Relations I report favorably the following nomination lists which were printed in the RECORDS on the dates indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that these nominations lie at the Secretary's desk for the information of Senators.

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

Foreign Service nominations beginning with Julie Ann Koenen and ending with Brian Keith Woody, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 30, 2014. (minus 1 nominee: Aaron Schubert)

Foreign Service nominations beginning with Ranya F. Abdelsayed and ending with Fireno F. Zora, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 9, 2014.

Foreign Service nominations beginning with Christopher David Frederick and ending with Julio Maldonado, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 30, 2014.

Foreign Service nominations beginning with James Benjamin Green and ending with Geoffrey W. Wiggin, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 30, 2014.

Foreign Service nominations beginning with Scott Thomas Bruns and ending with Janelle Weyek, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 30, 2014.

Foreign Service nominations beginning with Roberta Mahoney and ending with Ann Marie Yastishock, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 30, 2014. (minus 3 nominees: Susan K. Brems; Sharon Lee Cromer; R. Douglass Arbuckle)

Foreign Service nominations beginning with Kathleen M. Adams and ending with Sean Young, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 30, 2014.

Foreign Service nominations beginning with Kate E. Addison and ending with William F. Zeman, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 30, 2014.

Foreign Service nominations beginning with Gerald Michael Feierstein and ending with David Michael Satterfield, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 30, 2014. (minus 3 nominees: Douglas A. Koneff; Leslie Meredith Tsou; Lon C. Fairchild)

Foreign Service nominations beginning with Matthew D. Lowe and ending with Wilbur G. Zehr, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 30, 2014.

Foreign Service nominations beginning with Kevin Timothy Covert and ending with Paul Wulfsberg, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 30, 2014.

Foreign Service nominations beginning with Beata Angelica and ending with Benjamin Beardsley Dille, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 30, 2014. (minus 1 nominee: Daniel Menco Hirsch)

Foreign Service nominations beginning with Mark L. Driver and ending with Karl William Wurster, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 10, 2014.

Foreign Service nominations beginning with Scott S. Sindelar and ending with Christine M. Sloop, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 10, 2014.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. SANDERS, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 2235. A bill to secure the Federal voting rights of persons when released from incarceration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN:

S. 2236. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to enhance efforts to address antimicrobial resistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. HOEVEN (for himself and Ms. CANTWELL):

S. 2237. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an elective safe harbor for the expensing by small businesses of the costs of acquiring or producing tangible property; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. COATS (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. KIRK, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. WICKER, Mr. HATCH, Mr. RISCH, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. ENZI, and Mr. PORTMAN):

S. 2238. A bill to ensure that the United States Government in no way recognizes Russia's annexation of Crimea; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin (for himself and Mr. WARNER):

S. 2239. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit the Secretary of the Treasury to disclose certain return information related to identity theft, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. COONS (for Mr.COBURN (for himself, Mr. COONS, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL)):

S. 2240. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to encourage Medicare beneficiaries to voluntarily adopt advance directives guiding the medical care they receive; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BEGICH:

S. 2241. A bill to enhance the safety of drug-free playgrounds; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COATS:

S. 2242. A bill to establish the prudential regulator of community and independent depository institutions as the conduit and arbiter of all Federal financial oversight, examination, and reporting; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mrs. MURRAY:

S. 2243. A bill to expand eligibility for the program of comprehensive assistance for family caregivers of the Department of Veterans Affairs, to expand benefits available to participants under such program, to enhance special compensation for members of the uniformed services who require assistance in everyday life, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself, Mr. KIRK, Mr. REED, Mr. HELLER, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. JOHANNS, Mr. WARNER, Mr. BLUNT, and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. 2244. A bill to extend the termination date of the Terrorism Insurance Program established under the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. BEGICH (for himself and Mr. CARPER):

S. 2245. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Home Rule Act to streamline the

District's legislative process and conserve taxpayer dollars; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. BEGICH (for himself and Mr. CARPER):

S. 2246. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Home Rule Act to permit the Government of the District of Columbia to determine the fiscal year period, to make local funds of the District of Columbia for a fiscal year available for use by the District upon enactment of the local budget act for the year subject to a period of Congressional review, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mrs. MCCASKILL:

S. 2247. A bill to prohibit the awarding of a contract or grant in excess of the simplified acquisition threshold unless the prospective contractor or grantee certifies in writing to the agency awarding the contract or grant that the contractor or grantee has no seriously delinquent tax debts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. FRANKEN:

S. 2248. A bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 to increase the number of children eligible for free school meals, with a phased-in transition period, with an offset; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. FRANKEN (for himself and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 2249. A bill to amend the Indian Tribal Judgment Funds Use or Distribution Act to extend a certain income tax exemption to the Grand Portage Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. KIRK, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. WICKER, Mr. REID, Mr. HELLER, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. WARNER, Mr. GRAHAM, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. NELSON, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. HATCH, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. VITTER, Ms. COLLINS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Ms. MIKULSKI):

S. 2250. A bill to extend the Travel Promotion Act of 2009, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself and Mr. FRANKEN):

S. 2251. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to develop and test an expanded and advanced role for direct care workers who provide long-term services and supports to older individuals in efforts to coordinate care and improve the efficiency of service delivery; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. VITTER (for himself, Ms. HEITKAMP, and Mr. KIRK):

S. 2252. A bill to reaffirm the importance of community banking and community banking regulatory experience on the Federal Reserve Board of Governors, to ensure that the Federal Reserve Board of Governors has a member who has previous experience in community banking or community banking supervision, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. FRANKEN (for himself, Mr. KIRK, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 2253. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to provide for a temporary shift in the scheduled collection of the transitional reinsurance program payments; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. CASEY, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 2254. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to enhance the COPS ON THE BEAT grant program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. 2255. A bill to remove the Kurdistan Democratic Party and the Patriotic Union of Kurdistan from treatment as terrorist organizations and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Ms. MIKULSKI (for herself and Mr. HARKIN):

S. Res. 420. A resolution designating the week of October 6 through October 12, 2014, as ''Naturopathic Medicine Week'' to recognize the value of naturopathic medicine in providing safe, effective, and affordable health care; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself and Ms. LANDRIEU):

S. Res. 421. A resolution expressing the gratitude and appreciation of the Senate for the acts of heroism and military achievement by the members of the United States Armed Forces who participated in the June 6, 1944, amphibious landing at Normandy, France, and commending them for leadership and valor in an operation that helped bring an end to World War II; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. REID (for himself and Mr. MCCONNELL):

S. Res. 422. A resolution to authorize written testimony, document production, and representation in Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks Foundation, Inc. v. United States; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 162

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) was added as a cosponsor of S. 162, a bill to reauthorize and improve the Mentally Ill Offender Treatment and Crime Reduction Act of 2004.

S. 367

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 367, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to repeal the Medicare outpatient rehabilitation therapy caps.

S. 489

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 489, a bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to increase and adjust for inflation the maximum value of articles that may be imported duty-free by one person on one day, and for other purposes.

S. 576

At the request of Mr. JOHANNS, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 576, a bill to reform laws relating to small public housing agencies, and for other purposes.

S. 734

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 734, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to repeal the requirement for reduction of survivor annuities under the Survivor Benefit Plan by veterans' dependency and indemnity compensation.

S. 917

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 917, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a reduced rate of excise tax on beer produced domestically by certain qualifying producers.

S. 1163

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1163, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to include automated fire sprinkler system retrofits as section 179 property and classify certain automated fire sprinkler system retrofits as 15-year property for purposes of depreciation.

S. 1174

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1174, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the 65th Infantry Regiment, known as the Borinqueneers.

S. 1189

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1189, a bill to adjust the boundaries of Paterson Great Falls National Historical Park to include Hinchliffe Stadium, and for other purposes.

S. 1431

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1431, a bill to permanently extend the Internet Tax Freedom Act.

S. 1468

At the request of Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1468, a bill to require the Secretary of Commerce to establish the Network for Manufacturing Innovation and for other purposes.

S. 1500

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1500, a bill to declare the November 5, 2009, attack at Fort Hood, Texas, a terrorist attack, and to ensure that the victims of the attack and their families receive the same honors and benefits as those Americans who have been killed or wounded in a combat zone overseas and their families.

S. 1507

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1507, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify the treatment of general welfare benefits provided by Indian tribes.

S. 1530

At the request of Ms. LANDRIEU, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) and the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) were added as cosponsors of S. 1530, a bill to realign structures and reallocate resources in the Federal Government, in keeping with the core American belief that families are the best protection for children and the bedrock of any society, to bolster United States diplomacy and assistance targeted at ensuring that every child can grow up in a permanent, safe, nurturing, and loving family, and to strengthen intercountry adoption to the United States and around the world and ensure that it becomes a viable and fully developed option for providing families for children in need, and for other purposes.

S. 1622

At the request of Ms. HEITKAMP, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1622, a bill to establish the Alyce Spotted Bear and Walter Soboleff Commission on Native Children, and for other purposes.

S. 1645

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1645, a bill to limit the authority of States to tax certain income of employees for employment duties performed in other States.

S. 1728

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR) were added as cosponsors of S. 1728, a bill to amend the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act to improve ballot accessibility to uniformed services voters and overseas voters, and for other purposes.

S. 1802

At the request of Mr. DONNELLY, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1802, a bill to provide equal treatment for utility special entities using utility operations-related swaps, and for other purposes.

S. 1839

At the request of Mr. BEGICH, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1839, a bill to make certain luggage and travel articles eligible for duty-free treatment under the Generalized System of Preferences, and for other purposes.

S. 1862

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) and the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) were added as cosponsors of S. 1862, a bill to grant the Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the Monuments Men, in recognition of their heroic role in the preservation, protection, and restitution of monuments, works of art, and artifacts of cultural importance during and following World War II.

S. 1975

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the names of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL) and the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) were added as cosponsors of S. 1975, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an above-the-line deduction for child care expenses, and for other purposes.

S. 1996

At the request of Mrs. HAGAN, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL), the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE), the Senator from Montana (Mr. WALSH) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) were added as cosponsors of S. 1996, a bill to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes.

S. 2037

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) were added as cosponsors of S. 2037, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to remove the 96-hour physician certification requirement for inpatient critical access hospital services.

S. 2078

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2078, a bill to prohibit Federal funding for motorcycle checkpoints, and for other purposes.

S. 2082

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2082, a bill to provide for the development of criteria under the Medicare program for medically necessary short inpatient hospital stays, and for other purposes.

S. 2091

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) were added as cosponsors of S. 2091, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the processing by the Department of Veterans Affairs of claims for benefits under laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 2100

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2100, a bill to promote the use of clean cookstoves and fuels to save lives, improve livelihoods, empower women, and protect the environment by creating a thriving global market for clean and efficient household cooking solutions.

S. 2103

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2103, a bill to direct the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to issue or revise regulations with respect to the medical certification of certain small aircraft pilots, and for other purposes.

S. 2140

At the request of Mr. HEINRICH, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2140, a bill to improve the transition between experimental permits and commercial licenses for commercial reusable launch vehicles.

S. 2163

At the request of Mr. UDALL of Colorado, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2163, a bill to establish an emergency watershed protection disaster assistance fund to be available to the Secretary of Agriculture to provide assistance for any natural disaster.

S. 2178

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2178, a bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act with respect to the timing of elections and pre-election hearings and the identification of pre-election issues, and to require that lists of employees eligible to vote in organizing elections be provided to the National Labor Relations Board.

S. 2182

At the request of Mr. WALSH, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2182, a bill to expand and improve care provided to veterans and members of the Armed Forces with mental health disorders or at risk of suicide, to review the terms or characterization of the discharge or separation of certain individuals from the Armed Forces, to require a pilot program on loan repayment for psychiatrists who agree to serve in the Veterans Health Administration of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 2223

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL), the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN), the

Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) were added as cosponsors of S. 2223, a bill to provide for an increase in the Federal minimum wage and to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend increased expensing limitations and the treatment of certain real property as section 179 property.

S. CON. RES. 34

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 34, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the President should hold the Russian Federation accountable for being in material breach of its obligations under the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty.

S. RES. 413

At the request of Mr. COONS, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 413, a resolution recognizing 20 years since the genocide in Rwanda, and affirming it is in the national interest of the United States to work in close coordination with international partners to help prevent and mitigate acts of genocide and mass atrocities.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. SANDERS, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 2235. A bill to secure the Federal voting rights of persons when released from incarceration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, today I am pleased to introduce the Democracy Restoration Act, known as the DRA. I want to thank Judiciary Committee Chairman LEAHY and Senators DURBIN, WHITEHOUSE, BOOKER, HARKIN, and SANDERS as original cosponsors of this legislation.

As the late Senator Kennedy often said, civil rights is the ''unfinished business'' of America. The Democracy Restoration Act would restore voting rights in Federal elections to approximately 5.8 million citizens who have been released from prison and are back living in their communities.

After the Civil War, Congress enacted and the States ratified the Fifteenth Amendment, which provides that ''the right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.''

Unfortunately, many States passed laws during the Jim Crow period after the Civil War to make it more difficult for newly-freed slaves to vote in elections. Such laws included poll taxes, literacy tests, and disenfranchisement measures. Some disenfranchisement measures applied to misdemeanor convictions and in practice could result in lifetime disenfranchisement, even for individuals that successfully reintegrated into their communities as law-abiding citizens.

It took Congress and the States nearly another century to eliminate the poll tax, upon the ratification of the Twenty-Fourth Amendment in 1964. The Amendment provides that ''the rights of citizens of the United States to vote in any primary or other election for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Representative in Congress, shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State by reason of failure to pay any poll tax or other tax.''

Shortly thereafter Congress enacted the Voting Rights Act of 1965, which swept away numerous State laws and procedures that had denied African-Americans and other minorities their constitutional right to vote. For example, the act outlawed the use of literacy or history tests that voters had to pass before registering to vote or casting their ballot.

The act specifically prohibits States from imposing any ''voting qualification or prerequisite to voting, or standard, practice, or procedure . . . to deny or abridge the right of any citizen of the United States to vote on account of race or color.'' Congress overwhelmingly reauthorized the Act in 2006, which was signed into law by President George W. Bush. Congress is now working on legislation to revitalize the VRA after recent Supreme Court decisions curtailed its reach.

In 2014, I am concerned that there are still several areas where the legacy of Jim Crow laws and State disenfranchisement statutes lead to unfairness in Federal elections. First, State laws governing the restoration of voting rights vary widely throughout the country, such that persons in some States can easily regain their voting rights, while in other States persons effectively lose their right to vote permanently. Second, these State disenfranchisement laws have a disproportionate impact on racial and ethnic minorities. Third, this patchwork of State laws results in the lack of a uniform standard for eligibility to vote in Federal elections, and leads to an unfair disparity and unequal participation in Federal elections based solely on where an individual lives. Finally, studies indicate that former prisoners who have voting rights restored are less likely to reoffend, and disenfranchisement hinders their rehabilitation and reintegration into their community.

In 35 States, convicted individuals may not vote while they are on parole. In 11 States, a conviction can result in lifetime disenfranchisement. Several States require prisoners to seek discretionary pardons from Governors, or action by the parole or pardon board, in order to regain their right to vote. Several States deny the right to vote to individuals convicted of certain misdemeanors. States are slowly moving or repeal or loosen many of these barriers to voting for ex-prisoners.

An estimated 5,850,000 citizens of the United States, or about 1 in 40 adults in the United States, currently cannot vote as a result of a felony conviction. Of the 5,850,000 citizens barred from voting, only 25 percent are in prison. By contrast, 75 percent of the disenfranchised reside in their communities while on probation or parole after having completed their sentences. Approximately 2,600,000 citizens who have completed their sentences remain disenfranchised due to restrictive State laws. In six States: Alabama, Florida, Kentucky, Mississippi, Tennessee, and Virginia—more than 7 percent of the total population is disenfranchised.

Studies show that a growing number of African-American men, for example, will be disenfranchised at some point in their life, partly due to mandatory minimum sentencing laws that have a disproportionate impact on minorities.

Eight percent of the African-American population, or 2 million African-Americans, are disenfranchised. Given current rates of incarceration, approximately 1 in 3 of the next generation of African-American men will be disenfranchised at some point during their lifetime. Currently, 1 of every 13 African-Americans are rendered unable to vote because of felony disenfranchisement, which is a rate 4 times greater than non African-Americans. Nearly 8 percent of African-Americans are disenfranchised, compared to less than 2 percent of non-African-Americans. In 3 states more than 1 in 5 African-Americans are unable to vote because of prior convictions: the rates are Florida at 23 percent, Kentucky at 22 percent, and Virginia at 20 percent.

Latino citizens are disproportionately disenfranchised based on their disproportionate representation in the criminal justice system. If current incarceration trends hold, 17 percent of Latino men will be incarcerated during their lifetime, in contrast to less than 6 percent of non-Latino white men. When analyzing the data across 10 States, Latinos generally have disproportionately higher rates of disenfranchisement compared to their presence in the voting age population. In 6 out of 10 States studies in 2003, Latinos constitute more than 10 percent of the total number of persons disenfranchised by State felony laws. In 4 States, California, 37 percent; New York, 34 percent; Texas, 30 percent; and Arizona, 27 percent, Latinos were disenfranchised by a rate of more than 25 percent. Native Americans are also disproportionately disenfranchised.

Congress has addressed part of this problem by enacting the Fair Sentencing Act to partially reduce the sentencing disparity between crack cocaine and powder cocaine convictions. Congress is now considering legislation

that would more broadly revise mandatory sentencing procedures and create a fairer system of sentencing. While I welcome these steps, I believe that Congress should take stronger action now to remedy this particular problem.

The legislation would restore voting rights to prisoners after their release from incarceration. It requires that prisons receiving Federal funds notify people about their right to vote in Federal elections when they are leaving prison, sentenced to probation, or convicted of a misdemeanor. The bill authorizes the Department of Justice and individuals harmed by violation of this act to sue to enforce its provisions. The bill generally provides State election officials with a grace period to resolve voter eligibility complaints without a lawsuit before an election.

The legislation is narrowly crafted to apply to Federal elections, and retains the States' authorities to generally establish voting qualifications. This legislation is therefore consistent with Congressional authority under the Constitution and voting rights statutes, as interpreted by the U.S. Supreme Court.

I am pleased that this legislation has been endorsed by a large coalition of public interest organizations, including: civil rights and reform organizations; religious and faith-based organizations; and law enforcement and criminal justice organizations. In particular I want to thank the Brennan Center for Justice, the ACLU, the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, and the NAACP for their work on this legislation.

This legislation is ultimately designed to reduce recidivism rates and help reintegrate ex-prisoners back into society. When prisoners are released, they are expected to obey the law, get a job, and pay taxes as they are rehabilitated and reintegrated into their community. With these responsibilities and obligations of citizenship should also come the rights of citizenship, including the right to vote.

In 2008, President George W. Bush signed the Second Chance Act into law, after overwhelming approval and strong bipartisan support in Congress. The legislation expanded the Prison Re-Entry Initiative, by providing job training, placement services, transitional housing, drug treatment, medical care, and faith-based mentoring. At the signing ceremony, President Bush said: ''We believe that even those who have struggled with a dark past can find brighter days ahead. One way we act on that belief is by helping former prisoners who have paid for their crimes. We help them build new lives as productive members of our society.''

The Democracy Restoration Act is fully consistent with the goals of the Second Chance Act, as Congress and the States seek to reduce recidivism rates, strengthen the quality of life in our communities and make them safer, and reduce the burden on taxpayers.

More recently, in a February 2014 speech, Attorney General Eric Holder called on elected officials to reexamine disenfranchisement statutes and enact reforms to restore voting rights.

I therefore urge Congress to address the issue of disenfranchisement and support this legislation.

By Mrs. MURRAY:

S. 2243. A bill to expand eligibility for the program of comprehensive assistance for family caregivers of the Department of Veterans Affairs, to expand benefits available to participants under such program, to enhance special compensation for members of the uniformed services who require assistance in everyday life, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to introduce the Military and Veteran Caregiver Services Improvement Act. This is a bill that will make critical improvements to how we support our ill and injured veterans and their caregivers.

I am especially pleased to be joined this morning by our former colleague Senator Elizabeth Dole, who has come to the floor today and who has been such a tremendous and invaluable person in working to bring these caregiver issues to national attention. I really appreciate her being here and being such a champion on this, and a leader. She has brought people from all over the country together to make a difference for our caregivers and for our veterans.

We also have many of the very caregivers this bill is designed to help—representing, by the way, almost every State—in the gallery today to see this legislation introduced. I am very proud they are here. It is incredibly important that they are here today and on Capitol Hill because, as the Presiding Officer knows, our caregivers work extremely hard without any recognition, and they rarely ask for anything for themselves. In fact, most of the caregivers I have met sound much like the veterans and servicemembers they care for when they say: Oh, this isn't about me; I am just doing my part.

So last week, when RAND released their comprehensive, groundbreaking study on military caregivers, they chose a very appropriate title: ''Hidden Heroes.'' That is why it is so important to have all of those caregivers here today and working constantly to make sure we all understand what they do.

