



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 160

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JUNE 24, 2014

No. 99

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

PRAYER

The guest chaplain, Reverend Gloria Chaney-Robinson, Senior Pastor of Shiloh Baptist Church in Scranton, PA, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal Lord God, we pause in these revered halls to give thanks and to offer petition. We acknowledge in this place You have called humankind to exhibit righteousness and justice. You desire harmony, accord, peace, and wholeness. Bless now the representatives who gather in this place of policy and procedure.

We ask, O God, that You would impart the gift of now vision and future sights. We pray for Your gifts of vision, discernment, sensitivity, and perceptiveness. For those assembled present and those to come, grant the posture of patience and of cooperation. To those in debate, discussion, discourse, and duty, allow calm clarity.

Allow truth to reign, justice to reside, and mercy to resonate. Keep ever before us the broken, the disappointed, those in despair, and the destitute. Set ears to hear the cries of the poor, the needs of the sick, and the afflicted. Please allow hearts assembled to do that which is best for all.

In advance, for what You will do, we say thank You. We pray in Your holy Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore 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.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

BIPARTISAN SPORTSMEN'S ACT OF 2014—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 384, S. 2363, the Hagan Sportsmen's Act.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 384, S. 2363, a bill to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, shooting, and for other purposes.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following my remarks and those of the Republican leader, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 11 a.m. this morning, with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees.

At 11 a.m. the Senate will proceed to executive session, and we will have five rollcall votes which will be to confirm three judges from Florida, one from Vermont, and also a very important cloture vote on the Rodriguez nomination, to be the Director of U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services at the Department of Homeland Security.

NOMINATIONS

Mr. President, it is unfortunate that we still have scores and scores of good men and women on the Executive Calendar waiting to be confirmed. The delay by the Republicans is untoward. It has never happened before, and we are working through these as quickly as we can. The judges only take an hour of postcloture time, but the nominations take 8 hours of postcloture time. We can yield back 4 hours, which we do almost every time, but these stalling tactics by the Republicans have added to our doing nothing here in the Senate not by hours or days or weeks but by months. It is so unfortu-

nate. We have never had a situation such as this before.

As everyone knows, we changed the rules as they related to judges, and thank goodness we did that. Justice can move forward in our country without the delay and obstruction that has taken place over the last number of years with Republicans holding up judges. We, through the chairman of the committee, have moved lots of judges. We now have four circuit court judges we have to move toward, and we will do that, even though each one of those takes 30 hours. We are nearly caught up with district court judges, which speaks well for the Judiciary Committee and the Senators who are forwarding names to the President for submission to the committee.

WORKFORCE INVESTMENT ACT

Mr. President, tomorrow we are going to turn to the Workforce Investment Act—a nice, important piece of legislation. It is a picture of what we should be doing here on legislation in general. The Workforce Investment Act is a very complicated piece of legislation. We are not going to spend a lot of time on it, but that should not in any way take away from the importance of this legislation. It is very important legislation. It is an example of how we should be able to get done in the Senate.

I commend Senators MURRAY, HARKIN, and ALEXANDER for working to get this bill to us. They have spent untoward hours and hours of time to get us here. Everyone knows LAMAR ALEXANDER is a peacemaker, and I appreciate his work. I was told a few minutes ago that he came to the floor and said: Why don't we go ahead on the appropriations bills and on amendments that appear to be controversial, and we can have a 60-vote threshold on those? I suggested the same thing yesterday.

We voted here approximately 50 times. I have been forced to have, because of the McConnell rule, 60 votes

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S3903

on anything that is the least bit controversial. Let's move through the appropriations bills. People on my side of the aisle want to do this, and I don't know why the Republicans would prevent us from doing that, but that is where we are now.

VOTING RIGHTS

I will talk to the press about the next issue in more detail at a subsequent time, but I wish to congratulate RAND PAUL, the junior Senator from Kentucky.

About 15 years ago, I offered an amendment on the Senate floor that said if someone has been convicted of a crime or felony and completed their sentence, if they go to jail, and their probation, if they got probation, they should be able to vote, and that is what RAND PAUL said.

RAND PAUL offered legislation that said if it is a nonviolent crime, they should be able to vote when they have completed their time. I went a little farther than that with my legislation, but I appreciate his suggestion. I will have more to say about that later, and I hope I don't get him in trouble with the Republican caucus for congratulating him.

This is something that is long overdue. As a country, we should allow people who have served their time and penance, or however you want to state it, the ability to vote. I have said it before, and I now have said it for a third time. I will have a lot more to say about it later today.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

Will the Chair announce the business of the day?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOOKER). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be a period of morning business until 11 a.m. with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees.

The assistant majority leader.

FOR-PROFIT SCHOOLS AND UNIVERSITIES

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, for a number of years I have come to this floor to talk about an issue I wish to bring up again this morning, and the issue is for-profit colleges and universities.

Many people, when they hear me describe this, don't understand which schools I am talking about. It is not the public and private universities that you would think of automatically, such as the University of Illinois and Northwestern University and others. It is the for-profit world of higher education.

The for-profit colleges and universities are led by the Apollo Group,

which owns the University of Phoenix, and is the largest; DeVry University, which is based out of Chicago; Kaplan and Corinthian, and many others.

They bring about 10 to 12 percent of all the high school graduates into their for-profit colleges. They receive from the Federal Government 20 percent of all the Federal aid to education because the tuition they charge is very high, and these for-profit colleges have another distinction—their students account for 46 percent of all college student loan defaults. They enroll 10 percent of the students and account for 46 percent of the student loan defaults.

What is going on here? What is going on here is they are charging these students a high tuition for these for-profit schools, and they are not preparing them to go to work or at least not to work at jobs where they can pay off those student loans. As a result students will drop out before they finish or they will finish with a diploma that is worthless. They can't find a job, they can't pay back their student loans, and now they are in the worst of all possible worlds—deep in debt with no education to speak of.

The reason I am raising the point about the for-profit colleges and universities is because there have been several significant developments. Education Management Corporation owns a group of schools called the Art Institutes. I have run into them in the Chicagoland area. Argosy is another one of these for-profit schools, as is ITT Tech, and I mentioned Kaplan and Apollo.

Career Education Corporation has schools such as the American International University and the Harrington College of Design. They sound very appealing.

I met one of the students who attended Harrington. Her name is Hannah Moore. She is a young woman from Chicago. She went to community college for 2 years, and then she transferred into the Harrington College of Design in the suburbs of Chicago to get a degree in design. When it was all over, after she received her degree, she could not find a job—not in that field. It turned out the degree was basically worthless.

When she left Harrington College of Design, she had a college debt of \$125,000. She could not find a job, and she could not make the payments. She had to move back in with her parents because that is all she could do, and because she could not keep up with the payments, her college loan debt grew to \$150,000. Her father came out of retirement to help her pay for it.

Think about it. She did what she thought was a good thing in going to college, went to one of these worthless for-profit schools, and now her life has literally changed forever because of this mountain of debt.

Then there is a group called Corinthian College, which I want to focus on here. Corinthian College is based out of California. The local college's name,

you may recognize, is Everest Colleges. We have 6 in Illinois, about 10 in Michigan, a dozen in California, and they are across the United States.

It turned out that last year evidence surfaced that Everest Colleges were falsifying the information they provided to the Federal Government. In some cases it turns out they even paid employers to hire Everest graduates for a short period of time so they could report to the government that their graduates had found jobs, and then after the report was made, the people were let go. They didn't have a job.

Everest was asked to send additional information to the Federal Government about this fraudulent practice, and for 5 months they failed to do it. Then last week the U.S. Department of Education said: Because Everest won't provide us with the data they are supposed to under the law, we are going to suspend new student loan money to them for 21 days. Everest Colleges—or Corinthian, their parent corporation—announced that because of this, they will not have enough money and may not be able to continue their operations. The value of stock in this corporation, Corinthian Corporation, went down to the range of 28 cents last week. Nobody would loan them money.

Right now some 75,000 students across America are enrolled in Everest Colleges with student loans, and there is a very good chance that Everest Colleges—Corinthian as we know it—will not survive.

My obvious question is: What will happen to these students? They have the debt to go to this worthless school that appears to be going out of business.

We are working with the U.S. Department of Education right now. I am concerned about where these students are going to end up. I contacted the community colleges in my State and said: Reach out to the Everest College students and see if you can rescue these kids.

But when we look at this and put it in perspective, we see this is only one of many for-profit colleges and universities. Most parents and most students don't know this whole brand of higher education is out there. They think it is just like every other college. It is not, and we are not doing a good enough job at the Federal level to regulate these for-profit colleges and universities that are exploiting these students.

Let me tell my colleagues one story that was reported recently that I think is horrible, involving Corinthian Colleges. It is an article written by David Halperin entitled "For-profit College Enrolls 'Exploits' Student Who Reads at Third-grade Level."

A 37-year-old man with what appeared to be a developmental disability—he was described as shaking, speaking haltingly, reading at an elementary school level—37-years-old—was allowed to enroll in Everest College's criminal justice program.

According to the librarian who worked with him—and subsequently resigned because of the treatment of this man—the man was rarely able to comprehend sentences, was unable to sound out words, and does not have the ability to read documents he was asked to sign. She was worried about his ability to even understand the debt he was signing on for, the student loan debt at one of these Everest Colleges.

It apparently didn't matter to Everest. They were ready to sign him up into college. As long as this man was eligible to take out Federal loans, Everest was going to get paid. The man was just an ATM machine spitting out dollars to Everest Colleges.

Is that outrageous, to think they would lure someone with a disability into signing up?

The list goes on and on, including Ashford University, another one of these for-profit colleges and universities.

The obvious question we have to ask is this: When will our Department of Education and when will this Congress address this travesty? What is existing across the United States with these for-profit colleges and universities is an outrage, and it is exploiting the students and their families.

Sadly, a couple of weeks ago we tried to pass a bill on the floor of the Senate so that students could renegotiate their student loans and bring down the interest rates. Every Democrat voted for it. We needed 5 Republicans out of 45 to join us so that students in States such as New Jersey and Illinois could renegotiate their student loan rates down and make them more affordable. We got three Republicans: Senator COLLINS of Maine, Senator CORKER of Tennessee, and Senator MURKOWSKI of Alaska. We needed two more to start the debate about renegotiating college loans.

I think we have to wake up here. This debt families across America are facing—44 million individuals paying college loans—is an outrage. Part of it was started by these for-profit schools, but another part of it just reflects a debt that is out of control, and we ought to be more sensitive to it.

We are going to call this again. ELIZABETH WARREN brought the bill to the floor. This time we are going to hope that some of our Republican colleagues go home to their States and in town meetings actually speak with families who are paying college student loans. If they will, I think they will understand they should join us in this effort: to give these college students and their families a fighting chance to pay off their loans and to reform this higher education system to stop the outrageous conduct by these for-profit colleges and universities.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader is recognized.

LEGISLATIVE LOGJAM

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, last summer I said it felt as though the White House had hung a "Gone Campaignin'" sign outside the Oval Office. President Obama didn't seem the least bit interested in passing serious, bipartisan solutions for the middle class. It was all campaigning, all the time.

On the rarest of occasions when he did come to Congress, it was for internal campaign rallies with his party. Well, it has actually only gotten worse.

Since last summer he has barely picked up the phone and his bill-signing pen is literally starting to rust. Here is the reason: This summer the Democratic-controlled Senate seems to have put out a "Gone Campaignin'" sign of its own. That is why the Democratic Senate has become a veritable graveyard of good ideas.

Most people assume the purpose of the Senate is to pass legislation to help the American people, but these days the Democrats who run the Senate seem to think their role is actually to just bury good legislation. They are more interested in pleasing their far left political patrons—patrons who appear to oppose everything that could actually help the American middle class.

Case in point: The Republican-led House of Representatives has already passed hundreds of pieces of legislation this Congress—legislation introduced by Members of both parties, including dozens of jobs bills, that remain stuck here in the Senate. That means President Obama has not had to sign or veto them, and the Senate majority leader has been all too happy to protect him from choosing between helping the far-left fringe and the vast American middle. In other words, Senate Democrats are on a mission this summer to obstruct solutions for the middle class at every turn and to prevent almost any serious legislating from occurring at all—at all.

Over in the House the minority party has been offered more than 160 votes on their amendments since last July. Here in the Senate the Democratic leadership has blocked all but nine Republican rollcall votes.

And it is not just Republican amendments getting squashed either. The Democrats who run the Senate are so scared of legislating these days they are blocking virtually every amendment on both sides. It has gotten to the point where one House Democrat, a Congresswoman from Texas, has now had twice as many rollcall votes on amendments since last July—15—as the entire Senate Democratic caucus combined. One Member of the House in the minority party has had more votes than all of the Democratic Senators combined over the last year. Between the 55 Senate Democrats, they have had seven amendments in a year.

In other words, the majority leader is treating his one caucus even worse than he is treating us.

Even committee work can no longer escape the Democratic majority's political obsession. The majority shut down the committee process on important legislation that should have been and would have been bipartisan—bills about patents and appropriations.

This is the kind of stuff that makes Americans so very mad at Washington. I mean, how do we justify stifling the voices of so many Senators and the tens of millions of Americans they were sent here to represent? It is indefensible. It has gotten worse and worse under current Democratic leaders.

Of course, every now and then, when we push hard enough, we are able to force our Democratic friends to allow a few—a few—bipartisan ideas to go through, such as the job training and workforce development bill we expect to pass tomorrow. But, boy, that is the rare exception around here—a very rare exception. Instead, we usually just see the game playing on important issues.

On energy, Democratic leadership blocked every attempt to provide relief to blue collar families who have been bulldozed by the administration's elitist war on coal jobs. They will not help the millions of Americans who struggle every single day with high utility bills, and they will not allow a serious vote on shovel-ready projects such as the Keystone Pipeline, either. Senate Democrats have blocked just about every effort to move forward on these issues. In so doing the Democratic leadership actually embarrasses the handful of Democratic Senators who still call for action on energy and Keystone—even veteran Members who chair committees. It just shows what little influence those Members actually have under the current Democratic leadership.

It all lays bare a very simple truth about today's Democratic Senate: If the far left hates it, it ain't happening.

That is true with health care too. The middle class is being plummeted by ObamaCare. A recent study showed that an average 27-year-old Kentuckian from Taylor County saw his premiums skyrocket by almost 60 percent this year. Constituents such as he are looking to Washington for leadership and for solutions, but Senate Democrats will not even allow sensible bipartisan health care solutions to come to a vote.

Instead, we just get more politics, such as the legislation we hear may be coming up later this week—a tactic designed by the Democratic campaign committee to make Americans forget—forget—that Democrats voted to raid Medicare—voted to raid Medicare—by \$700 billion to fund new ObamaCare spending. Every Democrat in the Senate, on Christmas Eve, 2009, without exception, voted to take \$700 billion out of Medicare to help fund ObamaCare.

Senate Democrats are actually trying to distract from their votes to raid Medicare by making it even harder to

save and strengthen Medicare. But Americans will not forget that the sponsors of the proposal were the very same people who voted to raid Medicare in the first place, through ObamaCare.

And they will not forget what happened last week either when Republicans advanced a series of bills aimed at increasing flexibility in the workplace and boosting upward mobility. We thought Democrats might want to work with us in a bipartisan manner to move these bills forward, but apparently the far left will not let them. Democratic leadership will not even consider legislation I have introduced that would help more moms and dads work from home while caring for young children. My bill aims to bring tax policy in line with what life is really like for working parents, and it would help young families save on child care costs too. But as I said, Senate Democrats have just gone campaigning.

For the Democratic leadership, helping the middle class seems to be far from priority one. But the middle class needs help right now, and the only way to offer working moms and struggling college graduates real solutions is to break through the Senate Democratic logjam.

There are two ways to accomplish that. Either our friends on the other side can get serious about working for the people who elected them or the people who elected them can make the decision for them.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

THE ECONOMY

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, yesterday the White House held its Summit on Working Families. On the summit's Web site, the White House notes: "Too many working Americans—both men and women—are living paycheck to paycheck, struggling to make ends meet and respond to the competing demands of work and family." That, unfortunately, is the truth.

But what the White House does not acknowledge is how much its policies have done to create that situation. Working families have not fared well under the Obama administration. Household income has fallen by \$3,500 on the President's watch. Meanwhile, prices for nearly everything have risen. Food prices have gone up. Tuition costs are soaring. Airline fares are rising. The cost of recreational activities, such as going to the movies, has risen. And energy prices are placing a huge burden on American families.

Gas prices have nearly doubled since the President took office. Low-income

families in my State of South Dakota pay an average of 24 percent of their income on energy costs alone. And things are set to get much worse.

This month the President's EPA announced plans to implement a massive energy tax on Americans. Thanks to this tax, energy bills could rise to crippling levels for many families in the next few years. That is not what families need, especially—especially—when they are already paying huge amounts for health care.

ObamaCare was supposed to make things better for American families. The President assured the American people that his health care law would reduce premiums by \$2,500. But since ObamaCare passed, not only have premiums not fallen, they have actually risen—gone up—by \$2,500.

Millions of Americans were forced off the health plans they were promised they could keep and into exchange plans that frequently cost more money and offer less. Too many American families now have exchange plans with massive deductibles—some as high as \$12,000 or more.

What middle-class family can afford to pay \$12,000 a year for medical care—\$12,000 on top of their premiums? That is like having an additional mortgage payment every single month. It is no wonder 54 percent of Americans do not think the President "is able to lead the country and get the job done," according to a recent Wall Street Journal/NBC News poll.

So what can you do if you are a working family living paycheck to paycheck and struggling with the high cost of everything from health care to gasoline? Well, over the past few years the answer has been not much because opportunities are few and far between in the Obama economy. Instead of promoting policies to create jobs, too often the President has proposed policies that kill jobs.

The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office has reported that ObamaCare will cause 2.5 million full-time workers to leave the workforce. Mr. President, 2.6 million Americans earning less than \$30,000 are in danger of having their hours and wages cut thanks to ObamaCare's 30-hour workweek rule. Mr. President, 63 percent of those workers are women.

The President and his party have also pushed hard for a minimum wage hike the Congressional Budget Office said would destroy up to 1 million jobs. Low-income Americans would be hit the hardest by that.

Then there is the President's national energy tax. In addition to raising energy bills for all Americans, the President's energy tax would result in the loss of tens of thousands, if not hundreds of thousands, of jobs. The rule would gut the coal industry, putting tens of thousands of workers out of work there.

It is difficult to reconcile the President's ostensible commitment to families with a policy that would put thou-

sands and thousands of parents out of a job.

The Keystone XL Pipeline would allow the President to put thousands of Americans to work. With a stroke of his pen, the President could sign off on this project and the 42,000-plus jobs it would support. Instead, he has ignored American workers and union leaders and chosen to pander to the wishes of his extremist environmental base.

The American people need jobs—steady, good-paying, long-term jobs with opportunities for advancement. Democrats and the President are not giving that to them. Instead of spending time on real job-creation measures, the majority leader has chosen to waste the Senate's time on gimmicky, politically motivated legislation.

If Democrats were serious about providing real relief to American families, they would be working with Republicans on the many bills we have proposed to spur job creation and to support American workers—bills such as Senator COLLINS' Forty Hours Is Full-Time Act, which would repeal the ObamaCare 30-hour workweek rule, which is resulting in lower wages and fewer hours for American workers; or Senator FISCHER's workplace advancement amendment, which would further equip women with the tools and knowledge they need to fight discrimination in the workplace; and Senator RUBIO's RAISE Act, which would amend the National Labor Relations Act to allow employers to give merit-based pay increases to individual employees, even if those increases are not part of a collective bargaining agreement; and Senator MCCONNELL's Working Parents Home Office Act, which would fix a flaw in the Tax Code that prevents men and women from claiming a home office deduction if their home office has a baby crib so they can care for their child while they are working.

President Obama has talked about the importance of flextime for parents so they can adjust their work hours for parent-teacher conferences or soccer games. Well, Senator LEE has a bill that would help workers handle the constant challenge of work-life balance by allowing private-sector employers to offer all individuals who work overtime a choice between monetary compensation and comp time. Unfortunately, like so many other Republican bills, the Lee Working Families Flexibility Act is buried in the majority leader's Senate graveyard.

Traditionally thought of as a place where bills go to be debated, the Senate has, instead, become the place where bills go to die. But it is not just bills that go to die here; it is the solutions to improve the lives of millions of Americans. In addition to the many Senate Republican jobs bills that the majority leader has prevented from seeing the light of day, there are dozens—literally dozens—of House-passed jobs bills—several of them bipartisan—that the majority leader refuses to bring up. The Senate historically has

been a place where the voices of all Senators—Republican and Democrat, majority and minority—have been heard. But lately, the Senate seems to have become nothing so much as an arm of the Democrats' campaign committee. Democrats have brought up bills designed to win votes, not solve problems.

The Democratic leadership has worked hard to protect its vulnerable Members from ever having to take challenging votes. They do not want Democrats in tough campaigns to have to choose between the American people and the Democratic Party's far-left political base.

One of Congress's most basic duties is to consider appropriations, yet over the past 2 weeks the majority leader has pulled not one but two appropriations bills from committee consideration because he did not want his Members to have to take votes on ObamaCare or on the President's national energy tax.

That is wrong. We are here to take tough votes. If you do not want to have to take hard votes, do not run for the Senate. There is a lot of stuff that—amendments get offered by our colleagues on the other side that I do not like to vote on either, but that is what we are here for. We are here to debate. We are here to take votes. We are here to offer amendments, to put legislation on the floor.

All of us have different ideas. I may not agree with some of the things that are offered up by my colleagues on the other side, but the fact of the matter is, they have a right, on behalf of the constituents they represent, to bring the issues to the floor that are important to their constituents, and for us to debate them, and for us to vote on them.

In fact, the majority leader has exerted such tight control over the Senate that over the past year he has not only blocked almost all Republican amendments, he has blocked almost all of his party's amendments as well.

Since July of 2013—almost a year ago—the majority leader has allowed votes on just 9 Republican amendments, and just 7 Democratic amendments—out of 1,500 amendments that have been filed on the floor of the Senate.

Think about that. The world's greatest deliberative body—open to amendment, open to debate—1,500 amendments get filed; Republicans get 9 votes. I understand the whole idea, the political motivation of the leader in trying to protect his Members from having to take tough votes. But how are you as a majority Member—how do the Democrats in the Senate go back to their constituents at home and say: It is advantageous for us to be in the majority in Washington, when you have only had votes on seven amendments? Think about that. How do you, with a straight face, go back to your constituents and say: Being in the majority matters in the Senate, when

Democrats here are only getting—in the last year—seven amendments voted on? It is outrageous. One a month—about one amendment a month—is what we are voting on here, roughly.

Senators were elected to speak for the people of their State and to make sure their concerns are represented in the Senate. When Senators cannot add their voices to the process, the American people's concerns are not getting heard.

The American people have had a tough time getting their voices heard over the past few years. Over and over, they have made it clear they need good jobs and more economic opportunity. Instead, they have gotten 5½ years of higher costs and low job creation, and the jobs that are being created are not the kinds of jobs that were lost—the good-paying jobs that provide opportunities for advancement.

Republicans have proposed numerous bills to expand opportunities for American families and workers. It is time for the Senate to vote on these bills. The American people have spent enough time being ignored. It is high time for the Senate to change the way it is conducting its business.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

MINE BAN TREATY

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, yesterday in Maputo, Mozambique, representatives of many of the 161 countries that have joined the treaty banning the production, stockpiling, export, and use of antipersonnel landmines convened the third review conference in the 15 years since the treaty came into force.

The impact of that treaty, once ridiculed as a naive dream by many in the U.S. defense establishment, has been extraordinary. The vast majority of landmine use and production has stopped. New casualties have dropped significantly. Many countries have cleared the mined areas in their territories.

Of the 35 countries that have not yet joined the treaty, including the United States, almost all abide by its provisions. We can be proud that the United States has been the largest contributor to programs to clear mines and to help mine victims. Those programs have saved countless lives. In fact, the Leahy War Victims Fund was first used in Mozambique.

But I remember during the negotiations on the treaty how officials in the U.S. administration at the time urged, even warned, their counterparts in other countries, including our NATO allies, against signing the treaty. In the end, every member of NATO except the United States joined it.

Some in our government said it was a meaningless gesture that would accomplish nothing. I think they resented that other governments, especially Canada, and nongovernmental organizations from around the world

could achieve something outside the U.N. negotiation process, which had utterly failed to address this problem.

Instead, the treaty has already accomplished more than most people expected, thanks to the extraordinary advocacy of the International Campaign to Ban Landmines and three-quarters of the world's governments, many of whose people have suffered from the scourge of landmines.

But the problem is far from solved. There are still thousands of deaths and injuries from mines each year, and most are innocent civilians.

Twenty years ago this week, in a speech at the United Nations that inspired people around the world, President Clinton called for a global ban on antipersonnel mines. I was proud of President Clinton for doing that, but his Presidency, his administration, was outmaneuvered by the Pentagon, and it failed to join the treaty. Then, during the 8 years of the last Bush administration, nothing happened. In fact, during those years, the White House reneged on some of the pledges of the Clinton administration.

When President Obama was elected, I thought we would finally see the United States get on the right side of this issue. After all, we fought two long wars without using antipersonnel mines. All our NATO allies and most of our coalition partners have banned them.

But that has not happened.

Now we rightly condemned, and I do condemn, the Taliban for using victim-activated IEDs, which are also banned by the treaty, but we still insist on retaining our right to use antipersonnel mines.

Eighteen years ago, President Clinton charged the Pentagon to develop alternatives to antipersonnel mines. Instead, the Pentagon has fought every attempt to get rid of these indiscriminate weapons, even if they do not use them.

As I have said many times, no one argues that antipersonnel mines have no military utility. Every weapon does. Poison gas has a military utility, but we outlawed it a century ago. Are we incapable of renouncing, as our closest allies have, tiny explosives that are the antithesis of precision-guided weapons, weapons we have rightly not used during two long wars, weapons that kill children and innocent civilians, and weapons that should bring condemnation to anybody using them?

We talk about the importance of avoiding civilian casualties. We all believe in that. We have seen how civilian casualties can turn a local population against us. We do not export antipersonnel landmines. We do not use them. We can drive a robot on Mars by remote control, but we say we cannot solve this problem. It begs credulity.

This is not an abstract issue. This girl is who I am talking about. I have met countless people like her. She is lucky. She survived, even though without hands and legs. Many others like her bleed to death.

I have been to clinics in poor countries where, instead of soccer balls, they make artificial limbs like these. We support them with the Leahy War Victims Fund. I am glad we can help, but I wish there was absolutely no need for that.

I visited a young girl in a hospital after the Bosnia war. Her parents had sent her away so she could be safe. The war ended. The soldiers returned home. She was running down the road calling out to her parents, and she stepped on a mine. Both her legs were blown off. The war was over, but not for her.

We recently sent people to that part of the world after flooding. Why? Because thousands of landmines still in the ground had washed up and moved around. Schoolchildren now face the danger again, because even though they had mapped where the landmines were that was before the floods.

As in the past, the White House hides behind their failure to act by pointing at North Korea. Who is not concerned about North Korea? But are we so dependent on antipersonnel landmines that we cannot develop war plans to defend South Korea without them? I reject that just as former commanders of our forces in South Korea rejected it long ago.

Last week, after a cursory 2-minute debate that inaccurately described the landmines in the Korean DMZ as U.S. mines, which they are not, and that inaccurately asserted, based on erroneous press reports, that the White House is about to join the mine ban treaty, which it is not, the House Defense Appropriations Subcommittee adopted by voice vote a prohibition on the use of funds to implement the treaty.

The amendment's sponsor even claimed that the one thing—the only thing—stopping a North Korean invasion is U.S. antipersonnel mines. Balderdash. Did the Pentagon tell them that? Of course not. I wonder how many, if any, Members of that subcommittee have even read the treaty.

One would think, 61 years after the Korean war, that the Pentagon would not still be arguing that the defense of South Korea depends on tiny, indiscriminate explosives that would pose a threat to U.S. forces if we counter-attacked. It makes you wonder.

This country, with the most powerful army, that spends far more money on its armed forces than any country in the world, has to rely on antipersonnel landmines? Oh, come on.

President Obama can still put the United States on a path to join the treaty, but time is running out. It will require some revision of our Korea war plans. That can be done in a manner that protects the security of South Korea and our troops. It needs to be done, because without the participation and support of the United States, the most powerful Nation on Earth, no international treaty can achieve its potential.

I commend the participants at the Maputo review conference. I regret the

United States is there only as an observer, as it has been since the Ottawa process began 18 years ago. We sit on the sidelines as though we have no role in this. What a missed opportunity, what a stain on the country that should be the moral leader.

The next review conference is in 2019, the 25th anniversary of President Clinton's speech. What an anniversary it would be if that next review conference were held in Washington, with the United States attending as a party to the treaty.

I ask unanimous consent that a June 22 article in the Boston Globe and a June 23 article in the New York Times on this subject be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Boston Globe, June 22, 2014]

FORMERLY A LEADER ON LAND MINE BAN,
OBAMA NOW BALKS
(By Bryan Bender)

WASHINGTON.—In 2005, then-Senator Barack Obama wrote to a constituent that he would use his influence to help advance an international treaty banning land mines, decrying what he called the "horrific injuries and loss of life" among civilians long after wars end.

But in his five-plus years as president, Obama has not asked the US Senate to ratify the pact signed by 161 other nations, showing an unwillingness to take on military officials who assert that the devices, which the Pentagon last used in battle in 1991, are still needed. Instead, his administration has repeatedly delayed a review of the issue initiated early in his first term.

Senator Patrick Leahy, the Vermont Democrat who has spent more than two decades directing federal funding to clear minefields and provide victims with wheelchairs, prosthetics, and job training, is so frustrated at Obama's lack of action that he is complaining bitterly and publicly about it.

"I think of children who have gone to something shiny on the side of the road thinking it was a toy and instead having their legs blown off," Leahy said in a blunt floor speech in late March, the first in a series he has delivered to focus attention on the issue. "President Obama, you know what you should do."

Indeed, what is most vexing to many treaty supporters is that the United States has done more than other countries to address the problem, but still hasn't taken up the treaty.

In addition to spending more than \$2 billion over the last two decades to reduce the threat and aid victims, the United States has halted the production and export of so-called "persistent" or "dumb" mines that have no disarming mechanism and can remain a danger for unsuspecting villagers for decades.

"The United States has actually probably lived up to about 90 percent of the requirements of the treaty," said Lloyd Axworthy, the former foreign minister of Canada who hosted the treaty negotiations, expressing incredulity that the United States has nonetheless long resisted giving up the weapons.

Although it was among the first to call for a treaty banning land mines, the United States is now the only member of the NATO military alliance that has not joined the pact. The only other nation in the Western Hemisphere to refuse is Cuba. When treaty signatories meet on June 23 in Mozambique to discuss ways to accelerate the destruction

of mines as well as strengthen the pact, the United States will attend only as an observer.

"It was US leadership that really got the ball rolling," said Bobby Muller, president of the Vietnam Veterans of America Foundation, who was a key organizer of the original movement to ban the weapons. "But the United States is shamefully behind the curve."

THE KILLING CONTINUES

In late May, a six-year-old girl was killed and five other villagers wounded in Myanmar when they came upon a land mine near the border with Thailand.

The same week the US State Department dispatched a "quick reaction force" to Serbia and Bosnia-Herzegovina where flooding had dislodged land mines left over from the civil war in the former Yugoslavia.

Advocates for the ban believe America's continued reluctance to embrace the treaty is slowing momentum to render politically unacceptable a weapon that kills or injures an estimated 10 people every day in the 60-some countries where they remain in the ground. For example, US allies Ukraine and Finland have recently signaled they might withdraw from the treaty out of military necessity.