I am very proud to be introducing this bill not only as a Senator and a senior member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee and someone who has fought so hard for the implementation of the VA caregivers program, but, as many of my colleagues know, for me, this is really a deeply personal issue.

Growing up, I saw firsthand the many ways military service can affect both veterans and their families. My father served in World War II. He was among the first soldiers to land in Okinawa. He came home as a disabled veteran and was awarded the Purple Heart.

Later in life he was diagnosed with multiple sclerosis. Eventually he became too sick to work at the little five-and-dime store he managed, and my mom became his caregiver. This was no small burden for my mom, who had to raise seven children, care for my dad, and was now all of a sudden the primary source of income for our family.

Today, after more than a decade of two wars, men and women in uniform, as did my father, have done everything that has been asked of them and so much more. But now, as our role in this conflict winds down, the support we provide cannot end when the war no longer leads the nightly news broadcasts and disappears from the front pages of our newspapers. It is an enduring commitment for those who will first need help now or those who will need help later in their lives. It is a lifetime of care for so many.

In so many cases, the responsibility for providing that care often falls on the loved ones of severely injured veterans. Their courage and their devotion in taking on these responsibilities is inspiring for all of us. They are the reason we created the VA caregivers program, which now provides these family members with health care and counseling and training and respite and a living stipend.

I was proud to lead congressional efforts to push the VA to stop delaying the implementation of the caregivers program and restore the eligibility criteria to the intent of the law. Thankfully, as we know, in the end the White House and the VA announced they would allow more caregivers of more veterans to be eligible for benefits and finally got the program implemented. But there is a lot more we can do because, as the RAND study clearly shows us, caregivers are still struggling. Military caregivers have significantly worse health than noncaregivers, and they are at higher risk for depression. The stress they live under jeopardizes their relationships and puts them at greater risk of divorce, and they have trouble with employment and keeping health insurance. There is no way we will sit by and let caregivers and veterans face this on their own—not when we can make it a little bit easier.

The bill we are introducing this morning, the Military and Veterans Caregivers and Services Improvement Act, makes some broad changes to help give caregivers and veterans the tools they need to help tackle what they face. I wish to take a moment on the floor today to highlight just a few of the important provisions contained in this bill.

First and foremost, this bill will make veterans of all eras eligible for the full range of caregiver support services. We took an important first step in creating the post-9/11 veterans caregivers program. Now that the VA has had some time to get this program

working, it is time for us to get services to our older veterans who are also in great need.

The bill also expands eligibility for the VA caregivers program by recognizing a wider array of needs which may require caregiving, placing greater emphasis on mental health injuries and removing restrictions on who is eligible to become a caregiver.

Under the bill, caregiver services will also be expanded to include childcare, financial advice, and legal counseling. Those are some of the top and currently unmet needs of family caregivers.

The bill will also require the Federal Government to meet the unique needs of employees who are caregivers with flexible work arrangements so they can stay employed while caring for their veteran. I, of course, want to see all employers make these kinds of accommodations for caregivers, but I want the Federal Government to lead by example.

When it comes to the Department of Defense, the bill makes several improvements to the special compensation for assistance with activities of daily living—first, by making those benefits tax exempt, and second, eligibility for special compensation would also be set at a more appropriate level of disability and would be more inclusive of mental health injuries and TBI.

The Military and Veteran Caregiver Services Improvement Act also addresses a key theme identified by RAND. There are many services inside the government and outside to assist caregivers, but these programs are not coordinated. Eligibility criteria are different for each one of them, and there is not enough oversight to ensure the quality of those services. So what our bill does is create a national interagency working group on caregiver services. It will coordinate caregiver policy among all the different departments and create standards of care and oversight tools to make sure our veterans and their caregivers receive high-quality services.

The last provision I wish to highlight is intended to help a military spouse who may be required to become the primary source of income for the family after the servicemember has been injured, just as my mom was. In order to help that spouse get the job they need to support the family, this bill will allow the injured servicemember or veteran to transfer their post-9/11 GI bill benefits to their dependents by exempting them from the length of service requirements that would currently prevent them from transferring those benefits. Injured veterans should not be penalized because their injury occurred early in their service.

This provision is extremely important because for 2013 the unemployment rate for people with bachelor's degrees was only 4 percent—about one-third lower than the national average—and their median weekly earnings were 34 percent higher than the national average. Meanwhile, the RAND study found that 62 percent of post-9/11 caregivers reported financial strain because of their caregiving.

I know this is important because I saw it in my family. For my family, the additional education my mom obtained got her a better job so she could support her family while she was caring for my dad. It is what made the difference.

I want to again thank some key people who have been true leaders to get this to this point.

I again want to thank Senator Dole and her great staff at the Elizabeth Dole Foundation for keeping our country focused on the needs of our military and veteran caregivers and for bringing such national momentum to make the changes we need.

I also want to thank the Wounded Warrior Project, which was a driving force in creating the very first VA caregivers program. They have provided invaluable advice in developing the bill I am introducing today.

Finally, I really want to thank the outstanding folks at the RAND Corporation. They have put together a truly groundbreaking study that takes stock of where care and benefits have fallen short, where new needs are emerging, and how we can make it easier for veterans to get the care and benefits they deserve.

There are many ways for the whole country—government, nonprofits, businesses, community leaders, faith leaders—to do more to help. For all of us in Congress, that starts with passing this legislation to help our hidden heroes—our military and veteran caregivers.

I again want to thank all of our tremendous caregivers in this country for their service, for not asking for help, as they should. We are the ones who need to ask for help for them and to be there to provide it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 2243

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Military and Veteran Caregiver Services Improvement Act of 2014''.

SEC. 2. EXPANSION OF ELIGIBILITY FOR PARTICIPATION IN AND SERVICES PROVIDED UNDER FAMILY CAREGIVER PROGRAM OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) FAMILY CAREGIVER PROGRAM.—

(1) EXPANSION OF ELIGIBILITY.—Subsection (a)(2)(B) of section 1720G of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking ''on or after September 11, 2001''.

(2) CLARIFICATION OF ELIGIBILITY FOR ILLNESS.—Such subsection is further amended by inserting ''or illness'' after ''serious injury''.

(3) EXPANSION OF NEEDED SERVICES IN ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA.—Subsection (a)(2)(C) of such section is amended—

(A) in clause (ii), by striking ''; or'' and inserting a semicolon;

(B) by redesignating clause (iii) as clause (iv); and

(C) by inserting after clause (ii) the following new clause (iii):

''(iii) a need for regular or extensive instruction or supervision in completing two or more instrumental activities of daily living; or''.

(4) EXPANSION OF SERVICES PROVIDED.—Subsection (a)(3)(A)(ii) of such section is amended—

(A) in subclause (IV), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(B) in subclause (V), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new subclauses:

''(VI) child care services or a monthly stipend for such services if such services are not readily available from the Department;

''(VII) financial planning services relating to the needs of injured and ill veterans and their caregivers; and

''(VIII) legal services, including legal advice and consultation, relating to the needs of injured and ill veterans and their caregivers.''.

(5) EXPANSION OF RESPITE CARE PROVIDED.—Subsection (a)(3)(B) of such section is amended by striking ''shall be'' and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting ''shall—

''(i) be medically and age-appropriate;

''(ii) include in-home care; and

''(iii) include peer-oriented group activities.''.

(6) MODIFICATION OF STIPEND CALCULATION.—Subsection (a)(3)(C) of such section is amended—

(A) by redesignating clause (iii) as clause (iv); and

(B) by inserting after clause (ii) the following new clause (iii):

''(iii) In determining the amount and degree of personal services provided under clause (i) with respect to an eligible veteran whose need for personal care services is based in whole or in part on a need for supervision or protection under paragraph (2)(C)(ii) or regular instruction or supervision in completing tasks under paragraph (2)(C)(iii), the Secretary shall take into account the following:

''(I) The assessment by the family caregiver of the needs and limitations of the veteran.

''(II) The extent to which the veteran can function safely and independently in the absence of such supervision, protection, or instruction.

''(III) The amount of time required for the family caregiver to provide such supervision, protection, or instruction to the veteran.''.

(7) PERIODIC EVALUATION OF NEED FOR CERTAIN SERVICES.—Subsection (a)(3) of such section is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(D) In providing instruction, preparation, and training under subparagraph (A)(i)(I) and technical support under subparagraph (A)(i)(II) to each family caregiver who is approved as a provider of personal care services for an eligible veteran under paragraph (6), the Secretary shall periodically evaluate the needs of the eligible veteran and the skills of the family caregiver of such veteran to determine if additional instruction, preparation, training, or technical support under those subparagraphs is necessary.''.

(b) REPEAL OF GENERAL CAREGIVER SUPPORT PROGRAM.—Such section is amended by striking subsection (b).

(c) PROVISION OF ASSISTANCE TO CAREGIVERS OF CERTAIN VETERANS.—Such section is further amended by inserting after subsection (a) the following new subsection (b):

''(b) PROVISION OF ASSISTANCE TO CAREGIVERS OF CERTAIN VETERANS.—(1) In providing assistance under subsection (a) to family caregivers of eligible veterans who were discharged from the Armed Forces before September 11, 2001, the Secretary may enter into memoranda of understanding with agencies, States, and other entities to provide such assistance to such veterans.

''(2) The Secretary may provide assistance under this subsection only if such assistance is reasonably accessible to the veteran and is substantially equivalent or better in quality to similar services provided by the Department.

''(3) The Secretary may provide fair compensation to entities that provide assistance under this subsection pursuant to memoranda of understanding entered into under paragraph (1).

''(4) In carrying out this subsection, the Secretary shall work with the interagency working group on policies relating to caregivers of veterans and members of the Armed Forces established under section 7 of the Military and Veteran Caregiver Services Improvement Act of 2014.''.

(d) MODIFICATION OF DEFINITION OF FAMILY MEMBER.—Subparagraph (B) of subsection (d)(3) of such section is amended to read as follows:

''(B) is not a member of the family of the veteran and does not provide care to the veteran on a professional basis.''.

(e) MODIFICATION OF DEFINITION OF PERSONAL CARE SERVICES.—Subsection (d)(4) of such section is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''independent'';

(2) by redesignating subparagraph (B) as subparagraph (D); and

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following new subparagraphs:

''(B) Supervision or protection based on symptoms or residuals of neurological or other impairment or injury.

''(C) Regular or extensive instruction or supervision in completing two or more instrumental activities of daily living.''.

(f) ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (2) of section 101(c) of the Caregivers and Veterans Omnibus Health Services Act of 2010 (Public Law 111–163; 38 U.S.C. 1720G note) is amended to read as follows:

''(2) CONTENTS.—Each report required by paragraph (1) after the date of the enactment of the Military and Veteran Caregiver Services Improvement Act of 2014 shall include the following with respect to the program of comprehensive assistance for family caregivers required by subsection (a)(1) of such section 1720G:

''(A) The number of family caregivers that received assistance under such program.

''(B) The cost to the Department of providing assistance under such program.

''(C) A description of the outcomes achieved by, and any measurable benefits of, carrying out such program.

''(D) An assessment of the effectiveness and the efficiency of the implementation of such program, including a description of any barriers to accessing and receiving care and services under such program.

''(E) A description of the outreach activities carried out by the Secretary under such program.

''(F) An assessment of the manner in which resources are expended by the Secretary under such program, particularly with respect to the provision of monthly personal caregiver stipends under subsection (a)(3)(A)(ii)(V) of such section 1720G.

''(G) An evaluation of the sufficiency and consistency of the training provided to family caregivers under such program in preparing family caregivers to provide care to veterans under such program.

''(H) Such recommendations, including recommendations for legislative or administrative action, as the Secretary considers appropriate in light of carrying out such program.''.

(g) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) ELIGIBLE VETERAN.—Subsection (a)(2) of such section is amended, in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''subsection'' and inserting ''section''.

(2) DEFINITIONS.—Subsection (d) of such section is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''under subsection (a) or a covered veteran under subsection (b)'';

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking ''under subsection (a)'';

(C) in paragraph (3), by striking ''under subsection (a)''; and

(D) in paragraph (4), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''under subsection (a) or a covered veteran under subsection (b)''; and

(3) COUNSELING, TRAINING, AND MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES.—Section 1782(c)(2) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking ''or a caregiver of a covered veteran''.

SEC. 3. AUTHORITY TO TRANSFER ENTITLEMENT TO POST-9/11 EDUCATION ASSISTANCE TO FAMILY MEMBERS BY SERIOUSLY INJURED VETERANS IN NEED OF PERSONAL CARE SERVICES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter II of chapter 33 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''§ 3319A. Authority to transfer unused education benefits to family members by seriously injured veterans

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the provisions of this section, the Secretary may permit an individual described in subsection (b) who is entitled to educational assistance under this chapter to elect to transfer to one or more of the dependents specified in subsection (c) a portion of such individual's entitlement to such assistance, subject to the limitation under subsection (d).

''(b) ELIGIBLE INDIVIDUALS.—An individual referred to in subsection (a) is any individual who—

''(1) retired for physical disability under chapter 61 of title 10; or

''(2) is described in paragraph (2) of section 1720G(a) of this title and who is participating in the program established under paragraph (1) of such section.

''(c) ELIGIBLE DEPENDENTS.—An individual approved to transfer an entitlement to educational assistance under this section may transfer the individual's entitlement as follows:

''(1) To the individual's spouse.

''(2) To one or more of the individual's children.

''(3) To a combination of the individuals referred to in paragraphs (1) and (2).

''(d) LIMITATION ON MONTHS OF TRANSFER.—(1) The total number of months of entitlement transferred by a individual under this section may not exceed 36 months.

''(2) The Secretary may prescribe regulations that would limit the months of entitlement that may be transferred under this section to no less than 18 months.

''(e) DESIGNATION OF TRANSFEREE.—An individual transferring an entitlement to educational assistance under this section shall—

''(1) designate the dependent or dependents to whom such entitlement is being transferred;

''(2) designate the number of months of such entitlement to be transferred to each such dependent; and

''(3) specify the period for which the transfer shall be effective for each dependent designated under paragraph (1).

''(f) TIME FOR TRANSFER; REVOCATION AND MODIFICATION.—(1) Transfer of entitlement to educational assistance under this section shall be subject to the time limitation for use of entitlement under section 3321 of this title.

''(2)(A) An individual transferring entitlement under this section may modify or revoke at any time the transfer of any unused portion of the entitlement so transferred.

''(B) The modification or revocation of the transfer of entitlement under this paragraph shall be made by the submittal of written notice of the action to the Secretary.

''(3) Entitlement transferred under this section may not be treated as marital property, or the asset of a marital estate, subject to division in a divorce or other civil proceeding.

''(g) COMMENCEMENT OF USE.—A dependent child to whom entitlement to educational assistance is transferred under this section may not commence the use of the transferred entitlement until either—

''(1) the completion by the child of the requirements of a secondary school diploma (or equivalency certificate); or

''(2) the attainment by the child of 18 years of age.

''(h) ADDITIONAL ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS.—(1) The use of any entitlement to educational assistance transferred under this section shall be charged against the entitlement of the individual making the transfer at the rate of one month for each month of transferred entitlement that is used.

''(2) Except as provided under subsection (e)(2) and subject to paragraphs (5) and (6), a dependent to whom entitlement is transferred under this section is entitled to educational assistance under this chapter in the same manner as the individual from whom the entitlement was transferred.

''(3) The monthly rate of educational assistance payable to a dependent to whom entitlement referred to in paragraph (2) is transferred under this section shall be payable at the same rate as such entitlement would otherwise be payable under this chapter to the individual making the transfer.

''(4) The death of an individual transferring an entitlement under this section shall not affect the use of the entitlement by the dependent to whom the entitlement is transferred.

''(5)(A) A child to whom entitlement is transferred under this section may use the benefits transferred without regard to the 15-year delimiting date specified in section 3321 of this title, but may not, except as provided in subparagraph (B), use any benefits so transferred after attaining the age of 26 years.

''(B)(i) Subject to clause (ii), in the case of a child who, before attaining the age of 26 years, is prevented from pursuing a chosen program of education by reason of acting as the primary provider of personal care services for a veteran or member of the Armed Forces under section 1720G(a) of this title, the child may use the benefits beginning on the date specified in clause (iii) for a period whose length is specified in clause (iv).

''(ii) Clause (i) shall not apply with respect to the period of an individual as a primary provider of personal care services if the period concludes with the revocation of the individual's designation as such a primary provider under section 1720G(a)(7)(D) of this title.

''(iii) The date specified in this clause for the beginning of the use of benefits by a child under clause (i) is the later of—

''(I) the date on which the child ceases acting as the primary provider of personal care services for the veteran or member concerned as described in clause (i);

''(II) the date on which it is reasonably feasible, as determined under regulations prescribed by the Secretary, for the child to initiate or resume the use of benefits; or

''(III) the date on which the child attains the age of 26 years.

''(iv) The length of the period specified in this clause for the use of benefits by a child under clause (i) is the length equal to the length of the period that—

''(I) begins on the date on which the child begins acting as the primary provider of personal care services for the veteran or member concerned as described in clause (i); and

''(II) ends on the later of—

''(aa) the date on which the child ceases acting as the primary provider of personal care services for the veteran or member as described in clause (i); or

''(bb) the date on which it is reasonably feasible, as so determined, for the child to initiate or resume the use of benefits.

''(6) The purposes for which a dependent to whom entitlement is transferred under this section may use such entitlement shall include the pursuit and completion of the requirements of a secondary school diploma (or equivalency certificate).

''(7) The administrative provisions of this chapter shall apply to the use of entitlement transferred under this section, except that the dependent to whom the entitlement is transferred shall be treated as the eligible individual for purposes of such provisions.

''(i) OVERPAYMENT.—(1) In the event of an overpayment of educational assistance with respect to a dependent to whom entitlement is transferred under this section, the dependent and the individual making the transfer shall be jointly and severally liable to the United States for the amount of the overpayment for purposes of section 3685 of this title.

''(2)(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), if an individual transferring entitlement under this section fails to complete the service agreed to by the individual under subsection (b)(1) in accordance with the terms of the agreement of the individual under that subsection, the amount of any transferred entitlement under this section that is used by a dependent of the individual as of the date of such failure shall be treated as an overpayment of educational assistance under paragraph (1).

''(B) Subparagraph (A) shall not apply in the case of an individual who fails to complete service agreed to by the individual—

''(i) by reason of the death of the individual; or

''(ii) for a reason referred to in section 3311(c)(4) of this title.

''(j) REGULATIONS.—(1) The Secretary shall prescribe regulations to carry out this section.

''(2) Such regulations shall specify—

''(A) the manner of authorizing the transfer of entitlements under this section;

''(B) the eligibility criteria in accordance with subsection (b); and

''(C) the manner and effect of an election to modify or revoke a transfer of entitlement under subsection (f)(2).''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) TRANSFERS BY MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES.—The heading of section 3319 of such title is amended by inserting ''**by members of the Armed Forces**'' after ''**family members**''.

(2) BAR TO DUPLICATION OF EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE BENEFITS.—Section 3322(e) of such title is amended by inserting ''or 3319A'' after ''and 3319''.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 33 of such title is amended by striking the item relating to section 3319 and inserting the following new items:

''3319. Authority to transfer unused education benefits to family members by members of the Armed Forces.

''3319A. Authority to transfer unused education benefits to family members by seriously injured veterans.''.

SEC. 4. ENHANCEMENT OF SPECIAL COMPENSATION FOR MEMBERS OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES WITH INJURIES OR ILLNESSES REQUIRING ASSISTANCE IN EVERYDAY LIVING.

(a) EXPANSION OF COVERED MEMBERS.—Subsection (b) of section 439 of title 37, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking paragraphs (1) through (3) and inserting the following new paragraphs:

''(1) has a serious injury or illness that was incurred or aggravated in the line of duty;

''(2) is in need of personal care services (including supervision or protection or regular instruction or supervision) as a result of such injury or illness; and''; and

(2) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (3).

(b) NONTAXABILITY OF SPECIAL COMPENSATION.—Such section is further amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (e), (f), (g), and (h) as subsections (g), (h), (i) and (j), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (d) the following new subsection (e):

''(e) NONTAXABILITY OF COMPENSATION.—Monthly special compensation paid under subsection (a) shall not be included in income for purposes of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.''.

(c) PROVISION OF ASSISTANCE TO FAMILY CAREGIVERS.—Such section is further amended by inserting after subsection (e), as amended by subsection (b) of this section, the following new subsection (f):

''(f) ASSISTANCE FOR FAMILY CAREGIVERS.—(1) The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall provide family caregivers of a member in receipt of monthly special compensation under subsection (a) the assistance required to be provided to family caregivers of eligible veterans under section 1720G(a)(3)(A) of title 38 (other than the monthly personal caregiver stipend provided for in clause (ii)(V) of such section). For purposes of the provision of such assistance under this subsection, the definitions in section 1720G(d) of title 38 shall apply, except that any reference in such definitions to a veteran or eligible veteran shall be deemed to be a reference to the member concerned.

''(2) The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall provide assistance under this subsection—

''(A) in accordance with a memorandum of understanding entered into by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and the Secretary of Defense; and

''(B) in accordance with a memorandum of understanding entered into by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and the Secretary of Homeland Security (with respect to members of the Coast Guard).''.