Three dozen countries still remain outside the treaty, according to a recent report by the Arms Control Association, a nonprofit advocacy group, including the United States, China, Russia, India, and Pakistan. Together they collectively account for an estimated stockpile of 160 million landmines, while experts say there is no reliable way to estimate how many landmines are still littering global battlefields.

AT FIRST, SOME HIGH HOPES

The "Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Antipersonnel Mines and on Their Destruction" was proposed in 1997, requiring member nations to no longer use land mines, destroy all remaining supplies, and remove those planted on their territory.

The so-called Ottawa Treaty was heralded as the first global arms treaty to emerge from civil society, as opposed to governments. The International Campaign to Ban Landmines, a coalition of 1,400 nongovernmental organizations from around the world—led by American Jody Williams—was awarded the 1997 Nobel Peace Prize for spearheading the effort, which also benefited from high-profile advocates like the late Princess Diana.

The treaty's unique evolution is viewed as a possible reason why the American military brass is still resisting; the thinking goes that commanders fear that giving up land mines could encourage similar efforts by human rights groups to seek to ban other types of controversial weapons, such as drones.

The United States initially was a leading advocate of the pact; then-US President Bill Clinton called the land mine problem "a global tragedy."

"In all probability, land mines kill more children than soldiers, and they keep killing after wars are over," Clinton said.

But he opted not to sign the treaty and seek its ratification after US military leaders insisted that they needed time to develop alternatives to mines.

The Bush administration also adhered to that position, while the US Army began developing so-called "smart" mines as a replacement, devices officials say are now ready to be part of the arsenal.

One alternative, called the Spider, is designed to detonate only by command and to self-defuse after a limited period. It is designed and built in part by Textron Systems

in Wilmington, Mass. Textron officials did not respond to a request for comment.

When Obama came into office in 2009 there were high hopes that he would seek to join the treaty; he instead ordered up a review that has gone on for five years.

Asked about the assessment, Edward Price, a spokesman for the White House's National Security Council, said, "We are pressing forward to conclude our review of US land mine policy" but declined to provide details.

"The United States shares the humanitarian concerns of the parties to the Ottawa Convention," Price added, noting that "the United States is the single largest financial supporter of global humanitarian demining efforts."

A Pentagon spokeswoman, Lieutenant Commander Amy Derrickfrost, defended the military's position. She said that in addition to ending the use of so-called "dumb" mines in 2010, the US military also no longer uses plastic mines, which cannot be identified with a metal detector or other mine surveillance technologies.

But the military continues to say that it must have the ability to use anti-personnel land mines.

"I consider them to be an important tool in the arsenal of the armed forces of the United States," General Martin Dempsey, the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, told a congressional hearing in March, especially on the Korean peninsula, where they are intended to help blunt an invasion by the North Korean army.

The Pentagon position has its share of supporters on Capitol Hill, including Representative Randy Forbes, a Virginia Republican, who calls land mines "vitally important to the defense of South Korea." Fearing that Obama will sign the treaty, he has proposed an amendment to a new defense bill that would prohibit the administration from implementing the treaty.

Many observers, however, remain surprised at the extent of opposition at the Pentagon to the treaty.

"Some of the guys that wrote the [Korean] war plans were advocates of the mine ban," said retired Army Lieutenant General G. Robert Gard, who traveled to South Korea in the late 1990s at Leahy's request to make an assessment.

Gard, who is chairman of the Center for Arms Control and Nonproliferation, a non-profit think tank, said commanders asserted "we could accomplish the things that land mines were purported to do for us by other means."

A veteran of the Korean and Vietnam Wars, Gard believes that the continued Pentagon resistance is driven by fear that giving in could embolden human rights groups to try to ban other weapons.

He described the argument: "If you give in to those flaky nongovernmental organizations they will try to to make us get rid of other weapons we really need."

Meanwhile, the ongoing land mine policy review—the third such assessment since the Clinton years—has treaty advocates such as Williams, the peace prize recipient, deeply frustrated.

She said in an e-mail that she "does not understand why this review has taken place at all and even less do we understand or accept why it has taken five years already and President Obama still seems unable to bring it to a conclusion that can be shared with the American public."

'LIFE FOREVER RUINED'

The gruesome photographs, blown up to nearly life size for maximum effect, line a small, cluttered office of the Senate Appropriations Committee. One depicts a pair of legless men looking up from their wheel

chairs, another a woman hobbling along with the help of a stick.

The images were all captured by Leahy, an amateur photographer who has personally chronicled dozens of innocent war victims from Central America to Southeast Asia.

His crusade against land mines began more than two decades ago in a jungle village in Nicaragua, at the height of its civil war.

"There was a little boy, probably 12 years old, one leg, homemade crutch. He'd lost his leg from a landmine," Leahy recalled in an interview in his Senate office, where some of his war victim photos hang at eye level above his desk.

Leahy asked the boy if he was injured by the forces loyal to the Sandinista government or the so-called Contra rebels. "Well, he had no idea. He just knew that his life was forever ruined."

Leahy later used his perch on the panel overseeing the State Department budget to establish a US fund to help the most vulnerable victims of war, which was later named the Leahy Victims Fund. He also provided money for mine clearance groups around the world.

Leahy later proposed legislation prohibiting the United States from exporting land mines. To help convince a skeptical Senate, he persuaded DC Comics to publish a Batman comic edition in which the caped crusader, in his effort to rescue a child, had to walk through a minefield.

The last panel depicted the child reaching for a shiny object and being warned by Batman not to pick it up before there was a "Kaboom."

Leahy provided a copy of the special issue to every senator; his legislation passed by voice vote without opposition. He now remains optimistic that if Obama would sign the land mine treaty and send it to the Senate for ratification it has a good chance of garnering the required two-thirds, or 67 votes, to pass—despite the overall partisan rancor.

"I don't want to sound like I am on a crusade but nothing has gripped me as much since I have been here," Leahy said, tearing up when recalling how he lifted a Vietnamese landmine victim into his wheelchair. ("He grabbed my shirt, he pulled me down, and he kissed me".)

"This is today's poison gas," Leahy said. Failing to join the treaty, he believes, "is a moral failure of our country."

[From the New York Times, June 23, 2014]

TREATY IS MAKING LAND MINES WEAPON OF PAST, GROUP SAYS

(By Rick Gladstone)

Despite the conflicts in Syria, Iraq and Afghanistan, the armed uprising in Ukraine and turmoil in other hot spots in the Middle East and Africa, one of war's most insidious weapons—antipersonnel land mines—have been largely outlawed and drastically reduced, a monitoring group said in a report released Monday.

In the 15 years since a global treaty prohibiting these weapons took effect, the use and production of the mines has nearly stopped, new casualties have plummeted, and more than two dozen countries once contaminated by land mines buried since old wars have removed them, said the report by the group, the International Campaign to Ban Landmines.

"The Mine Ban Treaty remains an ongoing success in stigmatizing the use of land mines and mitigating the suffering they cause," said Jeff Abramson, the project manager of Landmine Monitor, the group's research unit.

The group, which won a Nobel Peace Prize in 1997 for its work, released the report to co-

incide with the Third Review Conference of the Mine Ban Treaty, which convened Monday in Maputo, Mozambique, where representatives from its 161 signers and other participants will spend five days discussing how to further strengthen enforcement of the agreement.

Antipersonnel mines are hidden explosive devices that are buried in the ground and designed to be detonated when a person steps on or near them, causing indiscriminate death and grievous injury. They can lie dormant for decades, long after a conflict has ended. Many of their victims are children.

The United States, which was among the original countries to call for a treaty banning mines and has done much to help other countries purge them, has not signed the treaty. It is among the 36 countries that have not signed it and is the only NATO member outside the treaty. (Russia and China also have not signed.)

An American delegation is attending the Maputo conference only as observers.

Human rights advocates criticize the United States for what they call a conspicuous lapse that may be dissuading other countries from joining the treaty.

The Obama administration, which says it has been evaluating the treaty's provisions since 2009, has issued conflicting signals about its intentions.

"It's going to be embarrassing for the U.S. to have to explain to the high-level officials at the summit meeting why it has been reviewing its land mine policies for five years without making a decision," said Stephen Goose, the executive director of the arms division at Human Rights Watch and the chairman of the United States Campaign to Ban Landmines, a coalition of groups that has been pressing the United States to join.

American defense officials have resisted a blanket renunciation of land mines. Gen. Martin E. Dempsey, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, told a congressional hearing in March that he considered such weapons "an important tool" in the American arsenal, citing as an example their use in South Korea to deter an invasion from North Korea.

Others, however, have expressed frustration over what they regard as an inexcusable American refusal to join the treaty. Senator Patrick J. Leahy, a Vermont Democrat and a prominent supporter of the treaty, has pressed the administration in speeches this year to endorse it.

"If land mines were littering this country—in schoolyards, along roads, in cornfields, in our national parks—and hundreds of American children were being crippled" like children in Cambodia, Mr. Leahy said in an April 9 statement, "how long would it take before the White House sent the Mine Ban Treaty to the Senate for ratification."

Despite its apparent reluctance to join the treaty, the United States has spent more than \$2 billion in the past two decades to help clear mines and aid victims, more than any other country.

The United States also has stopped production and export of so-called dumb mines that cannot be disarmed, and it no longer uses plastic materials that can foil metal detectors used to decontaminate mine-infested areas.

The report by the International Campaign to Ban Landmines said that only five countries—Israel, Libya, Myanmar, Russia and Syria, all nonsigners of the treaty—had used antipersonnel land mines since 2009.

But it also reported that Yemen, which has signed the treaty, disclosed last November that it violated its pledge against land mine use in 2011.

The report said global stockpiles of mines had dropped sharply, with 87 signers of the

treaty having completed their promised destruction of a total of about 47 million mines, since the treaty took effect. Twenty-seven nations contaminated with mines have proclaimed themselves mine-free during that period.

Casualties from leftover mines have also declined by more than half since the treaty took effect, the report said. Yet in the roughly 60 countries where contamination from land mines and other explosive remnants of war remains a problem, an estimated 4,000 people a year are killed or wounded.

The report said nearly half the victims were children. In Afghanistan, it said, children constitute 61 percent of all such casualties since 1999.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, what is the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is in morning business until 11 a.m.

Mr. LEAHY. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

NOMINATIONS

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I inform the Senate that the three judges from Florida we are about to vote on have the support of Senator RUBIO and I. It is as a result of a bipartisan process. It is actually a nonpartisan process as to how we select our judges in Florida. Senator RUBIO and I appoint a judicial nominating commission in the three judicial districts in Florida. They then, when there is a vacancy of a judge or U.S. attorney or U.S. marshal, receive the applications, do the interviews, and make—for one vacancy—three recommendations. Senator RUBIO and I then take these three recommendations, the two of us together interview the applicants. The arrangement we have with the White House—and of course we know the President could select whomever he wants, but the White House has graciously agreed, and this has been a longstanding practice with the Federal judge selections from Florida, the White House has agreed they will pick from among the three we send.

Senator RUBIO and I send comments to the White House about the three, even though what we primarily do is tell the White House if we have an objection to any one of the three who come through the judicial nominating commission process.

Therefore, what we do is we take politics out of the selection of judges.

I highly recommend to the Senate Paul Byron and Carlos Eduardo Mendoza, both of the Middle District, and Beth Bloom of the Southern District.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALSH).

Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF PAUL G. BYRON TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

NOMINATION OF CARLOS EDUARDO MENDOZA TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

NOMINATION OF BETH BLOOM TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

NOMINATION OF GEOFFREY W. CRAWFORD TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF VERMONT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nominations of Paul G. Byron, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Florida; Carlos Eduardo Mendoza, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Florida; Beth Bloom, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Florida; and Geoffrey W. Crawford, of Vermont, to be United States District Judge for the District of Vermont.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will be 2 minutes of debate prior to the Byron nomination.

The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to yield back all time.

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

VOTE ON BYRON NOMINATION

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Paul G. Byron, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Florida?

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER), and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. JOHANN). The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 94, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 206 Ex.]

YEAS—94

Alexander	Franken	Murkowski
Ayotte	Gillibrand	Murphy
Baldwin	Graham	Murray
Barrasso	Grassley	Nelson
Begich	Hagan	Paul
Bennet	Harkin	Portman
Blumenthal	Hatch	Reed
Blunt	Heitkamp	Reid
Booker	Heller	Risch
Boozman	Hirono	Roberts
Boxer	Hoeven	Rubio
Brown	Inhofe	Sanders
Burr	Isakson	Schumer
Cantwell	Johnson (SD)	Scott
Cardin	Johnson (WI)	Sessions
Carper	Kaine	Shaheen
Casey	King	Shelby
Chambliss	Kirk	Stabenow
Coats	Klobuchar	Tester
Coburn	Landrieu	Thune
Collins	Leahy	Toomey
Coons	Lee	Udall (CO)
Corker	Levin	Udall (NM)
Cornyn	Manchin	Vitter
Crapo	Markey	Walsh
Cruz	McCain	Warner
Donnelly	McCaskill	Warren
Durbin	McConnell	Whitehouse
Enzi	Menendez	Wicker
Feinstein	Merkley	Wyden
Fischer	Mikulski	
Flake	Moran	

NOT VOTING—6

Cochran	Johanns	Rockefeller
Heinrich	Pryor	Schatz

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON MENDOZA NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is now 2 minutes equally divided prior to a vote on the Mendoza nomination.

The Senator from Florida is recognized.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, just to remind the Senate, this judge and the next one—as was the previous one—were done by the Judicial Nominating Commission process that Senator RUBIO and I use in order to take any kind of politics out of the selection of judges. It has worked very well for years, and this judge and the next one are part of that process.

Thank you very much, Mr. President.

I yield back all time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, all time is yielded back.

Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Carlos Eduardo Mendoza, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Florida?

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER), and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator

from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. JOHANNNS).

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

The result was announced—yeas 94, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 207 Ex.]

YEAS—94

Alexander	Franken	Murkowski
Ayotte	Gillibrand	Murphy
Baldwin	Graham	Murray
Barrasso	Grassley	Nelson
Begich	Hagan	Paul
Bennet	Harkin	Portman
Blumenthal	Hatch	Reed
Blunt	Heitkamp	Risch
Booker	Heller	Roberts
Boozman	Hirono	Rockefeller
Boxer	Hoeven	Rubio
Brown	Inhofe	Sanders
Burr	Isakson	Schumer
Cantwell	Johnson (SD)	Scott
Cardin	Johnson (WI)	Sessions
Carper	Kaine	Shaheen
Casey	King	Shelby
Chambliss	Kirk	Stabenow
Coats	Klobuchar	Tester
Coburn	Landrieu	Thune
Collins	Leahy	Toomey
Coons	Lee	Udall (CO)
Corker	Levin	Udall (NM)
Cornyn	Manchin	Vitter
Crapo	Markey	Walsh
Cruz	McCain	Warner
Donnelly	McCaskill	Warren
Durbin	McConnell	Whitehouse
Enzi	Menendez	Wicker
Feinstein	Merkley	Wyden
Fischer	Mikulski	
Flake	Moran	

NOT VOTING—6

Cochran	Johanns	Rockefeller
Heinrich	Pryor	Schatz

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON BLOOM NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is now 2 minutes equally divided prior to the vote on the Bloom nomination.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to yield back all time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, all time is yielded back.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Beth Bloom, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Florida?

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER), and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. JOHANNNS).

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

The result was announced—yeas 95, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 208 Ex.]

YEAS—95

Alexander	Franken	Moran
Ayotte	Gillibrand	Murkowski
Baldwin	Graham	Murphy
Barrasso	Grassley	Murray
Begich	Hagan	Nelson
Bennet	Harkin	Paul
Blumenthal	Hatch	Portman
Blunt	Heinrich	Reed
Booker	Heitkamp	Reid
Boozman	Heller	Risch
Boxer	Hirono	Roberts
Brown	Hoeven	Rubio
Burr	Inhofe	Sanders
Cantwell	Isakson	Schumer
Cardin	Johnson (SD)	Scott
Carper	Johnson (WI)	Sessions
Casey	Kaine	Shaheen
Chambliss	King	Shelby
Coats	Kirk	Stabenow
Coburn	Klobuchar	Tester
Collins	Landrieu	Thune
Coons	Leahy	Toomey
Corker	Lee	Udall (CO)
Cornyn	Levin	Udall (NM)
Crapo	Manchin	Vitter
Cruz	Markey	Walsh
Donnelly	McCain	Warner
Durbin	McCaskill	Warren
Enzi	McConnell	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Menendez	Wicker
Fischer	Merkley	Wyden
Flake	Mikulski	

NOT VOTING—5

Cochran	Pryor	Schatz
Johanns	Rockefeller	

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON CRAWFORD NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 2 minutes equally divided prior to the vote on the Crawford nomination.

The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, is this the Crawford nomination?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LEAHY. Let me say he is strongly supported by both Senators from Vermont, and I might say also by the people of Vermont.

I yield back the remaining time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, all time is yielded back.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Geoffrey W. Crawford, of Vermont, to be United States District Judge for the District of Vermont?

Mr. INHOFE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second. There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR), and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. JOHANNNS).

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

The result was announced—yeas 95, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 209 Ex.]

YEAS—95

Alexander	Franken	Murkowski
Ayotte	Gillibrand	Murphy
Baldwin	Graham	Murray
Barrasso	Grassley	Nelson
Begich	Hagan	Paul
Bennet	Harkin	Portman
Blumenthal	Hatch	Reed
Blunt	Heinrich	Reid
Booker	Heitkamp	Risch
Boozman	Heller	Roberts
Boxer	Hirono	Rockefeller
Brown	Hoeven	Rubio
Burr	Inhofe	Sanders
Cantwell	Isakson	Schumer
Cardin	Johnson (SD)	Scott
Carper	Johnson (WI)	Sessions
Casey	Kaine	Shaheen
Chambliss	Kirk	Shelby
Coats	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Coburn	Landrieu	Tester
Collins	Leahy	Thune
Coons	Lee	Toomey
Corker	Levin	Udall (CO)
Cornyn	Manchin	Udall (NM)
Crapo	Markey	Vitter
Cruz	McCain	Walsh
Donnelly	McCaskill	Warner
Durbin	McConnell	Warren
Enzi	Menendez	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Merkley	Wicker
Fischer	Mikulski	Wyden
Flake	Moran	

NOT VOTING—5

Cochran	King	Schatz
Johanns	Pryor	

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, with respect to the confirmed nominations, the motions to reconsider are considered made and laid upon the table.

The President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are now 2 minutes equally divided prior to a cloture vote on the Rodriguez nomination.

Who yields time?

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I yield back all time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, all time is yielded back.

Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Leon Rodriguez, of Maryland, to be Director of the United States Citizenship and Immigration Services, Department of Homeland Security.

Harry Reid, Patrick J. Leahy, Richard J. Durbin, Patty Murray, Jack Reed, Sheldon Whitehouse, Christopher A. Coons, Sherrod Brown, Tom Harkin, Richard Blumenthal, Benjamin L. Cardin, Angus S. King, Jr., Thomas R. Carper, Elizabeth Warren, Amy Klobuchar, Debbie Stabenow, Charles E. Schumer.

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

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Leon Rodriguez, of Maryland, to be

Director of the United States Citizenship and Immigration Services shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR) and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. JOHANNIS).

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 52, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 210 Ex.]

YEAS—52

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

NAYS—44

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

NOT VOTING—4

Cochran	Pryor
Johanns	Schatz

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote the yeas are 52, the nays are 44. The motion is agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that following my remarks, the Senate recess until 2:15 p.m.; that when the Senate reconvenes, the time until 4:30 p.m. be equally divided and controlled in the usual form; and that at 4:30 p.m. all postcloture time be considered expired and the Senate vote on confirmation of the Rodriguez nomination.

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

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:39 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Ms. BALDWIN).

NOMINATION OF LEON RODRIGUEZ TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE UNITED STATES CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION SERVICES, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Nomination of Leon Rodriguez, of Maryland, to be Director of the United States Citizenship and Immigration Services, Department of Homeland Security.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 4:30 p.m. will be equally divided in the usual form.

The Republican whip.

CRIMINAL JUSTICE REFORM

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, there are two things I wish to address here briefly on the floor of the Senate. The first, strangely enough, has to do with an editorial that appeared in the New York Times this weekend.

I remember one of the people who was influential to me when I was coming up through the political system in Bexar County, TX, and in Austin, and now working here in Washington and back home in Texas. One of my mentors said: Don't ever get into a fight with somebody who buys ink by the barrel.

That seemed like pretty sage advice, but maybe it is a little dated these days because so much of what we see in the news is not in written newsprint itself.

The point is, the editorial in the New York Times this weekend I am referring to was talking about criminal justice reform, a topic that in recent months has produced some genuine bipartisan legislation. I am proud to be a cosponsor of one of those reform bills, along with my colleague, the junior Senator from Rhode Island, SHELDON WHITEHOUSE.

Our bill would allow low-risk Federal prisoners to earn credit toward completing a portion of their sentence outside of prison walls—for example, through home confinement, through halfway houses or community supervision.

Strangely enough, the Times editorial praises our bill as an example "of significant progress toward a legislative solution."

Unfortunately, it then proceeds to blame Senate Republicans, including me, for stalling progress on the bill and preventing a vote on the sentencing bill introduced by the distinguished majority whip, DICK DURBIN of Illinois.

The strange thing about it is, as every Senator and everybody within the sound of my voice knows, it is Majority Leader REID who determines what legislation comes up on the Senate floor, and this editorial didn't men-

tion him at all. An amazing oversight. The last time I checked, the majority leader was the only person in the Chamber with the power to schedule a vote on any legislation he wants, and he can do so whenever he wants.

So for the record, I wish to correct the error in the New York Times editorial. I strongly support criminal justice reform, including sentencing reform. My concerns about the sentencing reform bill cosponsored by Senator DURBIN and Senator LEE are that I believe the criteria it uses are excessively broad in deciding whose prison terms to shorten. But I think those are the sorts of things that could be worked out through an open amendment process on the Senate floor. And—I am sure we all agree on this—we don't want to prematurely release dangerous, higher level drug traffickers. That is my concern, that the bill is overly broad and would include them. Those kinds of concerns should not be taken lightly—and I am sure they are not—and I look forward to working with my colleagues to address them.

To reiterate, my opinions about the sentencing bill have nothing to do with the majority leader's prerogative to schedule a vote. He could schedule that vote anytime he wants. I would like to think the New York Times editorial board is knowledgeable enough to know that, but apparently they need a reminder.

IMMIGRATION POLICY

In the last week I have come to the floor a number of times to talk about the humanitarian crisis in South Texas. This of course is caused in large part by 52,000 unaccompanied minors, mostly from Central America, who have shown up on America's doorstep, on our border, saying they want to live in the United States. It is estimated those numbers could rise to as many as 60,000 to 90,000 this year alone and maybe double next year unless something is done.

I have to say I am somewhat encouraged because the Obama administration is finally acknowledging—somewhat belatedly, but finally they are acknowledging their policies may have contributed to this crisis in the first place.

This past weekend Department of Homeland Security Secretary Jeh Johnson published what he called an open letter to the parents of children crossing our Southwest border. This letter ran as an op-ed in Spanish language media outlets, and it warned parents of the extraordinary dangers facing Central American migrants who travel through Mexico, including the danger of kidnapping, sexual assault, torture, and murder.

Secretary of Homeland Security Johnson also made clear that the children who have been pouring into South Texas will not be eligible for the Obama administration's so-called deferred action programs. This is what he said:

There is no path to deferred action or citizenship, or one being contemplated by Congress, for a child who crosses our border illegally today.

In other words, Secretary Johnson's op-ed implicitly acknowledged that President Obama's policies have created a perception that children who make it across the border will be allowed to stay. I must say it is a very dangerous perception and one that simply has to be corrected, not only for the sake of U.S. border security and for the rule of law but for the sake of the very children who now constitute the humanitarian crisis on our southwestern border.

In discussing this matter with a number of our colleagues on a bipartisan basis, it has been observed that the drug cartels, which used to just traffic in drugs, now traffic in people. They have changed their business model. Essentially, they control the corridors by which drugs, people, and weapons traverse Mexico and, in this instance, come from Central America.

The fact is there should be a lot of concern on our part that this flood of unaccompanied children will prove to be a distraction from the interdiction of dangerous drugs coming across the same borders. In fact, in the Rio Grande sector of the Border Patrol, in the Rio Grande Valley, as the distinguished chairman of the Homeland Security Committee knows, there has actually been a drop in the number of drug interdictions coming across the southwestern border in part because the Border Patrol and other law enforcement have been diverted to deal with this humanitarian crisis.

I see the chairman on the floor, and it looks as though he has a question on his mind. I yield to him for a question if he has one.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. Madam President, I thank the Senator from Texas for his thoughtful comments.

When I was Governor, and long before that, and certainly in the Senate, I have liked to focus on underlying causes, not just the symptoms or problems but how do we solve the underlying challenge that is before us.

In this case we focus so much on the border and what we are doing on the border. We have tens of thousands of men and women arrayed there, drones, all kinds of technology to stop people from coming in. It is important for us to defend and secure our borders. The Senator from Texas has been a champion for that, and I would like to think I have as well, also, having been to Guatemala and El Salvador in the last couple of months, and Mexico and Colombia, trying to understand what is the underlying cause here.

As the Senator from Texas knows probably better than most of us, a big part of the underlying cause is the lives the folks are being forced to live in Guatemala, El Salvador, and Honduras. As we squeeze that bubble in

northern Mexico to try to go after the narco drug lords, we squeeze that bubble and they go somewhere else—they head south. They have made life miserable in those countries for a lot of people.

So as we secure our borders and do all the work there, sending a strong, clear message, as Secretary Johnson has said, to those parents of those in Guatemala and El Salvador, it is also important to figure out how we partner with Colombia and those folks in Mexico and Guatemala, El Salvador and Honduras, to improve the hellacious lives many are living, with a lack of hope, lack of safety, lack of jobs, lack of opportunity, lack of education. We can do that. We can do that while at the same time securing our borders. We have to do both. And the underlying cause is important.

I have no questions, but I want to thank the Senator for his thoughts this evening, for yielding, and for giving me a chance to join him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, the chairman of the Homeland Security Committee is exactly right to say we can't just look at the border in dealing with this crisis.

My friend HENRY CUELLAR from Laredo, TX, a Member of the House of Representatives, likened this to a football game. He said: You can't only do goal line defense. We need to find ways of deterring people from leaving their homes in the first place and coming to the United States.

I know Vice President BIDEN was in Guatemala this last week and Secretary Johnson was in the Rio Grande Valley, and I know they are looking at all of this. There is no simple, single-shot answer to it. But the fact is there are a lot of people who want to come to the United States, for obvious reasons.

But I look at it as even though we are a nation of immigrants, we are a nation of legal immigration, one of the most generous in the world. I think we naturalize roughly 800,000 people a year now because they want to become American citizens through the legal system.

But to have this mass of humanity come at such a great flood and in such a short period of time, particularly as unaccompanied minors, threatens to capsize the boat. It creates a lot of hardship in local communities, States, and places around the country we wouldn't expect to be dealing with this, because they are going to have to be taken care of. We are committed to making sure these children are taken care of, but we have to send a message very clearly that if you are a parent contemplating this circumstance, you should not send your children, particularly on the perilous and dangerous journey leading from Central America.

I have mentioned in recent days a book written in 2013 called "The Beast" by a courageous Salvadoran writer named Oscar Martinez. Mr. Mar-

tinez, a journalist, traveled I think eight different times with the migrants from Central America and wrote in this book about their experiences and, unfortunately, the unspeakable brutalities these migrants encounter on a daily basis—again, because they are traveling through a smuggling corridor controlled by the cartels, in this instance the Zetas. The Zetas are a spin-off of the Sinaloa cartel. They used to traffic in drugs, but now they realize they can make money off these migrants—and they do, in terrible sorts of ways. Of course they are lawless, and the brutalities they exact on these migrants are shocking.

For example, Mr. Martinez in his book "The Beast" tells a story of one migrant woman who was raped on the dirt-and-straw floor of a cardboard shack before being strangled to death in a Mexican town along the Guatemalan border. This woman's picture was subsequently published in a local newspaper on a half page, with two other pictures of tortured bodies. In the meantime, an epitaph was written on a small cross that read: The young mother and her twins died November 2008.

I realize this is shocking and really horrible, and we prefer not to even think about it. But I think we need to acknowledge—and certainly the parents who send their young children unaccompanied on this long, perilous journey need to understand—what they are vulnerable to.

The dangers of the trans-Mexican migration journey have become far worse over the past decade as powerful drug cartels have effectively taken over the human trafficking business. As Caitlin Dickson in the Daily Beast reported yesterday:

While the journey north was always treacherous and costly, in the hands of the cartels it has become deadlier than ever. The entire border, and the routes leading up to it, are controlled by some combination of Los Zetas, Sinaloa, and Knights of Templar cartels, along with a few smaller groups—making it impossible to cross without their permission.

What they have to pay to exact their permission is a tax or a fee—basically, protection money—to allow them to pass more or less safely through their territory. As I have said many times, there is nothing at all humane about encouraging mothers, daughters, fathers, and sons to put their lives in the hands of such vicious criminals. Yet when the President has talked as he has over the years about dealing humanely with migrants, he acts as if the decision to demonstrate more and more leniency or deferred action when it comes to our enforcement or immigration laws is itself a humanitarian act. Yet perversely what it does is it encourages this sort of illegal immigration and encourages mothers and fathers to subject their children to these tremendous brutalities.

I can only hope the ongoing crisis we are seeing now along the southwestern border will dispel any illusions that

somehow by saying, well, we will not enforce our immigration laws as to this class of individuals, we are going to pick and choose or we have deported too many people, so we are going to quit deporting people—these actions and inactions have consequences, and this is the sort of consequence that sort of action produces. I hope it will dissuade the President from announcing yet another unilateral suspension of immigration enforcement later this summer.

There are various stories written and rumors told that the President, if immigration reform doesn't pass this year in Congress, will take action unilaterally through an Executive order. He has encouraged that perception, saying, "I have a pen and I have a phone," and he has issued a number of Executive orders in a number of different areas, but I hope the President doesn't compound the problem by further sending the message that he is going to unilaterally suspend enforcement of our immigration laws because the consequences will be big and they will further jeopardize the health, welfare, and well-being of the people he thinks he is trying to help.

I would ask the President: What is more important, is it political posturing—trying to show to an important constituency that you are sympathetic to their concerns—or are we going to focus primarily on people's lives and their welfare?

Given all that has happened in this humanitarian crisis, how on Earth could the President possibly justify another unilateral change in immigration enforcement that will likely lead to another surge like we have seen on the border.

It is pretty simple. Unless we send a clear message that our borders are being enforced and that our laws are being upheld, we will continue to face crisis after crisis after crisis. Meanwhile, untold numbers of migrants will continue suffering and dying in Central America and Mexico just trying to get here or get here—showing up on our doorstep—and overwhelm our capacity to deal with them in a responsible way.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceed to do call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

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

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Colleagues, there is an unprecedented crisis unfolding on our border. The crisis threatens the very integrity of our national border, our laws, and our system of justice. It is something I have been talking about for a number of years, but it has reached unusual and dangerous proportions. It is a crisis of this administra-

tion's own making and a crisis the administration's policies continue to encourage.

America deserves leaders in the executive branch who will stand up and say clearly: The crisis must end now. The border is closed. Please do not come unlawfully to America. If you do come unlawfully, you will be deported. This is what we expect from our Chief Executive, the chief law enforcement officer in America and, for that matter, the head of Homeland Security, the office in charge of Border Patrol and ICE officers.

But President Obama and Secretary Johnson at the Department of Homeland Security refused—just refused—to plainly make this statement. How can they not? It is their duty. It is the law of the United States, and it is causing people around the world, particularly in Central America, to believe they can come unlawfully to America. It is encouraging this to happen. They are getting wrong messages from the leadership in our country.

So let's review the evidence.