(d) EXPANSION OF COVERED INJURIES AND ILLNESSES.—Subsection (i) of such section, as redesignated by subsection (b)(1) of this section, is amended to read as follows:

''(i) SERIOUS INJURY OR ILLNESS DEFINED.—In this section, the term 'serious injury or illness' means an injury, disorder, or illness (including traumatic brain injury, psychological trauma, or other mental disorder) that—

''(1) renders the afflicted person unable to carry out one or more activities of daily living;

''(2) renders the afflicted person in need of supervision or protection due to the manifestation by such person of symptoms or residuals of neurological or other impairment or injury;

''(3) renders the afflicted person in need of regular or extensive instruction or supervision in completing two or more instrumental activities of daily living; or

''(4) otherwise impairs the afflicted person in such manner as the Secretary of Defense (or the Secretary of Homeland Security, with respect to the Coast Guard) prescribes for purposes of this section.''.

(e) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) HEADING AMENDMENT.—The heading for such section is amended to read as follows:

''§ 439. Special compensation: members of the uniformed services with serious injuries or illnesses requiring assistance in everyday living''.

(2) TABLE OF SECTIONS AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 7 of such title is amended by striking the item relating to section 439 and inserting the following new item:

''439. Special compensation: members of the uniformed services with serious injuries or illnesses requiring assistance in everyday living.''.

SEC. 5. FLEXIBLE WORK ARRANGEMENTS FOR CERTAIN FEDERAL EMPLOYEES.

(a) DEFINITION OF COVERED EMPLOYEE.—In this section, the term ''covered employee'' means an employee (as defined in section 2105 of title 5, United States Code) who—

(1) is a caregiver, as defined in section 1720G of title 38, United States Code; or

(2) is a caregiver of an individual who receives compensation under section 439 of title 37, United States Code.

(b) AUTHORITY TO ALLOW FLEXIBLE WORK ARRANGEMENTS.—The Director of the Office of Personnel Management may promulgate regulations under which a covered employee may—

(1) use a flexible schedule or compressed schedule in accordance with subchapter II of chapter 61 of title 5, United States Code; or

(2) telework in accordance with chapter 65 of title 5, United States Code.

SEC. 6. LIFESPAN RESPITE CARE.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—Section 2901 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300ii) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) through (C) as clauses (i) through (iii), respectively, and realigning the margins accordingly;

(B) by striking ''who requires care or supervision to—'' and inserting ''who—

''(A) requires care or supervision to—'';

(C) by striking the period and inserting ''; or''; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

''(B) is a veteran participating in the program of comprehensive assistance for family caregivers under section 1720G of title 38, United States Code.''; and

(2) in paragraph (5), by striking ''or another unpaid adult,'' and inserting ''another unpaid adult, or a family caregiver as defined in section 1720G of title 38, United States Code, who receives compensation under such section,''.

(b) GRANTS AND COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—Section 2902(c) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300ii-1(c)) is amended by inserting ''and the interagency working group on policies relating to caregivers of veterans established under section 7 of the Military and Veteran Caregiver Services Improvement Act of 2014'' after ''Human Services''.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 2905 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300ii-4) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in paragraph (5), by striking the period and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(6) $15,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2019.''.

SEC. 7. INTERAGENCY WORKING GROUP ON CAREGIVER POLICY.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There shall be established in the executive branch an interagency working group on policies relating to caregivers of veterans and members of the Armed Forces (in this section referred to as the ''working group'').

(b) COMPOSITION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The working group shall be composed of the following:

(A) A chair selected by the President.

(B) A representative from each of the following agencies or organizations selected by the head of such agency or organization:

(i) The Department of Veterans Affairs.

(ii) The Department of Defense.

(iii) The Department of Health and Human Services.

(iv) The Department of Labor.

(v) The Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services.

(2) ADVISORS.—The chair may select any of the following individuals that the chair considers appropriate to advise the working group in carrying out the duties of the working group:

(A) Academic experts in fields relating to caregivers.

(B) Clinicians.

(C) Caregivers.

(D) Individuals in receipt of caregiver services.

(c) DUTIES.—The duties of the working group are as follows:

(1) To regularly review policies relating to caregivers of veterans and members of the Armed Forces.

(2) To coordinate and oversee the implementation of policies relating to caregivers of veterans and members of the Armed Forces.

(3) To evaluate the effectiveness of policies relating to caregivers of veterans and members of the Armed Forces, including programs in each relevant agency, by developing and applying specific goals and performance measures.

(4) To develop standards of care for caregiver services and respite care services provided to a caregiver, veteran, or member of the Armed Forces by a non-profit or private sector entity.

(5) To ensure the availability of mechanisms for agencies, and entities affiliated with or providing services on behalf of agencies, to enforce the standards described in paragraph (4) and conduct oversight on the implementation of such standards.

(6) To develop recommendations for legislative or administrative action to enhance the provision of services to caregivers, veterans, and members of the Armed Forces, including eliminating gaps in such services and eliminating disparities in eligibility for such services.

(7) To coordinate with State and local agencies and relevant non-profit organizations on maximizing the use and effectiveness of resources for caregivers of veterans and members of the Armed Forces.

(d) REPORTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than December 31, 2014, and annually thereafter, the chair of the working group shall submit to Congress a report on policies and services relating to caregivers of veterans and members of the Armed Forces.

(2) ELEMENTS.—Each report required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) An assessment of the policies relating to caregivers of veterans and members of the Armed Forces and services provided pursuant to such policies as of the date of submittal of such report.

(B) A description of any steps taken by the working group to improve the coordination of services for caregivers of veterans and members of the Armed Forces among the entities specified in subsection (b)(1)(B) and eliminate barriers to effective use of such services, including aligning eligibility criteria.

(C) An evaluation of the performance of the entities specified in subsection (b)(1)(B) in providing services for caregivers of veterans and members of the Armed Forces.

(D) An evaluation of the quality and sufficiency of services for caregivers of veterans and members of the Armed Forces available from non-governmental organizations.

(E) A description of any gaps in care or services provided by caregivers to veterans or members of the Armed Forces identified by the working group, and steps taken by the entities specified in subsection (b)(1)(B) to eliminate such gaps or recommendations for legislative or administrative action to address such gaps.

(F) Such other matters or recommendations as the chair considers appropriate.

SEC. 8. STUDIES ON POST-SEPTEMBER 11, 2001, VETERANS AND SERIOUSLY INJURED VETERANS.

(a) LONGITUDINAL STUDY ON POST-9/11 VETERANS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall provide for the conduct of a longitudinal study on members of the Armed Forces who commenced service in the Armed Forces after September 11, 2001.

(2) GRANT OR CONTRACT.—The Secretary shall award a grant to, or enter into a contract with, an appropriate entity unaffiliated with the Department of Veterans Affairs to conduct the study required by paragraph (1).

(3) PLAN.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives a plan for the conduct of the study required by paragraph (1).

(4) REPORTS.—Not later than October 1, 2019, and every four years thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives a report on the results of the study required by paragraph (1) as of the date of such report.

(b) COMPREHENSIVE STUDY ON SERIOUSLY INJURED VETERANS AND THEIR CAREGIVERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall provide for the conduct of a comprehensive study on the following:

(A) Veterans who have incurred a serious injury or illness, including a mental health injury.

(B) Individuals who are acting as caregivers for veterans.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The comprehensive study required by paragraph (1) shall include the following with respect to each veteran included in such study:

(A) The health of the veteran and, if applicable, the impact of the caregiver of such veteran on the health of such veteran.

(B) The employment status of the veteran and, if applicable, the impact of the caregiver of such veteran on the employment status of such veteran.

(C) The financial status and needs of the veteran.

(D) The use by the veteran of benefits available to such veteran from the Department of Veterans Affairs.

(E) Any other information that the Secretary considers appropriate.

(3) GRANT OR CONTRACT.—The Secretary shall award a grant to, or enter into a contract with, an appropriate entity unaffiliated with the Department of Veterans Affairs to conduct the study required by paragraph (1).

(4) REPORT.—Not later than two years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives a report on the results of the study required by paragraph (1).

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 420—DESIGNATING THE WEEK OF OCTOBER 6 THROUGH OCTOBER 12, 2014, AS ''NATUROPATHIC MEDICINE WEEK'' TO RECOGNIZE THE VALUE OF NATUROPATHIC MEDICINE IN PROVIDING SAFE, EFFECTIVE, AND AFFORDABLE HEALTH CARE

Ms. MIKULSKI (for herself and Mr. HARKIN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 420

Whereas, in the United States, more than 75 percent of health care costs are due to preventable chronic illnesses, including high blood pressure, which affects 88,000,000 people in the United States, and diabetes, which affects 26,000,000 people in the United States;

Whereas nearly ⅔ of adults in the United States are overweight or obese and, consequently, at risk for serious health conditions, such as high blood pressure, diabetes, cardiovascular disease, arthritis, and depression;

Whereas 70 percent of people in the United States experience physical or nonphysical symptoms of stress, and stress can contribute to the development of major illnesses, such as cardiovascular disease, depression, and diabetes;

Whereas the aforementioned chronic health conditions are among the most common, costly, and preventable health conditions;

Whereas naturopathic medicine provides noninvasive, holistic treatments that support the inherent self-healing capacity of the human body and encourage self-responsibility in health care;

Whereas naturopathic medicine focuses on patient-centered care, the prevention of chronic illnesses, and early intervention in the treatment of chronic illnesses;

Whereas naturopathic physicians attend 4-year, graduate level programs that are accredited by agencies approved by the Department of Education;

Whereas aspects of naturopathic medicine have been shown to lower the risk of major illnesses such as cardiovascular disease and diabetes;

Whereas naturopathic physicians can help address the shortage of primary care providers in the United States;

Whereas naturopathic physicians are licensed in 20 States and territories;

Whereas naturopathic physicians are trained to refer patients to conventional physicians and specialists when necessary;

Whereas the profession of naturopathic medicine is dedicated to providing health care to underserved populations; and

Whereas naturopathic medicine provides consumers in the United States with more choice in health care, in line with the increased use of a variety of integrative medical treatments: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the week of October 6 through October 12, 2014, as ''Naturopathic Medicine Week'';

(2) recognizes the value of naturopathic medicine in providing safe, effective, and affordable health care; and

(3) encourages the people of the United States to learn about naturopathic medicine and the role that naturopathic physicians play in preventing chronic and debilitating illnesses and conditions.

SENATE RESOLUTION 421—EXPRESSING THE GRATITUDE AND APPRECIATION OF THE SENATE FOR THE ACTS OF HEROISM AND MILITARY ACHIEVEMENT BY THE MEMBERS OF THE UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES WHO PARTICIPATED IN THE JUNE 6, 1944, AMPHIBIOUS LANDING AT NORMANDY, FRANCE, AND COMMENDING THEM FOR LEADERSHIP AND VALOR IN AN OPERATION THAT HELPED BRING AN END TO WORLD WAR II

Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself and Ms. LANDRIEU) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 421

Whereas June 6, 2014, marks the 70th anniversary of the Allied assault at Normandy, France, by American, British, and Canadian troops, which was known as Operation Overlord;

Whereas, before Operation Overlord, the German Army still occupied France and the Nazi government still had access to the raw materials and industrial capacity of Western Europe;

Whereas the naval assault phase on Normandy was codenamed ''Neptune'', and the June 6th assault date is referred to as D-Day to denote the day on which the combat attack was initiated;

Whereas the D-Day landing was the largest single amphibious assault in history, consisting of approximately 31,000 members of the United States Armed Forces, 153,000 members of the Allied Expeditionary Force, 5,000 naval vessels, and more than 11,000 sorties by Allied aircraft;

Whereas soldiers of 6 divisions (3 American, 2 British, and 1 Canadian) stormed ashore in 5 main landing areas on beaches in Normandy, which were code-named ''Utah'', ''Omaha'', ''Gold'', ''Juno'', and ''Sword'';

Whereas, of the approximately 10,000 Allied casualties incurred on the first day of the landing, more than 6,000 casualties were members of the United States Armed Forces;

Whereas the age of the remaining World War II veterans and the gradual disappearance of any living memory of World War II and the Normandy landings make it necessary to increase activities intended to pass on the history of these events, particularly to younger generations;

Whereas the young people of Normandy and the United States have displayed unprecedented commitment to and involvement in celebrating the veterans of the Normandy landings and the freedom that they brought with them in 1944;

Whereas the significant material remains of the Normandy landing, such as shipwrecks and various items of military equipment found both on the Normandy beaches and at the bottom of the sea in French territorial waters, bear witness to the remarkable material resources used by the Allied Armed Forces to execute the Normandy landings;

Whereas 5 Normandy beaches and a number of sites on the Normandy coast, including Pointe du Hoc, were the scene of the Normandy landings, and constitute both now and for all time a unique piece of humanity's world heritage, and a symbol of peace and freedom, whose unspoilt nature, integrity, and authenticity must be protected at all costs; and

Whereas the world owes a debt of gratitude to the members of the ''greatest generation'' who assumed the task of freeing the world from Nazi and Fascist regimes and restoring liberty to Europe: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the 70th anniversary of the Allied amphibious landing on D-Day, June 6, 1944, at Normandy, France, during World War II;

(2) expresses gratitude and appreciation to the members of the United States Armed Forces who participated in the D-Day operations;

(3) thanks the young people of Normandy and the United States for their involvement in recognizing and celebrating the 70th Anniversary of the Normandy landings with the aim of making future generations aware of the acts of heroism and sacrifice performed by the Allied forces;

(4) recognizes the efforts of the Government of France and the people of Normandy to preserve, for future generations, the unique world heritage represented by the Normandy beaches and the sunken material remains of the Normandy landing, by inscribing them on the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) World Heritage List; and

(5) requests the President to issue a proclamation calling on the people of the United States to observe the anniversary with appropriate ceremonies and programs to honor the sacrifices of their fellow countrymen to liberate Europe.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, on June 6th, 1944, the brave men and women of the Allied Forces began the opening phase of Operation Overlord in an effort to break the Nazi stranglehold on Western Europe. On that early morning, 31,000 members of the United States Armed Forces, and 153,000 of their counterparts in the Allied Expeditionary Force, stormed ashore five landing areas on the beaches of Normandy, France, in what is known as D-Day. In that first day alone, approximately 10,000 allied soldiers were wounded or killed, including 6,000 Americans. Now, 70 years later, it remains our duty to remember the sacrifices made by the members of the ''greatest generation'' who answered the call of those being oppressed by the Nazi and Fascist regimes. In recognition of the incredible feats achieved by our veterans, the Parliament of the French Republic has asked to join us in the passage of an identical resolution in both bodies, honoring these sacrifices made in the name of liberty. As co-chairs of the Senate French Caucus, I have joined with Senator LANDRIEU to introduce this resolution to recognize the upcoming 70th Anniversary of the D-Day Landings and to express our gratitude and appreciation to the members of the U.S. Armed Forces who participated in these operations.

SENATE RESOLUTION 422—TO AUTHORIZE WRITTEN TESTIMONY, DOCUMENT PRODUCTION, AND REPRESENTATION IN MONTANA FISH, WILDLIFE AND PARKS FOUNDATION, INC. V. UNITED STATES

Mr. REID of Nevada (for himself and Mr. MCCONNELL) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 422

Whereas, in the case of *Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks Foundation, Inc. v. United States*, No. 09–568 C, pending in the United States Court of Federal Claims, the plaintiff has issued a subpoena for testimony and production of documents from Holly Luck, a former employee of Senator Baucus;

Whereas, pursuant to sections 703(a) and 704(a)(2) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, 2 U.S.C. §§288b(a) and 288c(a)(2), the Senate may direct its counsel to represent current and former employees of the Senate with respect to any subpoena, order, or request for testimony relating to their official responsibilities;

Whereas, by the privileges of the Senate of the United States and Rule XI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, no evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate may, by the judicial or administrative process, be taken from such control or possession but by permission of the Senate; and

Whereas, when it appears that evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate may promote the administration of justice, the Senate will take such action as will promote the ends of justice consistent with the privileges of the Senate: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Holly Luck is authorized to provide written testimony and produce documents in the case of *Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks Foundation, Inc. v. United States*, except concerning matters for which a privilege should be asserted.

SEC. 2. The Senate Legal Counsel is authorized to represent Holly Luck in connection with the written testimony and document production authorized by section 1 of this resolution.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2970. Mr. WARNER (for Mr. CARPER (for himself, Mr. COBURN, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. PORTMAN)) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 994, to expand the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 to increase accountability and transparency in Federal spending, and for other purposes.

SA 2971. Mr. WARNER (for Mr. CARPER) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2970 proposed by Mr. WARNER (for Mr. CARPER (for himself, Mr. COBURN, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. PORTMAN)) to the bill S. 994, supra.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 2970. Mr. WARNER (for Mr. CARPER (for himself, Mr. COBURN, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. PORTMAN)) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 994, to expand the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 to increase accountability and transparency in Federal spending, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Digital Accountability and Transparency Act of 2014'' or the ''DATA Act''.

SEC. 2. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this Act are to—

(1) expand the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 (31 U.S.C. 6101 note) by disclosing direct Federal agency expenditures and linking Federal contract, loan, and grant spending information to programs of Federal agencies to enable taxpayers and policy makers to track Federal spending more effectively;

(2) establish Government-wide data standards for financial data and provide consistent, reliable, and searchable Government-wide spending data that is displayed accurately for taxpayers and policy makers on USASpending.gov (or a successor system that displays the data);

(3) simplify reporting for entities receiving Federal funds by streamlining reporting requirements and reducing compliance costs while improving transparency;

(4) improve the quality of data submitted to USASpending.gov by holding Federal agencies accountable for the completeness and accuracy of the data submitted; and

(5) apply approaches developed by the Recovery Accountability and Transparency Board to spending across the Federal Government.

SEC. 3. AMENDMENTS TO THE FEDERAL FUNDING ACCOUNTABILITY AND TRANSPARENCY ACT OF 2006.

The Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 (31 U.S.C. 6101 note) is amended—

(1) in section 2—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''this section'' and inserting ''this Act'';

(ii) by redesignating paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) as paragraphs (2), (4), and (7), respectively;

(iii) by inserting before paragraph (2), as so redesignated, the following:

''(1) DIRECTOR.—The term 'Director' means the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.'';

(iv) by inserting after paragraph (2), as so redesignated, the following:

''(3) FEDERAL AGENCY.—The term 'Federal agency' has the meaning given the term 'Executive agency' under section 105 of title 5, United States Code.'';

(v) by inserting after paragraph (4), as so redesignated, the following:

''(5) OBJECT CLASS.—The term 'object class' means the category assigned for purposes of the annual budget of the President submitted under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, to the type of property or services purchased by the Federal Government.

''(6) PROGRAM ACTIVITY.—The term 'program activity' has the meaning given that term under section 1115(h) of title 31, United States Code.''; and

(vi) by adding at the end the following:

''(8) SECRETARY.—The term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of the Treasury.'';

(B) in subsection (b)—

(i) in paragraph (3), by striking ''of the Office of Management and Budget''; and

(ii) in paragraph (4), by striking ''of the Office of Management and Budget'';

(C) in subsection (c)—

(i) in paragraph (4), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(ii) in paragraph (5), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

''(6) shall have the ability to aggregate data for the categories described in paragraphs (1) through (5) without double-counting data; and

''(7) shall ensure that all information published under this section is available—

''(A) in machine-readable and open formats;

''(B) to be downloaded in bulk; and

''(C) to the extent practicable, for automated processing.'';

(D) in subsection (d)—

(i) in paragraph (1)(A), by striking ''of the Office of Management and Budget'';

(ii) in paragraph (2)—

(I) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''of the Office of Management and Budget''; and

(II) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''of the Office of Management and Budget'';

(E) in subsection (e), by striking ''of the Office of Management and Budget''; and

(F) in subsection (g)—

(i) in paragraph (1), by striking ''of the Office of Management and Budget''; and

(ii) in paragraph (3), by striking ''of the Office of Management and Budget''; and

(2) by striking sections 3 and 4 and inserting the following:

''SEC. 3. FULL DISCLOSURE OF FEDERAL FUNDS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of the Digital Accountability and Transparency Act of 2014, and monthly when practicable but not less than quarterly thereafter, the Secretary, in consultation with the Director, shall ensure that the information in subsection (b) is posted on the website established under section 2.

''(b) INFORMATION TO BE POSTED.—For any funds made available to or expended by a Federal agency or component of a Federal agency, the information to be posted shall include—

''(1) for each appropriations account, including an expired or unexpired appropriations account, the amount—

''(A) of budget authority appropriated;

''(B) that is obligated;

''(C) of unobligated balances; and

''(D) of any other budgetary resources;

''(2) from which accounts and in what amount—

''(A) appropriations are obligated for each program activity; and

''(B) outlays are made for each program activity;

''(3) from which accounts and in what amount—

''(A) appropriations are obligated for each object class; and

''(B) outlays are made for each object class; and

''(4) for each program activity, the amount—

''(A) obligated for each object class; and

''(B) of outlays made for each object class.