On March 20, 2014, the University of Texas at El Paso did a study that was funded and supported by the U.S. Department of Homeland Security Science and Technology Directorate, and it states that "both Border Patrol and ICE officers agreed that the lack of deterrence for crossing the U.S./Mexican border has impacted the rate at which they have apprehended UACs."

UACs are unaccompanied alien children.

Officers assert that "UACs are aware of the relative lack of consequences they will receive when apprehended at the U.S. border."

Get this: Officers are certain the UACs are aware of this.

UTEP [University of Texas El Paso] was informed that smugglers of family members of unaccompanied alien children understand that once a UAC is apprehended for illegal entry into the United States, the individual will be reunited with a U.S.-based family member pending the disposition of the immigration hearing.

There will be some sort of hearing set for them.

This process appears to be exploited by illegal alien smugglers and family members in the United States who wish to reunite with separated children. It was observed by the researchers that the current policy is very similar to the "catch and release" problem that the Department of Homeland Security faced prior to the passage of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004.

If we catch somebody in the United States unlawfully, they will be given some minimal process and then released on bail and told to return back to court in so many weeks or months. In many cases, they do not show up. They enter the country unlawfully against the laws of the United States. They are apprehended but released—and why would they show up?

Recently Border Patrol agents in the Rio Grande Valley questioned 230 illegal immigrants about why they came. These are particularly related to chil-

dren, and 95 percent said they believed they would be allowed to stay and take advantage of the "new" U.S. "law" that grants a free pass or "permiso" being issued by the U.S. government to adults traveling with minors and unaccompanied children.

So this is what they said 95 percent of the people who came illegally believe. This memo that leaked out of the Department of Homeland Security continued:

The information is apparently common knowledge in Central America and is spread by word of mouth and international and local media. A high percentage of the subjects interviewed stated that their family members in the United States urged them to travel immediately, because the United States government was only issuing immigration 'permisos' until the end of June 2014.

On June 10, 2014, newspapers in Honduras and Guatemala quoted Secretary of Homeland Security Jeh Johnson as saying this—this is what he is being quoted as saying in Central America: "Almost all agree that a child who crossed the border illegally with their parents or in search of a father or a better life, was not making an adult choice to break our laws, and should be treated differently than adult violators of the law."

This conveys a message. Isn't it clear that people who are not students of the esoteric aspects of American law would hear the Secretary of Homeland Security basically saying if you are a young person and you come you will be treated differently? Then they hear they will be given a "permiso" and allowed to stay and be taken care of, that there is no risk or danger in coming to the United States unlawfully.

On June 13, the Washington Post published an article entitled "Influx of minors across Texas border driven by belief they will be allowed to stay in U.S." How hard is it to reverse that belief? We have not done it.

On June 19, Democratic Congressman HENRY CUELLAR of Texas said, "As long as they know they are going to be released and allowed to stay here, they are going to keep coming." Isn't that true?

The New York Times quoted one teenager from Honduras whose mother had sent for him: "If you make it, they take you to a shelter and take care of you and let you have permission to stay."

Records show the administration knew this surge we are seeing at the border, which is unprecedented in our history, was coming, and they knew of it for some time and did nothing to stop it or to send the message: Don't do this. Do not come to America unlawfully. Make your application if you feel you are justified in coming, and it will be processed in regular order. Indeed, the administration sought, rather than to stop this dramatic surge, to accommodate it.

Even before the public became aware of the beginning of the surge of this nature at our border, on January 29 of this year, the Federal Government—

get this—posted an advertisement seeking bids from a contractor to handle 65,000 “unaccompanied alien children” crossing the southern border. This was in January.

In 2011 we had approximately 6,000 coming into the country unlawfully. So in January of this year they posted an advertisement to handle 65,000. So this raises serious questions. Why would the administration claim to be surprised by the current influx of unaccompanied minors when they were taking bids in January for a contract to handle the exact situation—almost the exact number—we are seeing? This year it is expected to hit about 90,000 children; whereas, in 2011 it was 6,000. Projections from official sources say we may hit 130,000 next year. How did the administration anticipate the very numbers it seems we have at least to date?

In March of this year the Department of Health & Human Services estimated in its fiscal year 2014 budget proposal that the number of unaccompanied illegal alien children apprehended in 2014 this year would rise to 60,000, which is up 814 percent from the 6,560 who were apprehended in the United States only 3 years ago.

Over the weekend the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security published an “open letter to the parents of children crossing our Southwest border” on a Spanish language wire service. I had demanded of him in the Senate Judiciary Committee that he send a clear message, and he actually refused to do so. I had to ask him about three or more times before he would finally say: It is unlawful to come here, and that is the reason you shouldn’t. He said: You shouldn’t come because it is dangerous. He said: You shouldn’t come. It is not a good idea. But he was not simply saying: Do not come unlawfully.

In newspapers in Central and South America and on Univision’s Web site the letter noted, in part, that the Senate comprehensive immigration bill “provides for an earned path to citizenship, but only for certain people who came into this country on or before December 31, 2011.”

The Senate bill died in the House and will not become a law, and it was wrong to have done that very thing. That is what the law said, but it wasn’t passed. But the very fact that Mr. Johnson is advertising in foreign countries an earned path to citizenship for illegal immigrants undermines his primary responsibility, which is to enforce the law. The most primary responsibility for Mr. Johnson is not to see how many people he can apprehend and actually go through the cost and process of deporting; the primary job is to deter criminal activity to begin with, to send a message and back it up that people cannot come successfully illegally. Don’t come. Then you will see a large dropoff instead of this 800-percent increase we see today.

Human beings are rational actors, and if they believe the United States is

granting citizenship to illegal aliens who arrived before 2012, it stands to reason that the U.S. Government will move that date back if more illegal aliens arrive in the years to come. Why wouldn’t they think they would be given amnesty too? That is what happened in 1986—amnesty was given. There were 3 million people who were given legal status, and the message was heard.

Some say that today, we have over 11 million illegal aliens in the country.

Even a 2009 internal Department of Homeland Security report on approaches for implementing immigration reform recognizes this fundamental fact. This 2009 report said:

Virtually all immigration experts agree that it would be counterproductive to offer an explicit or implied path to permanent resident status (or citizenship) during any legalization program. That would simply encourage the fraud and illegal border crossings that other features of the program seek to discourage. In fact, for that reason and from that perspective, it would be best if the legislation did not even address future permanent resident status or citizenship.

That is from an official government report.

Contrary to the administration’s claims that illegal immigrants are acting on mere rumor and misinformation, it is the sad reality of lax enforcement plus the lack of a clear message that is driving the surge. The reality is if you get into the country today, you are not going to be deported. That is true.

A leaked May 30 internal memo written by the top border official, Deputy Chief Ronald Vitiello, said:

Currently only 3 percent of apprehensions from countries other than Mexico are being repatriated to their countries of citizenship, which are predominately located in Central America.

I repeat, only 3 percent are being repatriated back home.

According to the former head of Enforcement and Removal Operations for ICE, the Immigration and Customs Enforcement agency, Gary Mead:

It’s taking a year or more in some places for people to come up on a hearing and many times, they don’t have an attorney, or they’ve lost an attorney, and they get an extension, and maybe it’s two years before they have a hearing. And in the interim period, they enroll in school, or they get a job, or they are reunited with family members, and then they are no longer an enforcement priority.

That is significant. Even if after 2 or 3 years a judge finally orders removal—assuming the individuals show up in court at all—many illegal immigrants simply ignore that order, and having been here for a period of years, no one makes them leave.

As former ICE Director John Sandweg said: “If you are a run-of-the-mill immigrant here illegally, your odds of getting deported are close to zero.”

Yesterday, Byron York published in the Washington Examiner the findings of Jessica Vaughan, Director of Policy Studies at the Center for Immigration

Studies, which shows that the United States deported a total of 802 minors to Guatemala, Honduras, and El Salvador in 2011, 677 in 2012, and down to 496 last year. Weighed against the tens of thousands pouring in, it is clear that once again the reality on the ground—not merely rumor, talk, or policy—of the lax enforcement has influenced decisionmaking in Central America.

It is obvious to me. I have been a Federal prosecutor. You have to send the message, and if the message is heard that if you violate a certain law, you will be disciplined, the number of people who violate the law will drop. If you never enforce speeding tickets, people will speed. If you enforce them systematically, people will slow down.

York quotes ex-ICE official Gary Mead:

If you’re getting 90,000 a year, or 50,000 a year, or even 25,000 a year, and you only remove 1,200, you’re not eliminating the backlog.

How obvious is that?

Additionally, those here illegally have taken advantage of an asylum system that is easily open to abuse and that the administration has sought to widen rather than narrow. This asylum question is very serious. House Judiciary Committee Chairman GOODLATTE recently stated:

Many of the children, teenagers, and adults, arriving at the border are able to game our asylum and immigration laws because the Obama administration has severely weakened them and many thousands have already been released into the interior of the United States. What does President Obama plan to do with those who have already been released from custody?

That is a good question. We have a situation now where illegal immigrants seek out and turn themselves in to the Border Patrol officer. They come across the border and go straight to them and turn themselves in. That is a fact. What happens then? They are taken farther into the United States to be reunited with family members, apply for a job, attend school, have children in U.S. hospitals, and stay in the United States—whether through skipping court hearings, receiving asylum, or simply ignoring orders to leave.

We can all expect that 5 or 10 years from now—and correct me if I am wrong—politicians in this body will probably say these illegal immigrants “came here through no fault of their own” and are entitled to citizenship. Is this a policy of a great nation? It is a policy of a nation that believes and advocates for open borders, but it is not a policy that is compatible with a system of law, duty, and order.

If people apply and wait in line, why should other people be able to come from the outside, break in line, move ahead of them unlawfully, and then ultimately receive the very thing they sought unlawfully? The chaos continues.

Indeed, the President actively continues to incentivize even more illegal immigrants. That is the effect of what

he has accomplished here. He reauthorized his DACA program—based on a bill that did not pass the Senate or the House—for 2 years, which is a policy that exempts whole classes of certain individuals, particularly young people, from the immigration laws of the United States. He held a White House ceremony in the White House honoring 10 DACA recipients. DACA recipients are people who enter the country illegally. He also unilaterally authorized an additional 100,000 guest workers, and now the Justice Department is hiring lawyers to represent unaccompanied alien children in immigration court to maximize the number of those who will receive permission to stay in the country.

Claims that DACA—this policy of nonenforcement unilaterally carried out by the President of the United States not to enforce the law—does not apply to these new arrivals is simply a distraction. DACA is a unilateral action that established the precedent that those who come to America at a certain age will receive special exemptions from the law. That is what it says.

ICE officers report they are often forced to release even high-risk individuals of unknown ages and dates of entry who simply assert DREAM Act privileges.

In the internal Border Patrol memo, Deputy Border Patrol Chief Vitiello stressed the only way to stop the flow is to show potential illegal immigrants that there will be real consequences for their action. He said:

If the U.S. government fails to deliver adequate consequences to deter aliens from attempting to illegally enter the U.S. the result will be an even greater increase in the rate of recidivism and first-time illicit entries.

Our immigration system is unraveling before our very eyes. It is unbelievable. The American people have been denied the protections they are entitled to under our immigration system. Washington is failing the citizens of this country in a most dramatic and open way. Laws are passed by elected representatives of the people. We have passed laws that say you can't come to America without permission, and you need to file your papers and follow the rules. It is unlawful to just walk across the border because you want to come to this country. That is not lawful in this country.

I am calling on all the leaders and officials in this town to take the firm, bold, and decisive steps that are necessary to restore order and restore our borders. It is important for the children who are at risk. Many of them are having a difficult time. They have run out of money and the coyotes and smugglers have taken their money and mistreated them. We have heard a lot of horrible stories.

What is the best way to fix this problem? The best way to fix it is to have the President of the United States and the Secretary of Homeland Security

say we are not going to accept you coming unlawfully. Please do not come. Don't do it. Make your application like everybody else. Wait your turn like everybody else. We are not against immigration or young people, but it is unacceptable to have a lawless system—as we have today—that is placing children at risk and overwhelming our enforcement officers.

One TV program today said the Border Patrol officers, instead of doing their duty, are changing diapers. We have gone from 6,000 to maybe 90,000 to 100,000-plus next year. The cost of the budget item last year for these kinds of things was about \$800 million. I think they are now saying they need \$2.28 billion a year just to handle this overflow. We don't have money to do that. It is not the right thing. It is dangerous for children, it is corrosive of the law.

The President must send a clear message: Do not come. Please follow the law, and if you come anyway, contrary to the law, you will be apprehended, you will be deported, and you will be required to return home.

I thank the Chair, yield the floor, and note the absence of a quorum.

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

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, today, I would like to discuss the nomination of Leon Rodriguez to be the Director of the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Service. Mr. Rodriguez was appointed on December 19 and approved by the Judiciary Committee on April 3rd by a vote of 11–7.

I want to explain my opposition.

First and foremost, Mr. Rodriguez lacks adequate immigration experience to lead this agency. I only say that because his nomination comes on the heels of potentially sweeping immigration reform legislation. When we read his responses to my questions, it becomes clear that he has little appreciation for what this job as director entails. He basically says that he has a lot of studying to do. I think, with the situation of immigration in this country—the need for immigration reform—that we need to do better than have a director of the agency who says he has a lot of studying to do.

Second, his previous experience with Casa de Maryland is a concern as well. He was a member of the board of directors there from 2005 to 2007. The mission of Casa de Maryland is to help improve quality of life and fight for equal treatment for low-income Latinos. There is surely nothing wrong with that. That is a very noble cause. But if we peel back their mission statement, we will see that the activities they are involved in are a lot greater than just improving the quality of life for low-income people. They aid people here ille-

gally in finding employment and gaining legal status in this country. They provide legal services to do so, and they fund day labor centers that focus on ensuring undocumented workers can find work on a daily basis. And, of course, that entails the use of taxpayers' money to accomplish that goal.

Their efforts are in direct conflict with the mission of the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Service. That agency has to ensure the integrity of immigration programs and benefits. Casa de Maryland believes that anyone, even those who are here in contravention of our law, should be eligible for benefits. The organization has pushed for driver's licenses for people here unlawfully. They have worked to undermine REAL ID, a Federal law that needs to be fully implemented by the States. They have organized rallies that promote legal status for people who have broken the law. They have trained undocumented workers to understand their rights and published a cartoon pamphlet advising people not to speak to law enforcement when approached. They go so far as to encourage them not to even provide their names.

Mr. Rodriguez claimed that he had no knowledge of this pamphlet put out by Casa de Maryland. Yet, he was on the board at the time the pamphlet was published and disseminated.

Mr. Rodriguez doesn't disavow their work or their contempt for law enforcement. In fact, he stated in one response that he was "supportive of the use of local tax measures to support the day labor centers" that Casa de Maryland established.

So it is concerning that he could bring this same philosophy to an agency whose mission is to oversee legal immigration in the United States. And we all know that we are a welcoming Nation of immigrants because about a million people come here every year legally, and they are welcomed, and our laws allow that.

Now, a third reason to oppose him is my concern about Mr. Rodriguez's commitment to responding to congressional oversight, and my colleagues know how strongly I feel about Congress's doing its constitutional job of oversight; in other words, to be a check on the executive branch of government, to make sure that the laws are faithfully executed. Despite assurances given during his hearing, Mr. Rodriguez repeatedly failed to provide responsive answers to many of my questions. Mr. Rodriguez was not responsive to the questions I posed even in writing. While he repeatedly stated he would review the programs and policies if confirmed, Mr. Rodriguez claims not to be privy—that is his word—to internal functions or have knowledge of how the agency works. He refused to provide his opinions on very critical matters facing the agency, and I will give my colleagues examples.

In his initial responses he stated the following response not once, not twice,

but 17 times: “If confirmed, I will certainly commit to a careful study of this program to determine any additional appropriate steps forward, including any possible changes to address this matter.”

We are talking about a person who gives that response, and he is directing an agency of 18,000 people. He is not going to be ready to go to work on day one, and they need somebody who is ready to go to work yesterday.

The second time around asking questions, he responded a bit differently in each question, but always alluded to the fact that he was “not privy to the internal factors upon which USCIS and its leadership base its decisions.”

I wish to give my colleagues one example. I asked about whether drunk drivers or sex offenders should be eligible for legal status and immigration benefits. He responded in both instances saying, “In most cases, individuals who have been found guilty of a serious crime should not receive immigration benefits.”

Well, that is a big question mark. What does he mean by “in most cases”? I would read that this way: So when should these individuals be allowed to receive benefits and legal status? That is the question that is unanswered by his response.

By not answering the questions about felons, drunk drivers, or even gang members, he is essentially toeing Casa de Maryland’s line that no one should be deported.

He could not offer an opinion of his own or elaborate when such people should get benefits. He said he would be forthcoming with Congress, but his repetitive answers show, No. 1, he is avoiding the questions, and No. 2, he has a lot of studying to do before he takes this job.

A fourth reason: He wasn’t forthcoming with his views on what we call around here DACA, the Deferred Action for Child Arrivals program that grants work authorizations and stays of deportation for anyone under the age of 31.

One of the most pressing items on the agency’s plate right now is whether we are going to renew the President’s DACA directive. In his hearing and twice afterwards in questions for the record, I asked Mr. Rodriguez about his plans with DACA and whether he would expand the program. I couldn’t get a straightforward answer from him. I asked if he had any discussions about the program, and he stated that he was only “generally aware” of the renewal process. He clearly knew the agency published a renewal form for public comment, yet he claimed to have little knowledge or opinion on the matter.

What is more, I am told by employees within the agency that he has a person at the table who is reporting to him directly on the agency’s decisions. I am told he has a conduit during discussions on the deferred action program. It is not clear how much he is driving the policies, but it concerns me that he claims no knowledge of this matter.

Had Mr. Rodriguez been more forthcoming, we would also know what is in store for the President’s directive. Will he simply renew it, or will he expand it, as many believe is the plan? Congress should know this man’s views on those very important matters.

In connection to DACA, I asked about information sharing with USCIS and other Federal entities. My colleagues know I rely on whistleblowers for a lot of information. Just recently, a whistleblower brought me a case in which the FBI asked for information on a DACA applicant. The FBI agent, in an email, said this:

I am checking to see if there was any information available regarding fugitive “John Smith”? We would love to get him in custody. I was interested in knowing where he submitted his fingerprints and if he left a home address.

Now, that is the Federal Bureau of Investigation doing its work. Here is what the USCIS provided in response to the FBI:

We cannot confirm that a DACA request has been filed without reason to believe that the requestor would represent an enforcement priority. However, according to your email, the agent can see what form was filed. As such, you could also direct him to our website for additional publicly available information regarding immigration forms.

The USCIS’s response to the FBI was essentially this: Sorry. We can’t help you. We must protect the confidentiality of the applicant. That is not quoting anybody; that is the hypothetical answer I think our immigration agency gave to the FBI.

But this isn’t the only case we have like this. I have been informed about the lack of information sharing by the USCIS since DACA began in 2012. I asked Mr. Rodriguez about his commitment to provide law enforcement with information on people who apply for immigration benefits. Now, I didn’t ask about the statutory or regulatory hurdles in information sharing, but he refused to answer. I asked about his commitment to making sure people who defraud the government—or who are lawfully denied benefits—are turned over to law enforcement for removal. In one instance, he said it depended on the person’s circumstances.

The immigration agency is part of the Department of Homeland Security. Its core mission is, as we would expect, to protect the homeland. Yet, this agency has a culture that I call “getting to yes.” In other words, cut a whole bunch of red tape and don’t worry about what the law says. Just get people approved to be in this country.

Mr. Rodriguez’s nonresponsive answer on this matter of “getting to yes” concerns me, because it is not consistent with the mission of the department. I wanted a firm commitment he would change that culture, and I couldn’t get that from him.

Let me also address his connection to Mr. Perez, former head of the Civil Rights Division at the Department of Justice, now the Secretary of Labor.

Mr. Perez, of course, was involved in the Department’s decision to decline the prosecution of the New Black Panther Party voter intimidation case.

During his hearing, Mr. Rodriguez admitted he was aware of emails between political employees and career prosecutors discussing the decision to decline to prosecute that case. At that time, Mr. Rodriguez was serving as Mr. Perez’s chief of staff and personally assisted in preparing Mr. Perez for his testimony before Congress. Yet, after Mr. Perez testified that the political appointees were not involved in the decision when Mr. Rodriguez said that they were involved in that decision, Mr. Rodriguez made no effort to correct the testimony after the fact.

The U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Service can be a very powerful agency. They grant benefits to foreign nationals and are implementing the President’s weak prosecutorial discretion initiatives. This agency will have a lot of responsibility if an immigration reform bill is passed by Congress. We are talking about 12 to 30 million undocumented people applying for benefits if this legislation is passed. They will carry out an administrative amnesty if a bill is not passed.

Under President Obama, this agency has implemented very controversial policies and practices. Many of the policies this agency has undertaken were included in the July 2010 internal memo I obtained entitled “Administrative Alternatives to Comprehensive Immigration Reform.” That sounds a little bit like “I have got a pen and a phone, and if Congress won’t, I will.” The purpose of the memo was to “promote family unity, foster economic growth, achieve significant process improvements and reduce the threat of removal for certain individuals present in the United States without authorization.” The memo highlighted creative ways to achieve “meaningful immigration reform absent legislative action.”

Remember when the President said: I have got a pen and a phone, and if Congress won’t, I will.

That is a perfect example of it.

While the administration suggested this memo was only an internal deliberative document concocted by some bored bureaucrats, the Department has already undertaken many of these proposals. They will do even more under the new Director’s leadership if the President decides to act unilaterally regarding immigration.

Remember the President who said: I have a pen and a phone, and if Congress won’t, I will.

The agency’s culture of “getting to yes” must change before any legalization program is carried out. The Homeland Security inspector general has reported on this culture. Their own internal watchdog, the IG, admonished the leadership for appearing to pressure line adjudicators to “get to yes.” Their report clearly shows that the immigration service has a lot of work to do to

get rid of the “get to yes” culture that has pervaded this agency in recent years.

The fact that one-quarter of the immigration service officers felt pressured to approve questionable applications and 90 percent of the respondents felt they did not have sufficient time to complete interviews of those who seek benefits certainly warrants significant changes be made immediately. It does not appear Mr. Rodriguez is inclined to do that.

This culture stems from the leadership suggesting that line adjudicators lean toward approval and focus on eligibility and less on fraud. Unfortunately, I did not get any sense from Mr. Rodriguez that he was committed to changing the culture.

Mr. Rodriguez’s appointment to this agency concerns me a great deal. I hope my colleagues, before voting this afternoon, will have that same concern. I question his experience and his managerial judgment to lead an agency of 18,000 Federal employees. Unfortunately, I doubt his sincerity in working with Congress on oversight requests. I wish he had been more forthcoming.

For these reasons and others, I oppose the nomination.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, later this afternoon the Senate will vote on Leon Rodriguez as head of the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services. While I am unable to support this nomination, this is the prime time to raise some of the issues that are happening on the southwest border. I will summarize some of my remarks.

We have an incredible situation, as we all know, happening on the border today. We have had thousands of kids cross the border. In fact, from October 1 to mid-May, there were 148,017 apprehensions. Of those, a significant number—this is just the Rio Grande Valley in Texas—a significant number of those were unaccompanied minors. In fact, there were so many that we did not have the capacity to deal with them there, and many, to the great chagrin of many in Arizona, were shipped to Arizona to process and then released into the custody of a guardian or someone.

The Border Patrol and others are trying to make the best of a very tragic and unfortunate circumstance. I do not think anybody faults them for the big burden they have. I think they are doing the best they can.

But what the situation really points out is that not only do we have insufficient resources on the border itself to deal with those trying to cross, but once people get here, we have insufficient resources, infrastructure, and policies to actually deal with them in a timely fashion. They are actually released—most of them—and asked to appear at a later date. It is estimated that quite a few do not. In fact, very few will show up at their court date.

What are we to do here? Obviously those of us who have dealt with this situation for a long time—those of us from border States—have advocated broad legislation to deal with border security, a guest worker plan, mechanisms to deal with those who are here illegally now, employer enforcement—many items. But if we cannot get to that yet—I wish we could, but if we cannot get to that yet, then we need to have better policies for dealing with those who have come across the border and whom we are going to hold. If we are going to grant them asylum—or some of them—then that needs to be done. If not, we cannot just assume that we are going to release them and assume they will come back for their court date or at their appointed time.

So this is a situation with which we have to deal. One thing we need to address immediately is to try to stem the tide of those who are coming. Interviews suggest overwhelmingly—in fact, in one case there were 250 crossers during a 1-week period or a 2-week period into Texas. I believe 95 percent of them indicated that the main motivation for them coming across the border—this is largely unaccompanied minors—was that they would be granted some kind of legal status that would allow them to stay. This is contrary to our law. This is contrary to the President’s deferred action program. To qualify for that program, you would have had to have been here for 7 years. You cannot just arrive today or yesterday or tomorrow and qualify for this program. Nor was this contemplated by any legislation that has been passed by either body. The legislation we passed in the Senate does not allow those who come now to stay. You will have had to have been here since, I believe, December of 2011.

But what is happening is cartel members, human smugglers, and others are misinterpreting or willingly telling people they will receive some kind of legal status when they come. Too many people believe that, particularly from the countries of El Salvador, Honduras, and Guatemala.

Some suggest it is just economic conditions or violence in those countries that is driving people northward. That, no doubt, has some truth to it. There are some who come for those reasons. But we have seen a massive spike just in the last couple of months that cannot be explained by economic conditions or violence in those countries. It is because they believe they will be afforded some legal status.

Senator MCCAIN, I, and many others in this body have raised this with the administration and have asked the administration to make it clear that those who come now will not be allowed to stay.

I have a letter that has been—I think this is an advertisement or has been translated into Spanish. It is being circulated in the affected countries from Secretary Jeh Johnson at the Department of Homeland Security. It is a

good letter. It says the right things. I am glad we have taken that step. Vice President JOE BIDEN was in those countries telling those in charge and others that those who come now will not be allowed to stay; they will be deported. That is good. We need to keep that up. But what we really need right now is for President Obama himself to make such a statement. In all deference to the Vice President and the Secretary of Homeland Security, they simply do not carry the weight of the President of the United States making a statement and then following up that statement with a concerted effort in those countries to let people know they should not come north. That would make a tremendous difference. I call upon the President to make such a statement and to follow up that statement with efforts in those countries to make sure people understand this.

First and foremost, we need to stem the tide of those coming. It is estimated that this year there could be as many as 90,000 unaccompanied minors who come across the border. That figure may be higher next year. We have to stem that tide and then quickly figure out how we can deal with those who cross the border and whom we apprehend. We simply do not now have the infrastructure or policies that allow us to deal with them in a rationale, humane way.

I would call upon the President to make such a statement.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

(The remarks of Mr. WALSH pertaining to the submission of S. Res. 483 are printed in today’s RECORD under “Resolutions Submitted.”)

Mr. WALSH. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. BARRASSO. I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 20 minutes in a colloquy with a number of my colleagues.

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

KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE

Mr. BARRASSO. I come to the floor today with the ranking member of the Senate energy committee to discuss the issues of the Keystone XL Pipeline.

I turn to my colleague from Alaska to invite her to share with the Senate some of her observations, considerations, and concerns as we seek approval of an opportunity to create more jobs in America and improve our economy, as well as energy security for our country. I turn to the Senator from Alaska and ask her concerns, comments, and solutions that she may have regarding the Keystone XL Pipeline.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I appreciate that my friend and colleague from Wyoming is helping to lead this discussion about the Keystone XL Pipeline and really to encourage the Senate to move on it, to do something on this rather than just talk about it.

We are sitting here Tuesday afternoon. We had a series of votes on judges here this morning, and it looks like we are going to have some more this week. But from the view of so many around this country who are worried about jobs, worried about the economy, worried about what is happening with the IRS, with the VA—and not to mention what has happened on the world scene—it looks like we are going to have yet another unproductive week in the Senate.

Since we are here and we have time, I can't think of a better time on a better issue to take up than this Keystone XL Pipeline.

The bill that we are asking to be brought up is Senate bill S. 2280. It was introduced by our colleague from North Dakota, Senator HOEVEN. He introduced it on May 1.

It was placed on the legislative calendar a few days later. It has 55 cosponsors. When we talk about bipartisan issues and initiatives within the Senate, 55 is a very good number. It includes 11 Democrats, including the chair of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee.

We are well behind the House of Representatives, though, on this initiative. They passed a Keystone bill over 1 year ago, but we have been working in the energy committee. We had a Keystone bill that was reported out of the energy committee just last week.

We passed an original bill on a bipartisan basis. It has not yet been filed, but it is virtually identical to Senator HOEVEN's bill, which we are discussing today.

But I did vote. I know my colleague from Wyoming and I know the Presiding Officer voted for Senator LANDRIEU's original bill. I did so because I think it is good policy to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline. I committed at that hearing, and I certainly commit now, that I am going to do everything I can to help advance this initiative. If and when her bill is placed on the calendar, I intend to support that as well.

But the problem that we have—and it should be no surprise to most—is no matter how many Keystone bills are added to the calendar, it appears that the majority leader is going to ignore them. It doesn't matter how long Keystone has been under review, it doesn't matter how many new jobs will be created, and it doesn't matter that the delays are political and not substantive.

The fact of the matter is we cannot get to that point where we can take up this important initiative. The majority leader could have offered us a vote on Senator HOEVEN's bill at any point over

these past 6 weeks, but he has chosen not to.

It seems very clear to me that he has no intention of moving to it, especially if we just kind of sit back on this and don't push. It may be that is the will of some in this body—that they don't want us to do anything, they don't want us to push forward. But I think that is contrary to the will, to the wish of 56 Members of this Chamber, and it is contrary to our national interests.

It is interesting to note Democrats were not always opposed to importing crude oil from Canada, as they would appear today. Back in 1970 the Nixon administration announced that it would place a quota on Canadian oil imports, and it was none other than Senator Ted Kennedy who led the fight against this decision.

Senator Kennedy said in a Senate hearing in March of 1970:

The reason why Canadian oil has never been restricted in the past is obvious. Canadian oil is as militarily and politically secure as our own and thus there can be no national security justification for limiting its importation.

Those were pretty telling words back then, and I think they still hold true today. It wasn't only Ted Kennedy. There were other Democrats who opposed the Nixon administration's restriction on trade with Canada: Senator Proxmire of Wisconsin and Senator McIntyre of New Hampshire.

I think we have had such an opportunity on this floor to debate the merits of the Keystone XL Pipeline and to debate not only how many good-paying jobs it can bring to us but how it can help this Nation and Canada as we work to promote our North American energy independence.

Our energy partnership with Canada has taken decades to develop. It has had some rocky times, but all good and worthy relationships take a little bit of work to maintain.

So if the Obama administration is unwilling to do the hard work of diplomacy and make this remarkably easy decision—approving a job-creating and a security-enhancing pipeline—then I think it is time for Congress to act. That is why a few of us have gathered here today to move this issue forward, to do more than just talking about it, but to get the Senate to the point where we might actually have an opportunity to vote on it and do some good for this country.

So we are sitting here waiting. We have an opportunity to do it, and I think we should end the delay. I think we should move forward with this bill.

Mr. BARRASSO. I agree, Mr. President. Just think about what happened last week. Extremists from the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria, a terrorist group, attacked the largest oil refinery in Iraq. This terrorist group was actually kicked out of Al Qaeda for being too extreme.

It is a striking reminder to all of us—all of us in this Chamber and all of us in this Nation—how important it is for

the United States to take swift action to increase energy production here in North America. Energy security is key.

President Obama essentially conceded the point last week during a press conference when he announced he was sending troops back into Iraq. He was asked what Iraq's civil war is in terms of national security interests to the United States, and he gave a couple of reasons:

Obviously issues like energy and global energy markets continue to be important.