''SEC. 4. DATA STANDARDS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—

''(1) ESTABLISHMENT OF STANDARDS.—The Secretary and the Director, in consultation with the heads of Federal agencies, shall establish Government-wide financial data standards for any Federal funds made available to or expended by Federal agencies and entities receiving Federal funds.

''(2) DATA ELEMENTS.—The financial data standards established under paragraph (1) shall include common data elements for financial and payment information required to be reported by Federal agencies and entities receiving Federal funds.

''(b) REQUIREMENTS.—The data standards established under subsection (a) shall, to the extent reasonable and practicable—

''(1) incorporate widely accepted common data elements, such as those developed and maintained by—

''(A) an international voluntary consensus standards body;

''(B) Federal agencies with authority over contracting and financial assistance; and

''(C) accounting standards organizations;

''(2) incorporate a widely accepted, nonproprietary, searchable, platform-independent computer-readable format;

''(3) include unique identifiers for Federal awards and entities receiving Federal awards that can be consistently applied Government-wide;

''(4) be consistent with and implement applicable accounting principles;

''(5) be capable of being continually upgraded as necessary;

''(6) produce consistent and comparable data, including across program activities; and

''(7) establish a standard method of conveying the reporting period, reporting entity, unit of measure, and other associated attributes.

''(c) DEADLINES.—

''(1) GUIDANCE.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Digital Accountability and Transparency Act of 2014, the Director and the Secretary shall issue guidance to Federal agencies on the data standards established under subsection (a).

''(2) AGENCIES.—Not later than 2 years after the date on which the guidance under paragraph (1) is issued, each Federal agency shall report financial and payment information data in accordance with the data standards established under subsection (a).

''(3) WEBSITE.—Not later than 3 years after the date on which the guidance under paragraph (1) is issued, the Director and the Secretary shall ensure that the data standards established under subsection (a) are applied to the data made available on the website established under section 2.

''(d) CONSULTATION.—The Director and the Secretary shall consult with public and private stakeholders in establishing data standards under this section.

''SEC. 5. SIMPLIFYING FEDERAL AWARD REPORTING.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director, in consultation with relevant Federal agencies, recipients of Federal awards, including State and local governments, and institutions of higher education (as defined in section 102 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1002)), shall review the information required to be reported by recipients of Federal awards to identify—

''(1) common reporting elements across the Federal Government;

''(2) unnecessary duplication in financial reporting; and

''(3) unnecessarily burdensome reporting requirements for recipients of Federal awards.

''(b) PILOT PROGRAM.—

''(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Digital Accountability and Transparency Act of 2014, the Director, or a Federal agency designated by the Director, shall establish a pilot program (in this section referred to as the 'pilot program') with the participation of appropriate Federal agencies to facilitate the development of recommendations for—

''(A) standardized reporting elements across the Federal Government;

''(B) the elimination of unnecessary duplication in financial reporting; and

''(C) the reduction of compliance costs for recipients of Federal awards.

''(2) REQUIREMENTS.—The pilot program shall—

''(A) include a combination of Federal contracts, grants, and subawards, the aggregate value of which is not less than $1,000,000,000 and not more than $2,000,000,000;

''(B) include a diverse group of recipients of Federal awards; and

''(C) to the extent practicable, include recipients who receive Federal awards from multiple programs across multiple agencies.

''(3) DATA COLLECTION.—The pilot program shall include data collected during a 12-month reporting cycle.

''(4) REPORTING AND EVALUATION REQUIREMENTS.—Each recipient of a Federal award participating in the pilot program shall submit to the Office of Management and Budget or the Federal agency designated under paragraph (1), as appropriate, any requested reports of the selected Federal awards.

''(5) TERMINATION.—The pilot program shall terminate on the date that is 2 years after the date on which the pilot program is established.

''(6) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 90 days after the date on which the pilot program terminates under paragraph (5), the Director shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Committee on the Budget of the Senate and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform and the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives a report on the pilot program, which shall include—

''(A) a description of the data collected under the pilot program, the usefulness of the data provided, and the cost to collect the data from recipients; and

''(B) a discussion of any legislative action required and recommendations for—

''(i) consolidating aspects of Federal financial reporting to reduce the costs to recipients of Federal awards;

''(ii) automating aspects of Federal financial reporting to increase efficiency and reduce the costs to recipients of Federal awards;

''(iii) simplifying the reporting requirements for recipients of Federal awards; and

''(iv) improving financial transparency.

''(7) GOVERNMENT-WIDE IMPLEMENTATION.—Not later than 1 year after the date on which the Director submits the report under paragraph (6), the Director shall issue guidance to the heads of Federal agencies as to how the Government-wide financial data standards established under section 4(a) shall be applied to the information required to be reported by entities receiving Federal awards to—

''(A) reduce the burden of complying with reporting requirements; and

''(B) simplify the reporting process, including by reducing duplicative reports.

''SEC. 6. ACCOUNTABILITY FOR FEDERAL FUNDING.

''(a) INSPECTOR GENERAL REPORTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In accordance with paragraph (2), the Inspector General of each Federal agency, in consultation with the Comptroller General of the United States, shall—

''(A) review a statistically valid sampling of the spending data submitted under this Act by the Federal agency; and

''(B) submit to Congress and make publically available a report assessing the completeness, timeliness, quality, and accuracy of the data sampled and the implementation and use of data standards by the Federal agency.

''(2) DEADLINES.—

''(A) FIRST REPORT.—Not later than 18 months after the date on which the Director and the Secretary issue guidance to Federal agencies under section 4(c)(1), the Inspector General of each Federal agency shall submit and make publically available a report as described in paragraph (1).

''(B) SUBSEQUENT REPORTS.—On the same date as the Inspector General of each Federal agency submits the second and fourth reports under sections 3521(f) and 9105(a)(3) of title 31, United States Code, that are submitted after the report under subparagraph (A), the Inspector General shall submit and make publically available a report as described in paragraph (1). The report submitted under this subparagraph may be submitted as a part of the report submitted under section 3521(f) or 9105(a)(3) of title 31, United States Code.

''(b) COMPTROLLER GENERAL REPORTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In accordance with paragraph (2) and after a review of the reports submitted under subsection (a), the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress and make publically available a report assessing and comparing the data completeness, timeliness, quality, and accuracy of the data submitted under this Act by Federal agencies and the implementation and use of data standards by Federal agencies.

''(2) DEADLINES.—Not later than 30 months after the date on which the Director and the Secretary issue guidance to Federal agencies under section 4(c)(1), and every 2 years thereafter until the date that is 4 years after the date on which the first report is submitted under this subsection, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit and make publically available a report as described in paragraph (1).

''(c) RECOVERY ACCOUNTABILITY AND TRANSPARENCY BOARD DATA ANALYSIS CENTER.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may establish a data analysis center or expand an existing service to provide data, analytic tools, and data management techniques to support—

''(A) the prevention and reduction of improper payments by Federal agencies; and

''(B) improving efficiency and transparency in Federal spending.

''(2) DATA AVAILABILITY.—The Secretary shall enter into memoranda of understanding with Federal agencies, including Inspectors General and Federal law enforcement agencies—

''(A) under which the Secretary may provide data from the data analysis center for—

''(i) the purposes set forth under paragraph (1);

''(ii) the identification, prevention, and reduction of waste, fraud, and abuse relating to Federal spending; and

''(iii) use in the conduct of criminal and other investigations; and

''(B) which may require the Federal agency, Inspector General, or Federal law enforcement agency to provide reimbursement to the Secretary for the reasonable cost of carrying out the agreement.

''(3) TRANSFER.—Upon the establishment of a data analysis center or the expansion of a service under paragraph (1), and on or before the date on which the Recovery Accountability and Transparency Board terminates, and in addition to any other transfer that the Director determines is necessary under section 1531 of title 31, United States Code, there are transferred to the Department of the Treasury all assets identified by the Secretary that support the operations and activities of the Recovery Operations Center of the Recovery Accountability and Transparency Board relating to the detection of waste, fraud, and abuse in the use of Federal funds that are in existence on the day before the transfer.

''SEC. 7. CLASSIFIED AND PROTECTED INFORMATION.

''Nothing in this Act shall require the disclosure to the public of—

''(1) information that would be exempt from disclosure under section 552 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the 'Freedom of Information Act'); or

''(2) information protected under section 552a of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the 'Privacy Act of 1974'), or section 6103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

''SEC. 8. NO PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION.

''Nothing in this Act shall be construed to create a private right of action for enforcement of any provision of this Act.''.

SEC. 4. EXECUTIVE AGENCY ACCOUNTING AND OTHER FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT REPORTS AND PLANS.

Section 3512(a)(1) of title 31, United States Code, is amended by inserting ''and make available on the website described under section 1122'' after ''appropriate committees of Congress''.

SEC. 5. DEBT COLLECTION IMPROVEMENT.

Section 3716(c)(6) of title 31, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting ''(A)'' before ''Any Federal agency'';

(2) in subparagraph (A), as so designated, by striking ''180 days'' and inserting ''120 days''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(B) The Secretary of the Treasury shall notify Congress of any instance in which an agency fails to notify the Secretary as required under subparagraph (A).''.

SA 2971. Mr. WARNER (for Mr. CARPER) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2970 proposed by Mr. WARNER (for Mr. CARPER (for himself, Mr. COBURN, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. PORTMAN)) to the bill S. 994, to expand the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 to increase accountability and transparency in Federal spending, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 9, strike lines 17 through 21 and insert the following:

''(2) AGENCIES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), not later than 2 years after the date on which the guidance under paragraph (1) is issued, each Federal agency shall report financial and payment information data in accordance with the data standards established under subsection (a).

''(B) NONINTERFERENCE WITH AUDITABILITY OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Upon request by the Secretary of Defense, the Director may grant an extension of the deadline under subparagraph (A) to the Department of Defense for a period of not more than 6 months to report financial and payment information data in accordance with the data standards established under subsection (a).

''(ii) LIMITATION.—The Director may not grant more than 3 extensions to the Secretary of Defense under clause (i).

''(iii) NOTIFICATION.—The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall notify the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives of—

''(I) each grant of an extension under clause (i); and

''(II) the reasons for granting such an extension.

NOTICE OF HEARING

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Committee on Indian Affairs will meet on Wednesday, April 30, 2014, in room SD–628 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, at

2:30 p.m., to conduct a legislative hearing to receive testimony on the following bill: S. 2132, a bill to amend the Indian Tribal Energy Development and Self-Determination Act of 2005, and for other purposes. Those wishing additional information may contact the Indian Affairs Committee at (202) 224–2251.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 10, 2014, at 9:30 a.m.

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

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 10, 2014, at 9:30 a.m., in room SD–366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Keeping the Lights On—Are We Doing Enough to Ensure the Reliability and Security of the U.S. Electric Grid?''

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

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be authorized to meet, during the session of the Senate, on April 10, 2014, at 10 a.m., in room SD–430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Expanding Access to Quality Early Learning: the Strong Start for America's Children Act''.

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

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 10, 2014, at 10 a.m., in room SR–215 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''The President's Budget for Fiscal Year 2015.''

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

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 10, 2014, at 9:30 a.m., to hold a hearing entitled ''International Development Priorities in the FY 2015 Budget.''

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

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 10, 2014, at 2 p.m.

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

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 10, 2014, at 2:30 p.m.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EUROPEAN AFFAIRS

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 10, 2014, at 3 p.m., to hold an European Affairs subcommittee hearing entitled, ''Transatlantic Security Challenges: Central and Eastern Europe.''

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL AND CONTRACTING OVERSIGHT

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Financial and Contracting Oversight of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 10, 2014, at 10:30 a.m. to conduct a hearing entitled, ''Oversight of Small Agencies.''

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SEAPOWER

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Seapower of the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 10, 2014, at 2:30 p.m.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON STRATEGIC FORCES

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces of the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 10, 2014, at 2:30 p.m.

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

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Brian Winseck, a detailee assigned to the Budget Committee from Senator WARNER's office, be granted floor privileges for the duration of today's session.

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 5 p.m. tomorrow, all postcloture time be yielded back and the Senate proceed to vote without intervening action or debate on Calendar No. 574; further, that following disposition of that nomination, the Senate proceed to vote on cloture on Executive Calendar No. 613, and that if cloture is invoked, all postcloture time be yielded back and the Senate proceed to vote on confirmation of the nomination; that if confirmed, 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 nominations; that any statements related to the nominations be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider Calendar Nos. 760, 761, 762, 763, and 764, and all nominations placed on the Secretary's desk in the Coast Guard; that the nominations be confirmed en bloc; 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 any of the nominations; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

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

The nominations considered and confirmed en bloc are as follows:

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following named officers for appointment to the grade indicated in the United States Coast Guard under title 14, U.S.C., section 271(d):

To be rear admiral

Linda L. Fagan
Thomas W. Jones
Steven D. Poulin
James E. Rendon

The following named officer for appointment to a position of importance and responsibility in the United States Coast Guard and to the grade indicated under title 14, U.S.C., section 50:

To be vice admiral

Rear Adm. William D. Lee

The following named officer for appointment to a position of importance and responsibility in the United States Coast Guard and to the grade indicated under title 14, U.S.C., section 50:

To be vice admiral

Rear Adm. Charles W. Ray

The following named officer for appointment to a position of importance and responsibility in the United States Coast Guard and to the grade indicated under title 14, U.S.C., section 50:

To be vice admiral

Rear Adm. Charles D. Michel

The following named officer for appointment as Vice Commandant of the United States Coast Guard and to the grade indicated under title 14, U.S.C., section 47:

To be vice admiral

Vice Adm. Peter V. Neffenger

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK

IN THE COAST GUARD

PN1357 COAST GUARD nominations (2) beginning RUBY L. COLLINS, and ending MICHAEL W. WAMPLER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 16, 2014.

PN1358 COAST GUARD nominations (242) beginning William C. Adams, and ending Adam K. Young, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 16, 2014.

PN1402 COAST GUARD nominations (6) beginning KEVIN J. LOPES, and ending MARIETTE C. OGG, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 6, 2014.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session.

LEGAL AUTHORIZATION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 422.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 422) to authorize written testimony, document production, and representation in Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks Foundation, Inc. v. United States.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, this resolution concerns a subpoena to a Senate employee in a civil action pending in the Court of Federal Claims. The plaintiff in this case is an organization serving as trustee for a trust set up by Congress, through legislation sponsored by Senator Max Baucus, to promote conservation and recreational use of land in Montana. The suit arises out of a dispute between plaintiff and the Department of the Interior over the Department's amendment of the trust agreement with plaintiff. As part of discovery in the case, plaintiff has issued a subpoena to Holly Luck, a former employee of then-Senator Baucus, seeking information and documents involving this matter.

This resolution would authorize Ms. Luck to provide written testimony and to produce documents from Senator Baucus's office, except where a privilege should be asserted, with representation by the Senate Legal Counsel.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 422) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

APPOINTMENTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair announces, on behalf of the Republican leader, pursuant to Public Law 113–76, the appointment of the following individuals to be members of the National Commissioner on Hunger: Spencer A. Coates of Kentucky and J. Russell Sykes of New York.

ORDERS FOR FRIDAY, APRIL 11, 2014

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 4 p.m., Friday, April 11, 2014; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks, the Senate resume executive session to consider the Friedland nomination postcloture, with the time until 5 p.m. equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. REID. Mr. President, there will be up to three rollcall votes tomorrow at 5 p.m. The first vote will be on confirmation of the nomination of Michelle Friedland to be a U.S. circuit judge for the Ninth Circuit. The next vote will be a cloture vote on the nomination of David Weil to be Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division at the Department of Labor, and the last vote will be on confirmation of the Weil nomination.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 4 P.M. TOMORROW

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:05 p.m., adjourned until Friday, April 11, 2014, at 4 p.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

ROBERT M. SPEER, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE ARMY, VICE MARY SALLY MATIELLA, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

RAMIN TOLOUI, OF IOWA, TO BE A DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, VICE CHARLES COLLYNS, RESIGNED.

UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

JONATHAN NICHOLAS STIVERS, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR OF THE UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, VICE NISHA DESAI BISWAL, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

ALICE G. WELLS, OF WASHINGTON, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER–COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE HASHEMITE KINGDOM OF JORDAN.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

WILLIAM D. ADAMS, OF MAINE, TO BE CHAIRPERSON OF THE NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES FOR A TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE JAMES A. LEACH, RESIGNED.

THE JUDICIARY

NANCY B. FIRESTONE, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF FEDERAL CLAIMS FOR A TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS. (REAPPOINTMENT)

LYDIA KAY GRIGGSBY, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF FEDERAL CLAIMS FOR A TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS, VICE FRANCIS M. ALLEGRA, TERM EXPIRED.

THOMAS L. HALKOWSKI, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE A JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF FEDERAL CLAIMS FOR A TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS, VICE LYNN JEANNE BUSH, TERM EXPIRED.

FOREIGN SERVICE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED PERSONS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE FOR PROMOTION INTO AND WITHIN THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE TO THE CLASSES INDICATED:

CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, CLASS OF MINISTER–COUNSELOR:

MICHAEL A. LALLY, OF PENNSYLVANIA

CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, CLASS OF COUNSELOR:

JAMES M. FLUKER, OF KANSAS
JAMES M. MCCARTHY, OF MARYLAND
JOHN E. SIMMONS, OF CALIFORNIA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED PERSONS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE FOR APPOINTMENT AS FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF THE CLASSES STATED.

FOR APPOINTMENT AS FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS THREE, CONSULAR OFFICER AND SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

ANDREW J. BILLARD, OF CONNECTICUT
JOHN P. FAY, OF VIRGINIA
CATHERINE A. FEIG, OF TEXAS
MARSHA MCDANIEL, OF TEXAS
MEGAN A. SCHILDGEN, OF ILLINOIS

FOR APPOINTMENT AS FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS FOUR, CONSULAR OFFICER AND SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

DAVID E. AVERNE, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
JAY BIGGS, OF OHIO
MARTIN CLAESSENS, OF ILLINOIS
SARAH J. COOK, OF FLORIDA
RAFAEL A. PATINO, OF FLORIDA
BRENDA VANHORN, OF NEW YORK

THE FOLLOWING NAMED PERSONS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE FOR APPOINTMENT AS FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF THE CLASSES STATED.