Despite the urgency, the President refuses to take steps to reduce the effect that Iraq's oil can have on American national security in the future. The President admits energy is a national security interest but he refuses to do anything about it that is meaningful.

What do the President and the administration think should happen? The President was asked a week or so ago, as a result of a huge spike in oil prices per barrel of oil as a result of what was happening with ISIS in the Middle East: What about all of this?

He said he was concerned, but he said: The gulf should pick up the slack and produce more oil. Not North America, not the United States. The gulf. He was talking about the Persian Gulf should pick up the slack.

Vice President BIDEN put out a plan last week to support energy production—but not in the United States, in the Caribbean.

America shouldn't be asking for more energy from the Caribbean or the Persian Gulf. We should be producing more energy on our own, in our own gulf coast, offshore, on Federal lands, in Alaska.

That is why last week the Energy and Natural Resources Committee passed legislation approving construction of the Keystone XL Pipeline. The bill passed the committee. The ranking member said there was bipartisan support. Even Democrats voted for it. That bill would send oil from Canada into States such as North Dakota. The Senator from North Dakota is here on the floor. It will send oil from Canada and North Dakota to refiners in Texas and Louisiana.

Last week Democrats in the committee voted for this bill and talked about how important it is. The Keystone XL Pipeline application has been pending for more than 5 years. The State Department has done five environmental reviews of the project. All five have found the Keystone XL Pipeline will cause no significant environmental impact. We should not delay this project any longer. Democrats should push their party leaders to vote on this bill.

I am disappointed—I know my colleagues are—that Senate Democrats up to this point have chosen to block this important bill. I think it is outrageous the way a small group of Democrats refuse even to consider having a debate on this vital measure—energy security for our country, energy at home.

America needs the jobs. We need the energy. According to the U.S. State Department, this bill would support thousands and thousands of jobs. Energy is a national security issue for the United States, and this bill would help produce energy here in North America—not what the President said, where they will pick up the slack in the Persian Gulf.

The bill is on the calendar right now. The Democratic majority leader can bring it up for a vote, and we are going to ask him to do so today. The Chair of the Energy Committee should call on the majority leader and demand that he act on the bill.

We are here in the Senate and we get elected to the Senate to vote. The Keystone XL Pipeline is important. This bill is important. Democrats who want to vote against it can make their arguments and cast their vote.

So I turn to my friend and colleague, the Senator from North Dakota—a Senator who has been an incredible leader, a former Governor of his State, a Senator who knows the issue well, who knows the value of American energy—U.S. energy, North American energy—the impact on jobs, the impact on the economy, the impact of energy as a geopolitical weapon in what is happening around the world.

I ask my friend and colleague from North Dakota if he thinks there is any reason whatsoever to delay action on this bill or if we should move ahead.

I see the Senator from Oklahoma has also joined us. So there are obviously significant and growing voices coming to the floor to say it is time to vote now, not additional delay, not additional studies, not additional talk. It is time to vote.

I turn to my friend and colleague from North Dakota, the former Governor of North Dakota—I think the longest serving Governor in the history of the State—for his impression of why it is time to vote today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I thank the esteemed Senator from Wyoming not only for being here today to talk about this important issue but for his tremendous leadership on energy issues.

Wyoming produces an incredible amount of energy for this country, and the Senator from Wyoming well knows that you not only have to produce that energy, you have to get it to market, and you need pipelines to move oil and gas to market. We move some by truck, some by train. But we can't move everything by truck and by train. We have to have pipelines, and that is what this is all about.

The Keystone XL Pipeline is the latest, greatest technology that is the most efficient and the safest way to move this product to market. It will actually result in less greenhouse gas than if we don't build the pipeline, as was determined by the administration's own environmental impact state-

ment produced by the Department of State.

I have some additional comments I wish to make on this important issue, but first I would turn to the esteemed Senator from Oklahoma and ask that he provide some of his comments and insights from a State that produces an incredible amount of energy, and where actually hydraulic fracturing started in this country and has been done safely since I think the 1950s; somebody who understands not only that we have to produce energy so we can get to energy independence, but that we have to have the infrastructure to move that product safely to market.

With that, I turn to the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma and ask his thoughts on this important issue as well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I do appreciate that. I might elaborate a little bit.

Oklahoma is not just the place where they first started hydraulic fracturing, it was done in Oklahoma in 1948, and, according to Lisa Jackson, who was the Obama-appointed EPA Director, never has there been a confirmed case of groundwater contamination.

I know we are getting strapped for time here and I regret that. I draw the Presiding Officer's attention to the chart I am holding up here.

It happens that Cushing, OK, is considered to be the crossroads of the pipelines throughout the United States. In Cushing, OK, we had I guess the only trip President Obama has ever made to Oklahoma. He came to Oklahoma. Looking in the background, there are all the tubes up there to dramatically make a statement. And that statement:

I'm directing my administration to cut through the red tape, break through the bureaucratic hurdles, and make this project a priority, to go ahead and get it done.

That is what the President said in Oklahoma. I wasn't there, but that is what he said. That is a direct quote. Then he did everything he could do to destroy the Keystone Pipeline.

He made the statement down there: I'm not going to do anything to create a problem for the southern leg that goes from Cushing down into Texas. Well, there is a reason for that. The reason is, he couldn't do it. The reason he is stopping up there, because it crosses the country line from Canada into the United States. He has some jurisdiction there. But there is nothing he could do to stop it. So he came down to tell us that he wasn't going to do that.

I have to say to the President: People in Oklahoma aren't that dumb. They know you didn't have that authority or you would have stopped it.

The portion between Canada and Cushing is the part that remains stalled. At this point I think the reason is one guy named Tom Steyer. Let me introduce him.

First, we always hear a lot of things about the Koch brothers and other people who are putting money in or are concerned about it. This actually is a statement made by this very wealthy person. I am sure he is a nice person. Tom Steyer is a multibillionaire. He is very liberal. He is from the State of California. He is a good friend of the junior Senator from California, and he has made the statement that he is going to put up \$100 million to spend in campaigns of people who would do two things: one, try to resurrect the issue of global warming—which is dead. I can remember when global warming would be polled as the No. 1 or No. 2 problem in the country. Right now, according to last week's Gallup poll, it is No. 14 out of 15. So that is a dead issue.

But \$100 million would do two things: first, to resurrect that issue; secondly, to stop the Keystone Pipeline.

A few weeks ago he said explicitly—and these are his words, not mine:

It is true that we expect to be heavily involved in midterm elections. We are looking at a bunch of races. My guess is that we will end up being involved in eight or more races.

We just learned this week that as the President marks his 1-year anniversary of his climate action plan, Tom Steyer is going to meet personally with him. So there is \$100 million at work right there, if that is what it takes for a meeting. And we all know what the cost would be.

This is very important. One thing that has not been refuted, way back in the beginning of the whole global warming thing they talked about the cost is going to be somewhere between \$300 billion and \$400 billion a year. The Wharton Economics Foundation, MIT, Charles Rivers, everyone agreed with that.

The Keystone Pipeline, which Tom Steyer wants to stop, would create 42,000 jobs, and tens of thousands more would be supported in the manufacturing sector. But Keystone is just the tip of the iceberg.

If we look at this chart, No. 3, we can see all of the domestic energy resources being developed around the country right now. We are going through a shale revolution in America, and the only thing that is getting in the way is the Federal Government.

This is interesting: In the last 6 years, oil production on private and State lands is up 61 percent. On Federal land, however, oil production is down 6 percent. Now how could that be?

This map shows throughout the United States—not all in the western part. Look at New York and Pennsylvania. This is where the development is coming from, all of it on State and private land, an increase in 5 years, 5½ years, of 61 percent. At the same time, on Federal land it is down by 6 percent.

The IFC International, a well-respected consulting firm, released a report last month which said U.S. companies would need to invest \$641 billion of infrastructure over the next 20 years to keep up with the growing oil and gas production.

What does it mean for jobs? According to the analysis, the spending on these new pipelines alone will create 432,000 direct jobs. And that is based on a conservative estimate. That does not assume we develop all of the resources in our country. If that were included, it would be a lot more.

So keeping this from happening would be a great impact for imposing anti-energy, global warming policies. We need to build the Keystone Pipeline and provide regulatory certainty for the entire energy infrastructure sector. Without it, we will never reach energy independence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time for the colloquy has expired.

Mr. INHOFE. How much time is remaining on our side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 33 minutes remaining on the Republican side. But the question of the colloquy time has expired.

Mr. INHOFE. I ask unanimous consent I be given 4 more minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mrs. BOXER. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. What time do we have the vote?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. At 4:30.

Mrs. BOXER. That is the reason we were very careful with the time. And we gave my good friends—and they are my good friends—a lot of extra time.

I will allow the Senator to proceed for 1 minute. But after that, we need equal time on this. So I give 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator asked for 4 minutes.

Mrs. BOXER. I ask for 1 minute.

Mr. INHOFE. If I could ask my friend if we could compromise: 2 minutes.

Mrs. BOXER. Let me think it over. OK.

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

Mr. INHOFE. I appreciate my good friend from California thinking it over.

Anyway, 432,000 direct jobs. And when we stop and think about it, keeping it from happening would have the impact and effect of stopping us from becoming oil independent. We could do that.

The Keystone Pipeline needs to be built. We all know about the jobs. More importantly, there is not a single good reason why it shouldn't happen.

Tom Steyer's goal is to stop the oil in Canada from being developed, but he can't do it. We have seen this just in the last week. The Canadians have conversations going with China to have them accept it if we don't complete our Keystone Pipeline.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 2280

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to call up Calendar No. 371, S. 2280, to approve the Key-

stone XL Pipeline; that there will be up to 4 hours of debate and that the Senate then proceed to vote on passage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Reserving the right to object, I wish to explain how I come to my conclusion at the end by saying a couple of things.

I see that my dear friend—and these are all my friends whom I particularly enjoy working with—I say to my friend from Oklahoma, he said Tom Steyer is from California. This is correct. So is Justice Kennedy, and so is Richard Nixon, who signed the Clean Air Act. Richard Nixon signed the Clean Air Act, and I was a cosponsor of that act. And Republican Herbert Walker Bush signed the Clean Air Act Amendments.

Mr. INHOFE. Would the Senator yield to that point, because I was a cosponsor of that act.

Mrs. BOXER. I will not yield.

The fact is that Republican objections to controlling carbon pollution took that all the way to the Supreme Court.

Another thing on which I need to correct the record is my friend Senator BARRASSO talked about our President as if our President doesn't care about our being energy self-sufficient. The United States is producing more oil at home than it is buying from the rest of the world for the first time in nearly two decades. Let me repeat that. The United States is producing more oil at home than it is buying from the rest of the world for the first time in nearly two decades. And PolitiFact marked that as true and accurate.

I want to say to my friend who has left the floor, Senator MURKOWSKI—another good friend of mine—we offered a vote on Keystone as part of Senator SHAHEEN and Senator PORTMAN's bill on energy efficiency, and we said we would treat it the way MITCH MCCONNELL recommends treating controversial amendments. We offered a 60-vote threshold. Now they come to the floor decrying the fact that we didn't offer a vote, but we did.

Here is the point: Whenever America considers building a major infrastructure project, we make sure there is a process in place, and we have done that since 1968. It is a well-established process, and that process was updated by George W. Bush in 2004. So this unanimous consent request that would approve the pipeline would bypass the entire process we have set up in this country for these kinds of major infrastructure projects that has been in place since 1968.

We need to know whether the building of this pipeline is in the national interest, and it is critical that the process not be circumvented because there are major issues on behalf of America's families. Frankly, the request that is before us would cut short the process that protects our families. So rhetorically I ask, why would any-

one want to do that? They talk about a lot of jobs. That is in great dispute. The permanent jobs are like 35. So let's be clear. It is about other things. It is about special interests. That is what it is about. There is a lot of money that follows this pipeline.

Now I want to talk about the human health impacts. Tar sands is one of the filthiest kinds of oil on the planet—filthy dirty oil. That is why Senator WHITEHOUSE and I called on the State Department to conduct a comprehensive health impact study—because the pipeline itself is one thing; it is the type of oil that is going through the pipeline, this dirty, filthy tar sands oil.

If you don't believe me, ask our health professionals. A Gallup Poll found 12 years in a row that the most trusted profession is America's nurses. National Nurses United—the Nation's largest professional association of registered nurses, with 185,000 nurses—also called for a health impact study of Keystone because we know if this pipeline is built, immediately we will see a 45-percent increase in the tar sands coming in. Eventually we will see a 300-percent increase in the filthiest, dirtiest of oils coming into our country. We also know this oil has higher levels of dangerous oil pollutants and carcinogens because we documented that in our own country where they burn tar sands oil.

Mr. INHOFE. A parliamentary inquiry, I ask of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state his inquiry.

Mr. INHOFE. Our point is, I believe the distinguished Senator from California is reserving the right to object. I would ask her does she object.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, may I complete my remarks before I make a decision on the pending request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. INHOFE. A further parliamentary inquiry: Is the time unlimited to finish remarks before objecting or not objecting?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A reservation for the right to object occurs at the suffering of other Senators.

Mrs. BOXER. I didn't understand what the Chair said.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no right to reserve the right to object.

Mrs. BOXER. All right. Then I would ask unanimous consent that I complete my remarks—the other side had many minutes—and then object.

And I would also ask the Chair, do we not have time on our side at this point in the debate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator does, but there is a unanimous consent request pending.

Mrs. BOXER. OK. Well, just to allay my friend's concern and his excitement about whether or not I will object, I will absolutely object. I do object because we know that misery—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

Mrs. BOXER. Misery follows the tar sands from extraction, to transportation, to refining, to waste storage.

We are going to show you some pictures, folks, in case you don't know what it looks like when you refine this oil. We are going to show you photos from Port Arthur, TX.

This is what it looks like. There is a playground where this filthy, dirty stuff is burned. This is not a good place to be. We had people at a press conference with the nurses from Port Arthur, TX, and they brought us these pictures and said this is what it is like when they burn the tar sands.

Now let's talk about the types of cancers that are linked to these toxic chemicals, including leukemia, non-Hodgkin lymphoma.

Why would anyone want to short-circuit a process? Just because the oil companies want it? We have to think about our people. Tar sands oil from the Keystone Pipeline will flow to our gulf refineries, increasing this toxic air pollution that already plagues communities such as Port Arthur, TX. I ask you to meet with some of those kids, meet with some of their parents, meet with some of those health professionals, and they will tell you the asthma rates that are happening, the respiratory illnesses, the skin irritations, the cancer. All they talk about is the pipeline. What about what flows through it? What about the toxins that get burned into our air?

We know a pipeline does burst. We know a pipeline does burst. We have seen many of those incidents, and we know one did burst with tar sands oil in Kalamazoo, MI. They still haven't cleaned up the river—3 years, they still haven't cleaned it up. And we know that the pipeline goes through communities and environmentally sensitive areas in six States.

Why would my friends want to bypass a process that is going to look at the potential damage to the health of our citizens, to the safety of our drinking water, and the effect on kids and asthma and cancer?

And let's not forget the tar sands waste, by the way. Here is a picture of that, in case my friends don't know what it looks like. This is called petcoke, petroleum coke. Already, because we have increased tar sands importation, it is lining up around our cities—in Chicago, in Detroit—massive open piles of tar sands, waste products known as petcoke, billowing black clouds containing heavy metals. There was a story that was told to our committee. Children playing baseball have been forced off the field to seek cover from the clouds of black dust that pelt homes and cars.

So you have problems when you extract, you have problems when you transport, you have problems when you refine, and you have problems when you store the waste. Why do my colleagues want to bypass a process that has been put in place since 1968 so we can look at the impact on our people? Petcoke dust is particulate matter. It is among the most harmful of all air pollutants. When inhaled, these par-

ticles can increase the number and severity of asthma attacks, cause or aggravate bronchitis and other lung diseases, and reduce the body's ability to fight infections.

Do you know the Federal Government has said that asthma is a national epidemic? I am quoting. It affects 1 of every 12 people or 26 million Americans. I know if I asked people in this Chamber—which I cannot do because it is against the rules of the Senate—to raise their hands if they have asthma or they know someone who has asthma, I guarantee half of the people in the room would raise their hands.

We don't need more asthma. We have a very important system in place to look at the effects of tar sands oil, and I don't think we should be pushing this project forward. Exposing Americans to pollutants linked to cancer and respiratory illness is not in the national interest.

Lastly I want to talk about the climate change impacts. For those people who are listening to the news, they must be surprised to see how many former Republican Environmental Protection Agency officials have come out and said to their colleagues who are here now: Wake up. Climate change is here, it is real, and human activity is adding to it.

The planet is in trouble. Tar sands oil has at least 17 percent more carbon pollution than domestic oil. The State Department concluded even in their flawed study that the annual carbon pollution from just the daily operation of the pipeline, should it be built, will be the equivalent of adding 300,000 new cars on our roads.

So why do we want to short-circuit a process which has been in place since 1968 and which was then renewed by George W. Bush in 2004 to protect our people from just this kind of a project?

If you walk up to an average American and say "Should we build the Keystone Pipeline?" they will say "Pipeline? A pipeline is a pipeline." But when you explain the kind of oil you are putting through the pipeline, that is a different situation because this is the filthiest, dirtiest oil—more carbon intensive. The oil is linked to all kinds of illness.

I stood next to people from Canada, doctors who were so glad I was raising these issues. Even the newspapers in Alberta have called for a much better study on health impact.

So outside of this Chamber more and more Republicans are coming out in support of doing something serious about climate change.

My friend showed a picture of Tom Steyer. Let me thank him from the bottom of my heart. This is someone who is a very successful businessperson who realized he has to step up to the plate and preserve the planet for his kids and his grandkids. Thank you, Tom Steyer.

Just last week four former Republican EPA Administrators who served under Presidents Nixon, Reagan,

George Herbert Walker Bush, and George W. Bush spoke out on the need to address climate change.

I thank Senator WHITEHOUSE, my subcommittee chair on the committee, who called these four incredible—it was an iconic moment, frankly. Let's see if I remember them all. There was Ruckelshaus, who started off with Nixon. There was Christie Todd Whitman, who worked for George W. Bush. There was William Reilly, who worked for George Herbert Walker Bush. Then there was Mr. Thomas, who worked for Ronald Reagan—Ronald Reagan. There they sat, and there they spoke, and there they said very clearly: Wake up, Republicans. This is a serious matter.

Now today a bipartisan group of former Treasury Secretaries released a report showing that the U.S. economy is already feeling the negative financial impacts of climate change. These respected leaders say climate change is real and we must act.

So why would we want to short-circuit a critical review process when approval of the Keystone Pipeline would be a major step in the wrong direction? It is the equivalent of 300,000 cars added back on our roads after we struggled so hard to clean up carbon pollution.

Another concern that remains to be addressed is the Keystone Pipeline's impact on national security. I met with a former SEAL Team 6 leader, and he was involved in the assessment of the Keystone tar sands pipeline and the risk of that pipeline becoming a high-profile target vulnerable to attack. They concluded it absolutely was a high-profile target, and it would be vulnerable to an attack that could trigger a catastrophic tar sand spill.

As I said, the last tar sand spill 3 years ago in Michigan has still not been cleaned up. This stuff is filthy, dirty oil—the dirtiest. Why on Earth would we want to see an eventual 300-percent increase in the importation? The nurses don't want it and the public health doctors don't want it. They came to the press conference with us. We cannot afford to take a shortcut in the Keystone tar sands pipeline review project when so much is at stake—the health of our communities and the impact on climate change.

Finally, I have a picture that I show a lot these days, and it is a picture of what it looks like when you throw the environment under the bus. This is a picture of a province in China where the people walk out with masks over their faces because everybody says: Who cares? We can just do anything we want. Who cares?

I recently went to China. Over the course of 2 weeks, I never saw the Sun. I did not see the Sun. On one day when we had a little bit of Sun peeking through—I mean barely at all—the people there got so excited. The people who work in our embassy there get hazardous duty pay because it is so dangerous for their families. They can't go out and breathe the air because they can get sick.

We can have economic growth and a clean environment. You know why? We did it in the 1970s when everybody objected to the Clean Air Act. You should have seen the folks come to the Senate floor. You should have heard the Chamber of Commerce railing against the Clean Air Act. You know what happened since then? Tens of millions of jobs have been created. The air is clean. Thousands and millions of lives over time have been saved. Heart attacks, asthma attacks, and cancer have reduced. We can quantify it.

When colleagues come here and try to do something to bypass a procedure to protect human health and the environment, you can count on me standing right here. I am proud to do it.

I can report that California—under the great leadership of our Governor Jerry Brown—is moving to clean energy. We are moving to thousands and millions of new jobs. We have added more jobs over the last couple of reporting periods than any other State. We are balancing our budget. We have a surplus because we are moving to energy efficiency, and that means people are going to work.

I understand that my friend from New Hampshire is interested in making a few remarks, so at this time I wish to say to my Republican friends that it is with great respect and friendship, truly, that we see the world differently, and that is OK. That is what makes this the greatest country on Earth. We can come here and speak out.

I wish to say to the American people today that this rush to build the pipeline before the process is completed is dangerous to the health of people and to the health of the planet and to the importance of our national security.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I appreciate my colleague from California giving me an opportunity to respond.

As those of us on the floor probably remember, several weeks ago we were talking about trying to address the Energy Efficiency and Industrial Competitiveness Act, also known as Shaheen-Portman, an effort that Senator PORTMAN and I had worked on for 3½ years to try and put in place a comprehensive energy efficiency strategy for this country. The bill has no mandates in it and no new spending. It has the support of over 260 groups—everybody from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce to the National Association of Manufacturers to the NRDC to several trade unions, companies from Johnson Controls to Honeywell, the American Chemistry Council. It has the support of a broad coalition of people.

According to the American Council for an Energy-Efficient Economy, if the legislation of Senator PORTMAN and myself were to pass this year, by 2030 it would help create 192,000 jobs, save consumers \$16.2 billion a year, and it would be the equivalent of taking 22 million cars off the road.

As part of that discussion, we actually had what we thought was an agreement to have a vote on Shaheen-Portman on a date certain that would have a 60-vote threshold and also have another vote on the Keystone Pipeline on a date certain. All the Senators would know when the vote would take place, and again it would have a 60-vote threshold. Sadly, some of the sponsors of that legislation who worked with us to try and get a bill put forward refused to vote to consider the bill, and it went down. It is unfortunate because we could have had a vote on the Keystone Pipeline at that time. It was an agreement I thought we had all agreed made sense.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 2262

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at a time to be determined by the majority leader, after consultation with the Republican leader, the Senate resume consideration of S. 2262, the Shaheen-Portman energy efficiency bill; that the motion to commit be withdrawn; that amendment Nos. 3023 and 3025 be withdrawn; that the pending substitute amendment be agreed to; that there be no other amendments, points of order, or motions in order to the bill other than budget points of order and the applicable motions to waive; that there be up to 4 hours of debate on the bill equally divided between the two leaders or their designees; that upon the use or yielding back of time, the Senate proceed to vote on passage of the bill, as amended; that the bill be subject to a 60-affirmative-vote threshold; that if the bill is passed, the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 371, S. 2280, at a time to be determined by the majority leader, after consultation with the Republican leader, but no later than Thursday, July 17, 2014; that there be no amendments, points of order, or motions in order to the bill other than budget points of order and the applicable motions to waive; that there be up to 4 hours of debate on the bill equally divided between the two leaders or their designees; that upon the use or yielding back of time, the Senate proceed to vote on passage of the bill; finally, that the bill be subject to a 60-affirmative-vote threshold.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. INHOFE. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I do reserve the right to object. I have listened carefully to my very good friend from California, and it affects my decision as to whether to object.

The reason the American people are no longer interested in all the hype and all the world coming to an end on global warming is for four reasons. No. 1, according to the IPCC—let's keep in mind, the IPCC, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, is the science that is behind this opinion. They even admit today that there has

been no warming in the last 14 years. This is not just a report from the IPCC but Nature magazine.

Mrs. BOXER. Parliamentary inquiry, please.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator state the inquiry.

Mrs. BOXER. My understanding is the Senator is using the time of the Senators on this side of the aisle to make a speech before he objects. Am I correct? Is it our time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mrs. BOXER. I ask that the Senator object, and then Senator SHAHEEN have the rest of the time because we are running out of time.

Mr. INHOFE. I am reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator does not have the right to reserve the right to object.

Mr. INHOFE. I recall that a few minutes ago, the distinguished Senator from California reserved the right to object and gave her reasons. Is that incorrect?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time was under Democratic control at that time.

Mr. INHOFE. Very well. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. I wish to say I am disappointed we can't move forward to address the concern on both voting on the Keystone Pipeline as well as the concern Senator PORTMAN and I have to consider the Shaheen-Portman energy efficiency bill.

Shaheen-Portman is legislation that would go very far to address our energy needs. After all, energy efficiency is the first fuel. It is the cheapest, fastest way to deal with this country's energy needs. It has support from those people who believe in fossil fuels and from those people who support alternatives, such as wind and solar. It is something everybody benefits from, and it is something that would move us in a direction that would help address the pollution we are seeing—not just from carbon but from so many other pollutants that are being thrown into the air. It is a reasonable way to address both our concerns as well as the concerns of those people who support the Keystone Pipeline.

Let's have this vote—up or down—with a 60-vote threshold. I believe we have strong bipartisan support for Shaheen-Portman. We saw that in the motion to proceed when it got more than 70 votes here on the floor. We had strong bipartisan cosponsors on the legislation. I think we could have those votes now, everybody would be happy, and let the votes fall where they may.

I am disappointed to hear the objection. I hope we will have an opportunity to reconsider, and I hope we can all agree that there is a benefit to both sides of the aisle in voting on both of these issues in a way that gives the American people some idea of where we stand.

I thank the Presiding Officer, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Will the Senator from New Hampshire yield for a question?

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Happily.

Ms. HEITKAMP. I am obviously not as schooled in the procedures of the Senate, but I want to better understand what happened here. Obviously the Senator moved to bring forward a bill she and Senator PORTMAN worked tirelessly on, which is critical to jobs in America and to energy efficiency, while also agreeing to allow a number of amendments, which included an amendment this Senator would have loved a vote on, the Keystone Pipeline. Obviously I don't believe the Senator and I share the same opinion, but I think it is important to have a discussion about it.

With all of the discussion about how we are not moving legislation forward in the Senate, I am curious as to why someone would object to that consideration and moving that bill forward. It seems as though it is a reasonable and appropriate consequence.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. I know my colleague from California wishes to answer, but I will say that I share the Senator's disappointment. I think this was a great opportunity for us to address both energy efficiency in the Shaheen-Portman legislation and to also get a vote on the Keystone Pipeline, which is something we discussed several weeks ago when the energy efficiency legislation came to the floor. I thought we had an agreement where we would vote on the bill and then separately vote on Keystone, and they would both have a 60-vote threshold. Sadly, some of those sponsors of the legislation didn't vote for it when the bill was filibustered, and so it did not pass. I am hopeful we can still bring it back. I am happy to bring it back in a way that allows us to have the same 60-vote threshold for a vote on the Keystone Pipeline.

Mrs. BOXER. Will the Senator yield.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. I will.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. I wish to say through the Chair, I spoke for quite a while on why I feel it is not good governance to come to the floor and ask unanimous consent to move to a bill and to short circuit a process that is in place and has been in place since 1968. The process was renewed by President George W. Bush to make sure when we build an American infrastructure project that it is safe, that it is in our national security interests, that public health is considered, and all the rest.

I have said all along on an amendment of controversy—I am ready to vote on the Keystone Pipeline, and I support Senator SHAHEEN and Senator PORTMAN's bill. What a great bill. What a win-win. Senator SHAHEEN is willing to take a 60-vote threshold for that, and those of us who worry about the

pipeline are willing to vote with a 60-vote threshold. That is the way to go.

The minority leader, the Republican leader Senator MCCONNELL, said it over the years over and over. Whenever there is controversy, if people feel it is controversial, have a 60-vote threshold. He said that I don't know how many times, but I have the quotes. All of a sudden, when it comes to repealing President Obama's Climate Action Plan or Keystone, somehow that doesn't qualify as controversial from his point of view, but the thing about "controversial" is it is in the eye of the beholder. I don't think it is controversial to raise the minimum wage. It hasn't been raised in years, but my friends on the other side don't like it. They demand 60 votes. So we had a 60-vote threshold.

That is where we are, and that is why we are in this mess.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

Mrs. BOXER. I thank the Chair.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I applaud the Senate today for voting on the confirmation of Leon Rodriguez to be Director of the United States Citizenship and Immigration Services, USCIS. This is a vital leadership position within the Department of Homeland Security, responsible for administering and processing asylum and refugee applications, immigration benefits, and naturalization and visa petitions, including the EB-5 Regional Center Program.

Mr. Rodriguez's confirmation comes at a critical time. Nearly 1 year after the Senate's historic vote on the Border Security, Economic Opportunity and Immigration Modernization Act, House Republicans have failed to pass comprehensive immigration reform, and have maintained a status quo that leaves our immigration system in tatters. We are now seeing the human cost of this inaction, as tens of thousands of young, unaccompanied alien children flood our Southwest border. Many of these children fled their homes to escape unimaginable violence, only to endure a harrowing journey and, once here, yet another humanitarian crisis. House Republicans must act to fix our broken immigration system, as we did in the Senate 1 year ago this week. Until then, our borders will be undermanned, our immigration courts overwhelmed, our economy will lag, and millions of people who have lived and worked in our country for years will be left in limbo.

Although he will face these extraordinary challenges, I am confident that Mr. Rodriguez will ably lead USCIS. He currently serves as the Director for the Office for Civil Rights at the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. He previously served as the Deputy Assistant Attorney General and Chief of Staff for the Justice Department's Civil Rights Division. Prior to joining the administration, Mr. Rodriguez was the county attorney for Montgomery County, Maryland. Before that he was in private practice here in

Washington. He has vast leadership and management experience, spanning both public and private practice, and often intersecting with issues of national origin and immigration status, making him extremely qualified to lead USCIS effectively.

Mr. Rodriguez understands the need for both a comprehensive and compassionate response to the humanitarian crisis facing children seeking refuge in our country. With parents who fled an oppressive regime in Cuba, and grandparents who fled anti-Semitism and poverty in Turkey and Poland before that, Mr. Rodriguez understands the challenges and remarkable potential of immigration, both for the immigrant and for our country. This process begins with the fair, swift adjudication of asylum, refugee, and visa petitions.

Mr. Rodriguez also understands how important the USCIS-administered EB-5 jobs program is to States like Vermont. This important economic program has transformed parts of our State, providing much-needed capital and creating jobs. I have spoken to Mr. Rodriguez about the challenges facing the program, including long application processing delays that have threatened to undermine important projects. He is committed to working with us in Congress to strengthen the program and make it permanent.

He has the strong support of law enforcement, including the Major Cities Chiefs Association, as well as a coalition of 37 Latino organizations from across the country. I too support Mr. Rodriguez. I was proud to advance his nomination through the Senate Judiciary Committee and on the Senate floor. He is uniquely suited to lead this important office, and I look forward to seeing the progress to come at USCIS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Leon Rodriguez, of Maryland, to be Director of the United States Citizenship and Immigration Services, Department of Homeland Security?

Mrs. BOXER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR) and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. JOHANNIS).

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

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 211 Ex.]

YEAS—52

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

NAYS—44

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

NOT VOTING—4

Cochran	Pryor
Johanns	Schatz

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table. The President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. I ask that the Senate now resume legislative session.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. REID. I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 738.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

NOMINATION OF CHERYL ANN KRAUSE TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Cheryl Ann Krause, of New Jersey, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. Madam President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to report 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 Cheryl Ann Krause, of New Jersey, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit.