FOR APPOINTMENT AS FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS ONE, CONSULAR OFFICER AND SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

MELINDA MASONIS, OF MICHIGAN
SUSAN C. N'GARNIM, OF VIRGINIA

FOR APPOINTMENT AS FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS TWO, CONSULAR OFFICER AND SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

THOMAS F. DOHERTY, OF FLORIDA
ANTHONY R. ETERNO, OF VIRGINIA
CATHERINE RODRIGUEZ, OF FLORIDA

FOR APPOINTMENT AS FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS THREE, CONSULAR OFFICER AND SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

CAROLINE M. SCHNEIDER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

FOR APPOINTMENT AS FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS FOUR, CONSULAR OFFICER AND SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

DINA J. ABAA–OGLEY, OF CALIFORNIA
LESLIE ABITZ, OF WISCONSIN
KATHY ELIZABETH ADAMS, OF GEORGIA
ANA V. ADLER, OF FLORIDA
ERIC LOUIS ADLER, OF CALIFORNIA
MAZIN TERRY ALFAQIH, OF CALIFORNIA
ANGELA MONICA ALLEN, OF NEW JERSEY
KURT W. ALLRED, OF TEXAS
ADRIAN JOHN AMEN, OF OREGON
ANNE CLAIRE D. ANDAYA–NAUTS, OF TEXAS
STEVEN E. ANDERSON, OF TEXAS
MELANIA RITA ARREAGA, OF ILLINOIS
KRIS ARVIND, OF ILLINOIS
THOMAS OWEN ASH, OF TEXAS
ELIZABETH ATEGOU, OF ILLINOIS
CHRISTOPHER M. AUSDENMOORE, OF TENNESSEE
AARON M. BANKS, OF NEW YORK
MOHAMMAD F. BARGHOUTY, OF NEW YORK
JENNIFER BARNES KERNS, OF TEXAS
ROBERT EDWARD BARNEY, OF ARIZONA
DIANA MICHELLE BATES, OF COLORADO
THOMAS P. BENZ, OF VIRGINIA
NAZANIN BERARPOUR, OF CALIFORNIA

NAMITA SHAH BIGGINS, OF NORTH CAROLINA
DAVID A. BIGGS, OF TEXAS
ROBERT EDWARD BLAKESLEE, OF FLORIDA
BION NORTHAM BLISS, OF MARYLAND
PATRICK THOMAS BOLAND, OF VIRGINIA
JEANETTE KATHRYN BRACKETT, OF FLORIDA
DUSTIN WILLIAM BRADSHAW, OF HAWAII
JESSICA LYNN BRADSHAW, OF PENNSYLVANIA
BRIAN D. BRENDEL, OF MICHIGAN
MICHAEL A. BROOKE, OF CALIFORNIA
CAROLINE N. BROUN, OF MISSOURI
CHERONDA E. BRYAN, OF TEXAS
CYNTHIA T. BURLEIGH, OF FLORIDA
BLAKE EDWARD BUTLER, OF TEXAS
JUSTIN SCOTT BYTHEWAY, OF UTAH
KATHERINE E. CANTRELL, OF TEXAS
ROBERT CAVESE, OF OHIO
DANIEL CEDERBERG, OF TEXAS
ELIZABETH CERABINO–HESS, OF CALIFORNIA
JAMES CERVEN, OF VIRGINIA
MEREDITH L. CHAMPLIN, OF FLORIDA
ISABELLE CHAN, OF MINNESOTA
VANNA CHAN, OF MINNESOTA
MATTHEW GLENN CHOWN, OF CALIFORNIA
JACOB CHRIQUI, OF CALIFORNIA
MICHAEL HUGH COGNATO, OF PENNSYLVANIA
BRADLEY STEWART COLEY, OF TEXAS
JASON ERIC CONROY, OF IOWA
EDWARD JOSEPH COX, OF OREGON
SARAH CRANSTON, OF TEXAS
M. KELLY CULLUM, OF MARYLAND
KARLA A. DANIELS, OF CALIFORNIA
KEVIN GREGORY DAUCHER, OF ARIZONA
JAMESON LEE DEBOSE, OF NEBRASKA
DIANE C. DEL ROSARIO, OF NEW YORK
STUART RICHARD DENYER, OF VIRGINIA
NATHAN SHANE DETTMAN, OF UTAH
CHRISTOPHER DE VEER, OF NEW YORK
THEODORE E. DIEHL, OF CALIFORNIA
TABARI AHMED DOSSETT, OF CALIFORNIA
NATHAN T. DOYEL, OF VIRGINIA
DAVID DREILINGER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
BAYLOR MCKAY DUNCAN, OF VIRGINIA
JEANIE MARIE DUWAN, OF VIRGINIA
BRETT DVORAK, OF INDIANA
MELANIE L. EDWARDS, OF LOUISIANA
RACHEL EHRENDREICH, OF NEW YORK
EVAN ELLIOTT, OF COLORADO
JOEL ANTHONY ERWIN, OF TEXAS
SAMANTHE A. EULETTE, OF NEW YORK
DANIEL GLENN EVENSEN, OF UTAH
TRAVIS WALTON FEUERBACHER, OF CALIFORNIA
ADAM J. FIELDS, OF WASHINGTON
JEROME S. FIELDS, OF MINNESOTA
NICHOLAS CHARLES FIETZER, OF MINNESOTA
JOEL A. FIFIELD, OF UTAH
JAMES PATRICK FINAN, OF WASHINGTON
SAMUEL N. FONTELA, OF FLORIDA
BENJAMIN TODD FORD, OF VIRGINIA
ELIZABETH FRANKENFIELD, OF VIRGINIA
M. SHAYNE GALLAHER, OF KENTUCKY
PATRICK S. GAN, OF WASHINGTON
EUGENE GARMIZE, OF NEW YORK
PATRICK CHRISTOPHER GERAGHTY, OF FLORIDA
THOMAS MICHAEL GODDARD, OF MICHIGAN
ERIN LEIGH GORDON, OF OHIO
MONICA COLMENARES GRECO, OF FLORIDA
CHRISTOPHER DOUGLAS GREEN, OF FLORIDA
DILLON MICHAEL GREEN, OF CALIFORNIA
MICHAEL GRIFFITH, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
LEWIS F. GROW, OF FLORIDA
KOFI GWIRA, OF NEW JERSEY
BERNADETTE REGINA HALAT, OF NEW YORK
BRIAN HALL, OF TEXAS
ERIK M. HALL, OF TEXAS
LYDIA S. HALL, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
MATTHEW ZAKIN HALLOWELL, OF NEW YORK
JOEL B. HANSEN, OF NEVADA
B. CAIN HARRELSON, JR., OF GEORGIA
JESSICA HARTZFELD, OF OHIO
LAILA MITCHELL HASAN, OF ARIZONA
NICHOLAS ADAM HASKO, OF WASHINGTON
JAMES LINDLEY HATHAWAY, OF MONTANA
JONATHAN LEIF HAYES, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
LARINA HELM KONOLD, OF IDAHO
NICHOLAS C. HERSH, OF PENNSYLVANIA
JOHN P. HESFORD, JR., OF VIRGINIA
EVA ELISE HOLM, OF WASHINGTON
MATTHEW M. HUGHES, OF PENNSYLVANIA
CHRISTOPHER NEIL HUNNICUTT, OF NORTH CAROLINA
KAREN E. HUNTRESS, OF MAINE
VI LUAT JACOBS-NHAN, OF WASHINGTON
BRYAN DAVID JANDORF, OF VIRGINIA
MARCUS GEORGE EDGAR JASONIDES, OF SOUTH DAKOTA
STEPHANIE ANGELA JENSBY, OF VIRGINIA
AMON O. JOHNSON, OF WASHINGTON
NOLEN JOHNSON, OF WISCONSIN
ROSS GORDON JOHNSTON, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
ELIZABETH YOUNG JONES, OF FLORIDA
MIN G. KANG, OF FLORIDA
AARON P. KARNELL, OF CALIFORNIA
MARGARET THOMSEN KATSUMI, OF MASSACHUSETTS
RICHARD P. KAUFMAN, OF TENNESSEE
MICHELLE MARGOT KAYSER, OF VERMONT
MAURA M. KENISTON, OF MARYLAND
ANNA M. KERNER ANDERSSON, OF SOUTH DAKOTA
KELLI KETOVER, OF FLORIDA
DANIEL A. KIEFER, OF FLORIDA
JULI S. KIM, OF TEXAS
KENDRA D. KIRKLAND, OF FLORIDA
ADAM C. KOTKIN, OF VIRGINIA
ELIZABETH E. KOZLOW, OF VIRGINIA
MICHAEL J. KREIDLER, OF FLORIDA
ANAND KRISHNA, OF CALIFORNIA
NANCY E. LAMANNA, OF CALIFORNIA
MARITA I. LAMB, OF PENNSYLVANIA
SONIA LAUL, OF TEXAS
ELIJAH PIA COCKETT LAWRENCE, OF UTAH
SUSAN BERNADETTE L'ECUYER, OF NEW JERSEY
YOUNG E. LEE, OF TEXAS
ERIKA REGINA LEWIS, OF ILLINOIS
NINA S. LEWIS, OF FLORIDA
FRANCESCA GRACE LICHAUCO, OF CALIFORNIA
ERIK D. LIEDERBACH, OF WISCONSIN
CHRISTINA F. LIM, OF VIRGINIA
JULIE M. LIMOGES, OF CONNECTICUT
JOHNNY J. LO, OF VIRGINIA
PETER CHARLES LOHMAN, OF VIRGINIA
SARAH KATHLEEN LONGBRAKE, OF OHIO
SARAH LUNDQUIST NUUTINEN, OF WISCONSIN
ANDERS EUGENE LYNCH, OF PENNSYLVANIA
STEPHEN C. MACLEOD, OF MARYLAND
MINTA ELAINE MADELEY, OF TEXAS
EVAN CAMPBELL MAHER, OF WASHINGTON
JOZANNE ML MALONEY, OF UTAH
JASON REID MARTIN, OF NEW YORK
LEAH ANN MARTIN, OF LOUISIANA
KENNETH W. MCBRIDE, OF MINNESOTA
KELLY RABELLO MCCALEB, OF VIRGINIA
RICK MCDANIEL, OF FLORIDA
MARGARET MCELLIGOTT, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
MEGHAN EMILY MCGILL, OF WASHINGTON
JOHN THORSEN MCKANE, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
ANSON PIERCE MCLELLAN, OF TEXAS
PETER JOSEPH MCSHARRY, OF MASSACHUSETTS
JONATHAN MARC MERMIS-CAVA, OF CALIFORNIA
PATRICK JOSEPH MERRILL, OF CALIFORNIA
GEORGE MARCELLUS MILLER, OF OKLAHOMA
SHAMIS MOHAMUD, OF VIRGINIA
MEAGHAN CHRISTINE MONFORT, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
STEPHANIE VAN HOFF MONIOT, OF FLORIDA
MICHELLE J. MORALES, OF FLORIDA
WILLIAM MORGAN, OF NEW JERSEY
AUDREY FERN STAMPER MOYER, OF VIRGINIA
BARBARA M. MOZDZIERZ, OF NEW YORK
TRAVIS J. MURPHY, OF KANSAS
MAUREEN D. MURRAY, OF OREGON
ALEXIS VESTA RUTH MUSSOMELI, OF WASHINGTON
LORENZO B. NEW III, OF FLORIDA
PHILIP DANIEL O'HARA, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
IFEOMA MARY FRANCES OKWUJE, OF MARYLAND
SERGEY OLHOVSKY, OF NEW JERSEY
KATHERINE EARHART ORDONEZ, OF GEORGIA
LUKE D. ORTEGA, OF ARIZONA
CLARE E. ORVIS, OF MASSACHUSETTS
ANDREW BELL PACELLI, OF ILLINOIS
GEOFFREY ADAM PARKER, OF VIRGINIA
MAREN ELIZABETH PAYNE-HOLMES, OF VIRGINIA
CHARLES JOHN PEREGO, OF PENNSYLVANIA
TIMOTHY M. PIERGALSKI, OF ILLINOIS
EITAN M. PLASSE, OF NEW YORK
LINDSEY MICHELE PLUMLEY, OF ARIZONA
REGIS PREVOT, OF MAINE
URFA QADRI, OF FLORIDA
MELISSA LEE QUARTELL, OF ILLINOIS
VENKATESH RAMACHANDRAN, OF FLORIDA
DARREL RICHARD RASMUSSEN, OF WISCONSIN
TOY INMAN REID, OF FLORIDA
NICHOLAS HICKSON REYNOLDS, OF VIRGINIA
AUSTIN R. RICHARDSON, OF COLORADO
MICHAEL KEITH RITCHIE, OF VIRGINIA
PETER JEROME RITTER, OF MINNESOTA
BRENDAN M. RIVAGE-SEUL, OF TEXAS
DANE RALPH ROBBINS, OF TENNESSEE
ERIN S. ROBERTSON, OF ALASKA
DAVID BIANCO ROCHFORD, OF LOUISIANA
GRIFFIN T. ROZELL, OF TEXAS
AARON J. RYAN, OF MINNESOTA
BRIGID J. RYAN, OF MARYLAND
RAPHAEL SAMBOU, OF CALIFORNIA
LAURA MARIE SANTINI, OF MINNESOTA
MICAH M. SAVIDGE, OF PENNSYLVANIA
GEORGINA SCARLATA, OF VIRGINIA
HEIDI J. SCHELLENGER, OF MAINE
RICHARD E. SCHILLING, JR., OF TENNESSEE
STACY MICHELLE SESSION, OF COLORADO
SOLMAZ SHARIFI, OF CALIFORNIA
SUCHETA SHARMA, OF GEORGIA
ADAM HARRIS SIGELMAN, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
ADAM SILVER, OF NEW JERSEY
PETER T. SLOAN, OF VIRGINIA
AMY L. SMITH, OF WISCONSIN
SAMANTHA H. SMITH, OF OREGON
TIMOTHY J. SMITH, OF WASHINGTON
KERRI P. SPINDLER-RANTA, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
RAJ SRIRAM, OF NEW YORK
WILLIAM A. STARK, OF ARKANSAS
JACOB DARYL STEVENS, OF WASHINGTON
ROBERT MURRAY STEVENS, OF FLORIDA
MAXWELL HARPER STONEMAN, OF UTAH
WALLACE FRANKLIN STURM III, OF ILLINOIS
DAWN MICHELLE SUNI, OF FLORIDA
DAVID ALLEN SWALLEY, OF CALIFORNIA
MARK TEMPLER, OF ARIZONA
MIA TER HAAR, OF CALIFORNIA
CHRISTINA IRENE TILGHMAN, OF VIRGINIA
JAY B. TRELOAR, OF FLORIDA
JULIUS N. TSAI, OF VIRGINIA
AMANDA JEAN TYSON, OF VIRGINIA
SHARI LEE ULERY, OF COLORADO
MATTHEW CARL UNDERWOOD, OF CALIFORNIA
ANDREEA DANIELA URSU, OF VIRGINIA
ADAM K. VANDERVORT, OF VIRGINIA
PHILLIP J. VANHORN, OF TEXAS
LISA NUCH VENBRUX, OF PENNSYLVANIA
JESSE FREIMAN VICTOR, OF FLORIDA
KEVIN JAKOB VOGEL, OF TEXAS
MELISSA DAATON VONHINKEN, OF VIRGINIA
JUSTIN THOMAS WALLS, OF TEXAS
CODY CANTWELL WALSH, OF NEW YORK
DAVID M. WALTER, OF TEXAS
CHRISTOPHER DANIEL WALTON, OF CALIFORNIA
JONATHAN M. WEADON, OF MARYLAND
NATHAN WEBBER, OF UTAH
MATTHEW B. WEST, OF VIRGINIA
SEAN PATRICK WHALEN, OF TEXAS
STEFAN ROBERT WHITNEY, OF NEW YORK
SETH AARON WIKAS, OF OHIO
NATALIE WILKINS, OF COLORADO
BENJAMIN STEVEN WILLIAMS, OF TEXAS
MATTHEW JAMES WILSON, OF UTAH
CHRISTOPHER JOSEPH WILZ, OF CALIFORNIA
JEREMY R. WISEMILLER, OF FLORIDA
SAM WORLAND-ESQUITH, OF VIRGINIA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED MEMBERS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE TO BE CONSULAR OFFICERS AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

DANA SCOTT ADKINS, OF VIRGINIA
JULIE PETERS AKEY, OF VIRGINIA
SANDI R. B. ALLAWAY, OF OREGON
CHRISTOPHER N. ALLEN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
LINA ANDERSON, OF VIRGINIA
ANTOINE ABI ANTOUN, OF VIRGINIA
MICHAEL T. AZZARELLA, OF VIRGINIA
NARAYAN BADHEY, OF NEW YORK
EMILY S. BAKER, OF VIRGINIA
ALISON FLANIGAN BASSI, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
DANIEL JAMES BEAUCHAMP, OF ARIZONA
SARAH M. BELOUSOV, OF FLORIDA
WILLIAM C. BLISS, JR., OF VIRGINIA
JAMES S. BLITZET, OF VIRGINIA
ANDRA BONET, OF VIRGINIA
STRAUN WOLFE BOSTON, OF CALIFORNIA
MARISSA BRADLEY, OF SOUTH DAKOTA
MATTHEW D. BRAVO, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
SHANNON MARIE BRINK, OF COLORADO
ANTHONY BROSNAN, OF MISSOURI
ERIC W. BROWN, OF VIRGINIA
TUCKER AVINGTON BROWN, OF GEORGIA
ALEJANDRO BULNES, OF VIRGINIA
JOEL A. BURGER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
PETER DAVID BURGESS, OF WASHINGTON
BRYAN THOMAS BURKE, OF VIRGINIA
ALAN M. BURRIS, OF VIRGINIA
JAMES D. BURRISS, OF VIRGINIA
SADE D. CAMPBELL, OF VIRGINIA
FRANK A. CARDAMONE IV, OF MARYLAND
EDWARD SCOTT CARDEN, OF TEXAS
OLGA TERESA CARDENAS, OF VIRGINIA
TIMOTHY RYAN CARPENTER, OF TEXAS
BRIAN CARR, OF VIRGINIA
THOMAS G. CECIL, OF KENTUCKY
BRYAN CHAMBERLAIN, OF UTAH
REMONA G. CHARLES, OF VIRGINIA
PETER H. CHENG, OF VIRGINIA
HAT NIM CHOI, OF VIRGINIA
DARIN CHRISTENSEN, OF OREGON
VINCENT GABRIEL CILLI, OF PENNSYLVANIA
ADAM R. COLVIN, OF ALABAMA
EDWARD J. DANIELSON, OF VIRGINIA
CHRISTOPHER SEAN DAVEY, OF VIRGINIA
RENE P. DAVIDSON, OF VIRGINIA
CRAIG DENNISON, OF IOWA
PATRICK G. DIGNAN, OF FLORIDA
ROBERT EDWARD DILLON, OF VIRGINIA
COLIN JOHN DONOVAN, OF WISCONSIN
DANIEL W. EBERT, OF TEXAS
KEVIN GERARD ELLERBROCK, OF OHIO
MARK L. EVANS, OF TENNESSEE
MARK FERULLO, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
MANDY ZHANG FEUERBACHER, OF CALIFORNIA
NEIL PATRICK FINNEGAN, OF MASSACHUSETTS
JOHN R. FINNELL, OF MASSACHUSETTS
MARGARET A. FISHER, OF CALIFORNIA
PATRICK M. FITZGERALD, OF VIRGINIA
KEITH L. FLICK, OF VIRGINIA
DARIN M. FOSTER, OF NEW MEXICO
ANNA V. FRAVEL, OF VIRGINIA
MONIKA J. GALVYDIS, OF VIRGINIA
DANIELA GARRETON PEREZ, OF CALIFORNIA
STACY ANN GORDONI, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
TRACY ANNE MILLER GOSAR, OF VIRGINIA
BRANDON S. GRIFFITHS, OF CONNECTICUT
VIKRAM GUPTA, OF VIRGINIA
PHILLIP MAX GUTHRIE, OF TEXAS
TARA N. HALL, OF KANSAS
JOSEPH HARBOUK, OF VIRGINIA
BRIAN NASH HARDESTY, OF VIRGINIA
MICHAEL M. HARMON, OF NEW YORK
KELLY E. HARRINGTON, OF VIRGINIA
KELLY LYNN HART, OF RHODE ISLAND
MARCO A. HERNANDEZ, OF TEXAS
CONOR D. HICKTON, OF VIRGINIA
STEPHANIE A. HICKTON, OF VIRGINIA
TRAVIS C. HIGGINS, OF VIRGINIA
LEE ANDREW HILGARTNER, OF ALASKA
RACHEL C. HINES, OF MARYLAND
DENNIE HOOPINGARNER, OF MICHIGAN
WILLIAM CHARLES HOPE, OF WASHINGTON
JENNIFER N. HUBBARD, OF VIRGINIA
ARIEL ANGELA HUERTA, OF CALIFORNIA
CHELSEA LYNNE HUTCHINSON, OF ILLINOIS
TODD ALAN JURKOWSKI, OF FLORIDA
COURTNEY M. KAPLIN, OF VIRGINIA
ALAN D. KATZ, OF FLORIDA
DIVYA D. KHOSLA, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
ERICA G. KIEHL, OF VIRGINIA
KRISTIN E. KIEL, OF VIRGINIA
YURI P. KIM, OF VIRGINIA
GAIL LANE-GRIFFITH KIRTLEY, OF MARYLAND
NICHOLAS ANTHONY KLINGER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
ANASTASIA MAE KOLIVAS, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
ABRAHAM Y. LEE, OF MARYLAND

JOSHUA LEE, OF VIRGINIA
RANDY C. LEE, OF VIRGINIA
ANDREW G. LEYVA, OF VIRGINIA
PATRICK J. LOMBARDO, OF MICHIGAN
DAVID J. LONGENECKER, OF VIRGINIA
KRISTIN M. LUNDBERG, OF VIRGINIA
MATTHEW MAJERNIK, OF MARYLAND
CALEB K. MAK, OF WASHINGTON
FAITH KROEKER MAUS, OF MINNESOTA
SEAN D. MCGINNIS, OF PENNSYLVANIA
THOMAS J. MCGOWAN, OF VIRGINIA
LAURA B. MCINTYRE, OF VIRGINIA
ROCHELLE L. MCMURRAY, OF VIRGINIA
TIMOTHY SIMON MCNALLY, OF ILLINOIS
GARHETT GRAHAM MECHAM, OF MARYLAND
OMAR W. MEDINA, OF MARYLAND
KEVIN ANDREW MILES, OF KANSAS
KENNETH C. MILLEN, OF FLORIDA
KEVIN B. MILLS, OF VIRGINIA
ADNAN SUNNY MITHANI, OF TEXAS
BRYAN S. MONTEITH, OF VIRGINIA
DAVID E. MOORE, OF CALIFORNIA
CYNTHIA MORENO, OF TEXAS
ROBERT R. MORTON II, OF VIRGINIA
CHELSEA E. MOTTER, OF VIRGINIA
LAURA A. MURPHY, OF VIRGINIA
ANDREW R. NELSEN, OF VIRGINIA
KEITH C. NELSON, OF VIRGINIA
COURTNEY E. NICOLAISEN, OF VIRGINIA
FRED FURAT ODISHO, OF ILLINOIS
MICHAEL ARI OSKIN, OF ILLINOIS
ANDREW H. PAGE, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
RICHARD J. PARR, OF TEXAS
LYNN M. PARTIK, OF VIRGINIA
KURT PEARSON, OF WASHINGTON
RICHARD E. PINKHAM, OF OHIO
NATHAN MARC PINKUS, OF FLORIDA
CHRISTOPHER JAMES PISTULKA, OF SOUTH DAKOTA
CALEB PORTNOY, OF MASSACHUSETTS
JUSTIN MICHAEL PRAIRIE, OF MARYLAND
PAIGE LINCOLN THORNER PUNTSO, OF VIRGINIA
STACI RAAB, OF VIRGINIA
STEPHANIE L. REMAR, OF VIRGINIA
RYAN M. REYNOLDS, OF UTAH
CHARLES LEWIS RIDLEY, OF FLORIDA
ROYAL S. RIPLEY, OF FLORIDA
JUDD L. ROBERTSON, OF VIRGINIA
BRITTANY ELIZABETH ROGERSON, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
RANDY L. ROOT, OF VIRGINIA
SEAN WHITING RUTHE, OF TEXAS
ANDREA MARIE SANTORO, OF GEORGIA
STEPHEN E. SAWKA, OF PENNSYLVANIA
MARK JOHN SCHAVER, OF KENTUCKY
BRITTANY A. SCHICK, OF OKLAHOMA
KATHRYNE SCHILLING, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
DONALD R. SEMON, OF CONNECTICUT
DAMON SEXTON, OF VIRGINIA
AMELIA SHAW, OF NEW YORK
CRYSTAL SHERIDAN, OF VIRGINIA
NABIL SIDDIQI, OF VIRGINIA
GENEVIEVE C. SIEBENGARTNER, OF OREGON
NICHOLAS SHEAHAN SIEGEL, OF VIRGINIA
HANNAH SIN, OF CALIFORNIA
RICHARD N. SLOANE, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
JEFFREY SPOON, OF VIRGINIA
SARAH RACHEL STEPHENS, OF OKLAHOMA
FREDERICK W. THIELKE, OF VIRGINIA
SCOTT C. TUTTLE, OF NEW YORK
CHRIS J. TYLER, OF MARYLAND
MATTHEW THOMAS VAN WAES, OF NEW YORK
OREN VARNAI, OF MARYLAND
JEREMY VENTUSO, OF CALIFORNIA
HEATHER E. WADSWORTH, OF VIRGINIA
JOSHUA W. WALKER, OF VIRGINIA
MERRY MICHELLE WALKER, OF MICHIGAN
BART J. WALKINS, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
JESSICA E. WARDER, OF FLORIDA
MICHAEL Y. WARDER, JR., OF FLORIDA
MICHELLE KRISTINE WARREN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
KATHRYN WESTLUND, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
JOEL R. WILLETT, OF KENTUCKY
CALDWELL R. WILLIG, OF KENTUCKY
NICOLAS ROBERT WISECARVER, OF VIRGINIA
SHIRLENE YEE, OF ARIZONA
VERA ZDRAVKOVA, OF IDAHO
DA YU ZHAO, OF VIRGINIA
JEFFREY R. ZIHLMAN, OF VIRGINIA

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. SAMUEL A. GREAVES

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. JOHN F. THOMPSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be brigadier general

COL. LEE E. PAYNE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. WARREN D. BERRY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. JON A. NORMAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be brigadier general

COL. RICKY N. RUPP

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be brigadier general

COL. WALTER J. LINDSLEY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 8081:

To be major general

COL. ROOSEVELT ALLEN, JR.