Harry Reid, Patrick J. Leahy, Richard J. Durbin, Patty Murray, Jack Reed, Sheldon Whitehouse, Christopher A. Coons, Jeff Merkley, Sherrod Brown, Tom Harkin, Richard Blumenthal, Benjamin L. Cardin, Angus S. King, Jr., Thomas R. Carper, Debbie Stabenow, Elizabeth Warren, Amy Klobuchar.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. REID. I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

RECOGNIZING BISHOP DON DIXON WILLIAMS

Mr. REID. Madam President, today I honor and recognize the career of Bishop Don Dixon Williams, a member of the organization Bread for the World and the face of antihunger advocacy for over 25 years. At Bread for the World, Bishop Williams has been the national associate for African-American church engagement and a globally recognized advocate for the poorest among us.

During his tenure at Bread for the World, Bishop Williams traveled across the world confronting the problem of hunger both at home and abroad. Bishop Williams also served as a US delegate to the G8 summit, and he has traveled to Israel and Palestine to help engage Muslim, Jewish, and Christian leaders in discussions about peace.

In addition to his service for Bread for the World, Bishop Williams has been the consummate churchman. He was consecrated a bishop in 2007 for the United Church of Jesus Christ, and he has served in various capacities with other faith-based organizations throughout his career.

On behalf of the Senate, I commend Bishop Don Dixon Williams on a lifetime of public service and wish him the best in all his future endeavors.

CHILDREN'S HEALTH

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I am pleased, although not surprised, with

the latest news that Vermont's children rank as the healthiest. Recent data released by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention shows that Vermont ranks at the top or near the top of the list on a variety of metrics, including a child's access to health care, and percentage of children who exercise regularly. We all know that healthy habits begin in childhood, and Vermont has worked for years to ensure that all Vermont children have access to healthy beginnings.

Vermont has long been a trailblazer on health care, particularly for children. Recognizing that access to health care for children and pregnant women is critical to a healthy society, Vermont created the Dr. Dynasaur Program in 1989 to help families who could not afford health insurance but could not qualify for Medicaid. The program was such a success, Governor Howard Dean expanded Dr. Dynasaur in 1991 to cover all children and teens. Governor Dean's success with the program and leadership on the issue paved the way for Congress to create the Children's Health Insurance Program.

Vermont has taken other steps as well to ensure all children can grow up healthy. In addition to having one of the lowest rates of uninsured children, Vermont has worked hard to give children access to healthy meals at school. Vermont brings local food into schools and teaches children about healthy eating through the Farm to School Program. And in order to make sure all children have access to school meals, Vermont gives those eligible for reduced-price lunches those meals for free. By working in a coordinated fashion across agencies and with advocacy groups, Vermont reaches out to children in need to help those families receive access to health care, nutrition assistance, and other vital safety net programs.

Unfortunately, there are still some troubling national trends related to children's health of which Vermont is not immune. Larger serving sizes and greater access to junk food combined with sedentary lifestyles have contributed to the steady rise in childhood obesity rates. Additionally, we are seeing a rise in the number of children living in poverty and without consistent access to nutritious food and health care. If we fail to reverse these trends, we are setting our children up for health problems that will last well into adulthood.

We must continue to support the efforts of our States and so many families who are trying to help their children make healthy choices. Instead of working to undermine the efforts we have made to ensure children can eat nutritious meals in school or to repeal the Affordable Care Act, or reducing eligibility in the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children Program or other nutrition programs, we should be working together to ensure all American children have the chance to succeed.

Vermont has shown tremendous leadership in this area, and I hope we can all learn from its model.

I ask unanimous consent that the following Washington Post article, "Best state in America: Vermont, for its healthy kids," be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, June 21, 2014]

BEST STATE IN AMERICA: VERMONT, FOR ITS HEALTHY KIDS

A lifetime of good health starts in childhood. Health insurance, access to health care and regular exercise make for fit kids with long life expectancies. And nowhere in America are kids healthier than in Vermont.

Across a range of metrics, the Green Mountain State excels, according to the latest data collected by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Fewer than one in four Vermont children are overweight or obese. More than 81 percent have access to medical and dental care. Nearly 99 percent have health insurance. And one-third of all Vermont children report exercising at least 20 minutes a day.

Vermont's relatively small and prosperous population makes it easier than in some other states for officials to reach out to potentially vulnerable children, said Cathy Hess, managing director for coverage and access at the National Academy for State Health Policy. What's more, Vermont has been a pioneer in children's health reform.

The state's Dr. Dynasaur program, created in 1989, covered tens of thousands of low-income children long before the federal Children's Health Insurance Program came into being. Congressional authors modeled the federal program in part on Vermont's plan.

Vermont policymakers have also worked for years to build partnerships between public and private institutions to promote children's health. There's the Vermont Child Health Improvement Program, run through the University of Vermont; Children's Integrated Services, run through the state Department for Children and Families, which works to connect low-income families with young children to social services; and the Blueprint for Health, established in 2006 to improve health-care services and control costs.

"They're focusing on the child and the family, and not so much trying to fit the child in different bureaucratic holes," Hess said.

Other states can brag about their successes: Children in West Virginia, Missouri, Tennessee and Oklahoma report getting more exercise than their compatriots in Vermont. Kids in Utah and Colorado are less likely to be obese or overweight. And Hawaii and Massachusetts insure a greater proportion of their children.

States with higher percentages of low-income families tend to fall at the less healthy end of the spectrum, especially if those families are minorities with less access to health care. Nearly 40 percent of children in Louisiana and Mississippi are obese or overweight. Only 56 percent of children in Nevada and 59 percent in Idaho have access to medical and dental care. Just 18 percent of Utah children say they get 20 minutes of daily exercise.

Perhaps those states should study Vermont's model. The Green Mountain State is a lap ahead of the rest of the field.

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

LANCE CORPORAL ADAM WOLFF

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I have the sad task of paying tribute to a fellow Iowan who has given his life in service to his country. LCpl Adam Wolff was killed while supporting combat operations in Helmand province, Afghanistan. He was 25 years old. Adam was a native of Eldon, IA, and lived in Cedar Rapids. Eldon is home to the house depicted in Grant Wood's famous painting "American Gothic," which has come to symbolize a certain indomitable American spirit. Certainly there can be no greater representation of the spirit of self-sacrifice that has preserved American liberty through the generations than patriots like Lance Corporal Wolff. We can never repay him for his sacrifice, but we as a country must remember him and all those who have given their lives in defense of freedom. My thoughts and prayers go out to his family and friends who are feeling his loss very deeply, particularly his father Nicholas, his mother Deborah, and his siblings. We cannot begin to comprehend their loss, but they should know that Adam's service and sacrifice have earned the gratitude of an entire nation.

CHIEF WARRANT OFFICER TWO RANDY L. BILLINGS

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I wish to remember the life and sacrifice of a remarkable young man, Army CW2 Randy L. Billings. Randy died December 17, 2013, of injuries he sustained when his helicopter crashed in Zabul Province, Afghanistan, in support of Operation Enduring Freedom.

Randy was born September 1, 1979, in Poteau, OK, and later moved to Heavener, OK. After graduating Heavener High School in 1997, he joined the military and served our country for 16 years.

While attending flight school to Rucker, AL, Randy met his wife Ashley. Bonding through a mutual enjoyment of the outdoors, they were married in 2008.

In September 2009, Randy transferred to the 3rd Assault Helicopter Battalion, 1st Aviation Regiment, 1st Combat Aviation Brigade, and 1st Infantry Division in Fort Riley, KS.

The couple made a home in Manhattan, KS, but they planned to move south after he retired from the military and start a family.

Ashley and her family are suffering their second loss to war. Ashley Billings' brother died in a 2004 helicopter crash in Iraq. "It's much harder because we've been through this before," she said. However, they were comforted by the knowledge that Randy "loved what he did and was going to do it right."

On December 17, 2013, Randy tragically died of injuries he sustained when his Black Hawk U-60 helicopter crashed in southern Afghanistan. Five other soldiers on board were killed alongside of Randy.

His uncle Hurschel Billings said, "He really loved it. Every time he came back, he couldn't wait to go back." He served two tours in Iraq and two in Afghanistan. "He died loving what he does. Serving the country."

"He was just one of the nicest people you could possibly be around . . . He was the definition of what a hero is. He served his country well," said Amanda Morrison, Billings' cousin.

A memorial service was held January 4, 2014, at Cornerstone Baptist Church in Inverness, FL, and he was buried at Florida National Cemetery. Oklahoma Governor Mary Fallin ordered flags on State property to fly at half-staff from 3-6 January, 2014.

"He's pushed me to be a better person for myself every single day of my life," his wife Ashley said. "That's the kind of person he was."

Chief Warrant Officer Billings' wife Ashley Billings resides in Manhattan, KS; mother Eva Cooper in Poteau, OK; and father Robert Billings in Heavener, OK.

Today we remember Army CW2 Randy L. Billings, a young man who loved his family and country and gave his life as a sacrifice for freedom.

COMMENDING TOM CARPER

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, on June 4, 2014, I was proud to participate with the National Energy Resource Organization in bestowing its Distinguished Service Award to Senator TOM CARPER.

NERO has, since 1978, recognized in a nonpartisan manner outstanding achievements in the energy field, particularly in the areas of public awareness regarding energy development, supply, and use.

Senator CARPER was recognized for his long career of honorable public service and his leadership. In the Senate, Senator CARPER has served as a senior member of the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee and as one of the wisest supporters of nuclear power. Senator CARPER is the past chair of the Clean Air and Nuclear Safety Subcommittee. In that role he led the effort to pass the Diesel Emissions Reduction Act with Senator George Voinovich and conducted vigorous oversight of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. It has been my privilege to work with him on this committee as his ranking member.

As we all know, Senator CARPER has been willing to work across the aisle on energy issues, and he is simply one of the best people we have in this body. He lives by the Golden Rule and sets the kind of example on a daily basis that we all admire and should seek to emulate. I wanted to share this good news with my colleagues.

COMMENDING JIM INHOFE

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, I was proud to participate on June 4, 2014, with the National Energy Resource Organization when it presented

its Distinguished Service Award to our colleague, Senator JIM INHOFE.

Since 1978, NERO has recognized in a nonpartisan manner outstanding achievements in the energy field, particularly in the areas of public awareness regarding energy development and use. In addition to working for 30 years in the private sector, JIM is the past mayor of Tulsa, U.S. Congressman, and has represented the State of Oklahoma in the U.S. Senate since 1994.

Senator INHOFE was recognized for his service as the lead Republican on the Senate Environment & Public Works Committee for 10 years, 4 of those years as its chairman. He has been a strong proponent of Oklahoma's energy resources and truly believes in an "all of the above" approach to American energy. Through his work on both of his committees, he has demonstrated that energy independence is not just an economic issue but a national security issue.

Senator INHOFE is well respected in the Senate on energy issues, and he has been in the forefront of every energy and environmental issue in the Senate for the last 20 years.

All of us know of Senator INHOFE's dedication to this Nation, his faith, and to a strong energy production. We also know of his giving spirit and his heart for Africa. We are amazed at all he accomplishes. Every day he gives his total and relentless effort towards making America a better place.

I wanted to share this good news with our colleagues.

FOREIGN DUMPING

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Madam President, I wish to speak about the importance of a level playing field for Minnesotan miners and American steel. My State's iron ore mines and the thousands of Minnesota jobs they support are the backbone of the Iron Range. It started in the days when miners like my grandfather worked in the underground mines with picks and shovels and continues today in open-pit mines with giant electric shovels and haul trucks.

Through the generations, these Minnesotans have earned a reputation for possessing a strong work ethic. They have proven that our miners on the range can compete with anybody in the world on a level playing field. Unfortunately, that fairness is being compromised by foreign trading practices that are putting steelworker jobs in jeopardy.

The U.S. Department of Commerce is currently investigating the trading practices of countries that are dumping steel products in the U.S. market. This flood of foreign oil country tubular—OCTG—goods is causing our Nation's steel industry to lose sales and market to underpriced foreign competitors. An example is South Korea, which is the world's largest steel industry but has no domestic OCTG market. The result is Korean producers exporting more to the United States, creating a drop in the price of steel.

While the U.S. demand for OCTG products is increasing, American producers are not seeing the benefits. In fact, they are losing sales to foreign competitors, with imports of OCTG doubling since 2008 and increased by 61 percent this year compared to the previous year. This is already having an impact in American facilities with reduced hours and the threat of layoffs for workers.

Dumping of steel products has nationwide economic implications. The OCTG steel produced for the U.S. energy market accounts for approximately 10 percent of domestic steel production. U.S. OCTG producers directly employ nearly 8,000 workers across the country, and every one of those jobs in turn supports another 7 jobs in the supply chain. Here in Minnesota, where the steelmaking process begins, there are more than 10,000 high-quality, steel-related jobs.

That is why I recently joined 58 of my colleagues in sending a bipartisan letter to the Secretary of Commerce expressing concern at the antidumping investigation of OCTG imports from South Korea. The letter asks the administration to more closely examine these imports for any misrepresentations in origin and nature of the products and to take action against any unfair dumping practices.

We all know our industries need to be competitive—but they also need to be competing on fair terms. It is critical that our trade laws serve as the last line of defense for American companies and workers. I will continue fighting to ensure that we have a level playing field for this Minnesota industry vital to the economic prosperity of our State.

PENNSYLVANIA'S ACA MARKETPLACE

Mr. CASEY. Madam President, I wish to speak about encouraging news from Pennsylvania. A June 17 article from the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette details how Pennsylvania's health insurance marketplace, established through the Affordable Care Act, is working as intended for enrollees. I would like to enter this article into the RECORD as evidence of how the Affordable Care Act is expanding access to health insurance, in Pennsylvania and throughout our Nation. I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, June 17, 2014]

PA. HEALTH MARKETPLACE 'WORKING' FOR ENROLLEES

68% HAD PREMIUMS OF \$100 OR LESS: REPORT
(By Steve Twedt)

Pennsylvanians who selected midrange coverage "silver" plans in the new private health insurance marketplace created as part of the federal Affordable Care Act paid an average monthly premium of \$60 with tax

credits, according to a new report by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

Overall for all four plans—bronze, silver, gold and platinum—68 percent of enrollees had premiums of \$100 or less after factoring in tax credits and 47 percent found plans with premiums of \$50 a month or less, the report said.

"What we're finding is that the marketplace is working for Pennsylvanians," said HHS Secretary Sylvia Burwell in a release. "Consumers have more choices, and they're paying less for their premiums."

More than 300,000 Pennsylvanians have signed up for a marketplace health plan since enrollment began Oct. 1. Nationally, the number of enrollees has surpassed 8 million who HHS says have collectively saved nearly \$1.2 billion in premiums from what insurers had originally sought.

The exchanges are an integral part of the 2010 Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, designed to give people, and particularly the uninsured, access to low-cost health insurance.

The tax credits for lower income enrollees are a major factor in plan affordability, as the HHS report said; Pennsylvanians who were eligible for tax credits saw their monthly premiums decrease by 74 percent, from \$330 to \$84.

Information about the tax credits, including eligibility requirements, can be found at the IRS website: www.irs.gov/uac/Newsroom/Questions-and-Answers-on-the-Premium-Tax-Credit.

LITTLE LEAGUE INTERNATIONAL ANNIVERSARY

Mr. TOOMEY. Madam President, I wish to recognize Little League International on its 75th anniversary. Little League International was founded in Williamsport, PA, in 1939 by Carl Stotz as a means for area youth to learn the sport at a time when they were considered too young to play organized baseball. The basic goal of Little League was, and remains, to introduce children to a game that teaches its set of values, including courage, character and loyalty, that will guide them throughout their lives. Congress recognized the valuable role Little League has played in America's communities when it unanimously granted Little League a Federal charter on July 16, 1964. That charter was signed into law by President Lyndon B. Johnson the very next day.

Over the course of its 75 years, Little League Baseball has become the world's largest organized youth sports program, growing from 3 teams in 1939 to nearly 200,000 teams located in all 50 States and more than 80 countries worldwide. Each year, more than 2.4 million children participate in Little League Baseball in various divisions, including baseball, softball, and a challenger division for physically and developmentally challenged children. Some notable Little League alumni include former U.S. President George W. Bush, two Vice Presidents, numerous U.S. Senators and Representatives, two Nobel Prize laureates, and a Medal of Honor recipient. Also, several professional athletes and Hall of Fame baseball players began their journey in Little League. In keeping with the tradition of our national pastime, thousands

of games are played throughout the summer months at various levels of competition. These events bring together children from the international community and foster principles that transcend cultural or regional differences.

Since the very first game was played on June 6, 1939, Little League International has made an invaluable contribution to the lives of millions of children across the globe. I wish Little League International all the best as it continues to grow and fulfill its mission by laying a strong foundation for today's youth.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

CONGRAULATING SOUTHEAST ISLAND SCHOOL DISTRICT

• Mr. BEGICH. Madam President, I wish to pay tribute to the hard work of the students and faculty of the Southeast Island School District, their local community members, and their Superintendent, Lauren Busch.

In response to high food costs, the school district sought funding and community support to build greenhouses for students at each of its four schools: Thorne Bay, Coffman Cove, Naukati, and Barry Stewart. Students and community members found funding, purchased and constructed greenhouses and are now using locally sourced biomass to heat them.

While building a few greenhouses may not sound like much to those in the lower 48, things are different in Alaska. High transportation costs, high energy costs, the lack of access to raw materials, and sometimes severe weather all combine to make for a high cost of living. This makes this district-wide greenhouse project a tremendous achievement.

A central part of my job is to explain how different Alaska is to my colleagues here and to help them understand these high costs our Alaska communities face. These are the central challenges of our State and, in one project, have been smartly and creatively addressed through the Southeast Island School District greenhouse program. In addition, the program also teaches students many other valuable skills, including entrepreneurship.

I am proud to congratulate these hard-working and resourceful Alaskans and I wish them continued success.●

VAN BUREN COUNTY, IOWA

• Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, the strength of my State of Iowa lies in its vibrant local communities, where citizens come together to foster economic development, make smart investments to expand opportunity, and take the initiative to improve the health and well-being of residents. Over the decades, I have witnessed the growth and revitalization of so many communities across my State. And it has been deep-

ly gratifying to see how my work in Congress has supported these local efforts.

I have always believed in accountability for public officials, and this, my final year in the Senate, is an appropriate time to give an accounting of my work across four decades representing Iowa in Congress. I take pride in accomplishments that have been national in scope—for instance, passing the Americans with Disabilities Act and spearheading successful farm bills. But I take a very special pride in projects that have made a big difference in local communities across my State.

Today, I would like to give an accounting of my work with leaders and residents of Van Buren County to build a legacy of a stronger local economy, better schools and educational opportunities, and a healthier, safer community.

Between 2001 and 2013, the creative leadership in your community has worked with me to successfully acquire financial assistance from programs I have fought hard to support, which have provided more than \$13 million to the local economy.

Of course, one of my favorite memories of working together is the success that the Van Buren County Hospital has had in securing funds for wellness activities and facilities expansions through programs I fought for as chair of the Senate Agriculture Committee.

Among the highlights:

Main Street Iowa: One of the greatest challenges we face—in Iowa and all across America—is preserving the character and vitality of our small towns and rural communities. This isn't just about economics. It is also about maintaining our identity as Iowans. Main Street Iowa helps preserve Iowa's heart and soul by providing funds to revitalize downtown business districts. This program has allowed towns like Bonaparte to use that money to leverage other investments to jumpstart change and renewal. I am so pleased that Van Buren County has earned \$55,000 through this program. These grants build much more than buildings. They build up the spirit and morale of people in our small towns and local communities.

School grants: Every child in Iowa deserves to be educated in a classroom that is safe, accessible, and modern. That is why, for the past decade and a half, I have secured funding for the innovative Iowa Demonstration Construction Grant Program—better known among educators in Iowa as Harkin grants for public schools construction and renovation. Across 15 years, Harkin grants worth more than \$132 million have helped school districts to fund a range of renovation and repair efforts—everything from updating fire safety systems to building new schools. In many cases, these Federal dollars have served as the needed incentive to leverage local public and private dollars, so it often has a tre-

mendous multiplier effect within a school district. Over the years, Van Buren County has received \$2,722,823 in Harkin grants. Similarly, schools in Van Buren County have received funds that I designated for Iowa Star Schools for technology totaling \$144,729.

Agricultural and rural development: Because I grew up in a small town in rural Iowa, I have always been a loyal friend and fierce advocate for family farmers and rural communities. I have been a member of the House or Senate Agriculture Committee for 40 years—including more than 10 years as chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee. Across the decades, I have championed farm policies for Iowans that include effective farm income protection and commodity programs; strong, progressive conservation assistance for agricultural producers; renewable energy opportunities; and robust economic development in our rural communities. Since 1991, through various programs authorized through the farm bill, Van Buren County has received more than \$5 million from a variety of farm bill programs.

Keeping Iowa communities safe: I also firmly believe that our first responders need to be appropriately trained and equipped, able to respond to both local emergencies and to statewide challenges such as, for instance, the methamphetamine epidemic. Since 2001, Van Buren County's fire departments have received over \$2,000,000 for firefighter safety and operations equipment.

Wellness and health care: Improving the health and wellness of all Americans has been something I have been passionate about for decades. That is why I fought to dramatically increase funding for disease prevention, innovative medical research, and a whole range of initiatives to improve the health of individuals and families not only at the doctor's office but also in our communities, schools, and workplaces. I am so proud that Americans have better access to clinical preventive services, nutritious food, smoke-free environments, safe places to engage in physical activity, and information to make healthy decisions for themselves and their families. These efforts not only save lives, they will also save money for generations to come thanks to the prevention of costly chronic diseases, which account for a whopping 75 percent of annual health care costs. I am pleased that Van Buren County has recognized this important issue by securing more than \$350,000 in grants for community wellness activities.

Disability Rights: Growing up, I loved and admired my brother Frank, who was deaf. However, I was deeply disturbed by the discrimination and obstacles he faced every day. That is why I have always been a passionate advocate for full equality for people with disabilities. As the primary author of the Americans with Disabilities Act, ADA, and the ADA Amendments Act, I

have had four guiding goals for our fellow citizens with disabilities: equal opportunity, full participation, independent living and economic self-sufficiency. Nearly a quarter century since passage of the ADA, I see remarkable changes in communities everywhere I go in Iowa—not just in curb cuts or closed captioned television, but in the full participation of people with disabilities in our society and economy, folks who at long last have the opportunity to contribute their talents and to be fully included. These changes have increased economic opportunities for all citizens of Van Buren County, both those with and without disabilities, and they make us proud to be a part of a community and country that respects the worth and civil rights of all of our citizens.

This is at least a partial accounting of my work on behalf of Iowa, and specifically Van Buren County, during my time in Congress. In every case, this work has been about partnerships, cooperation, and empowering folks at the State and local level, including in Van Buren County, to fulfill their own dreams and initiatives. And, of course, this work is never complete. Even after I retire from the Senate, I have no intention of retiring from the fight for a better, fairer, richer Iowa. I will always be profoundly grateful for the opportunity to serve the people of Iowa as their Senator.●

FLOYD COUNTY, IOWA

● Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, the strength of my State of Iowa lies in its vibrant local communities, where citizens come together to foster economic development, make smart investments to expand opportunity, and take the initiative to improve the health and well-being of residents. Over the decades, I have witnessed the growth and revitalization of so many communities across my State. And it has been deeply gratifying to see how my work in Congress has supported these local efforts.

I have always believed in accountability for public officials, and this, my final year in the Senate, is an appropriate time to give an accounting of my work across four decades representing Iowa in Congress. I take pride in accomplishments that have been national in scope—for instance, passing the Americans with Disabilities Act and spearheading successful farm bills. But I take a very special pride in projects that have made a big difference in local communities across my State.

Today, I would like to give an accounting of my work with leaders and residents of Floyd County to build a legacy of a stronger local economy, better schools and educational opportunities, and a healthier, safer community.

Between 2001 and 2013, the creative leadership in your community has worked with me to secure funding in

Floyd County worth over \$600,000 and successfully acquire financial assistance from programs I have fought hard to support, which have provided more than \$9 million to the local economy.

Of course, one of my favorite memories of working together is their work to combine several issues I care deeply about by renovating a former Carnegie Library to serve the community as the Charles City Art Center, and by making it accessible to people with disabilities.

Among the highlights:

Main Street Iowa: One of the greatest challenges we face—in Iowa and all across America—is preserving the character and vitality of our small towns and rural communities. This isn't just about economics. It is also about maintaining our identity as Iowans. Main Street Iowa helps preserve Iowa's heart and soul by providing funds to revitalize downtown business districts. This program has allowed towns like Charles City and Hampton to use that money to leverage other investments to jumpstart change and renewal. I am so pleased that Floyd County has earned \$72,000 through this program. These grants build much more than buildings. They build up the spirit and morale of people in our small towns and local communities.

School grants: Every child in Iowa deserves to be educated in a classroom that is safe, accessible, and modern. That is why, for the past decade and a half, I have secured funding for the innovative Iowa Demonstration Construction Grant Program—better known among educators in Iowa as Harkin grants for public schools construction and renovation. Across 15 years, Harkin grants worth more than \$132 million have helped school districts to fund a range of renovation and repair efforts—everything from updating fire safety systems to building new schools. In many cases, these Federal dollars have served as the needed incentive to leverage local public and private dollars, so it often has a tremendous multiplier effect within a school district. Over the years, Floyd County has received \$538,648 in Harkin grants. Similarly, schools in Floyd County have received funds that I designated for Iowa Star Schools for technology totaling \$55,000.

Disaster mitigation and prevention: In 1993, when historic floods ripped through Iowa, it became clear to me that the national emergency-response infrastructure was woefully inadequate to meet the needs of Iowans in flood-ravaged communities. I went to work dramatically expanding the Federal Emergency Management Agency's hazard mitigation program, which helps communities reduce the loss of life and property due to natural disasters and enables mitigation measures to be implemented during the immediate recovery period. Disaster relief means more than helping people and businesses get back on their feet after a disaster, it means doing our best to prevent the

same predictable flood or other catastrophe from recurring in the future. The hazard mitigation program that I helped create in 1993 provided critical support to Iowa communities impacted by the devastating floods of 2008. Floyd County has received over \$2.8 million to remediate and prevent widespread destruction from natural disasters.

Agricultural and rural development: Because I grew up in a small town in rural Iowa, I have always been a loyal friend and fierce advocate for family farmers and rural communities. I have been a member of the House or Senate Agriculture Committee for 40 years—including more than 10 years as chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee. Across the decades, I have championed farm policies for Iowans that include effective farm income protection and commodity programs; strong, progressive conservation assistance for agricultural producers; renewable energy opportunities; and robust economic development in our rural communities. Since 1991, through various programs authorized through the farm bill, Floyd County has received more than \$4.8 million from a variety of farm bill programs.

Keeping Iowa communities safe: I also firmly believe that our first responders need to be appropriately trained and equipped, able to respond to both local emergencies and to statewide challenges such as, for instance, the methamphetamine epidemic. Since 2001, Floyd County's fire departments have received over \$500,000 for firefighter safety and operations equipment.

Disability rights: Growing up, I loved and admired my brother Frank, who was deaf. But I was deeply disturbed by the discrimination and obstacles he faced every day. That is why I have always been a passionate advocate for full equality for people with disabilities. As the primary author of the Americans with Disabilities Act and the ADA Amendments Act, I have had four guiding goals for our fellow citizens with disabilities: equal opportunity, full participation, independent living and economic self-sufficiency. Nearly a quarter century since passage of the ADA, I see remarkable changes in communities everywhere I go in Iowa—not just in curb cuts or closed captioned television, but in the full participation of people with disabilities in our society and economy, folks who at long last have the opportunity to contribute their talents and to be fully included. These changes have increased economic opportunities for all citizens of Floyd County, both those with and without disabilities. And they make us proud to be a part of a community and country that respects the worth and civil rights of all of our citizens.

This is at least a partial accounting of my work on behalf of Iowa, and specifically Floyd County, during my time in Congress. In every case, this work has been about partnerships, cooperation, and empowering folks at the

State and local level, including in Floyd County, to fulfill their own dreams and initiatives. And, of course, this work is never complete. Even after I retire from the Senate, I have no intention of retiring from the fight for a better, fairer, richer Iowa. I will always be profoundly grateful for the opportunity to serve the people of Iowa as their Senator.●

LAKE CITY, SOUTH DAKOTA

● Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Madam President, today I rise to recognize the 100th anniversary of the founding of Lake City, SD. In 1885, Marshall County separated from Day County and became a separate entity. A man named Stout bought the Lake City area land and divided it into lots to be sold to Lake City settlers. When the railroad came through in 1914, residents voted to split from Eden City and create the township of Lake City in Marshall County. This close-knit community will celebrate its centennial July 4-5, 2014.

Part of a resilient community, the residents of Lake City have overcome several large fires. The largest of these broke out in 1949 and quickly spread to the local pool hall and then throughout the town. After this, and every other fire, the people of Lake City came together and rebuilt their town.

On Friday night the celebration will kick off with a street dance. Festivities will continue the following day with a parade, team watermelon-eating contest, a tug-of-war competition, and many other fun-filled activities. That evening, another street dance will bring the event to a close.

Today, this small town in Marshall County symbolizes what it means to be a South Dakota community. I am proud to honor the successes of Lake City and to offer my congratulations to the residents of the town on this historic milestone.●

EDEN, SOUTH DAKOTA

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I wish to recognize Eden, SD. The town of Eden will be celebrating its centennial on June 27-29, 2014. Eden will host centennial events which include a tractor and car show, school reunion, 5K color run, beard contest, fireworks, and a veteran recognition ceremony.

Located in Marshall County and founded in 1914, Eden was named by its residents based on its beautiful setting. Eden has long been known as a community with deep ties to South Dakota's agriculture economy. Since its beginning 100 years ago, the community of Eden continues to serve as a strong example of South Dakota values and traditions.

I offer my congratulations to the citizens of Eden on its centennial and wish them continued prosperity in the years to come.●

LAKE CITY, SOUTH DAKOTA

● Mr. THUNE. Madam President, today I recognize Lake City, SD. The town of Lake City will be celebrating its centennial on July 4-5, 2014. Lake City will host centennial events which include a community history display, bake-off, line dancing, all-school gathering, various tournaments, and a parade.

Located in Marshall County, Lake City was founded in 1914. Lake City has long been known as the location for the annual Fort Sisseton Historical Festival, as well as being a community with deep ties to South Dakota's agriculture economy. Since its beginning 100 years ago, the community of Lake City continues to serve as a strong example of South Dakota values and traditions.

I offer my congratulations to the citizens of Lake City on its centennial and wish them continued prosperity in the years to come.●

WIBAUX COUNTY, MONTANA

● Mr. WALSH. Madam President, I wish to recognize Wibaux County in eastern Montana on the occasion of its 100th birthday. Founded by bold pioneers at the turn of the century, Wibaux is living proof of the strength of the American prairie spirit.

The county was founded in August of 1914 by Pierre Wibaux, a Frenchman who left the family textile business to try to tame the Wild West. When those like Wibaux first settled in eastern Montana, they brought with them a strong work ethic. That resilience became apparent when Wibaux's W-Bar Ranch grew to cover 70,000 acres in Wibaux County. The lively community attracted Theodore Roosevelt, whose famed ranch was nearby across the North Dakota border.

Since its founding, Wibaux County has undergone many changes. Farmers have experienced agricultural booms, and the local schools are known statewide for academic and athletic excellence. The discovery of oil in the region as well as the recent introduction of hydraulic fracking have transformed the local economy and brought the county into the international spotlight. Through it all, the people who call the county home share the core values of service, honesty, and the willingness to help a neighbor in need.

Perhaps the greatest quality of the county is its kind citizens who are always willing to lend a hand to a neighbor. The residents of Wibaux County still exhibit the same generosity, diligence, and drive that Pierre Wibaux and other pioneers brought to the area 100 years ago.