THE FOLLOWING AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

To be brigadier general

COL. RICHARD W. KELLY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. CARLTON D. EVERHART II

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. DARRYL L. ROBERSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. ELLEN M. PAWLIKOWSKI

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. KAREN E. DYSON

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) MATHIAS W. WINTER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. THOMAS W. LUSCHER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) ERIC C. YOUNG

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. KEITH M. JONES

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) JANET R. DONOVAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) MARTHA E. G. HERB
REAR ADM. (LH) JOHN F. WEIGOLD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) ALTHEA H. COETZEE
REAR ADM. (LH) VALERIE K. HUEGEL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) BRIAN B. BROWN
REAR ADM. (LH) SEAN R. FILIPOWSKI
REAR ADM. (LH) BRETT C. HEIMBIGNER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPTAIN KEVIN C. HAYES
CAPTAIN DANIEL B. HENDRICKSON
CAPTAIN THOMAS G. RECK
CAPTAIN LINDA R.D. WACKERMAN
CAPTAIN MATTHEW A. ZIRKLE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) SEAN S. BUCK
REAR ADM. (LH) MARK W. DARRAH
REAR ADM. (LH) MICHAEL M. GILDAY
REAR ADM. (LH) JEFFREY A. HARLEY
REAR ADM. (LH) KEVIN J. KOVACICH
REAR ADM. (LH) DIETRICH H. KUHLMANN III
REAR ADM. (LH) VICTORINO G. MERCADO
REAR ADM. (LH) JOHN C. SCORBY, JR.
REAR ADM. (LH) JOHN W. SMITH, JR.
REAR ADM. (LH) RICHARD P. SNYDER
REAR ADM. (LH) SCOTT A. STEARNEY
REAR ADM. (LH) JOSEPH E. TOFALO

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUAL FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant colonel

SCOTT A. RABER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be major

MARK D. LEVIN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be major

JEREMY P. GARLICK
DERICK A. SAGER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be major

TONYA Y. WHITE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

DANIEL L. ROSERA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

JASON E. OBRIEN
ERIK D. RUDIGER

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

STANLEY F. ZEZOTARSKI

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

ERIC S. COMETTE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

WILLIAM D. SWENSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

GREGORY R. SHEPARD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be colonel

DAVID F. CAPORICCI
JAMES G. JONES
LARRY M. PINKERTON, JR.
WILLIAM C. REITEMEYER
CHRISTOPHER L. SELVEY
TYLER B. SMITH
DAVID J. UNDERWOOD
ERIC G. WISHART

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

STEPHEN R. ABRAMS
LEONEL B. ACOBA
VASILIOS AGAPIOS
PAUL W. ALDAYA
DANIEL R. ALEXANDER
CHRISTOPHER R. ALLEN
NATASJA K. ALLEN
CARLOS D. ALVAREZ
MATTHEW D. APOSTOL
CHRISTOPHER M. ARDOHAIN
BRYAN B. AULT
ALEXANDER D. BAILEY
SCOTT M. BAILEY
BRIAN M. BAPTIST
JODY L. BARTH
TRISH A. BASILE
JENNIFER L. BATES
TIFFANY R. BATISTE
SCOTT A. BEAL
BRIAN R. BECK
RACHEL K. BECK
DAVID R. BEERS, JR.
JOHN R. BELANGER
LAUREN J. BELL
PATRICK J. BELL
MICHAEL G. BENNER
WILLIAM R. BENNETT
BRADFORD M. BETHEA II
PAUL M. BISHOP
CHRISTOPHER S. BIZOR
CHARLES L. BONDURANT
JEFFREY M. BONHEIM
JONATHAN S. BORDERS
DWAYNE E. BOWDEN
SAMUEL J. BOYD
ALAN R. BOYES
CRAIG A. BREWER
TIMOTHY M. BROOKS
QUENTIN L. BROWN
TERRENCE T. BRUNO
DOLORES R. BRYANT
KRISTEN M. BUMCROT
MARREO T. BURCH
DAX E. BURROUGHS
SPENCER R. CALDER
CHRISTOPHER N. CAMPBELL
DANIEL C. CANCHOLA
GLEN E. CARR II
PAUL M. CARROLL
JERMAINE A. CARTER
JOHNATHAN N. CARTER
RONALD A. CARTER
DANIEL D. CASTLE
RAYLEE D. CAVAZOSCAVASIER
CHANEL M. CHAMBERLIN
KENYARDA A. CHAMBERS
ALICIA R. CHAPMAN
REBECCA B. CHARLES
CHRISTOPHER J. CHRISTIANA
WOOWON CHUNG
BARRIE J. CIOTTI
ROBERT W. CLARKE, JR.
TRICIA M. CLARKE
MARC D. CLEVELAND
SAMUEL E. CLONCH
GARRETT A. CLOSE
LOUIS D. COGSWELL
RYAN E. COLLINS
SERGIO CONTRERAS, JR.
JAMES R. COOKE
MICHAEL P. COOKE
DAVID R. COOPER
STEPHEN T. COPPEDGE
CHAD D. CORBIN
DANNY P. CORNEJO
DAVID L. CORNELIUS
NANCY I. CORTES
BRENT P. COURTNEY
WAYNE J. DAHL, JR.
JEFFREY A. DALEY
JASON K. DAVIDSON
EVAN R. DAVIES
KRISHNA L. DAVIS
MICHAEL R. DAVIS
WILLIAM J. DENN
BRIAN A. DEVLIN
AMANDA G. DODD
CHRISTOPHER A. DRERUP
DUSTIN W. DURST
JORDAN J. EARLEY
ADAM R. EATON
NOAH A. EMERYMORRIS
D S. EPSTEIN
CRYSTAL D. ERNST
SAMUEL O. FADARE
TERRANCE E. FAVAROTH
ERIN L. FELLA
AARON J. FERGUSON
MATTHEW D. FERGUSON
JEFFREY R. FIELDS
SLOAN C. FISK
AARON S. FLETCHER
MARAEA M. A. FLUKER
MATTHEW J. FONTAINE
NICHOLAS R. FORLENZA
STEVEN L. FOSTER
JEREMY J. FOX
MICHAEL A. FRAAS
ANDREW E. FULTON
BRANDON M. FULTON
THOMAS S. FURMAN
THOMAS L. GAINES
KELLEY L. GALLOWAY
ARTURO M. GARCIA, JR.
ANDREW D. GARDNER
VITALY D. GELFGAT
DANIEL J. GERSHEY
SARAH E. GET
WALTER A. GIBBONS
ANDREW D. GIESEY
MICHAEL A. GLOVER
BENJAMIN W. L. GONG
EDUARDO A. GONZALEZ
JUSTIN S. GRATZEL
EDWARD W. GREEN, JR.
KYLE A. GREENBERG
ROBERT L. GRIER
ANDREW Z. GRIMES
ALFRED W. GRISSIM, JR.
MATTHEW P. GROSS
ALLAN C. GRYSKEWICZ
JASON C. HALL
JEFFREY R. HAMER
GREGORY I. HAMILTON
DAVID L. HAMLIN
MATTHEW D. HARDY
STEPHEN B. HARKER
MICHAEL S. HARMISON
BRIAN J. HARRIS
CLYDE D. HARRIS
MARK R. HASEMAN
WALTER G. HEDRICK IV
MICHELLE A. HENDERSON
STEPHANIE D. HENDERSON
WILLIAM J. HENNESSY
THOMAS M. HICKEY
ANDREW J. HIGHTOWER
DRUANN HILL
JASON C. HILLMAN
NICHOLAS J. HITT
MAURIO S. HOLSTON
NICHOLAS M. HOLTZ
CLARISA A. HORTON
PAUL E. HOUK
DANIEL R. HUDALLA
EDWARD A. HUDSON
BLAKE K. HUFF
DAVID S. HULSE
TAMAR N. HURDITT
JASON P. HUSSEY
SCOTT A. HUTCHISON
SHAMEKA T. HYDER
OTIS J. INGRAM
JOSEPH L. JACKSON
JOSEPH A. JAUNICH
NICHOLAS D. JEFFERSON
JACOB M. JENDREY
SPENGER JEUNE
ANDREW R. JOHNSON
JUSTIN L. JOHNSON
MATTHEW J. JOHNSON
TIMOTHY M. JONES
STEPHEN J. JOOSTEN
TODD C. JUSTICE
LINCOLN L. KAFFENBERGER
BRIAN P. KALAHER
MUSTAFA KAMALREZA
ISSA KAMARA
BARCLAY D. KEAY
ROBERT D. KEELER
CHRISTOPHER J. KEGEL
LEJUANA L. KEHL
NICHOLAS A. KEIPPER
EVAN B. KELLY
ANDREW R. KEMP
BRITNEY E. KENNEDY
DARREN J. KERR
BENJAMIN J. KIM
JACOB J. KIM
DANIEL J. KOEPKE
JAMES P. KOLKY
NICHOLAS J. KRANITES
MICHAEL W. KUMMERER
MERLIN J. KYNASTON
DANIEL P. LAAKSO
TIMOTHY W. LAMBERT
JAMES M. LAMBRIGHT
ERIK J. LAMPE
BRIAN S. LANEY
CHRISTOPHER M. LAREAU
TIMOTHY H. LAWRENCE
COLIN L. LAYNE
BRIAN G. LEBIEDNIK
ANDREW J. LEE
PAUL H. LEE
NATHAN A. LEPPERT
CHRISTOPHER S. LILL
JOSHUA B. LIMBERG
NICHOLAS R. LINSE
JESSAMYN J. LIU
JOHN C. LIVINGSTON
PETERO LOLE
JAMIE C. LONG
LEE C. LORENZ
IZABELLA LUNDY
KYLE R. LUOMA
PAUL A. LUSHENKO
SANTINO A. MAFFEI
RYAN J. MANN
MARVIN S. MARK
WILLIAM N. MARMION
DAVID W. MATHEW
DEAN A. MATHIS
MICHELLE S. MCCARROLL
QUENTIN D. MCCART
RICHARD J. MCCUAN
JOSHUA L. MCDONALD
TIMOTHY M. MCGEE
PAUL MCKNIGHT
JOSHUA S. MEADOR
GILBERT C. MENDOZA
JOSHUA A. MENDOZA
SAUL MEREJO
JASON W. MERRIMAN
RICARDO MEZA
RICHARD K. MICHEL
GREGORY J. MINETOS
TABBER N. MINTZ
TYLER J. MITCHELL
TYRONE A. MOORE
JASON R. MORALES
MALIKAH S. MORGAN
MARCUS A. MORGAN
EROL K. MUNIR
RYAN M. NEELY
FRANCIS S. NELSON
RUSSELL J. NELSON
RYAN M. NELSON
UCHENNA K. NJOKU
PRISCELLA A. NOHLE
CHRISTIAN S. W. NOUMBA
SAMUEL E. NUXOLL
JOHN M. OLIVER
COURTNEY R. OLSON
KYLE D. PACKARD
JENNIFER R. PARKER
NATHAN L. PARKER
DAVID S. PARSONS
JOSHUA J. PASSER
EDWARD D. PATTERSON
STEVEN P. PATTERSON
BRANDON H. PAYNE
MICHAEL J. PEDERSON
DANIEL P. PESATURE
DAVID J. PETERSON
SPENCER W. PHILLIPS
TIFFANY L. PHILLIPS
NICHOLAS B. PICKFORD
MATTHEW J. PICKLE
FRANTZ PIERRE
THOMAS C. PLANT
FRANCISCO R. POLZIN
ERIC F. PRAZINKO
AARON M. PROBST
JOELLE S. QUIAPO
CHRISTOPHER J. RANKIN
ANDREW J. RAYMOND
FRANK D. REMILLARD
AARON J. RETTKE
JOEL W. RHEA
BRANDON W. RICHARDS
PAUL F. RICKMEYER
DANIEL W. RIESENBERGER
ROBERT D. RIGGS
AARON S. RITZEMA
JEAN F. RIVERAGARCIA
ELIEZER D. RIVERALOPEZ
ANGEL L. ROBLES
DAVID G. RODRIGUEZ
JESUS S. RODRIGUEZ
VIVIANA RODRIGUEZ
STEPHANIE ROGERS
DAVID ROKHLIN
MARTIN R. ROSARIO
JAMES F. ROSEBERY
JERWIN P. RUAZOL
COREY H. RUCKDESCHEL
JOSEPH D. RUHL
KEVIN M. RYAN
BENJAMIN J. RYDER
SIMON D. SANCHEZ
ANDREW R. SANDSTRUM
RANDY C. SCHNELL
RAYMOND C. SCHULTZ
JOSHUA D. SCHULZ
JASON H. SEALES
KERRIE M. SECOND
DONALD E. SEDIVY
RYAN M. SEE
BENJAMIN J. SEIBERT
MICHAEL D. SEMINELLI
REZA SHAMS
MICHELLE L. SHARP
VICTOR M. SHEPHERD
JASON J. SHERRILL
CHRISTOPHER E. SHERWOOD
WILLIAM J. SHIELDS
HEIDI B. SHIRLEY
ERIC J. SIDIO
JASON T. SILER
MICHAEL P. SILVERMAN
CHRISTOPHER W. SIMS
ARKORN SINGHASENI
DAVID P. SINON
JESSE L. SKATES
TAD A. SLATTER
CAROL M. SMITH
KEVIN R. SMITH
PHILIP J. SMITH
VALARIE A. SOLIS
CAMERO K. W. SONG
TIMOTHY P. SORENSEN
STEVEN K. SOUZA
WILLIE C. SPENCER II
CHRISTOPHER M. STACY

CASSANDRA L. STALL
JAMES J. STALL
ROBIN A. STARK
AUSTIN T. STARKEN
CRAIG D. STARN
BERRY M. STATON
BRITTIANE V. STATON
ZACHARY M. STAUDTER
PATRICK R. STAUFFER
JONATHAN D. STJOHN
ERIC R. STOLLE
DANIEL S. SUMMERS
ERIC A. SWETT
JEFFREY S. SWINFORD
DERRICK N. SYED
CALVIN W. TAETZSCH
JONATHAN C. TAYLOR
JASON P. TEMPLET
WILBERT E. THIBODEAUX III
DONALD W. THOMAS
RODNEY J. THOMAS
KATIE L. THOMEN
LYNDSEY L. THOMPSON
MATTHEW K. THOMPSON
ARTURO A. TIBAYAN
AUDREY T. TIUMALU
DARIA A. TOLER
TREVER P. TOLER
KENNETH E. TORRES
DAVID K. TOY
JASON A. TURNER
NICHOLAS R. TURNER
MICHAEL A. VALENTINE
CHARLES M. VANOTTEN
DOUGLAS R. VASQUEZ
MARC C. VIELLEDENT
MICHAEL D. VILLALOBOS
PATRICK S. WACHUTKA
CHRISTOPHER S. WADSWORTH
CHRISTOPHER J. WAGENER
JOSEPH W. WALKER
JOSHUA R. WALKER
MARLON A. WALKER
SAMUEL M. WALKER
SCOTT D. WARES
MATTHEW D. WATERFIELD
JAMES B. WEAKLEY
ANNAH M. WEAVER
BRITTANY L. WEIGHTMAN
BRYANT A. WELLMAN
ASHLEY E. WELTE
RYAN M. WEMPE
BRENDAN T. WENTZ
MATTHEW C. WESMILLER
EVAN M. WESTGATE
KIRA C. WEYRAUCH
SARAH M. WHITTEN
ROBERT H. WIDMYER
GREGORY M. WILHELM
AARON A. WILLIAMS
ANTHONY WILLIAMS
JAMILA N. WILLIAMS
SIDNEY I. WILSON
STEPHANIE J. WILSON
KEVIN D. WINFREY
GREGORY R. WORTMAN
JON I. WRIGHT
DONGSHENG XIE
SONG H. YI
DANIEL L. ZIMMERMAN
CHAD M. ZINNECKER
D011223
D011702
D011782
D011862
D011871
D012050
G010127
G010129
G010228
G010232
G010257

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

ISAIAH C. ABBOTT
LEONARD D. J. ACQUISTAPACE
JACOB P. ADDY
ADEBAYO T. ADELEKE
HENRY J. AGUIGUI
KWAME O. AGYEMANG
RAYMOND D. AKERS
JOHN H. ALBRIGHT
JAMES I. ALFARO
ELLIS E. ALLEN III
JEREMY W. ALLIE
MARRIO A. ALMADA
AUBREY R. ASHFORD
JERMAINE A. ATHILL
JASON C. ATKINSON
STEVEN J. AUSTIN
LEONARD J. BAKLARZ
ARTHUR R. BALL, JR.
ANDREW J. BAME
APRIL L. BAPTISTE–ROBERTSON
BRENDAN L. BARCLAY
BENJAMIN A. BARRETT
MATTHEW J. BARWICK
WILLIAM P. BASS
JOSE G. BELTRE
DANIEL J. BELZER
MATTHEW C. BENDER
ROLAND L. BETHEA
ANDREW D. BIONDI
JEFFREY R. BLACKSHER
MARK D. BLAIN
BRYAN K. BLOCKLINGER, JR.
ZACHARY R. BOCK
ROBYN E. BOEHRINGER
SHARI S. BOWEN
DAVID J. BOWERS
ADAM G. BRADFORD
ORNA T. BRADLEY
MARLON J. BRIDE
BART B. BRIMHALL
JAMES D. BROOKS
JASON H. BROTHERTON
CHRISTOPHER M. BROWN
KEIRN C. BROWN
MINDY A. BROWN
NADIYA BRYANT
RORI P. BUCHANAN
STEPHANIE F. BUNKER
MICHAEL F. BURNS
BRIAN C. BUTCHER
JUAN A. CANTU
CATHERINE C. CARLSON
RANDALLE M. CARTER
TIMOTHY J. CASHEN
MARY M. L. CASTERLINE
PHILLIP CASTILLO
DAVID E. CERRATO
JIMMY Y. CHANG
NICHOLAS J. CHERRY
ERICA E. CHIN
FELECIA S. CHINA
ANGELA N. CHIPMAN
YONG C. CHOE
WON S. CHUNG
NATHANIEL S. CINCALA
FRANCINE Y. CLARKE
TRAVIS T. COATES
STUART A. COLEMAN
ERIKA J. COLLINS
ANDREW W. COLSIA
NANCY A. COLSIA
DAVID H. COOK
JAMES R. COOK
LEON A. COOK
LAVONE J. CORDON
TWYGENA M. COTTON
ROBERT J. COVINGTON
STEPHANIE B. CRAWFORD
JOHN P. CRUMLEY
MICHAEL A. CUMBIE
STEVEN R. CUSACK
ROBERT A. CUTHBERTSON
ANDRE L. DARLING–WHITTEN
FERNANDO M. DELRIO
JORGE DELTORO
FREDERICK T. DEQUINA
MATTHEW J. DERFLER
HEATHER S. DETERS
DAVID V. DIELMANN
MICAH J. DIGREZIO
PHILIP H. DILLINGHAM
DAMIAN L. DIXON
JASON B. DOLAN
KRISTIN M. DONETH
KELVIN J. DOUGLAS
YAKENA M. DOUGLAS
CHARMAINE M. DOUSE
RAYMOND J. DROESSLER
TARON S. DUKES
DUSTIN C. DUMBRAVO
ROSALYN R. DUMBRAVO
DERRICK H. DUNLAP
WAYNE A. DUNLAP
JOHN D. DUNLAPP
BRETT T. DUNNING
JASON C. DUPUIS
JUSTIN J. DWYER
TASHA M. DYER
ANDREW M. ELJDID
JOHN D. ENFINGER
PATRICK J. ENGEMAN
ROBIN A. ESKELSON
YVONNE M. EVANGELISTA
RAYMOND M. EVERHART
KYLE D. FAILS
BARRY B. FARMER
PEDRO E. FERNANDEZ
JAMES F. FINK
JUSTIN M. FITCH
PAUL R. FLANIGEN
JEFFREY D. FOSTER
RORY C. A. FOSTER
CISCO J. FULLER
BRIAN J. FURBER
MEILING T. FYE
PAUL M. GARCIA
CHAD D. GARDINER
CHRISTOPHER D. GARDINER
JONATHAN G. GARDNER
CHRISTOPHER B. GARRETT
QUENELLA L. GARRETT
DAVID C. GARRISON
MATTHEW J. GARVIN
BRANDON J. GATES
FREDERICK A. GAYLES
TIMOTHY P. GIBBONS
RYAN P. GILLES
CHRISTINA N. GILLETTE
HALDANE C. GILLETTE
JEREMY J. GLENZ
ABRAHAM P. GOEPFERT
MICHAEL A. GOLD
ASHLEY M. GOLDMAN
EDDIE M. GORBETT
MARSHALL L. GRAY
ANDREW T. GRAZIANO
CALEB S. GREEN
NATHAN L. GREER
DEMARIO A. GROVER
NATHANIEL J. GROVES
JAMES O. GRUBE
ELISABET GUILLEN
DANIEL P. GUSTKE
LARRY M. GWINN
RONALD H. HAAS
JOSHUA M. HAFER
WILLIAM F. HAGUE
ERIC J. HALLGREN
JERRY M. HALLMAN, JR.
MICHAEL R. HANNAH
RONALD L. HARO
MICHAEL S. HARRELL
JAMES E. HARRIS IV
CHRISTOPHERJAMES A. HART
JEFFREY M. HART
DIRK C. HASBACH
JASON A. HAYNES
JEREMY HAYNES
KEITH R. HEINDL
JOSEPH D. HENDERSON
RONALD A. HENDERSON
PATRICK W. HENSON
JAMES B. HICKEY
MATTHEW E. HILL
CRYSTAL E. HINES
GEORGE E. HORNE
MATTHEW T. HORSTMAN
PATRICK T. HORVAT
TROY D. HOUSTON
BRAD R. HUCKO
ERIC J. HUGGARD
JERRICK J. HUNTER
RYAN P. HURLEY
CHADWICK E. HYMAN
WALTER L. IVORY, JR.
NICOLE L. JACKSON
RODNEY D. JACKSON
RONALD D. JACKSON
LENDRICK Y. JAMES
MISTY D. JAMES
STEVEN D. JEFFERSON
STACEY N. JELKS
ANGELA N. JEWETT
DEVANIE N. JOHNSON
ERIC M. JOHNSON
JOSEPH H. JOHNSON III
NATHALIA J. JOHNSON
PATRICE L. JOHNSON
ROY C. JOHNSON
CRYSTAL R. JONES
JACOB V. JONES
JEREMIAH JONES
KEITH A. JORDAN
REUBEN T. JOSEPH
CHAD M. JUHLIN
HASSAN M. KAMARA
JASON T. KAPPES
SAMUEL J. KARR
MICHAEL Z. KEATHLEY
KELLEY A. KEATING
MICHAEL B. KEE
ZACHARY J. KEEFER
CAMERON M. KEOGH
TODD KETTERER
ISMAIL A. KHAN
JOHN F. KIEFER
THOMAS F. KIRCHGESSNER
BRIAN R. KNUTSON
WILLIAM B. KOBBE
JODI D. KRIPPEL
MATTHEW F. KROG
LAMOND I. LACEY
DEVEILLA N. LAMBERT
PATRICK A. LANIER
NOLAN O. LASITER
GAVIN R. LASKOWSKI
ROYDREGO V. LAVANT
JOSEPH J. LEE
MARIBEL M. LEE
WAYNE R. LEE, JR.
RYAN K. LERDALL
CHARMAIN L. LETT
DAVID B. LEVERETT
ZACHARY M. LEWIS
WALTER D. LILLEGARD
WILLIAM D. LINCOLN
JASMIN A. LIRIO
YITEH LIU
NORMAN D. LOCKHART
CHRISTOPHER W. LOWRY
BENJAMIN J. LUKAS
ALLEN J. LUNA
LIONEL MACKLIN, JR.
BRIANNA M. MAIER
STEPHEN M. MALLORY
JAMES J. MANUEL
CAMERON D. MAPLES
ERIC J. MARAFFI
ERIC P. MARTIN
JOSEPH B. MARTIN
LENFORD D. MARTIN
MICHAEL J. MARTIN
RYAN P. MARTIN
CATHERINE M. MARTINEZ
SIDNEY E. MASON
ANTON H. MASSMANN
AARON L. MATTHEWS
TELISHA L. MATTHEWS
BRADLEY A. MATTISON
MATTHEW D. MATTISON
MATTHEW G. MAXWELL
LEV L. MAZERES
EBRIMA F. MBAI

JEREMY J. MCCRILLIS
LATASHA D. MCCULLAR
WILLIAM G. MCDUSTRELL
LATECIA S. MCGRADY
MAGEN L. MCKEITHEN
DONIEL D. MCPHAIL
SARAH E. MICHOLICK
ANDREW P. MILLER
MATTHEW C. MILLER
WILLIAM R. MILLS II
KEITH A. MINER
JON D. MOHUNDRO
SENECA H. MOORE
JONATHON A. MORALEE
CARLOS G. MORALES
DAVID MORENO
ALLISON N. MORSE
RACHEL A. MULLHOLLAND
TRAVIS J. MUNSCH
DANIELLE D. MURRELL
SHAWN C. NAIGLE
JOSEPH W. NALLI
PATRICK J. NELSON
BRANDON E. NIXON
LYNDSEY R. NOTT
JONATHAN D. OBLON
KAI H. OBOHO
THOMAS J. OBRIEN
OTAZERIA B. ODIBO
JUSTIN M. OLES
JACOB P. OLSZEWSKI
JOSHUA A. ONEILL
MATTHEW B. OTTO
TIMOTHY J. OWENS
KIMBERLY E. PAGE
DION D. PANDY
SHAWN D. PARDEE
JOEL PARKER
KLAIROONG PATTUMMA
TRAVIS G. PECK
CHRISTOPHER D. PENDLETON
ASHLEY E. PHILBIN
CHARLES L. PHILLIPS
TRAVIS A. PHIPPS
CLINTON E. PIERCE
NICHOLAS R. PINES
JAMIE E. PITTMAN
JOHN A. PLITSCH
FELIPE POSADAMONTES
CHRISTOPHER D. PRICE
JUSTIN D. PRIESTMAN
ROBERT J. PRIGMORE
JERMAINE C. PRUITT
CHAD E. RABURN
BRYAN J. RALLS
LUCAS J. RAND
RUBEN A. RANGEL
ELFONZO J. REED
ALETHIA D. REYNOLDS
JILLIAN C. RIVERA
KATHERINE E. ROBERTSON
STEVEN C. ROBINETTE
EDWARD D. ROBINSON
GERALD A. ROBINSON
ESPERANZA RODRIGUEZSIDDALL
RICHARD F. ROGERS
WAYNE D. ROGERS, JR.
CLINTON A. ROUNTREE
NICHOLAS L. ROWLAND
CASEY A. RUMFELT
YASHICA T. RUSHIN
JASON A. RUSSELL
DARSHAREE J. SAIK
ADAM M. SAMIOF
ALFREDO M. SANCHEZ
MARIA E. SANCHEZ
MIGUEL N. SANTANA
MATTHEW B. SCHADE
HEATHER L. SCHMITT
JASON M. SCHULZ
ELIZABETH A. SCHWEMMER
ANDREW M. SCRUGGS
MARION P. SEWELL, JR.
JOSIE E. SHAHEEN
JEFFREY D. SHAMSI
TYRONE D. SHIELDS
LESLIE A. SHIPP
ERIC P. SHOCKLEY
JAMES E. SHORT
SHAWN M. SKINNER
DIECILLA T. SLEDGE
ATIYA M. SMITH
CHRISTIAN J. SMITH
RACHEL Z. SMITH
STEVEN T. SMITH
EMILY H. SPENCER
JASON E. STAIB
JOSEPH C. STALNAKER
GWENDOLYN E. STANCIL
KEITH E. STEWART
DAVID W. STORRS
MIGDALIA SUMMERVILLE
MATTHEW W. SWIM
ROBERT M. SZYMANSKI
ALLEN J. TAYLOR
JUSTIN B. TEAGUE
JOSEPH E. TEXIDOR
KASANDRA B. THARP
COLE M. THERKILDSEN
LATASHA R. THOMAS
WALDRELL J. THOMAS, JR.
JOHN D. THOMPSON
MATTHEW K. THOMPSON
JEFFREY L. TIMMONS
ALEX J. TORRES
BELINDA C. TREVILLION
MATTHEW A. TURCOTTE
CHRISTINA S. VALENTINE
AGUSTIN O. VALERIONUNEZ
CHRISTOPHER P. VANDELIST
RODRICO P. VARGAS
ANGEL A. VEGACOLON
NICHOLAS D. VIAR
ALEXANDER B. VICTORIA
PETER J. VILLALUZ
CLIFTON J. VINCENT
JUAN M. VIRUETCOLLAZO
JASON D. WAGNER
PETER C. WARNER
NOAH WASHINGTON, JR.
HAROLD K. WATSON
MATTHEW M. WEBB
DANIEL K. WEIDMAN
RYAN P. WELCH
GARY L. WHEELER
BARRY J. WHITE
REGINALD V. WHITE
MICHAEL D. WHITTEN
JASON E. WHITUS
LATIA K. WICKLIFFE
INGA A. WILDERMUTH
ERVIN J. WILLIAMS
STUART P. WILLIAMS
YOLANDA G. WILLIAMS
RYAN M. WILSON
MATTHEW R. WIMMER
SHADRIKA Y. WITHERSPOON
ROSILYN C. WOODARD
BRIAN W. WORSHAM
YOLANDA V. WRIGHT
JAMIL WYNN
LOURDES M. YANESMOORE
DWAYNE M. YOUNG
VANCE E. ZEMKE
SHERRI L. ZIMMERMAN
D011465
D012187

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

JASON K. ABBOTT
CLINTON M. ACKLIN
DENVER K. AKI
NEIL R. ALCARIA
NICOLE M. ALEXANDER
ANTHONY J. ALLEN
JACOB A. ALLEN
JONATHON M. ALLEN
MOHAMADOU M. AMAR
BLAKELY M. ANDERSON
JAMES C. ANDERSON
BENJAMIN K. ANDRUS
CHRISTOPHER R. ANTHONY
MICHAEL J. AREVALO
ALLYN L. ARMESON
SAMUEL A. ARNETT
CRAIG D. ARNOLD II
JAMES S. ARTHURS, JR.
CHAD J. ASHE
BRANNON L. ASKEW
MARK C. ASKEW
MARK A. AXTELL
RICHARD A. BABBITT
WILLIAM S. BADER
WESLEY R. BAER
RICHARD J. BAILEY
ANDREW J. BAILIFF
CHAD M. BAKER
JONATHAN S. BAKER
CHRISTOPHER L. BALA
KEVIN S. BALENTINE
MICHAEL D. BALES
TIMOTHY S. BALL
ANDREW R. BALLOW
ROBERT J. BARNO
JONATHAN D. BATE
KEVIN M. BEASLEY
THOMAS L. BEATTIE
JEFFREY M. BEEMAN
TYSON J. BEHNKE
DANIEL R. BELL
NICHOLAS P. BELL
LUKAS B. BERG
JEFFREY M. BERNARD
JEFFREY C. BESS
CELIO S. BIERING
ADRIAN O. BIGGERSTAFF
DONALD J. BIGHAM
RANDALL F. BITTNER
JEFFREY S. BLACK
MICHAEL C. BLAKE
JOSIAH B. BLALOCK
BENJAMIN T. BLANE
JOSHUA J. BLIZZARD
JAMES A. BLOOM, JR.
DUSTIN D. BLUM
RYAN L. BOEKA
JOSEPH C. BOGART
ANDREW S. BOGGS
JOHN Q. BOLTON
CHRISTOPHER A. BOLZ
JOSHUA P. BOST
CRAIG W. BOSVELD
JESSE H. BOULTON
DANIEL K. BOURKE
GERALD L. BOWMAN
GABRIEL R. BOWNS
ANDREW H. BOYD
CHESTER D. BOYLES
JORDAN G. BRADFORD
MARK BRANA
BRANDON W. BRANCA
JOSEPH R. BRANCH
MARVIN T. BRANCH
ROBERT C. BRAND
BENJAMIN D. BRANDS
NATHAN A. BRANEN
ERIN E. BRASWELL
KEVIN L. BRASWELL
JAMES V. BRAUDIS
NATHAN S. BRAXTON
SEAN P. BREEN
LANCE B. BRENDER
KYLE P. BRENGEL
DEVIN R. BRIGHT
MICHAEL D. BRIMAGE
ANDREW A. BROWN
DAVID L. BROWN
JENNIFER M. BROWN
JEREMY P. BROWN
MORGAN R. BROWN
WILLIAM R. BROWN
BENJAMIN P. BROWNLEE
EREKE D. BRUCE
TANYA J. BUCKLEY
ERICK D. BUCKNER
KATHERINE A. BUEHNER
HERMAN E. BULLS, JR.
JASON K. BURFORD
JOHN A. BURKHART
CLINT E. BURLESON
ELLIOTT B. BURNS
JOHN P. BYLER
JOSEPH K. BYRNES
MATTHEW J. CAHILL
MATTHEW E. CAIN
CHRISTOPHER R. CALWAY
JOSHUA J. CAMBRA
MICHAEL E. CAMPBELL
RICHARD C. CAMPBELL
GREGORY W. CANADY
MICHAEL V. CANN
DANIEL P. CAPOZZA
DAVID CARATTINI
PETER D. CARETTO
JUSTIN D. CARLTON
COURTNEY W. CARNEGIE
CLAYTON O. CARPENTER
JOSEPH R. CARR
MICHAEL A. CARRION
WILLIAM CARRION II
JUAN M. CASTELLANOS
SEAN M. CASTILLA
MICHAEL D. CASTILLO
FELIX CASTRO
IVAN CASTRO
JASON D. CASTRO
MICHAEL J. CENTOLA
JONATHAN M. CHAKERES
JARED A. CHANDLER
CHAD J. CHAPMAN
ALBERT J. CHATWOOD
TRINIDAD N. CHAVEZ
KURT E. CHEESEMAN
DEBORAH L. CHEN
JEFFREY J. CHENARD
CHAD P. CHENOWETH
TIMOTHY W. CHESS
GEOFFREY D. CHILDS
SCOTT M. CHRISTIE
JOHN K. CHUNG
JON M. CHYCHOTA
THOMAS J. CIESLAK
TOBIAS R. CLARK
STEVEN L. CLEGHORN
JOSHUA W. CLEMMONS
CHARLES T. CLIFFORD
DANIEL J. CLINEBELLE
JUSTON R. CLYMORE
JEREMY T. COATES
SEAN R. COCHRAN
JONATHAN A. COE
PETER N. COFFMAN
SEAN R. COFFMAN
JARED D. COIL
CHRISTOPHER T. COLBERT
PATRICK M. COLE
TAD J. COLEMAN
ANTHONY F. COLGARY
MARK E. CONKLIN
RYAN D. CONLEY
WILLIAM F. CONNERS
TIMOTHY C. CONNORS
DANIEL G. CORBETT
GREGORY J. CORMIER
JOSEPH R. CORSENTINO
RICKY COTTO
JONATHAN S. COUCH
JEFFREY M. COUGHLIN
DAVID R. COWAN
LUCAS M. CRABTREE
CARL A. CRANDALL
ADAM B. CREEL
JUSTIN W. CROCKER
WILLIAM A. CROSS
MARY C. CRUMBY
RICARDO CRUZ
JUSTIN M. CUFF
JEREMY P. CURRIN
AARON J. DANIELE
CARL J. DANKO
ESTAN N. DAVIS
KARL A. DAVIS, JR.
MATTHEW D. DAVIS
SEAN J. DAVIS
ALEXANDER R. DEAN
CLAYTON J. DEGENHARDT
DAVID A. DELLERMAN