I congratulate Wibaux County on 100 wonderful years. We look forward to the next century being as exciting as the last.●

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:40 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by

Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House agrees to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 316) to reinstate and transfer certain hydroelectric licenses and extend the deadline for commencement of construction of certain hydroelectric projects.

The message also announced that the House has passed the following bills, without amendment:

S. 1044. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to install in the area of the World War II Memorial in the District of Columbia a suitable plaque or an inscription with the words that President Franklin D. Roosevelt prayed with the United States on D-Day, June 6, 1944.

S. 2086. An act to address current emergency shortages of propane and other home heating fuels and to provide greater flexibility and information for Governors to address such emergencies in the future.

The message further announced that the House passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 412. An act to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate segments of the mainstem of the Nashua River and its tributaries in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts for study for potential addition to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4002. An act to revoke the charter of incorporation of the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma at the request of that tribe, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4092. An act to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to establish the office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy as the lead Federal agency for coordinating Federal, State, and local assistance provided to promote the energy retrofitting of schools.

H.R. 4801. An act to require the Secretary of Energy to prepare a report on the impact of thermal insulation on both energy and water use for potable hot water.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

At 4:17 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bills:

S. 1044. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to install in the area of the World War II Memorial in the District of Columbia a suitable plaque or an inscription with the words that President Franklin D. Roosevelt prayed with the United States on D-Day, June 6, 1944.

S. 2086. An act to address current emergency shortages of propane and other home heating fuels and to provide greater flexibility and information for Governors to address such emergencies in the future.

H.R. 316. An act to reinstate and transfer certain hydroelectric licenses and extend the deadline for commencement of construction of certain hydroelectric projects.

The enrolled bills were subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 412. An act to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate segments of

the mainstem of the Nashua River and its tributaries in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts for study for potential addition to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 4002. An act to revoke the charter of incorporation of the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma at the request of that tribe, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H.R. 4092. An act to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to establish the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy as the lead Federal agency for coordinating Federal, State, and local assistance provided to promote the energy retrofitting of schools; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 4801. An act to require the Secretary of Energy to prepare a report on the impact of thermal insulation on both energy and water use for potable hot water; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

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-6201. 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 "Olives Grown in California; Decreased Assessment Rate" (Docket No. AMS-FV-14-0002; FV14-932-1 FIR) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 18, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-6202. A communication from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the mobilizations of select reserve units, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 18, 2014; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-6203. A communication from the Chairman of the Appraisal Subcommittee, Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Appraisal Subcommittee's 2013 Annual Report; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-6204. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Export Administration Regulations (EAR): Addition of Certain Persons to the Unverified List (UVL) and Making a Correction" (RIN0694-AG20) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 18, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-6205. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Update of Short Supply Export Controls: Unprocessed Western Red Cedar, Crude Oil, and Petroleum Products" (RIN0694-AG06) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 18, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-6206. A communication from the Acting Director, Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Estimates of Natural Gas and Oil Reserves, Reserves Growth, and Undiscovered Resources in Federal and State Waters off the Coasts of

Texas, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Alabama"; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-6207. A communication from the Deputy Director, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Ninety-Day Waiting Period" (RIN0938-AR77) (CMS-9952-F2) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 23, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-6208. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel, General Law, Ethics, and Regulation, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Member, IRS Oversight Board within the Department of the Treasury, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 18, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-6209. A communication from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department of Defense Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2013 through March 31, 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-6210. A communication from the Acting Inspector General of the General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2013 through March 31, 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-6211. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report prepared by the Department of State on progress toward a negotiated solution of the Cyprus question covering the period February 1, 2014 through March 31, 2014; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-6212. A communication from the General Counsel, Peace Corps, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Deputy Director of the Peace Corps, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 18, 2014; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-6213. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, an addendum to a certification, of the proposed sale or export of defense articles and/or defense services to a Middle East country (OSS-2014-0887); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-6214. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "International Fisheries; Pacific Tuna Fisheries; Fishing Restrictions for Pacific Bluefin Tuna in the Eastern Pacific Ocean" (RIN0648-BD55) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 19, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6215. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Emergency Rule To Revise the Recreational Measures and Revise the 2014 Recreational Fishing Season for Red Snapper in the Gulf of Mexico" (RIN0648-BE18) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 19, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6216. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Northeastern United

States; Summer Flounder Fishery; Quota Transfer" (RIN0648-XD298) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 19, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6217. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Fisheries off West Coast States; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; Annual Specifications and Management Measures for the 2014 Tribal and Non-Tribal Fisheries for Pacific Whiting" (RIN0648-BD75) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 19, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6218. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Special Local Regulations; ODBA Draggin' on the Waccamaw, Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway; Bucksport, SC" ((RIN1625-AA08) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0097)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 18, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6219. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries Off West Coast States; Highly Migratory Fisheries; California Drift Gillnet Fishery; Sperm Whale Interaction Restrictions" (RIN0648-BD57) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 18, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6220. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Fisheries off West Coast States; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; 2013-2014 Biennial Specifications and Management Measures; Correction" (RIN0648-BE14) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 18, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6221. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; 2014 Limited Commercial and Recreational Fishing Seasons for Red Snapper in Southern Atlantic States" (RIN0648-XD307) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 19, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6222. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Alleghany River; Pittsburgh, PA" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2014-0157)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 18, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6223. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Monongahela River; Pittsburgh, PA" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2014-0231)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 18, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6224. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department

of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone, Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway; Morehead City, NC" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2014-0155)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 18, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6225. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone: Village West Marina 4th of July Fireworks Display, Fourteenmile Slough, Stockton, CA" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2014-0307)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 18, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6226. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Cincinnati Reds Fireworks Displays Ohio River, Mile 470.1-470.4; Cincinnati, OH" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2014-0080)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 18, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6227. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Cincinnati Symphony Orchestra Fireworks Displays Ohio River, Mile 460.9-461.3; Cincinnati, OH" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2014-0238)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 18, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6228. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone: Petaluma River Closure for Highway Widening, Petaluma River, Petaluma, CA" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2014-0311)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 18, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6229. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone: Vallejo 4th of July Fireworks, Mare Island Strait, Vallejo, CA" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2014-0394)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 18, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6230. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Pelican Island Causeway, Galveston Channel, TX" ((RIN1625-AA09) (Docket No. USCG-2014-0063)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 18, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6231. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Drawbridge Operation Regulation; West Pearl River, Pearl River, LA" ((RIN1625-AA09) (Docket No. USCG-2014-0197)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 18, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6232. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Drawbridge Operation Regulation;

Terrebonne Bayou, LA" ((RIN1625-AA09) (Docket No. USCG-2014-1072)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 18, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6233. A communication from the Acting Deputy Chief Counsel (Regulations and Security Standards), Transportation Security Administration, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Adjustment of Passenger Civil Aviation Security Service Fee" ((RIN1652-AA68) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 23, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6234. A communication from the Deputy Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Control of Air Pollution From Motor Vehicles: Tier 3 Motor Vehicle Emission and Fuel Standards" ((RIN2060-AQ86) (FRL No. 9906-86-OAR)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 24, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-258. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Louisiana memorializing the United States Congress to review and support H.R. 3930, the National Commission on the Structure of the Army Act of 2014; to the Committee on Armed Services.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 69

Whereas, H.R. 3930 was introduced on January 27, 2014, and seeks to establish the National Commission on the Structure of the Army to undertake a comprehensive study of the structure of the Army; and

Whereas, the focus of this study is to determine two factors, which include the proper force mixture of the active component and reserve component, and how the structure should be modified to best fulfill mission requirements in a manner that is consistent with available resources; and

Whereas, H.R. 3930 also directs the commission to give careful consideration in evaluating a structure that meets current and anticipated requirements of combat commands, achieves a cost-efficient balance between the regular and reserve components with particular focus on fully burdened and lifestyle costs of Army personnel, and ensures that the regular and reserve components possess the capacity needed to support homeland defense and disaster assistance missions in the United States; and

Whereas, H.R. 3930 further provides for sufficient numbers of regular members of the Army to provide a base of trained personnel from which the personnel of the reserve components could be recruited; maintains a peacetime rotation force to support operational tempo goals of a ratio of one to two for regular members and a ratio of one to five for members of the reserve components; and further maximizes and appropriately balances affordability, efficiency, effectiveness, capability, and readiness; and

Whereas, H.R. 3930 further prohibits the use of any funds made available for the 2015 Fiscal Year for the Army to divest, retire, or transfer any aircraft of Army assigned units of the Army National Guard as of January 15, 2014, or to reduce personnel below the authorized end strength levels of three hundred fifty thousand members of the Army Na-

tional Guard as of September 30, 2014; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of Louisiana does hereby memorialize the United States Congress to review and support H.R. 3930, which would, if enacted, be known as the National Commission on the Structure of the Army Act of 2014; and be it further

Resolved, That a suitable copy of this Resolution be transmitted to the presiding officers of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America and to each member of the Louisiana congressional delegation.

POM-259. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Louisiana memorializing the United States Congress to take such actions as are necessary to ensure proper expenditures and the restoration of the Gulf Coast for the benefit of all the citizens of the United States; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 50

Whereas, on April 20, 2010, an explosion occurred on the mobile offshore drilling unit Deepwater Horizon which resulted in the fire that eventually sank the rig, killing eleven crewmen, and destroying Louisiana's delicate coast and industries that rely on the coast with an estimated 4.1 million barrels of oil released over an eighty-seven day period from the Macondo well five thousand feet below on the ocean bottom; and

Whereas, this incident has had a long-lasting impact on the state's natural resources, including land, water, fish, wildlife, fowl, and other biota, and likewise on the livelihoods of Louisiana's citizens living along the coast; and

Whereas, the Federal Water Pollution Control Act also known as the Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. 1321, provides for administrative and civil penalties for parties responsible for unauthorized discharge of pollutants into United States waters as occurred during the Deepwater Horizon disaster; and

Whereas, these fines estimated between \$5.4 billion and \$21.1 billion would ordinarily be deposited into the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund pursuant to the Clean Water Act; however, congress passed the Resources and Ecosystems Sustainability, Tourist Opportunities, and Revived Economies of the Gulf Coast States Act of 2012 (RESTORE) that requires eighty percent of the fines to be deposited into the Gulf Coast Restoration Trust Fund (trust fund) for restoration efforts in the five coastal states damaged by the spill: Alabama, Florida, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Texas; and

Whereas, the monies from the trust fund will be principally divided into three funding mechanisms, the Direct Component that evenly distributes thirty-five percent to the five affected states; the Comprehensive Plan Component that directs thirty percent to the Gulf Coast Ecosystem Restoration Council to implement a comprehensive Gulf Coast wide recovery plan; and the Spill Impact Component that distributes thirty percent to the affected states based upon a formula calculated on the miles of coastline affected by the oil spill, distance from Deepwater Horizon, and the average 2010 population; and

Whereas, unfortunately, Louisiana has recent experience in administering restoration and recovery programs in the wake of disasters such as hurricanes Katrina, Rita, Gustav, and Isaac and has learned the value of real-time audit practices in terms of ensuring proper expenditures, providing guidance to program administrators, and assuring transparency of decisions for the public; and

Whereas, auditing after the fact provides little assistance for parish and county governments with minimal resources to recoup

large sums in the case of improper expenditures; and

Whereas, the RESTORE Act provides for up to three percent for administrative costs; there remains uncertainty whether those funds are only for the cost of the United States Treasury Department administering the RESTORE Act and whether those funds can be utilized by state and local governments for real-time audits: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of Louisiana does hereby memorialize the United States Congress to take such actions as are necessary for the proper allocation of resources on the federal, state, and local level to fund real-time audit practices in developing, planning, constructing, and executing projects funded by the RESTORE Act's Gulf Coast Restoration Trust Fund to ensure proper expenditures and the restoration of the Gulf Coast for the benefit of all the citizens of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this Resolution be transmitted to the presiding officers of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America and to each member of the Louisiana congressional delegation.

POM-260. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Louisiana memorializing the Congress of the United States to review the Government Pension Offset and the Windfall Elimination Provision Social Security benefit reductions and to consider eliminating or reducing them by enacting the Social Security Fairness Act of 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 5

Whereas, the Congress of the United States of America has enacted both the Government Pension Offset (GPO), reducing the spousal and survivor Social Security benefit, and the Windfall Elimination Provision (WEP), reducing the earned Social Security benefit for any person who also receives a public pension benefit; and

Whereas, congress enacted these reduction provisions to provide a disincentive for public employees to receive two pensions; and

Whereas, the GPO negatively affects a spouse or survivor receiving a federal, state, or local government retirement or pension benefit who would also be entitled to a Social Security benefit earned by a spouse; and

Whereas, the GPO formula reduces the spousal or survivor Social Security benefit by two-thirds of the amount of the federal, state, or local government retirement or pension benefit received by the spouse or survivor, in many cases completely eliminating the Social Security benefit earned by the spouse even though the spouse paid Social Security taxes for many years; and

Whereas, the GPO often reduces spousal benefits so significantly it makes the difference between self-sufficiency and poverty; and

Whereas, the GPO has a harsh effect on thousands of citizens and undermines the original purpose of the Social Security dependent/survivor benefit; and

Whereas, the GPO negatively impacts over thirty thousand Louisianians; and

Whereas, the WEP applies to those persons who have earned federal, state, or local government retirement or pension benefits, in addition to working in employment covered under Social Security and paying into the Social Security system; and

Whereas, the WEP reduces the earned Social Security benefit using an averaged indexed monthly earnings formula and may reduce Social Security benefits for affected persons by as much as one-half of the retirement benefit earned as a public servant in

employment not covered under Social Security; and

Whereas, the WEP causes hardworking individuals to lose a significant portion of the Social Security benefits that they earn themselves; and

Whereas, the WEP negatively impacts over thirty thousand Louisianians; and

Whereas, in certain circumstances both the WEP and GPO can be applied to a qualifying survivor's benefit, each independently reducing the available benefit and in combination eliminating a large portion of the total Social Security benefit available to the survivor; and

Whereas, the calculation characteristics of the GPO and the WEP have a disproportionately negative effect on employees working in lower-wage government jobs, like policemen, firefighters, teachers, and state employees; and

Whereas, Louisiana is making every effort to improve the quality of life of its citizens and to encourage them to live here lifelong, yet the current GPO and WEP provisions compromise their quality of life; and

Whereas, individuals drastically affected by the GPO or WEP may have no choice but to return to work after retirement in order to make ends meet, but the income earned during this post-retirement employment may cause additional reductions to the Social Security benefits to which the individual is entitled; and

Whereas, retired individuals affected by both GPO and WEP have significantly less money to support their basic needs and sometimes must rely on government assistance programs to bridge the gap; and

Whereas, the GPO and the WEP penalize individuals who have dedicated their lives to public service by taking away benefits they have earned; and

Whereas, our nation should respect, not penalize, public servants; and

Whereas, the number of people affected by the GPO and WEP is growing daily as the baby boomers attain retirement age and advances in health care increase longevity; and

Whereas, the GPO and WEP are established in federal law, and repeal of the GPO and the WEP can only be enacted by congress: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of Louisiana does hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States of America to review the Government Pension Offset and the Windfall Elimination Provision Social Security benefit reductions and to consider eliminating or reducing them by enacting the Social Security Fairness Act of 2013 (S. 896 and H.R. 1795); and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this Resolution be transmitted to the presiding officers of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America and to each member of the Louisiana congressional delegation.

POM-261. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Louisiana memorializing the Congress of the United States to review the Government Pension Offset and the Windfall Elimination Provision Social Security benefit reductions and to consider eliminating or reducing them; to the Committee on Finance.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 33

Whereas, the Congress of the United States of America has enacted both the Government Pension Offset (GPO), reducing the spousal and survivor Social Security benefit, and the Windfall Elimination Provision (WEP), reducing the earned Social Security benefit for any person who also receives a public pension benefit; and

Whereas, the intent of congress in enacting the GPO and the WEP provisions was to ad-

dress concerns that a public employee who had worked primarily in federal, state, or local government employment might receive a public pension in addition to the same Social Security benefit as a worker who has worked only in employment covered by Social Security throughout his career; and

Whereas, congress enacted these reduction provisions to provide a disincentive for public employees to receive two pensions; and

Whereas, the GPO negatively affects a spouse or survivor receiving a federal, state, or local government retirement or pension benefit who would also be entitled to a Social Security benefit earned by a spouse; and

Whereas, the GPO formula reduces the spousal or survivor Social Security benefit by two-thirds of the amount of the federal, state, or local government retirement or pension benefit received by the spouse or survivor, in many cases completely eliminating the Social Security benefit even though their spouses paid Social Security taxes for many years; and

Whereas, the GPO has a harsh effect on hundreds of thousands of citizens and undermines the original purpose of the Social Security dependent/survivor benefit; and

Whereas, according to the Social Security Administration, in 2013, at least 614,644 individuals nationally were affected by the GPO; and

Whereas, the WEP applies to those persons who have earned federal, state, or local government retirement or pension benefits, in addition to working in employment covered under Social Security and paying into the Social Security system; and

Whereas, WEP reduces the earned Social Security benefit using an averaged indexed monthly earnings formula and may reduce Social Security benefits for affected persons by as much as one-half of the retirement benefit earned as a public servant in employment not covered under Social Security; and

Whereas, the WEP causes hardworking individuals to lose a significant portion of the Social Security benefits that they earn themselves; and

Whereas, according to the Social Security Administration, in 2013, at least 1,549,544 individuals nationally were affected by the WEP; and

Whereas, in certain circumstances both the WEP and GPO can be applied to a qualifying survivor's benefit, each independently reducing the available benefit and in combination eliminating a large portion of the total Social Security benefit available to the survivor; and

Whereas, because of the calculation characteristics of the GPO and the WEP, they have a disproportionately negative effect on employees working in lower-wage government jobs, like policemen, firefighters, teachers, and state employees; and

Whereas, Louisiana is making every effort to improve the quality of life of its citizens and to encourage them to live here lifelong, yet the current GPO and WEP provisions compromise their quality of life; and

Whereas, the number of people affected by GPO and WEP is growing every day as more and more people reach retirement age; and

Whereas, individuals drastically affected by the GPO or WEP may have no choice but to return to work after retirement in order to make ends meet, but the earnings accumulated during this return to work can further reduce the Social Security benefits the individual is entitled to; and

Whereas, the GPO and WEP are established in federal law, and repeal of the GPO and the WEP can only be enacted by congress: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of Louisiana does hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States of America to review the Government Pension Offset and the Windfall

Elimination Provision Social Security benefit reductions and to consider eliminating or reducing them; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this Resolution be transmitted to the presiding officers of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America and to each member of the Louisiana congressional delegation.

POM-262. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana expressing sympathy in support of the families of victims of massacres and atrocities perpetrated against the Armenian people in Azerbaijan and requesting that the President of the United States and the Congress exert all available influence on the government of Azerbaijan to cease the falsification of the historical facts and bring to justice those responsible in Azerbaijan; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 166

Whereas, the Armenian populated area of Nagorno-Karabakh is located between the Republic of Armenia and the Republic of Azerbaijan; and

Whereas, in 1920 the Soviet Union forcibly established control over the areas of Armenia and Azerbaijan; and

Whereas, the Soviet Union created the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast within Azerbaijan in 1923 and this region became a source of dispute between Armenia and Azerbaijan; and

Whereas, in 1988, the Armenians in Nagorno-Karabakh peacefully demonstrated against Azerbaijan for the right of self-determination and individual freedom from repression and discrimination; and

Whereas, in February 1988, in the seaside town of Sumgait in Soviet Azerbaijan a pogrom targeted the Armenian population when mobs composed of largely ethnic Azerbaijanians formed groups which attacked and killed hundreds of Armenians on the streets, in their apartments in a situation that was allowed to continue by Soviet and Azerbaijan officials for three days before government forces imposed a state of martial law and curfew bringing the crisis to an end; and

Whereas, the crimes committed against Armenians in Sumgait remain unpunished thereby opening the door for similar atrocities against the Armenian people starting in the capital Baku and spreading to other areas of Azerbaijan and Nagorno-Karabakh; and

Whereas, Azerbaijan seeks to avoid responsibility for the violence and atrocities by falsifying historical events and by portraying the involvement of Soviet troops to Baku to restore order on the seventh day of the Armenian atrocities as a crackdown on the alleged independence movement in Azerbaijan; and

Whereas, it is well known that there was no large scale movement for independence in Azerbaijan due to the fact in a March 1991, referendum that more than 94% of the Azerbaijan constituencies favored preserving the Soviet Union; and

Whereas, Azerbaijan continues to distort events of other atrocities, including the events in the village of Khojaly in which Azerbaijan troops fired on their own population and the deportation of Armenian villages in Nagorno-Karabakh: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate of the Legislature of Louisiana does hereby express sympathy in support of the families of victims of massacres and atrocities perpetrated against the Armenian people in Azerbaijan; and be it further

Resolved, That the Senate requests that the President of the United States and the Con-

gress exert all available influence on the government of Azerbaijan to cease the falsification of the historical facts and bring to justice those in Azerbaijan who are responsible for the Armenian massacres in Sumgait, Baku, Kirovabad, Maragha, Nagorno-Karabakh, and of the citizens of Khojaly; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this Resolution shall be transmitted to the President of the United States of America, the secretary of the United States Senate, the clerk of the United States House of Representatives, and each member of the Louisiana delegation to the United States Congress.

POM-263. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Louisiana memorializing the United States Congress to take such actions as are necessary to raise awareness of human trafficking and sex trafficking to abolish this modern-day slavery and continue to aid Nigeria in the plight of finding the remaining two hundred seventy-six missing girls; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 138

Whereas, on April 14, 2014, three hundred twenty-nine girls were kidnapped from their school in Chibok, Nigeria, by dozens of gunmen who stormed the girls dormitories while they were sleeping; and

Whereas, in a region where only four percent of girls complete secondary schooling, the kidnapped girls were the best and the brightest; looking forward to bright futures as global leaders, teachers, or lawyers; and

Whereas, the girls were abducted by a radical Islamic group called Boko Haram, which in English, means "Western education is sinful"; and

Whereas, on January 31, 2012, in testimony before United States Congress, the director of national intelligence, James Clapper, included Boko Haram in his worldwide threat assessment, stating, "There are also fears that Boko Haram, elements of which have engaged al-Qa'ida in the Islamic Maghreb, is interested in hitting Western targets, such as the United States Embassy and hotels frequented by Westerners"; and

Whereas, the United States has offered a seven million dollar bounty for the group's elusive leader, Abubakar Shekau; and

Whereas, the Department of State designated Boko Haram as a Foreign Terrorist Organization in November 2013, recognizing the threat posed by the group's large-scale and indiscriminate attacks against civilians, including women and children; and

Whereas, fifty-three girls were able to escape and have described their experiences as extremely distressing; and

Whereas, concern is growing about the safety of those who are still missing; and

Whereas, Nigerian President Goodluck Jonathan has accepted offers from the United States of military personnel, law enforcement officials, and other experts; and

Whereas Boko Haram's militant leader, Abubakar Shekau, released a video in which he expresses his abhorrence of Western education, saying that the girls should be married instead of being educated and further claims that he will sell the women as he has been commanded by Allah; and

Whereas, Abubakar Shekau referred to the girls as slaves and stated that he plans to kidnap more girls; and

Whereas, United Nations and the United States have both stressed an absolute prohibition against slavery and sexual slavery in international law, making these actions crimes against humanity; and

Whereas, the White House press secretary has said that appropriate action must be taken to locate and to free these young

women before they are trafficked or killed; and

Whereas, Louisiana has taken a most aggressive stand to abolish and condemn slavery among women in Louisiana and worldwide: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of Louisiana does hereby memorialize the United States Congress to take such actions as are necessary to raise awareness of human trafficking and sex trafficking to abolish this modern-day slavery and continue to aid Nigeria in the plight of finding the remaining two hundred seventy-six missing girl; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this Resolution be transmitted to the presiding officers of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America and to each member of the Louisiana congressional delegation.

POM-264. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Louisiana memorializing the United States Congress to take such actions as are necessary to pass the Diabetic Testing Supply Access Act; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 122

Whereas, the Diabetic Testing Supply Access Act would allow Medicare to reimburse retail community pharmacies for delivery of diabetic testing supplies to Medicare recipients' homes; and

Whereas, seniors would be safe from entering hazardous circumstances, risking debilitating falls, or other comparable inconveniences to obtain diabetic testing supplies because of lack of supply delivery; and

Whereas, the cost of delivery of diabetic testing supplies may be equivalent regardless of whether they are delivered same-day by local pharmacies or through the mail; and

Whereas, the integrity of health care access to seniors in need of diabetic testing supply access would be increased; and

Whereas, in July 2013, the Diabetic Testing Supply Access Act of 2013 was introduced as H.R. 2845 by United States Representative Peter Welch of Vermont, and

Whereas, in January 2014, Senator John Thune of South Dakota introduced the Diabetic Testing Supply Access Act of 2014 as S. 1935; and

Whereas, the percentage of people diagnosed with diabetes from 1980-2011 for those aged sixty-five to seventy-four years increased one hundred forty percent, and one hundred twenty-five percent for those age seventy-five years and older, and the overall prevalence of diagnosed diabetes has risen sharply among all groups for which data is available; and

Whereas, community pharmacies play a pivotal role in affordable and accessible health care within rural and other underserved communities by providing delivery services: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of Louisiana does hereby memorialize the United States Congress to take such actions as are necessary to pass the Diabetic Testing Supply Access Act; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this Resolution be transmitted to the presiding officers of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America and to each member of the Louisiana congressional delegation.

POM-265. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Louisiana memorializing the United States Congress to take such actions as are necessary to pass the Helping Families in Mental Health Crisis Act of 2013; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 153

Whereas, according to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, mental illness is defined as "health conditions that are characterized by alterations in thinking, mood, or behavior (or some combination thereof) associated with distress and/or impaired function"; and

Whereas, approximately sixty-one million five hundred thousand Americans experience mental illness in a given year; and

Whereas, approximately thirteen million six hundred thousand Americans live with a serious mental illness such as schizophrenia, major depression, or bipolar disorder; and

Whereas, more than eleven million Americans have severe schizophrenia, bipolar disorder, and major depression; and

Whereas, one-half of all chronic mental illness begins by the age of fourteen; and

Whereas, fewer than one-third of adults and one-half of children with a diagnosed mental disorder receive mental health services in a given year; and

Whereas, individuals living with mental health challenges and their families soon discover that the illness affects many aspects of their lives and that they need more than medical help; and

Whereas, many loved ones are left feeling hopeless in receiving effective and appropriate treatment for their family members who suffer from mental illness; and

Whereas, there is a need to better allocate current resources to focus on the most effective services and most severe mental illnesses; and

Whereas, it is prudent to promote stronger interagency coordination, increase data collection on treatment outcomes, and raise efforts to drive evidence-based care; and

Whereas, Congressman Tim Murphy of Pennsylvania has introduced the Helping Families in Mental Health Crisis Act of 2013 as H.R. 3717; and

Whereas, the bill will create within the Department of Health and Human Services a new assistant secretary for mental health and substance-abuse disorders who would lead federal mental illness efforts, be responsible for promoting the medically oriented models of care adopted by the National Institute of Mental Health, and oversee the grant process while holding community centers accountable by ensuring they are meeting evidence-based standards; and

Whereas, H.R. 3717 would push states to efficiently allocate funds towards modernizing mental illness state laws and raise support for community mental health centers and hospital psychiatric care; and

Whereas, to address issues regarding the shortage of psychiatric professionals, the Helping Families in Mental Health Crisis Act of 2013 would advance medical tools like telepsychiatry which links primary physicians in underserved areas to psychiatric professionals in order to decrease the average span of time between an initial episode of psychosis for a patient and his preliminary evaluation and treatment procedures; and

Whereas, H.R. 3717 would give physicians legal safe harbor to volunteer at understaffed mental health centers; and

Whereas, the Helping Families in Mental Health Crisis Act of 2013 will adjust the federal privacy law known as the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act, by allowing mental health professionals and families to share information about loved ones to promote more appropriate and effective treatment procedures: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of Louisiana does hereby memorialize the United States Congress to take such actions as are nec-

essary to pass the Helping Families in Mental Health Crisis Act of 2013; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this Resolution be transmitted to the presiding officers of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America and to each member of the Louisiana congressional delegation.

POM-266. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Louisiana memorializing the United States Congress to amend the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 or to take such actions as are necessary to require that places of public accommodation and commercial facilities be equipped with seating for persons who are unable to rise from a seated position without assistance; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 95

Whereas, Title III of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12181) requires places of public accommodation and commercial facilities to be designed, constructed, and altered in compliance with the accessibility standards established by federal regulation; and

Whereas, as our population ages and our veterans return home from overseas, there is a growing population who are unable to rise from the seated position without physical hands-on assistance from others, including strangers; and

Whereas, the need to require assistance from others to complete the task of rising from a seated position robs persons of their independence and dignity; and

Whereas, if seating accommodations were to be equipped with raised arms or parts from which a person could push when rising then this would eliminate the need for persons to obtain assistance from others: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of Louisiana does hereby memorialize the United States Congress to amend the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12181) or to take such actions as are necessary to require that places of public accommodation and commercial facilities be equipped with seating for persons who are unable to rise from a seated position without assistance; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this Resolution be transmitted to the presiding officers of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America and to each member of the Louisiana congressional delegation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. TESTER, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, without amendment:

H.R. 2388. To take certain Federal lands located in El Dorado County, California, into trust for the benefit of the Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113-197).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. LEVIN for the Committee on Armed Services.

*Miranda A. A. Ballentine, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

*Laura Junor, of Virginia, to be a Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense.

*Monica C. Regalbuto, of Illinois, to be an Assistant Secretary of Energy (Environmental Management).

*Gordon O. Tanner, of Alabama, to be General Counsel of the Department of the Air Force.

*Debra S. Wada, of Hawaii, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Army.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Colonel Julian D. Alford and ending with Colonel Joseph F. Shrader, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 12, 2014.

Navy nomination of Capt. Shane G. Gahagan, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. (lh) Raquel C. Bono, to be Rear Admiral.

Air Force nomination of Maj. Gen. John F. Thompson, to be Lieutenant General.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. (lh) Mathias W. Winter, to be Rear Admiral.

Navy nomination of Capt. Thomas W. Luscher, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. (lh) Eric C. Young, to be Rear Admiral.

Navy nomination of Capt. Keith M. Jones, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. (lh) Janet R. Donovan, to be Rear Admiral.

Navy nominations beginning with Rear Adm. (lh) Martha E. G. Herb and ending with Rear Adm. (lh) John F. Weigold, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 10, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Rear Adm. (lh) Althea H. Coetzee and ending with Rear Adm. (lh) Valerie K. Huegel, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 10, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Captain Kevin C. Hayes and ending with Captain Matthew A. Zirkle, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 10, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Rear Adm. (lh) Sean S. Buck and ending with Rear Adm. (lh) Joseph E. Tofalo, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 10, 2014.

Army nominations beginning with Colonel Francis M. Beaudette and ending with Colonel Brian E. Winski, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 20, 2014.

Marine Corps nomination of Maj. Gen. David H. Berger, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nominations beginning with Brigadier General Daniel R. Ammerman and ending with Colonel Donna R. Williams, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 21, 2014. (minus 1 nominee: Colonel Leela J. Gray)

Air Force nomination of Col. Warren H. Hurst, Jr., to be Brigadier General.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. Walter E. Carter, Jr., to be Vice Admiral.

Air Force nomination of Maj. Gen. William J. Bender, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nominations beginning with Brigadier General Bradley A. Becker and ending with Brigadier General Cedric T. Wins, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 16, 2014.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, for the Committee on Armed Services 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.

Air Force nominations beginning with Christine R. Berberick and ending with Deedra L. Zabokrtsky, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 7, 2014.

Air Force nomination of Troy R. Harting, to be Colonel.

Air Force nomination of William E. Bundy, to be Colonel.

Air Force nomination of David V. Eastham, to be Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Ralf C. Beilhardt and ending with Richard L. Williams, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 10, 2014.

Army nominations beginning with Michael P. Abel and ending with D001883, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 10, 2014.

Army nominations beginning with Robert L. Boyles and ending with Tyler B. Smith, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 4, 2014.

Army nominations beginning with Jeremy J. Bearss and ending with Jodi L. Nicklas, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 5, 2014.

Army nominations beginning with Norman W. Ayotte and ending with D005191, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 5, 2014.

Army nominations beginning with Dawud A. A. Agbere and ending with Robert K. Walker, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 5, 2014.

Army nominations beginning with Denise K. Askew and ending with Bret G. Witt, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 5, 2014.

Army nominations beginning with Doreene R. Aguayo and ending with George J. Zeckler, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 5, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Colin Campbell and ending with Jay T. Young, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 5, 2014.

Navy nomination of Joseph M. Acosta, to be Captain.

Navy nominations beginning with John Bellissimo and ending with Randall J. Wroblewski, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 5, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Daryl S. Borgquist and ending with John Filostrat, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 5, 2014.

Navy nomination of David R. Storr, to be Captain.

Navy nomination of Billy C. Young, to be Captain.

Navy nomination of Mark J. Mouriski, to be Captain.

Navy nominations beginning with Phillip H. Burnside and ending with Eric M. Thomas, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 5, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Robert Dryman and ending with Jeri L. Oneill, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 5, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Timothy M. Baker and ending with John E. Sedlock,

which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 5, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Chad E. Baker and ending with Chris F. White, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 5, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Scott W. Alexander and ending with James A. Young, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 5, 2014.

Navy nomination of Roger F. Wilbur, to be Captain.

Navy nominations beginning with Todd A. Abrahamson and ending with David A. Youtt, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 7, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Timothy A. Barney and ending with Robert A. Wolf, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 7, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Douglas S. Belvin and ending with Laura A. Schuessler, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 7, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Jerry L. Alexander, Jr. and ending with Jason L. Webb, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 7, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Robert L. Calhoun, Jr. and ending with Thaddeus O. Walker III, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 7, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Christopher J. Couch and ending with Nathan D. Schneider, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 7, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Gregory S. Ireton and ending with Cynthia V. Morgan, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 7, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Charles W. Brown and ending with Scott E. Norr, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 7, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Jeffrey D. Buss and ending with Braulio Paiz, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 7, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Michael L. Baker and ending with Robert F. Ogden, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 7, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Nonito V. Blas and ending with David S. Warner, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 7, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Anthony T. Butera and ending with Miriam K. Smyth, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 7, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Bryan E. Braswell and ending with Tyrone L. Ward, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 7, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Reginald T. King and ending with Kevin L. Steck, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 7, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Addie Alkhas and ending with Patrick E. Young, which nominations were received by the Sen-

ate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 20, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Jeffrey G. Ant and ending with Donna M. Williams, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 20, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Paul J. Brochu and ending with Gary D. West, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 20, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Bradley A. Appleman and ending with Joseph Romero, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 20, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Jeffrey W. Bledsoe and ending with Susan A. Union, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 20, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Kristin Acquavella and ending with Jerome R. White, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 20, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Christopher G. Adams and ending with Nicolas D. I. Yamodis, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 20, 2014.

Navy nomination of Thor Martinsen, to be Commander.

Navy nomination of Christopher S. Mayfield, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nominations beginning with Robert Arias and ending with Bobby L. Woods, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 16, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Adam L. Albarado and ending with Eric D. Wyatt, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 16, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Joshua J. Burkholder and ending with Jimmy J. Stork, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 16, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Adrian Z. Bejar and ending with Deborah B. Yusko, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 16, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Charles R. Allen and ending with Ricardo A. Trevino, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 16, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Gregory R. Adams and ending with David R. Wilcox, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 16, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with David A. Benham and ending with James D. Stockman, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 16, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Jeffrey A. Brown and ending with Michael D. Wagner, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 16, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Jeffery A. Barrett and ending with Cecily E. Walsh, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 16, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Christopher D. Addington and ending with Kurt A. Young, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 16, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Keith Archibald and ending with Mckinnya J.

Williamsrobinson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 16, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Jeremiah V. Adams and ending with Charles B. Zuhoski, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 16, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Katherine E. Boyce and ending with Jon C. Watson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 16, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Michael S. Giles and ending with Marty E. Griffin, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 16, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Robert H. Carpenter and ending with Joseph V. Sheldon III, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 16, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with James F. Croom and ending with Todd L. Smith, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 16, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Timothy K. Atmajian and ending with Rumei Yuan, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 16, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Ramesh S. Durvasula and ending with Ben M. Smith, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 16, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Francis F. Derk and ending with Katherine T. Ormsbee, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 16, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Thomas P. Belsky and ending with Jeffrey J. Truitt, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 16, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Julio C. Albornoz and ending with Eric L. Peterson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 16, 2014.

By Mr. MENENDEZ for the Committee on Foreign Relations.

*Noah Bryson Mamet, of California, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Argentine Republic.

Nominee: Noah Bryson Mamet.
Post: U.S. Ambassador to the Argentine Republic.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:
1. Self: \$2,600, 03/24/2013, Ruiz, Raul; \$1,000, -11/01/2012, Berkley, Shelley; \$500, -11/01/2012, Donnelly, Joe; \$500, 11/01/2012, McCaskill, Claire; \$250, -11/01/2012, Brown, Sherrord; \$250, -11/01/2012, Heitkamp, Heidi; \$1,500, -10/29/2012, Tester, Jon; \$250, -09/14/2012, Carmona, Richard; \$250, -08/24/2012, Cherny, Andrei; \$1,000, -07/30/2012, Voices for Progress PAC; \$30,000, 07/16/2012, DNC (Obama Victory Fund); \$250, -07/05/2012, Duckworth, Tammy; \$250, -06/21/2012, Delaney, John; \$500, -11/10/2011, Berman, Howard; \$500, -06/04/2011, Kaine, Tim; \$5,000, -06/02/2011, Obama, Barack (Obama Victory Fund); \$30,800, 06/02/2011, DNC (Obama Victory Fund); \$1,000, 05/09/2011, Landrieu, Mary; -\$500, 05/02/2011, Gillibrand, Kirsten; \$350, 11/01/2010, McAdams, Scott; \$500, -10/31/2010, -DCCC; \$500, -10/28/2010, -Conway, Jack; \$250,

-10/28/2010, -Markey, Betsy; \$250, -10/28/2010, -McNerney, Jerry; \$250, -10/28/2010, -Perriello, Tom; \$250, -10/28/2010, -Sestak, Joe; \$250, -10/28/2010, -Bennet, Michael; \$250, -10/27/2010, -Giannoulas, Alexi; \$250, -10/15/2010, -McNerney, Jerry; \$250, -10/15/2010, -Conway, Jack; \$250, -10/15/2010, -Sestak, Joe; \$250, -10/15/2010, -McAdams, Scott; \$250, -09/24/2010, -Coons, Chris; \$500, -09/08/2010, -Reid, Harry (Reid Victory Fund); \$250, 09/02/2010, Hall, John; \$250, 07/27/2010, Hodes, Paul; \$1,000, 04/29/2010 -Bennet, Michael; \$1,000, 04/22/2010, Boxer, Barbara; \$1,000, 04/22/2010, DNC; \$200, 01/13/2010, Coakley, Martha; \$250, 06/29/2009, Bennet, Michael.

2. Spouse: None.
3. Children and Spouses: None.
4. Parents: Mildred Mamet (Mother): \$30 10/08/2012, Obama Victory Fund; \$30, 08/29/2012, Obama for America; \$90, 07/09/2012, Obama for America; \$30, 09/09/2010, Obama for America; \$25, 10/20/2010, Obama for America.
5. Grandparents: -None.
6. Brothers and Spouses: None.
7. Sister: Lisa Mamet: \$35, 2012, Obama for America.

*Mark William Lippert, of Ohio, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Korea.

Nominee: Mark William Lippert
Post: U.S. Ambassador to the Republic of Korea

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:
1. Self: \$0.00.
2. Spouse: Robin E. Lippert (Schmidch): \$250.00, 6/13/13, Patrick J. Leahy; \$282.41, 12/18/12, Earl "Ben" Nelson; \$2,059.00, 6/30/11, United Health Grp PAC; \$250.00, 6/30/10; Patrick J. Leahy; \$300.00, 9/30/10, United Health Grp PAC.
3. Children and Spouses: N/A.
4. Parents: James W Lippert, Susan Lippert: \$0.00.
5. Grandparents: N/A—deceased.
6. Brothers and Spouses: N/A.
7. Sisters and Spouses: Amy Lippert: \$0.00; Anne Lippert: \$0.00; Brandon Collier (spouse): \$0.00; Susan Collier (sister): \$0.00.

*James D. Nealon, of New Hampshire, 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 Republic of Honduras.

Nominee: James D. Nealon.
(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, donee:
1. Self: None.
2. Spouse: Kristin F. Nealon: None.
3. Children and Spouses: Rory P. Nealon—son: None; Katherine G. Nealon—daughter: \$50.00, 2008, Barack Obama; Maureen S. Nealon—daughter: None; Liam J. Nealon—son: None.
4. Parents: James D. Nealon—father: Deceased—2000; Barbara H. Nealon—mother: Deceased—1987.
5. Grandparents: George A. Nealon—grandfather: Deceased—1937; Loretta A. Ahearn—grandmother: Deceased—1973; William A. Holland—grandfather: Deceased—1935; Alice P. DeVaney—grandmother: Deceased—1994.

6. Brothers and Spouses: Robert M. Nealon—brother: \$120.00, yearly, United Airlines Pilot Pac; Jean Marie Nealon—his wife: None; Thomas R. Nealon—brother: None; Doris Nealon—his wife: None; David E. Nealon—brother: None; Elizabeth Nealon—his wife: None; Patrick J. Nealon—brother: \$300.00, yearly, Deloitte Political Action Committee; Susan B. Nealon—his wife: None.
7. Sisters and Spouses: Suzanne E. Nealon: None; Richard Rodriguez—her husband: None.

*Dana Shell Smith, of Virginia, 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 State of Qatar.

Nominee: Dana Shell Smith.
Post: Qatar.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, Amount, Date, and Donee:
1. Self: \$55, 9-2012, Obama; \$20, 7-2012, Obama.
2. Spouse: none.
3. Children and Spouses: none.
4. Parents: William Shell, \$1000, 4-2012, Romney; Susan Shell, \$100, 4-2012, Obama.
5. Grandparents: none.
6. -Brothers and Spouses: Jeff Shell: \$500, 10/26/2010, Alexi for Illinois; \$200, 9/24/2010, Allen West for Congress; \$1250, 11/10/2011, Ben Nelson 2012; \$1150, 6/30/2009, Bennet for Colorado; \$2400, 1/23/2010, Bennet for Colorado; \$1250, 2/10/2009, Bennet for Colorado; \$2400, 6/26/2009, Bob Casey for Senate Inc.; \$1000, 6/28/2010, Boucher for Congress Committee; \$1000, 6/17/2010, Boucher for Congress Committee; \$250, 9/4/2010, Buck for Colorado; \$500, 6/30/2010, Carney for Congress; \$250, 3/9/2010, -Charlie Melancon Campaign Committee Inc.; \$1000, 10/22/2010, Chris Coons for Delaware; \$500, 1/1/2008, Chris Gregoire for Governor; \$500, 2/21/2008, Citizens for Altmire; \$2400, 6/30/2009, Citizens for Arlen Specter; \$2400, 6/30/2009, Citizens for Arlen Specter; \$1000, 10/11/2010, Debbie Wasserman Schultz for Congress; \$500, 6/7/2010, Fisher for Ohio; \$1000, 5/5/2009, Friends for Harry Reid; \$1000, 6/30/2010, Friends for Harry Reid; \$1000, 10/13/2010, Friends of Blanche Lincoln; \$1250, 2/10/2009, Friends of Blanche Lincoln; \$1000, 2/6/2008, Friends of Byron Dorgan; \$2000, 3/31/2008, Friends of Max Baucus; \$225, 9/10/2010, Friends of Sharron Angle; \$1000, 3/4/2010, Gillibrand for Senate; \$1000, 1/1/2008, Hagan for US Senate; \$500, 6/10/2009, Hodes for Senate; \$1000, 11/30/2009, Hoffman for Illinois; \$750, 4/24/2008, Jeanne Shaheen for Senate; \$500, 6/30/2010, Kathy Dahlkemper for Congress; \$1500, 3/31/2012, Klobuchar for Minnesota 2012; \$250, 3/23/2011, Klobuchar for Minnesota 2012; \$2000, 5/10/2010, Leahy for U.S. Senator Committee; \$500, 3/5/2008, Levin for Congress; \$2400, 6/11/2010, Levin for Congress; \$1500, 3/29/2012, McCaskill for Missouri 2012; \$250, 3/23/2011, McCaskill for Missouri 2012; \$1250, 1/9/2011, Montanans for Tester; \$2000, 9/14/2008, Obama for America; \$2500, 6/13/2011, Obama for America; \$2500, 6/13/2011, Obama for America; \$2300, 8/31/2008, Obama for America; \$300, 11/3/2008, Obama for America; \$1000, 10/4/2010, Onorato for Governor; \$4000, 4/9/2010, Onorato for Governor; \$2500, 3/15/2012, Patrick Murphy for Attorney General; \$700, 4/2/2008, Patrick Murphy for Congress; \$2300, 4/2/2008, Patrick Murphy for Congress; \$1000, 9/29/2008, Patrick Murphy for Congress; \$600, 10/21/2008, Patrick Murphy for Congress; \$2400, 6/29/2009, Patrick Murphy for Congress; \$1000, 12/22/2009, Patrick Murphy for Congress; \$1400, 2/1/2010, Patrick Murphy for Congress; \$500, 1/1/2008, Rob McCord for State Treasurer; \$900, 6/

29/2009, Robin Carnahan for Senate; \$2500, 6/1/2010, Shapiro for Congress; \$1500, 1/1/2008, Shapiro for Congress; \$1000, 2/5/2010, Trivedi for Congress; \$1000, 6/30/2010, Trivedi for Congress; \$1000, 10/7/2010, Trivedi for Congress; \$750, 4/24/2008, Udall for Us All; \$500, 6/23/2009, Wyden for Senate; \$5000, 5/9/2011, Cable PAC; \$15000, 6/1/2009, COMPAC—USA; \$15000, 9/1/2010, COMPAC—USA; \$15000, 1/25/2011, COMPAC—USA; \$5000, 4/1/2008, COMPAC Federal; \$5000, 6/11/2009, COMPAC Federal; \$5000, 9/28/2010, COMPAC Federal; \$5000, 1/31/2011, COMPAC Federal; \$4600, 6/26/2008, DNC Services Corporation; \$30800, 6/13/2011, DNC Services Corporation; \$5000, 3/31/2012, DSCC; \$3200, 9/29/2009, DSCC; \$500, 3/14/2011, Minnesota & Missouri Victory Fund; \$900, 6/17/2009, Missouri New Hampshire Victory Fund; \$2500, 11/3/2011, Montana-Nebraska Victory Fund; \$2000, 2/19/2008, NCTA; \$2000, 3/20/2008, NCTA; \$2000, 3/11/2009, NCTA; \$2000, 3/3/2010, NCTA; \$5000, 5/13/2011, NCTA; \$2,500.00, 3/20/2013, Friends for Harry Reid; \$1,000.00, 3/20/2013, The Markey Committee; \$2,600.00, 10/2/2013, Mark Udall for Colorado; \$2,600.00, 10/2/2013, Udall for All of Us; \$32,400.00, 12/3/2013, DSCC—Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee; \$5,000.00, 12/12/2013, NCTA—National Cable & Telecommunications Association; \$2,600.00, 3/27/2014, Mark Pryor for US Senate; \$2,600.00, 3/27/2014, Alaskans for Begich, Laura Shell; \$2400, 6/30/2009, Bennet for Colorado; \$2400, 5/26/2010, Bennet for Colorado; \$2400, 7/17/2010, Citizens for Arlen Specter; \$2400, 6/30/2009, Citizens for Arlen Specter; \$2400, 6/30/2009, Citizens for Arlen Specter; \$1000, 1/8/2012, Gillibrand for Senate; \$1000, 9/22/2008, Hagan Senate Committee Inc.; \$2300, 8/31/2008, Obama for America; \$200, 6/13/2011, Obama for America; \$2500, 6/13/2011, Obama for America; \$2300, 9/14/2011, Obama for America; \$1200, 2/1/2010, Patrick Murphy for Congress; \$2400, 2/1/2010, Patrick Murphy for Congress; \$400, 8/25/2010, Sestak for Senate; \$1000, 2/22/2008, The Bob Roggio for Congress Committee; \$500, 4/21/2008, The Bob Roggio for Congress Committee; \$1000, 9/29/2008, The Bob Roggio for Congress Committee; \$500, 3/25/2010, Trivedi for Congress; \$1500, 6/30/2010, Trivedi for Congress; \$900, 10/7/2010, Trivedi for Congress; \$5000, 6/26/2008, DNC Services Corporation; \$2700, 9/14/2011, DNC Services Corporation; \$5000, 10/20/2010, Pennsylvania Democratic party; \$250, 9/29/2008, Republican National Committee; \$2,600.00, 10/9/2013, Alison for Kentucky.

7. Sisters and Spouses: none.

*Robert Stephen Beecroft, of California, 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 Arab Republic of Egypt.

Nominee: Robert Stephen Beecroft.

Post: Cairo, Egypt.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: none.
2. Spouse: Anne Tisdell Beecroft, none.
3. Children and Spouses: Blythe A. Beecroft, none; Robert Warren Beecroft, none; Sterling S. Beecroft, none; Grace A. Beecroft, none.
4. Parents: Robert L. Beecroft (Deceased), none; Emma Lou Beecroft, none.
5. Grandparents: Irl R. Beecroft (Deceased), none; Ruth V. Beecroft (Deceased), none; John E. Warren (Deceased), none; Emma Warren (Deceased), none.
6. Brothers and Spouses: Warren E. Beecroft: \$100, May 2012, Romney; \$100, June 2012, Romney; Frances Beecroft, none; Regan

E. Beecroft, none; JoAn Stopa Beecroft, none; Collin J. Beecroft, \$2,500, March 2012, Romney; Melinda K. Beecroft, none.

7. Sisters and Spouses: —Robyn R. Ryskamp, None; Barry Ryskamp, none.

*Stuart E. Jones, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Career Minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Iraq.

Nominee: Stuart E. Jones.

Post: Iraq.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: 0.
2. Spouse: 0.
3. Children and Spouses: 0.
4. Parents: 0.
5. Grandparents: 0.
6. Brothers and Spouses: 0.
7. Sisters and Spouses: 0.

*Theodore G. Osius III, of Maryland, 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 Socialist Republic of Vietnam.

Nominee: Theodore George Osius III.

Post: Vietnam.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:—

1. Self: \$250, 2008, Obama for America; \$450 (with spouse), 2012, Obama for America/Obama Victory Fund; \$185, 2012, Mark Takano campaign; \$200, 2014, Mark Takano campaign.
2. Spouse: Clayton A. Bond—no Federal contributions.
3. Children and Spouses: Theodore Alan Bond-Osius—none.
4. Parents: Nancy Osius Zimmerman: \$305, 2008, —DNC, DCCC, and Obama for America; \$515, 2009, —Democratic National Committee, DCCC, Al Franken; \$440, 2010, Democratic National Committee, DCCC Kratovil for Congress; \$305, 2011, Democratic National Committee, DCCC, Obama for America; \$855, 2012, Obama for America, Elizabeth for Massachusetts, DCCC, Ben Cardin for Senate, Senate Democrats, DSCC; \$754, 2013, Al Franken, DCCC, DSCC, Organizing for Action, House Democrats, Frederick Zimmerman—none.
5. Grandparents: deceased.
6. Brothers and Spouses: N/A.
7. Sisters and Spouses: Margaret E. Osius: \$1000, 2009, Rick Lazio; \$250, 2010, Rick Lazio; \$100, 2011, Mitt Romney; \$1500, 2012, Mitt Romney. Alison K. Osius and Michael Benge—none. Lucile L. Osius—none.

*Joan A. Polaschik, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria.

Nominee: Joan A. Polaschik.

Post: Algeria.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: none.
2. Spouse: none.
3. Children and Spouses: none.
4. Parents: Marion W. Polaschik, none; John Polaschik (deceased).
5. Grandparents: Nellie Wassel (deceased); John Wassel (deceased); Mary Polaschik (deceased); John Polaschik, Sr. (deceased).
6. Brothers and Spouses: none.
7. Sisters and Spouses: Anne M. Barcal, none; Keith B. Barcal, none.

*Karen Kornbluh, of New York, to be a Member of the Broadcasting Board of Governors for a term expiring August 13, 2016.

*Jonathan Nicholas Stivers, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development.

*Gentry O. Smith, of North Carolina, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Director of the Office of Foreign Missions, and to have the rank of Ambassador during his tenure of service.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

(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. FLAKE (for himself, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. RISCH, Mr. WICKER, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mr. VITTER, Mr. ENZI, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. COATS, Mr. CORNYN, and Mr. THUNE):

S. 2514. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to delay the review and revision of the national ambient air quality standards for ozone; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. HARKIN:

S. 2515. A bill to ensure that Medicaid beneficiaries have the opportunity to receive care in a home and community-based setting; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself, Mr.

LEAHY, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. KING, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. HAGAN, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. REED, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. TESTER, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. NELSON, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mrs. McCASKILL, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. WARREN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. COONS, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. KAINE, Mr. WARNER, Mr. WALSH, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. CARPER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. REID, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. LEVIN, and Ms. LANDRIEU):

S. 2516. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide for additional disclosure requirements for corporations, labor organizations, Super PACs and

other entities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. CORNYN:

S. 2517. A bill to prohibit bonuses to senior-level IRS executives until all Congressional requests for documents, including electronic communications, related to the investigation of IRS targeting of taxpayers are complete; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. FRANKEN:

S. 2518. A bill to establish a grant program to incentivize States to implement comprehensive reforms and innovative strategies to significantly improve postsecondary outcomes for low-income and first generation college students, including increasing postsecondary enrollment and graduation rates, to reduce the need of postsecondary students for remedial education, to increase alignment of elementary, secondary, and postsecondary education, and to promote innovation in postsecondary education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CARPER (for himself and Mr. COBURN):

S. 2519. A bill to codify an existing operations center for cybersecurity; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself and Mr. CORNYN):

S. 2520. A bill to improve the Freedom of Information Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARPER (for himself and Mr. COBURN):

S. 2521. A bill to amend chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code, to provide for reform to Federal information security; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR:

S. 2522. A bill to designate the James L. Oberstar Memorial Highway and the James L. Oberstar National Scenic Byway in the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR:

S. 2523. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 14 3rd Avenue, NW, in Chisholm, Minnesota, as the "James L. Oberstar Memorial Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. WARNER (for himself and Mr. KAINE):

S. 2524. A bill to support access to career and technical education programs of study that provide students with education and training combining rigorous academics with technical curricula focused on specific high-skill, high-wage, high-demand and high-growth occupations and industries; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. CRUZ:

S. Res. 482. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the area between the intersections of International Drive, Northwest Van Ness Street, Northwest International Drive, Northwest and International Place, Northwest in Washington, District of Columbia, should be designated as "Liu Xiaobo Plaza"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. WALSH (for himself, Mr. HEINRICH, and Mr. UDALL of Colorado):

S. Res. 483. A resolution establishing a point of order against legislation selling

Federal land in order to reduce the deficit; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 709

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 709, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to increase diagnosis of Alzheimer's disease and related dementias, leading to better care and outcomes for Americans living with Alzheimer's disease and related dementias.

S. 1049

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1049, a bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior and Secretary of Agriculture to expedite access to certain Federal lands under the administrative jurisdiction of each Secretary for good Samaritan search-and-recovery missions, and for other purposes.

S. 1091

At the request of Ms. MIKULSKI, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1091, a bill to provide for the issuance of an Alzheimer's Disease Research Semipostal Stamp.

S. 1307

At the request of Ms. LANDRIEU, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1307, a bill to provide for evidence-based and promising practices related to juvenile delinquency and criminal street gang activity prevention and intervention to help build individual, family, and community strength and resiliency to ensure that youth lead productive, safe, healthy, gang-free, and law-abiding lives.

S. 1318

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1318, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to cover physician services delivered by podiatric physicians to ensure access by Medicaid beneficiaries to appropriate quality foot and ankle care, to amend title XVIII of such Act to modify the requirements for diabetic shoes to be included under Medicare, and for other purposes.

S. 1534

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1534, a bill to provide a framework establishing the rights, liabilities, and responsibilities of participants in closing procedures for certain types of consumer deposit accounts, to protect individual consumer rights, and for other purposes.

S. 1692

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a co-

sponsor of S. 1692, a bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to modify the final rule relating to flightcrew member duty and rest requirements for passenger operations of air carriers to apply to all-cargo operations of air carriers, and for other purposes.

S. 1738

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1738, a bill to provide justice for the victims of trafficking.

S. 1799

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1799, a bill to reauthorize subtitle A of the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990.

S. 2141

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2141, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide an alternative process for review of safety and effectiveness of nonprescription sunscreen active ingredients and for other purposes.

S. 2188

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2188, a bill to amend the Act of June 18, 1934, to reaffirm the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to take land into trust for Indian tribes.

S. 2472

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) were added as cosponsors of S. 2472, a bill to establish in the Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor of the Department of State a Special Envoy for the Human Rights of LGBT Peoples.

S. 2496

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) were added as cosponsors of S. 2496, a bill to preserve existing rights and responsibilities with respect to waters of the United States.

S. 2502

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2502, a bill to establish in the United States Agency for International Development an entity to be known as the United States Global Development Lab, and for other purposes.

S. 2508

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2508, a bill to establish a comprehensive United States Government policy to assist countries

in sub-Saharan Africa to improve access to and the affordability, reliability, and sustainability of power, and for other purposes.

S. 2510

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2510, a bill to establish a temporary limitation on the use of funds to transfer or release individuals detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

S. RES. 447

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 447, a resolution recognizing the threats to freedom of the press and expression around the world and reaffirming freedom of the press as a priority in the efforts of the United States Government to promote democracy and good governance.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. HARKIN:

S. 2515. A bill to ensure that Medicaid beneficiaries have the opportunity to receive care in a home and community-based setting; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being on objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2515

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 “Community Integration Act of 2014”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) The Supreme Court’s 1999 decision in *Olmstead v. L.C.*, 527 U.S. 581 (1999), held that the unnecessary segregation of individuals with disabilities is a violation of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12101 et seq.).

(2) Under *Olmstead*, individuals generally have the right to receive their supports and services in home and community-based settings, rather than in institutional settings, if they so choose.

(3) *Olmstead* envisioned that States would provide appropriate long-term services and supports to individuals with disabilities through home and community-based services and end forced segregation in nursing homes and other institutions.

(4) While there has been progress in rebalancing State spending on individuals with disabilities in institutions as compared to home and community-based settings, more than 75 percent of States continue to spend the majority of their long-term care dollars on nursing homes and other institutional settings, and the number of individuals with disabilities under age 65 in nursing homes increased between 2008 and 2012.

(5) As of June 2013, there were more than 200,000 individuals younger than age 65 in nursing homes – almost 16 percent of the total nursing home population.

(6) Thirty-eight studies published from 2005 to 2012 concluded that providing services in home and community-based settings is less costly than providing care in a nursing home or other institutional setting.

(7) No clear or centralized reporting system exists to compare how effectively States are meeting the *Olmstead* mandate.

SEC. 3. ENSURING MEDICAID BENEFICIARIES MAY ELECT TO RECEIVE CARE IN A HOME AND COMMUNITY-BASED SETTING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1902(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396a(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (80), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (81), by striking the period and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (81) the following new paragraph:

“(82) in the case of any individual with respect to whom there has been a determination that the individual requires the level of care provided in a nursing facility, intermediate care facility for the mentally retarded, institution for mental disease, or other similarly restrictive or institutional setting—

“(A) provide the individual with the choice and opportunity to receive such care in a home and community-based setting, including rehabilitative services, assistance and support in accomplishing activities of daily living, instrumental activities of daily living, and health-related tasks, and assistance in acquiring, maintaining, or enhancing skills necessary to accomplish such activities, tasks, or services;

“(B) ensure that each such individual has an equal opportunity (when compared to the receipt and availability of nursing facility services) to receive care in a home and community-based setting, if the individual so chooses, by ensuring that the provision of such care in a home and community-based setting is widely available on a statewide basis for all such individuals within the State; and

“(C) meet the requirements of section 1904A (relating to the provision of care in a home and community-based setting).”.

(b) REQUIREMENTS FOR COMMUNITY CARE OPTIONS.—Title XIX of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 1904 the following new section:

“PROVISIONS RELATED TO HOME AND COMMUNITY-BASED CARE

“SEC. 1904A. (a) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section, section 1902(a)(82), and section 1905(a)(4)(A):

“(1) ACTIVITIES OF DAILY LIVING.—The term ‘activities of daily living’ includes, but is not limited to, tasks such as eating, toileting, grooming, dressing, bathing, and transferring.

“(2) HEALTH-RELATED TASKS.—The term ‘health-related tasks’ means specific tasks related to the needs of an individual, including, but not limited to, bowel or bladder care, wound care, use and care of ventilators and feeding tubes, and the administration of medications and injections, which, in the opinion of the individual’s physician, can be delegated to be performed by an attendant.

“(3) HOME AND COMMUNITY-BASED SETTING.—The term ‘home and community-based setting’ means, with respect to an individual who requires a level of care provided in a nursing facility, intermediate care facility for the mentally retarded, institution for mental disease, or other similarly restrictive or institutional setting, a setting that—

“(A) includes a house, apartment, townhouse, condominium, or similar public or private housing where the individual resides that—

“(i) is owned or leased by the individual or a member of the individual’s family;

“(ii) ensures the individual’s privacy, dignity, respect, and freedom from coercion; and

“(iii) maximizes the individual’s autonomy and independence;

“(B) is integrated in, and provides access to, the general community in which the setting is located so that the individual has access to the community and opportunities to seek employment and work in competitive integrated settings, participate in community life, control and utilize personal resources, benefit from community services, and participate in the community in an overall manner that is comparable to that available to individuals who are not individuals with disabilities; and

“(C) has the services and supports that the individual needs in order to live as independently as possible.

“(4) INSTRUMENTAL ACTIVITIES OF DAILY LIVING.—The term ‘instrumental activities of daily living’ means activities related to living independently in the community and includes, but is not limited to, meal planning and preparation, managing finances, shopping for food, clothing, and other items, performing household chores, communicating by phone or other media, and traveling around and participating in the community.

“(5) PUBLIC ENTITY.—The term ‘public entity’ means a public entity as defined in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of section 201(1) of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990.

“(b) REQUIREMENTS FOR PROVIDING SERVICES IN HOME AND COMMUNITY-BASED SETTINGS.—With respect to the availability and provision of services under the State plan under this title, or under any waiver of State plan requirements (subject to section 3(d) of the Community Integration Act of 2014), in a home and community-based setting to any individual who requires a level of care provided in a nursing facility, intermediate care facility for the mentally retarded, institution for mental disease, or other similarly restrictive or institutional setting, any public entity that receives payment under the State plan or waiver for providing services to such an individual shall not—

“(1) impose or utilize policies, practices, or procedures, such as unnecessary requirements or arbitrary service or cost caps, that limit the availability of services in home and community-based settings to an individual with a disability (including individuals with the most significant disabilities) who need such services;

“(2) impose or utilize policies, practices, or procedures that limit the availability of services in a home and community-based setting (including assistance and support in accomplishing activities of daily living, instrumental activities of daily living, health-related tasks, and rehabilitative services) based on the specific disability of an otherwise eligible individual;

“(3) impose or utilize policies, practices, or procedures that arbitrarily restrict an individual with a disability from full and meaningful participation in community life;

“(4) impose or utilize policies, practices, or procedures that unnecessarily delay or restrict the provision of services in a home and community-based setting to any individual who requires such services;

“(5) fail to establish and utilize adequate payment structures to maintain a sufficient workforce to provide services in home and community-based settings to any individual who requires such services;

“(6) fail to provide information, on an ongoing basis, to help any individual who receives care in a nursing facility, intermediate care facility for the mentally retarded, institution for mental disease, or

other similarly restrictive or institutional setting, understand the individual's right to choose to receive such care in a home and community-based setting; or

“(7) fail to provide information to help any individual that requires the level of care provided in a nursing facility, intermediate care facility for the mentally retarded, institution for mental disease, or other similarly restrictive or institutional setting, prior to the individual's placement in such a facility or institution, understand the individual's right to choose to receive such care in a home and community-based setting.