REID M. DENSON
BRIAN J. DERMODY
RANDY S. DESJARDIN, JR.
DAVID W. DESJARDINS
DERRICK W. DEW
MATTHEW J. DEWITT
JASON R. DICKINSON
JOHN A. DICKSON
JOSEPH J. DIDOMENICO
MATTHEW C. DIVICO
SEAN M. DIXON
RICHARD D. DOBKINS, JR.
JOHN S. DOCKERY
JOHN P. DOLAN
ROBERT J. DOMITROVICH
TIMOTHY J. DOWNING
JOSHUA R. DRAKE
JOHN T. DREW
BRANDON R. DROBENAK
BRIAN J. DROHAN
NICHOLAS R. DUBAZ
RYAN R. DUFFY
THOMAS G. DULL
CHRISTOPHER T. DUPREY
STEVEN A. EATON
WILLIAM N. EBERLE
ADAM C. ECCLESTON
SCOTT R. EDEN
IAN D. EDGERLY
BENJAMIN J. EDWARDS
KENNETH P. ELGORT
BRANDON T. ELLISON
SCOTT D. ELWELL
ANGELA M. ERALE
JESSE J. ERICKSON
VITO J. ERRICO
JONATHAN W. ERWIN
TYLER J. ESPINOZA
JACOB M. ESTRADA
MATTHEW T. ETHERIDGE
BRIAN D. EVANS
JAMES G. FALLS III
DAVID R. FARRAR
JENNIFER L. FAUTH
DARRELL E. FAWLEY
AURLBRIO L. FENNELL
ANTHONY J. FERA
KATIE R. FIDLER
MICHAEL A. FIGER
EDUARDO M. FIGUEROA
FELIX FIGUEROA
ARI D. FISHER
SHAWN P. FITZGERALD
DEREK R. FITZPATRICK
THOMAS G. FITZPATRICK
RYAN Q. FLAHERTY
RANDOLPH J. FLEMING
CORY S. FLORENCE
JUAN FLORES
LUIS N. FLORES
VANCE C. FLOWERS
THOMAS L. FLYNN
OWEN G. S. FOGARTY
MICHAEL Z. FOOR
JOHN C. FORD
CHAD M. FORSYTHE
AMOS C. FOX
JOHN J. FRAYER
JUSTIN L. FRAZIER
JOSEPH A. FREDERICK
TARIK K. FULCHER
CURT F. FULMER
SEAN M. GAILEY
STUART E. GALLAGHER
JEFFREY R. GAMBLE
TERRY E. GAMBREL
JULIO A. GARCIA
ROCKNEE M. GARDNER
CHRISTOPHER R. GARNETT
MEGAN J. GARRETT
JAMES A. GARRISON
WILFORD L. GARVIN
JOHN P. GASSMANN
ELISABETH C. GERHARDT
JASON A. GILCHRIST
JEFFERY M. GIVENS
ERIC M. GLASSMAN
JEFFREY D. GLICK
JEFFREY L. GOINES
ANDREW M. GOLDEN
ALBERT J. GOMEZ
DANIEL E. GONZALEZ
DELVIN M. GOODE
GARY C. GOODMAN
DANIEL D. GOODWIN
BENJAMIN J. GORCZYNSKI
VINCENT C. GOTHARD
JARED G. GRAHAM
LARRY P. GRAHAM
JEREMY L. GRAY
WALTER C. GRAY
BRADLEY S. GREAVER
BRANT L. GREEN
BRIAN P. GREEN
ROBERT W. GREEN
ROBERT W. GREEN
KYLE L. GREENHECK
GERALD W. GREENLEE
DAVID W. GRIFFITH
RUSSELL P. GRIGSBY
BRIAN D. GRIMSLEY
BRENDAN W. GRISWOLD
VICTOR T. GRONENTHAL
CLINTON J. GUTIERREZ
DANIEL F. GWOSCH
BRIAN L. HAAS
TODD R. HABITZREUTHER
MATTHEW C. HAITH
DENNIS W. HALL
JASON M. HALLIGAN
DAVID P. HALPERN
JOHN D. HAMMETT, JR.
SANG K. HAN
RORY P. HANLIN
HENRY V. HANSEN
PAUL W. HANSON
TODD J. HARALSON
PAUL B. HARGROVE
STEPHEN G. HARNSBERGER
JOSE A. HARO
JACQUELINE A. HARRIS
EDWARD N. HARRISON
KELLY S. HAUX
MICHAEL E. HAVEY, JR.
JASON L. HAWKINS
AARON E. HEATH
SCOTT P. HEESEMANN
ULRICH HELLMEIER
JEREMY R. HENDRICKS
DANIEL M. HENDRIX
SEAN D. HENLEY
DEVIN M. HENRY
BRIAN R. HICKERSON
ANDREW M. HILL
DAVID C. HILLING
WILLIAM M. HILLS
RYAN A. HINTZ
SCOTT M. HINZ
CRAIG HOBBS
ANTHONY T. HOEFLER
DOUGLAS E. HOER
TROY A. HOKANSON
MATTHEW T. HOLDEN
SEAN M. HOLLARS
MATTHEW R. HOLLEY
SAMUEL D. HONE II
EDWARDARTHUR K. HOOMALU
ZACHARY T. HOOVER
BENJAMIN J. HORNER
KEVIN A. HORRIGAN
JEREMY N. HORTON
PAUL C. HORTON
MATTHEW A. HOVDE
JOSHUA A. HOWARD
RYAN D. HOWELL
LISA J. HUBBARD
JACOB J. HUBER
DANIEL R. HUFF
TY HUFFMAN
BREG A. HUGHES
JAYSON L. HUGHES
TUCKER N. HUGHES
LEE C. HUMPHREY
ROBERT W. HUMPHREY
JESSICA B. HUTTON
RICHARD W. B. HUTTON
NICHOLAS R. INGRAO
JACK B. IRBY
JEREMY L. IRVINE
RUSSELL J. ISAACS
ROBERT B. ISRAEL
MATTHEW A. IVES
MARK W. IVEY
JOSHUA J. JACQUEZ
BRIAN W. JAMES
NICHOLAS M. JAMES
MICHAEL C. JEANETTA
HEATH L. JENNI
NATHAN A. JENNINGS
BRIAN R. JENSON
CHRISTIAN R. JOHNSON
JACOB T. JOHNSON
ROLLAND H. JOHNSON
RYAN R. JOHNSON
KYLE M. JOHNSTON
SHAWN R. JOKINEN
KELLY S. JONES
MICHAEL L. JONES
RICKY R. JONES
CAMDEN S. JORDAN
STEPHEN M. JUNG
MICHAEL J. KAISER
MATTHEW J. KAPLAN
DOUGLAS K. KAPULE
ADAM M. KARR
MICHAEL R. KEASLER
CHRISTINE M. KEATING
THEODORE A. KEHLER
ADAM C. KELLER
PATRICK J. KELLEY
SHAWN H. KELLEY
DAVID R. A. KELSO
DAVID A. KENDZIOR
CHRISTIAN S. KENNERLY
ELIJAH S. KERNRUESINK
ALEXANDER A. KERR
CHAD E. KESSLING
DON Y. KIM
JONATHAN T. KIM
STEVE Y. KIM
WILLIAM J. KIMMINS
CARL A. KING, JR.
CHARLES W. KING
BRENT B. KINNEY
NATHAN G. KISH
KYLE A. KIVIOJA
JASON R. KNEIB
ANDREW M. KOCHLI
MICHAEL J. KOLLER
SHANNON E. KONVALIN
MICHAEL P. KOVALSKY
BRADLEY J. KRAUSS
WILLIAM K. KREBS
JEFFREY J. KROHN
KEVIN F. KRUPSKI
MORGAN H. LAIRD
WILLIAM R. LAMBERT
JOHN E. LANDRY
JAMES E. LANGFORD
STEVEN M. LANNI
JOSHUA A. LARSON
CLIFFORD D. LATTING
PETER A. LAWALL
JOSHUA D. LAZZARINI
JOHNATHAN D. LEE
MARK J. LEE
MICHAEL H. LEEPER
JOSHUA O. LEHMAN
MICHAEL A. LENGEL
KENYON M. LENO
DAVID J. LENZI II
JOSHUA T. LEVALLEY
LEVI M. LEWELLYN
MELISSA L. LEWIS
JUSTIN A. LIESEN
MICHAEL S. LINNINGTON
LISA M. LIVINGSTON
KEVIN W. LOCKETT
PAUL G. LOCKHART
ALBERTO J. LOCSIN
MATTHEW R. LOMMEL
NATHAN P. LONGWORTH
JASON W. LOPEZ
CHRISTOPHER G. LOSCHIAVO
CHRISTOPHER R. LOSSING
KEVIN M. LOUGHNANE
THOMAS R. LOVELESS
CURTIS T. LOWRY
DANIEL R. LUDWIG
WILLIAM C. LUKA, JR.
JOSHUA A. LYONS
JERRAULD MA
IAN B. MACGREGOR
WILLIAM T. MACH III
TANIKA T. MACIAS
BRANDON J. MACKEY
DAVID N. MACPHAIL
JOHN F. MADDEN
MORGAN MAIER
NICHOLAS J. MAKSIM
NATALIE G. MALLICOAT
JOSEPH R. MANGAN
EMBER S. MANIEGO
DONNALE L. MANN
REIMUND G. MANNECK
BENJAMIN H. MARCH
REED T. MARKHAM
ADAM M. MARSH
KEITH A. MARSHALL
JEFFREY L. MARSHBURN
ANDREW P. MARTIN
BRANDON K. MARTIN
JACOB J. MATHEWS
RONNIE L. E. MATHIS
JASON J. MATOVICH
SCOTT K. MATTINGLY
BRETT M. MATZENBACHER
JOEL D. MAXWELL
THOMAS J. MCCARTHY
DAVID A. MCCOLLUM
IAN M. MCCONNELL
CHARLES T. MCCORMICK
BENJAMEN A. MCDANIEL
EDWARD L. MCDONALD
PATRICK M. MCGUIGAN
JAMES M. MCKAY
PATRICK W. MCLAIN
DANIEL W. MCMANUS
TERENCE L. MCMILLAN
JOSEPH E. MCNAIR
WILLIAM R. MCNALLY
MATTHEW D. MCNEAL
JORGE A. MEDINA
JEFFREY B. MEINDERS
MATTHEW A. MELONI
GEORGE B. MELTON
DANIEL N. MENDEZ
THOMAS J. MENN
ERIC W. MERCER
GRIFFIN J. MERRILL
RALPH C. MERRILL
SEAN A. MERRITT
SCOTT F. MERTZ
ANTHONY A. MESSENGER
JOHN A. MEYER
JOSEPH I. MEYER
JOSHUA A. MEYER
JASON G. MICHAELS
RUSSELL J. MICHO
RYAN R. MIDDLEMISS
BRIAN M. MIDDLETON
PAUL J. MILAS
CHRISTOPHER M. MILLER
MATTHEW R. MILLER
STEVEN J. MILLER
DONALD S. MINCHEW
NICOLE R. MINER
PAUL B. MINNIE
KELLY R. MISELES
RUSSELL G. MITSCHERLING
MICHAEL T. MIXON
MICHAEL P. MOAD
WECHNER MOMPREVIL
KENT B. MONAS
DYLAN J. MONTGOMERY
APRIL M. K. MOORE
JEFFREY P. MOORE
MICHAEL B. MOORE
JOHN R. MORRIS
RONALD L. MORRIS
DOUGLAS J. MORRISON

DANIEL D. MORSE
MICHAEL J. MOYER
JONATHAN R. MRAZ
JOHN F. MULHOLLAND
RYAN A. MURPHY
WILLIAM C. MURRAY
ELIJAH A. MYERS
MICHAEL S. NAFF
JOSHUA A. NAILLON
CHAD A. NAKAMURA
SETH B. NASON
JOSEPH M. NATTER
MATHEW B. NEYLAND
KHA M. NGUYEN
COREY A. NICHOLS
CHRISTIAN C. NICOLAS
SETH R. NIEMAN
MATTHEW G. NOREUS
ERIK S. NORMAN
JASON L. NORQUIST
KELLY R. NORRIS
ERIKA A. NOYES
PATRICK J. OBRIEN, JR.
CHRISTOPHER B. ODOM
NICOLO O. OLCESE
MARCO D. OLEDAN
TREVOR P. OMALLEY
PATRICK J. OROURKE
JUAN J. ORTIZ
JOSEPH F. OSMANSKI III
RUBEN A. OTERO
JUSTIN J. OTTENWALTER
ALAN R. OVERMYER
JOSEPH E. OWENS
DANIEL V. PACE
MICHAEL J. PADDEN
LAURA E. PANGALLO
CHEYNE C. PARHAM
RALPH S. PARLIN
CHARLES R. S. PARSONS
ROBERT A. PARSONS
GREG A. PASQUANTONIO
TYLER J. PATTERSON
JAMES P. PATTON
JUSTIN S. PATTON
SEAN M. PATTON
CHRISTINA A. PAYNE
ROBERT D. PAYNE
JONATHAN L. PAYNTER
JOSEPH W. PAYTON
THOMAS E. PEABODY
DANIEL K. PECK
CHAD A. PELTIER
CHARLES E. PENN
IAN T. PEOPLES
MATTHEW A. PERDUE
DAVID PEREZ
JOSEPH D. PERRY
JEROME A. PETERSEN
ANDREW A. PFEIFFER
BRENT PFEIFFER
ANDREW R. PHILLIPS
CALEB G. PHILLIPS
JOSEPH J. PHILLIPS
THOMAS G. PIERCE
IAN C. PITKIN
LARRY M. PITTS
ROSS C. PIXLER
BRIAN P. PLOVER
JONATHAN P. PLUNDO
FRENCH D. POPE
MICHAEL A. PORGES
DANIEL J. POUTIER
JAMES M. POWERS
MATTHEW L. PRATT
SAMUEL M. PRICE III
LAURA A. PROFFIT
RICHARD P. PURCELL
WILLIAM C. PYANT
KRISTOPHER M. PYETTE
DAVID B. QUAYLE
MICHELE C. QUILLE
JOHN D. RADNOCZI
RAMON A. RAMOS
RUBEN RAMOS
BENJAMIN D. RAPHAEL
TIMOTHY M. RATLIFF
JULIAN A. RAVILIOUS
DOUGLAS W. K. RAY
RANDY D. READY
JEFFREY C. REED
TYE L. REEDY
JAMES M. REILLY
TRAVIS N. REINOLD
MIKEL E. D. RESNICK
EFRAIN REYNA
DOUGLAS W. REYNOLDS
KEVIN R. RICE
PATRICK R. RICE
RACHEL M. RICE
THOMAS C. RICHERT
ROSS M. RIDGE
TERRY L. RIESEL, JR.
BETH A. RIORDAN
ANGEL J. RIOSPELATI
JARED A. RIPPERGER
ERICH K. ROBERTS
JOHN R. ROBINSON
STEVEN S. ROBINSON
JASON L. ROCK
ROBERTO RODRIGUEZ
ERIC N. ROLES
WIDMAR J. ROMAN
JASON ROMANELLO
JONATHAN ROMANESKI
RITA C. ROSALESGONZALEZ
MICHAEL E. ROSCOE
ALBERT L. ROSS
CHRISTOPHER P. ROSSI
CHARLES P. ROWAN
TYLER J. RUND
JASON A. RUSSELL
LAWRENCE W. RUSSELL, JR.
WILLIAM A. RUSSO
KEVIN E. RYAN
LINDSAY A. RYAN
PHILIP A. SANABRIA
CESARE A. SANTAROSA
CESAR H. SANTIAGOSANTINI
PHILLIP R. SAULS
HAYDEN D. SCARDINA
KURTIS J. SCHAAF
CHARLES L. SCHAEFER
CLIFFORD K. SCHAEFER
ROBERT J. SCHAFFLING
MATTHEW B. SCHARDT
RANDY M. SCHILLING
ERIC J. SCHMITZ
CARLTON M. SEARCY
KENNETH A. SEGELHORST
JAMES L. SELF
DAVID T. SHAMS
KIRK K. SHANDS
JOSHUA B. SHAVER
BENJAMIN G. SHEAN
JEREMIA Z. SHEEHAN
JOHN T. SHELTON
JOHN J. SHERIDAN
JONATHAN L. SHERRILL
JASON M. SHICK
WOO C. SHIN
NATHAN E. SHOWMAN
ROBERT J. SHUMAKER
STEPHEN M. SIEGNER
SCOTT T. SIGGINS
JOSHUA I. SILVER
JOSHUA C. SIMS
WILLIAM R. SITZE
DANIEL A. SJURSEN
AARON K. SMITH
CHRISTOPHER D. C. SMITH
HOWARD R. SMITH
JUSTIN M. SMITH
MICAH S. SMITH
MICHAEL K. SMITH
RICHARD J. SMITH
SCOTT W. SMITH
WADE H. SMITH
MATTHEW C. SMOOSE
ANTHONY J. SNIPES
ROBERT E. SNOW
JOHN M. SOLOMON
NICHOLAS A. SOROKA
DAVID M. SPANGENBERG
GRANT M. SPEAKES
DAARON L. SPEARS
JOHN D. STAEHELI
MICHAEL P. STALLINGS
DANIEL R. STANLEY, JR.
SEAN R. STAPLER
TERENCE K. STAPLES
ANNE M. STARK
NEIL B. STARK
COREY M. STEINER
TRAVIS J. STELLFOX
DANIEL M. STEPHENS
THEODORE W. STEPHENS
BRADLEY STUBBLEFIELD
LYNN W. SULLIVAN
ADAM F. SUMMERS
BENJAMIN T. SUMMERS
JOSHUA T. SUTHOFF
STANLEY S. SWAINTEK
MICHAEL P. SWANGER
NATHANIEL L. SWANN
MARK A. SWINEY
CHRISTOPHER S. SYLVAIN
ADAM L. TALIAFERRO
NICHOLAS B. TARAN
MATTHEW M. TARAZON
GRACIETTE TAVARES
ANDREW W. TAYLOR
ANDREW M. TEAGUE
JASON C. TEBEDO
CHARLES A. TELESCO
THOMAS J. TEPLEY
ALEXANDER J. TESAR
JEREMY M. TETER
CHAD E. THIBODEAU
CHRISTOPHER R. THIELENHAUS
ANTHONY S. THIES
ANNE N. THOMAS
CURTIS A. THOMAS
DEMARIUS L. THOMAS
JOHN C. THOMAS
CHARLES E. THOMPSON
LEVI THOMPSON
GABRIEL M. THORN
MASON W. THORNAL
JAMES D. THORNTON
MARY E. THORNTON
JEREMY E. TILLMAN
TIMOTHY R. TOERBER
JOHN P. TOLL
WALTER R. TOMPKINS
TRAVIS N. TOOLE
CESAR TORRES
GERARD L. TORRES
LEHA R. TOTTENWADE
RYAN T. TRAVIS
DAVID C. TRENT
TRAVIS A. TRIPP
KYLE T. TROTTIER
ALLEN M. TRUJILLO
GARRETT P. TURLEY
CHRISTOPHER A. TURNER
JAMES R. VANCE
MATTHEW R. VANEPPS
ALAN M. VARGO
RUSSELL VARNADO
PHILLIP T. VAUGHN
LORIN D. VEIGAS
MICHAEL L. VENAFRO
DAVID W. VENEY
RICHARD W. VESPA, JR.
JOHN P. VICKERY
RONALD K. VINYARD
JOSEPH F. VOGEL
TREVOR J. VONNAHME
LUCAS R. WADSWORTH
JARED H. WAGNER
JULIE A. WAGNER
BRIAN C. WALKER
JOSHUA J. WALKER
LIAM P. WALSH
SHANNON M. WALSH
SEAN C. WALSTROM
PETER B. WALTHER
TIMOTHY C. WALTON
LINCOLN R. WARD
CHRISTOPHER M. WARDLAW
MOHAMMAD I. WASEEM
JAMES L. WATSON
JASON C. WATSON
CHRISTOPHER D. WEBB
JUSTIN T. WEBB
CAROLYN M. WEHRHEIM
IAN A. WELCH
NICKOLAS J. WELCH
DOUGLAS M. WELLS
JASON S. WENGER
MARCO P. WENNESON
ANTHONY M. WERTZ
PETER J. WETTERAUER
JACOB A. WHARTON
TERRON O. WHARTON
ANTHONY A. WHEELER
GARY M. WHIDDEN
JASON L. WHITE
JAY S. WHITTAKER
JORY E. WHORTON
DANIEL S. WILCOX
MATTHEW P. WILKINSON
CHRISTOPHER G. WILLIAMS
DORIAN J. WILLIAMS
JAMAINE J. WILLIAMS
JASON A. WILLIAMS
JOSEPH W. WILLIAMS III
TIMOTHY J. WILLIAMS
ROBERT F. WILLIAMSON
AUSTIN M. WILSON
DAVID A. WILSON
LINUS D. WILSON
JOSHUA D. WINES
PAUL S. WINTERTON
LLOYD B. WOHLSCHLEGEL
SCOTT F. WOIDA
CECIL E. WOLBERTON
MASEY V. WOLFE
THOMAS P. WOMBLE
CHRISTOPHER L. WONG
MATTHEW R. WOOD
SHAWN T. WOODARD
PHILLIP J. WORKS
GERALD F. WYNN
CANESSA R. YANCEY
AMOREENA L. YORK
SHAUN M. YOUNG
DAVID S. YU
RONALD J. YUHASZ, JR.
PATRICK H. YUN
TIMOTHY D. ZALESKY
JOSHUA J. ZARUBA
RUSSELL D. ZAYAS
LUKE A. ZECK
WILLIAM B. ZEWADSKI
ANDREW F. ZIKOWITZ
AMY M. ZOLENDZIEWSKI
SCOTT M. ZOLENDZIEWSKI
D011352
D011701
D011804
D012084

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U. S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

JAMES P. EDMUNDS III
MICHAEL T. LEGENS, JR.
RUSSELL W. MANTZEL
CRAIG J. PRICE
THOMAS E. RINGO
TERRY L. STEIN, JR.
JASON L. WALLACE
PAUL B. WEBB

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U. S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

LEONARD F. ANDERSON IV
MARK H. BACHARACH
TIMOTHY J. BLEIDISTEL
MICHAEL G. BRENNAN

DARRIN S. BRIGHTMON
ROBERT W. BRUCE
KIP P. BUNTEN
CHAD J. BURKE
THADDEUS COAKLEY
SCOTT A. CRAIG
SCOTT D. CROCKETT
LUIS G. DELVALLE
SARAH Q. FULLWOOD
MAX GORALNICK
THOMAS C. GRESSER II
JOHN P. HANLON
WILLIAM W. HOOPER
PATRICK S. HOULAHAN
BURL Z. HUDSON
KENNETH E. HUMPHREY
BRADLEY S. JEWITT
TROY F. LIDDI
JEFFREY P. LIPSON
THOMAS F. MARBLE
PETER C. MCCONNELL
JEFFREY J. MCNEIL
ABRAHAM M. MUNOZ
BRIAN M. OLEARY
KARL D. PIERSON
BRIAN H. ROBERTS
BRIAN P. ROBINS
STEVEN J. SINNER
JEFFREY A. STIVERS
CHRISTOPHER P. TANSEY
TERRANCE R. THOMAS III
CHARLES R. WATKINS
SCOTT A. WILLIS
DERRICK C. YOUNG
KONSTANTIN E. ZOGANAS

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

WILLIAM A. GARREN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

LEANDER J. SACKEY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant commander

CHRISTOPHER M. DAVIS

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 10, 2014:

IN THE COAST GUARD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD UNDER TITLE 14, U.S.C., SECTION 271(D):

To be rear admiral

LINDA L. FAGAN
THOMAS W. JONES
STEVEN D. POULIN
JAMES E. RENDON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY IN THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD AND TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 14, U.S.C., SECTION 50:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. WILLIAM D. LEE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY IN THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD AND TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 14, U.S.C., SECTION 50:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. CHARLES W. RAY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY IN THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD AND TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 14, U.S.C., SECTION 50:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. CHARLES D. MICHEL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS VICE COMMANDANT OF THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD AND TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 14, U.S.C., SECTION 47:

To be vice admiral

VICE ADM. PETER V. NEFFENGER

COAST GUARD NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH RUBY L. COLLINS AND ENDING WITH MICHAEL W. WAMPLER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 16, 2014.

COAST GUARD NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH WILLIAM C. ADAMS AND ENDING WITH ADAM K. YOUNG, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 16, 2014.

COAST GUARD NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH KEVIN J. LOPES AND ENDING WITH MARIETTE C. OGG, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 6, 2014.