“(C) PLAN TO INCREASE AFFORDABLE AND ACCESSIBLE HOUSING.—Not later than 180 days after the enactment of this section, each State shall develop a statewide plan to increase the availability of affordable and accessible private and public housing stock for individuals with disabilities (including accessible housing for individuals with physical disabilities and those using mobility devices).

“(d) AVAILABILITY OF REMEDIES AND PROCEDURES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The remedies and procedures set forth in sections 203 and 505 of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 shall be available to any person aggrieved by the failure of—

“(A) a State to comply with this section or section 1902(a)(82); or

“(B) a public entity (including a State) to comply with the requirements of subsection (b).

“(2) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in paragraph (1) shall be construed to limit any remedy or right of action that otherwise is available to an aggrieved person under this title.

“(e) ENFORCEMENT BY THE SECRETARY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may reduce the Federal matching assistance percentage applicable to the State (as determined under section 1905(b)) if the Secretary determines that the State has violated the requirements of subsection (b).

“(2) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in paragraph (1) shall be construed to limit any remedy or right of action that is otherwise available to the Secretary.

“(f) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—With respect to fiscal year 2016, and for each fiscal year thereafter, each State shall submit to the Administrator of the Administration for Community Living of the Department of Health and Human Services, not later than April 1 of the succeeding fiscal year, a report, in such form and manner as the Secretary shall require, that includes—

“(1) the total number of individuals enrolled in the State plan or under a waiver of the plan during such fiscal year that required the level of care provided in a nursing facility, intermediate care facility for the mentally retarded, institution for mental disease, or other similarly restrictive or institutional setting, disaggregated by the type of facility or setting;

“(2) with respect to the total number described in paragraph (1), the total number of individuals described in that paragraph who received care in a nursing facility, intermediate care facility for the mentally retarded, institution for mental disease, or other similarly restrictive or institutional setting, disaggregated by the type of facility or setting; and

“(3) with respect to the total number described in paragraph (2), the total number of individuals described in that paragraph who were transitioned from a nursing facility, intermediate care facility for the mentally retarded, institution for mental disease, or other similarly restrictive or institutional setting to a home and community-based set-

ting, disaggregated by the type of home and community-based setting.”

(C) INCLUSION AS A MANDATORY SERVICE.—Section 1905(a)(4)(A) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396d(a)(4)(A)) is amended by striking “other than” and inserting “including similar services such as rehabilitative services and assistance and support in accomplishing activities of daily living, instrumental activities of daily living, and health-related tasks, that are provided, at the individual's option, in a home and community-based setting (as defined in section 1904A(a)(3)), but not including”.

(D) APPLICATION TO WAIVERS.—Notwithstanding section 1904A of the Social Security Act (as added by subsection (b)), such section, and sections 1902(a)(82), and 1905(a)(4)(A) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.), as amended by subsections (a) and (c), respectively, shall not apply to any individuals who are eligible for medical assistance for home and community-based services under a waiver under section 1115 or 1915 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1315, 1396n) and who are receiving such services, to the extent such sections (as so added or amended) are inconsistent with any such waiver.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the amendments made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 2014.

(2) DELAY PERMITTED IF STATE LEGISLATION REQUIRED.—In the case of a State plan under section 1902 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396a) which the Secretary of Health and Human Services determines requires State legislation (other than legislation appropriating funds) in order for the plan to meet the additional requirements imposed by the amendments made by this section, the State plan shall not be regarded as failing to comply with the requirements of such section 1902 solely on the basis of the failure of the plan to meet such additional requirements before the 1st day of the 1st calendar quarter beginning after the close of the 1st regular session of the State legislature that begins after the date of enactment of this Act. For purposes of the previous sentence, in the case of a State that has a 2-year legislative session, each year of such session shall be deemed to be a separate regular session of the State legislature.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. KING, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. HAGAN, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. REED, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. TESTER, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. NELSON, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. WARREN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. COONS, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. Kaine, Mr. WARNER, Mr. WALSH, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. CARPER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. REID, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. LEVIN, and Ms. LANDRIEU):

S. 2516. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to pro-

vide for additional disclosure requirements for corporations, labor organizations, Super PACs and other entities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today, I join with several Democratic Senators to reintroduce the DISCLOSE Act, renewing—for the third time—our fight to curtail some of the worst abuses resulting from the Supreme Court's decision in Citizens United. Republicans mounted filibusters of this commonsense bill when it was first introduced in 2010 and then again when it was reintroduced in 2012. This was the case even though Republicans claim to support disclosure.

Earlier this month, I chaired a hearing on a proposed constitutional amendment to repair the damage done by Citizens United and a series of other flawed Supreme Court decisions that have eviscerated our campaign finance laws. At this hearing, even Floyd Abrams, the noted First Amendment attorney who testified against the proposed amendment argued that he supported greater disclosure. And yet, Republicans have already filibustered this bill twice and are likely to continue filibustering it. I am hoping that Republicans have come to their senses after seeing how Citizens United has allowed unlimited, undisclosed money to pollute our elections.

Since that decision, our elections have been defined by corporations and billionaires spending vast amounts of secret money to influence elections. In the 2012 election cycle, spending from undisclosed sources exceeded \$310 million, a massive increase from the \$69 million from undisclosed sources in the previous presidential election cycle in 2008. And this number will only increase. No one doubts that.

While states like Vermont and Congress continue their heavy lift of passing a constitutional amendment to address the flawed Supreme Court decisions that have gutted our campaign finance laws, the Senate can take more immediate action today. By passing the DISCLOSE Act, we can restore transparency and accountability to campaign finance laws by ensuring that all Americans know who is paying for campaign ads. This is a crucial step toward restoring the ability of Vermonters and all American voters to be able to speak, be heard and to hear competing voices, and not be drowned out by powerful corporate interests.

We know disclosure laws can work because they do work for individual Americans donating directly to political campaigns. When you or I give money directly to a political candidate, our donation is not hidden. It is publicly disclosed. Yet those who oppose the DISCLOSE Act are standing up for special rights for corporations and wealthy donors that you and I do not have.

Recently, the Washington Post documented a trend whereby politically active organizations manipulate and use

their tax-exempt status to keep its donor lists private even though these organizations are pouring millions of dollars of undisclosed money into our elections. The increase of secret money can only harm our political process. The DISCLOSE Act would fix this problem. This bill would require any organization spending money on political ads, including 501(c)(4)s and Super PACs, to disclose donors who had given \$10,000 or more. This is a commonsense transparency measure that everyone should be willing to support.

When the race is on for secret money and election campaigns are won or lost by who can collect the largest amount of unaccountable, secret donations, it puts at risk government of, by and for the people. In a democracy, our ballots should be secret not massive corporate campaign contributions. Disclosure of who is paying for election ads should not be kept secret from the public.

Vermont is a small state. It would not take more than a tiny fraction of the corporate money flooding the airwaves in other states to outspend all of our local candidates combined. I know that the people of Vermont, like all Americans, take seriously their civic duty to choose wisely on Election Day. Like all Vermonters, I cherish the voters' role in the democratic process and am a staunch believer in the First Amendment. The rights of Vermonters and all Americans to speak to each other and to be heard should not be undercut by corporate spending.

I hope that Republicans who have seen the impact of waves of unaccountable corporate campaign spending will join us to take up this important legislation. I hope Republican Senators will let us vote on the DISCLOSE Act and help us take an important step to ensure the ability of every American to be heard and to be able to meaningfully participate in free and fair elections.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself and Mr. CORNYN):

S. 2520. A bill to improve the Freedom of Information Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, the Freedom of Information Act, FOIA, is one of our Nation's most important laws, established to give Americans greater access to their government and protect their ability to hold government accountable. In keeping with my commitment to support this law and expand its mission, today I join with Senator JOHN CORNYN to introduce bipartisan legislation that will improve the implementation of FOIA.

I have sought for decades to make our government more open and transparent. Senator CORNYN has been an important partner in these efforts, and our collaboration has resulted in the enactment of several improvements to FOIA: the OPEN Government Act, the first major reform to FOIA in more than a decade; the OPEN FOIA Act, which increased the transparency of legislative exemptions to FOIA; and

the Faster FOIA Act, which responded to the concerns of FOIA requestors and addressed agency delays in processing requests.

The FOIA Improvement Act we are introducing today will make additional improvements to the law. It will enshrine into law the presumption of openness that the President laid out on his first day in office. He said, "The Freedom of Information Act should be administered with a clear presumption: In the face of doubt, openness prevails." Our bipartisan legislation will require that Federal agencies consider the public interest in the disclosure of government information before invoking a FOIA exemption. It will provide additional independence for the Office of Government Information Services, OGIS, created by the OPEN Government Act in 2007, and reduce the overuse of Exemption 5 to withhold information by adding a public interest balancing test.

There has been significant progress in improving the FOIA process over the years, but I am concerned that the growing trend towards relying upon FOIA exemptions to withhold large swaths of government information is hindering the public's right to know. According to the OpenTheGovernment.org 2013 Secrecy Report, Federal agencies used Exemption 5 more than 79,000 times in 2012—an incredible 41 percent increase from the previous year. This does not exemplify the presumption of openness that we expect from our Government, and that is why Senator CORNYN and I are introducing the FOIA Improvement Act today.

Both Democrats and Republicans understand that a commitment to transparency is a commitment to the American values of openness and accountability, and to the public's right to know what their government is doing. I value the strong partnership that I have formed with Senator CORNYN on open government matters. Ensuring an open government should be a non-partisan issue, and I invite all Members to support the FOIA Improvement Act of 2014.

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. 2520

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 "FOIA Improvement Act of 2014".

SEC. 2. AMENDMENTS TO FOIA.

Section 552 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking "for public inspection and copying" and inserting "for public inspection in an electronic format";

(ii) by striking subparagraph (D) and inserting the following:

"(D) copies of all records, regardless of form or format—

"(i) that have been released to any person under paragraph (3); and

"(ii)(I) that because of the nature of their subject matter, the agency determines have become or are likely to become the subject of subsequent requests for substantially the same records; or

"(II) that have been requested not less than 3 times; and"; and

(iii) in the undesignated matter following subparagraph (E), by striking "public inspection and copying current" and inserting "public inspection in an electronic format, and current";

(B) in paragraph (4)(A), by striking clause (viii) and inserting the following:

"(viii)(I) Except as provided in subclause (II), an agency shall not assess any search fees (or in the case of a requester described under clause (ii)(II) of this subparagraph, duplication fees) under this subparagraph if the agency has failed to comply with any time limit under paragraph (6).

"(II)(aa) If an agency determines that unusual circumstances apply (as the term is defined in paragraph (6)(B)) and the agency provides a timely written notice to the requester in accordance with paragraph (6)(B), a failure described in subclause (I) is excused for an additional 10 days. If the agency fails to comply with the extended time limit, the agency may not assess any search fees (or in the case of a requester described under clause (ii)(II) of this subparagraph, duplication fees).

"(bb) If a court determines that exceptional circumstances exist (as that term is defined in paragraph (6)(C)), a failure described in subclause (I) shall be excused for the length of time provided by the court order.";

(C) in paragraph (6)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)(i), by striking "making such request" and all that follows through "determination; and" and inserting the following: "making such request of—"

"(I) such determination and the reasons therefore;

"(II) the right of such person to seek assistance from the FOIA Public Liaison of the agency; and

"(III) in the case of an adverse determination—

"(aa) the right of such person to appeal to the head of the agency, within a period determined by the head of the agency that is not less than 90 days after the receipt of such adverse determination; and

"(bb) the right of such person to seek dispute resolution services from the FOIA Public Liaison of the agency or the Office of Government Information Services; and"; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B)(ii), by striking "the agency," and inserting "the agency, and notify the requester of the right of the requester to seek dispute resolution services from the Office of Government Information Services."; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

"(8) An agency—

"(A) shall—

"(i) withhold information under this section only if—

"(I) the agency reasonably foresees that disclosure would harm an interest protected by an exemption described in subsection (b) or other provision of law; or

"(II) disclosure is prohibited by law; and

"(ii)(I) consider whether partial disclosure of information is possible whenever the agency determines that a full disclosure of a requested record is not possible; and

"(II) take reasonable steps necessary to segregate and release nonexempt information; and

"(B) may not—

“(i) withhold information requested under this section merely because the agency can demonstrate, as a technical matter, that the records fall within the scope of an exemption described in subsection (b); or

“(ii) withhold information requested under this section because the information may be embarrassing to the agency or because of speculative or abstract concerns.”;

(2) in subsection (b), by amending paragraph (5) to read as follows:

“(5) inter-agency or intra-agency memorandums or letters that would not be available by law to a party other than an agency in litigation with the agency, if—

“(A) in the case of deliberative process privilege or attorney work-product privilege, the agency interest in protecting the records or information is not outweighed by a public interest in disclosure;

“(B) in the case of attorney-client privilege, the agency interest in protecting the records or information is not outweighed by a compelling public interest in disclosure; and

“(C) the requested record or information was created less than 25 years before the date on which the request was made;”;

(3) in subsection (e)

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting “and to the Director of the Office of Government Information Services” after “United States”;

(ii) in subparagraph (N), by striking “and” at the end;

(iii) in subparagraph (O), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(iv) by adding at the end the following:

“(P) the number of times the agency denied a request for records under subsection (c); and

“(Q) the number of records that were made available for public inspection in an electronic format under subsection (a)(2).”;

(B) by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

“(3) Each agency shall make each such report available for public inspection in an electronic format. In addition, each agency shall make the raw statistical data used in each report available in a timely manner for public inspection in an electronic format, which shall be made available—

“(A) without charge, license, or registration requirement;

“(B) in an aggregated, searchable format; and

“(C) in a format that may be downloaded in bulk.”;

(C) in paragraph (4)—

(i) by striking “Government Reform and Oversight” and inserting “Oversight and Government Reform”;

(ii) by inserting “Homeland Security and” before “Governmental Affairs”;

(iii) by striking “April” and inserting “March”; and

(D) by striking paragraph (6) and inserting the following:

“(6)(A) The Attorney General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Judiciary of the Senate, and the President a report on or before March 1 of each calendar year, which shall include for the prior calendar year—

“(i) a listing of the number of cases arising under this section;

“(ii) a listing of—

“(I) each subsection, and any exemption, if applicable, involved in each case arising under this section;

“(II) the disposition of each case arising under this section; and

“(III) the cost, fees, and penalties assessed under subparagraphs (E), (F), and (G) of subsection (a)(4); and

“(iii) a description of the efforts undertaken by the Department of Justice to encourage agency compliance with this section.

“(B) The Attorney General of the United States shall make—

“(i) each report submitted under subparagraph (A) available for public inspection in an electronic format; and

“(ii) the raw statistical data used in each report submitted under subparagraph (A) available for public inspection in an electronic format, which shall be made available—

“(I) without charge, license, or registration requirement;

“(II) in an aggregated, searchable format; and

“(III) in a format that may be downloaded in bulk.”;

(4) in subsection (g), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “publicly available upon request” and inserting “available for public inspection in an electronic format”;

(5) in subsection (h)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by adding at the end the following: “The head of the Office shall be the Director of the Office of Government Information Services.”;

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking subparagraph (C) and inserting the following:

“(C) identify procedures and methods for improving compliance under this section.”;

(C) by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

“(3) The Office of Government Information Services shall offer mediation services to resolve disputes between persons making requests under this section and administrative agencies as a non-exclusive alternative to litigation and may issue advisory opinions at the discretion of the Office or upon request of any party to a dispute.”; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

“(4)(A) Not less frequently than annually, the Director of the Office of Government Information Services shall submit to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives, the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, and the President—

“(i) a report on the findings of the information reviewed and identified under paragraph (2);

“(ii) a summary of the activities of the Office of Government Information Services under paragraph (3), including—

“(I) any advisory opinions issued; and

“(II) the number of times each agency engaged in dispute resolution with the assistance of the Office of Government Information Services or the FOIA Public Liaison; and

“(iii) legislative and regulatory recommendations, if any, to improve the administration of this section.

“(B) The Director of the Office of Government Information Services shall make each report submitted under subparagraph (A) available for public inspection in an electronic format.

“(C) The Director of the Office of Government Information Services shall not be required to obtain the prior approval, comment, or review of any officer or agency of the United States, including the Department of Justice, the Archivist of the United States, or the Office of Management and Budget before submitting to the Congress, or any committee or subcommittee thereof, any reports, recommendations, testimony, or comments, if such submissions include a statement indicating that the views expressed therein are those of the Director and

do not necessarily represent the views of the President.

“(5) The Director of the Office of Government Information Services may submit additional information to Congress and the President as the Director determines to be appropriate.

“(6) Not less frequently than annually, the Office of Government Information Services shall conduct a meeting that is open to the public on the review and reports by the Office and shall allow interested persons to appear and present oral or written statements at the meeting.”; and

(6) by striking subsections (i), (j), and (k), and inserting the following:

“(i) The Government Accountability Office shall—

“(1) conduct audits of administrative agencies on compliance with and implementation of the requirements of this section and issue reports detailing the results of such audits; and

“(2) catalog the number of exemptions described in subsection (b)(3) and the use of such exemptions by each agency.

“(j)(1) Each agency shall designate a Chief FOIA Officer who shall be a senior official of such agency (at the Assistant Secretary or equivalent level).

“(2) The Chief FOIA Officer of each agency shall, subject to the authority of the head of the agency—

“(A) have agency-wide responsibility for efficient and appropriate compliance with this section;

“(B) monitor implementation of this section throughout the agency and keep the head of the agency, the chief legal officer of the agency, and the Attorney General appropriately informed of the agency’s performance in implementing this section;

“(C) recommend to the head of the agency such adjustments to agency practices, policies, personnel, and funding as may be necessary to improve its implementation of this section;

“(D) review and report to the Attorney General, through the head of the agency, at such times and in such formats as the Attorney General may direct, on the agency’s performance in implementing this section;

“(E) facilitate public understanding of the purposes of the statutory exemptions of this section by including concise descriptions of the exemptions in both the agency’s handbook issued under subsection (g), and the agency’s annual report on this section, and by providing an overview, where appropriate, of certain general categories of agency records to which those exemptions apply;

“(F) offer training to agency staff regarding their responsibilities under this section;

“(G) serve as the primary agency liaison with the Office of Government Information Services and the Office of Information Policy; and

“(H) designate 1 or more FOIA Public Liaisons.

“(3) The Chief FOIA Officer of each agency shall review, not less frequently than annually, all aspects of the administration of this section by the agency to ensure compliance with the requirements of this section, including—

“(A) agency regulations;

“(B) disclosure of records required under paragraphs (2) and (8) of subsection (a);

“(C) assessment of fees and determination of eligibility for fee waivers;

“(D) the timely processing of requests for information under this section;

“(E) the use of exemptions under subsection (b); and

“(F) dispute resolution services with the assistance of the Office of Government Information Services or the FOIA Public Liaison.

“(k)(1) There is established in the executive branch the Chief FOIA Officers Council

(referred to in this subsection as the ‘Council’).

“(2) The Council shall be comprised of the following members:

“(A) The Deputy Director for Management of the Office of Management and Budget.

“(B) The Director of the Office of Information Policy at the Department of Justice.

“(C) The Director of the Office of Government Information Services.

“(D) The Chief FOIA Officer of each agency.

“(E) Any other officer or employee of the United States as designated by the Co-Chairs.

“(3) The Director of the Office of Information Policy at the Department of Justice and the Director of the Office of Government Information Services shall be the Co-Chairs of the Council.

“(4) The Administrator of General Services shall provide administrative and other support for the Council.

“(5)(A) The duties of the Council shall include the following:

“(i) Develop recommendations for increasing compliance and efficiency under this section.

“(ii) Disseminate information about agency experiences, ideas, best practices, and innovative approaches related to this section.

“(iii) Identify, develop, and coordinate initiatives to increase transparency and compliance with this section.

“(iv) Promote the development and use of common performance measures for agency compliance with this section.

“(B) In performing the duties described in subparagraph (A), the Council shall consult on a regular basis with members of the public who make requests under this section.

“(6)(A) The Council shall meet regularly and such meetings shall be open to the public unless the Council determines to close the meeting for reasons of national security or to discuss information exempt under subsection (b).

“(B) Not less frequently than annually, the Council shall hold a meeting that shall be open to the public and permit interested persons to appear and present oral and written statements to the Council.

“(C) Not later than 10 business days before a meeting of the Council, notice of such meeting shall be published in the Federal Register.

“(D) Except as provided in subsection (b), the records, reports, transcripts, minutes, appendixes, working papers, drafts, studies, agenda, or other documents that were made available to or prepared for or by the Council shall be made publicly available.

“(E) Detailed minutes of each meeting of the Council shall be kept and shall contain a record of the persons present, a complete and accurate description of matters discussed and conclusions reached, and copies of all reports received, issued, or approved by the Council. The minutes shall be redacted as necessary and made publicly available.”.

SEC. 3. REVIEW AND ISSUANCE OF REGULATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the head of each agency (as defined in section 551 of title 5, United States Code) shall review the regulations of such agency and shall issue regulations on procedures for the disclosure of records under section 552 of title 5, United States Code, in accordance with the amendments made by section 2.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—The regulations of each agency shall include procedures for engaging in dispute resolution through the FOIA Public Liaison and the Office of Government Information Services.

SEC. 4. PROACTIVE DISCLOSURE THROUGH RECORDS MANAGEMENT.

Section 3102 of title 44, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraphs (3) and (4); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

“(2) procedures for identifying records of general interest or use to the public that are appropriate for public disclosure, and for posting such records in a publicly accessible electronic format;”.

SEC. 5. NO ADDITIONAL FUNDS AUTHORIZED.

No additional funds are authorized to carry out the requirements of this Act or the amendments made by this Act. The requirements of this Act and the amendments made by this Act shall be carried out using amounts otherwise authorized or appropriated.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 482—EX-PRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT THE AREA BETWEEN THE INTERSECTIONS OF INTERNATIONAL DRIVE, NORTHWEST VAN NESS STREET, NORTHWEST INTERNATIONAL DRIVE, NORTHWEST AND INTERNATIONAL PLACE, NORTHWEST IN WASHINGTON, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, SHOULD BE DESIGNATED AS “LIU XIAOBO PLAZA”

Mr. CRUZ submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs:

S. RES. 482

Whereas June 4, 2014, marked the 25th anniversary of the brutal crackdown on protestors at Tiananmen Square in Beijing;

Whereas Dr. Liu Xiaobo is a Chinese human rights activist and Nobel Laureate who is currently serving an 11-year prison sentence for inciting subversion against the Government of the People’s Republic of China;

Whereas in recognition of Dr. Liu Xiaobo’s long and non-violent struggle for fundamental human rights in the People’s Republic of China, he was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in October 2010; and

Whereas renaming a portion of the street in front of the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China in the District of Columbia after Dr. Liu Xiaobo serves as an expression of solidarity between the people of the United States and the people of the People’s Republic of China who are, like Dr. Liu Xiaobo, engaged in a long and non-violent struggle for fundamental human rights: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the area between the intersections of International Drive, Northwest and Van Ness Street, Northwest and International Drive, Northwest and International Place, Northwest in Washington, District of Columbia, should be known and designated as “Liu Xiaobo Plaza”, and any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record to that area should be deemed to be a reference to Liu Xiaobo Plaza;

(2) the address of 3505 International Place, Northwest, Washington, District of Columbia, should be redesignated as 1 Liu Xiaobo Plaza, and any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to that address should be deemed to be a reference to 1 Liu Xiaobo Plaza; and

(3) the Administrator of General Services should construct street signs that—

(A) contain the phrase “Liu Xiaobo Plaza”;
(B) are similar in design to the signs used by Washington, District of Columbia, to designate the location of Metro stations; and

(C) should be placed on—

(i) the parcel Federal property that is closest to 1 Liu Xiaobo Plaza (as described in paragraph (2)); and

(ii) the street corners of International Drive, Northwest and Van Ness Street, Northwest and International Drive, Northwest and International Place, Northwest, Washington, District of Columbia.

SENATE RESOLUTION 483—ESTABLISHING A POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION SELLING FEDERAL LAND IN ORDER TO REDUCE THE DEFICIT

Mr. WALSH (for himself, Mr. HEINRICH, and Mr. UDALL of Colorado) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources:

S. RES. 483

Resolved,

SECTION 1. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST SELLING FEDERAL LAND IN ORDER TO REDUCE THE DEFICIT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), it shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, amendment between the houses, or conference report that sells any Federal land and uses the proceeds of the sale to reduce the Federal deficit.

(b) EXCEPTION.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to the sale of Federal land as part of a program that acquires land in the same State that is of comparable value or contains exceptional resources.

(c) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL IN THE SENATE.—

(1) WAIVER.—This section may be waived or suspended only by the affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(2) APPEAL.—An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about one of our greatest treasures in this country: our public lands. Growing up in Butte, MT, I woke up every day under the morning shadow of the Continental Divide, part of the Deerlodge National Forest. When I was a kid, my dad would take me fishing on the Big Hole River. On the living room wall in my parents’ home, there were pictures of three people: a picture of Jesus, a picture of JFK, and a picture of George Meany. I have carried the values my parents instilled in me to this day.

I grew up in a Catholic home similar to Montana writer Norman Maclean, who wrote in his famous book “A River Runs Through It” that his father, a Presbyterian minister, “told us about Christ’s disciples being fishermen, and we were left to assume, as my brother and I did, that all first-class fishermen on the Sea of Galilee were fly fishermen, and that John, the favorite, was a dry-fly fisherman.”

As an adult serving in the Montana National Guard, I would ride my mountain bike almost daily all over trails in

the Helena National Forest that connect our streets in the capital city of Helena. One day my granddaughter Kennedy will fish and bike these same lands and waters. These places all have one thing in common beyond being gorgeous and being in Montana; they belong to you and me. We all own them. They are part of what makes living in Montana and in America so special. Other countries and other States have lost this heritage but not in Montana.

Maintaining and improving access to these lands is one of the most important things we can do. That is why today I submitted legislation to make it harder to sell off this land. My bill will create a budget point of order in the Senate to block attempts to sell off public land to pay for Congress's bills.

There is no question that Washington has a spending problem. Since arriving in the Senate, I have proposed several ways to rein in out-of-control spending. But selling off our kids' and grandkids' heritage is a terrible idea. Jeopardizing the countless jobs that rely on our outdoors is also a terrible idea.

There is a theory circulating in some parts of the West that the Federal Government has a continuing duty to dispose of its lands in Western States. What this really means is handing over our most popular recreation areas to the highest out-of-State bidder. That is good for copper barons and trophy-home developers, but it is bad for us.

This theory is as radical as it is wrong, as court rulings have repeatedly found, but it is getting real traction.

Our colleagues in the House of Representatives have passed a budget that could sell off millions of acres of public land—our land—in Montana.

I want you to know that I will fight any similar attempts in this Chamber. I want my granddaughter Kennedy to grow up in Montana with the same easy access to streams and forests I enjoyed, whether she wants to hunt, hike, fish or bike.

We also need to get our forests healthy and working again, creating good jobs and making our forests more resilient to wildfires.

Like many Montanans, I am frustrated with how long it takes to conduct a timber sale or complete an environmental analysis of potential projects. Even simple projects get tied up in court, and our rural communities and the land itself suffer for it.

But the solution isn't to hand the keys over to special interests and walk away. The solution is to manage the land—from the ground up.

In Montana, tourism is critical to our economy. Outdoor recreation supports 64,000 jobs and generates over \$5.8 billion in revenue annually. Cutting off access or selling the land to out-of-State development is a direct threat to jobs in Montana.

Turning over land in the State is just one step away from privatizing. There is no question that private land is the misguided ultimate goal of many who don't understand our outdoor heritage in the West.

In the year 2000 I led the response of the Montana National Guard to the wildfires that consumed over 1 million acres of Montana land. The Departments of Agriculture and Interior have spent about \$1.8 billion annually to fight wildfires in the past 5 years. States simply cannot afford that pricetag. One bad wildfire season could bankrupt a State.

I want to share a little more about what is at stake.

Under the Ryan budget in the House of Representatives, with an auction of our public lands, Montana hunters could lose access to elk wallows of the Pioneer Mountains. You might hear elk bugling on Tenderfoot Creek in the Little Belt Mountains, but it could be on private land instead of land protected by the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

Montanans could be shut out of the Missouri River Breaks, locked out of putting a canoe in or hunting a mule deer or sheep.

We could lose the Rocky Mountain Front, facing padlocks and orange signs instead of open space and the chance for a bighorn sheep tag.

Under the House plan, anglers in Montana could lose the headwaters of Rock Creek or the Smith River and the chance to sink a perfect fly from a streamside the public owns.

Despite years of effort to secure access, we could be shut out of land around the Three Dollar Bridge south of Bozeman that helped kids like me—growing up, fishing in our own blue-ribbon streams. The same thing could happen to the centennials and swan.

We could lose the best eastern Montana has to offer, from the monster bucks and turkeys in the Custer National Forest to the duck factory of the BLM's prairie potholes.

Under the House plan, we could be facing closed roads, closed trails, and closed land in the Gallatin National Forest that thousands of Montanans worked together 20 years ago to keep open and keep public forever.

Montana is the last best place because we can hunt, fish, hike, and play on the land that we all own. I will fight to keep it that way.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 3375. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3376. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3377. Mr. LEVIN (for himself, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, and Mr. COBURN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such

fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 3375. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE III—GULF OF MEXICO RED SNAPPER FISHERY

SEC. 301. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) GULF STATES.—The term “Gulf States” means the States of Alabama, Florida, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Texas.

(2) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Commerce.

SEC. 302. FISHERY MANAGEMENT RIGHTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (b), not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall grant to the Gulf States exclusive fishery management authority over the red snapper fish (*Lutjanus campechanus*) in the Gulf of Mexico in the area located between the coast line of each Gulf State and the point that is 200 miles seaward of the coast line of each Gulf State, consistent with the jurisdictional limit of the exclusive economic zone.

(b) AGREEMENT BETWEEN GOVERNORS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The grant of authority under subsection (a) is contingent on the condition that not later than 180 days after the date on which the Secretary grants the authority, the Governors of each of the Gulf States—

(A) agree on a fishery management plan governing management of the red snapper fish (*Lutjanus campechanus*); and

(B) certify in writing to the Secretary that the Governors have entered into that agreement.

(2) REVERSION.—If the Governors fail to enter into an agreement under paragraph (1), the authority granted to the Governors under subsection (a) shall revert to the Secretary.

SA 3376. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . TRANSPARENCY OF REGIONAL FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL MEETINGS.

(a) OPEN MEETINGS.—Section 302(i)(2) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1852(i)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (E), by striking “session,” and inserting “session that is not subject to paragraph (3)(C).”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(G) Any member of a Council, committee, or panel who intends to use a document, exhibit, fact, or statistic at an open or closed meeting of the Council, committee, or panel shall provide to all other members of the Council, committee, or panel the source of the document, exhibit, fact, or statistic not less than 48 hours prior to the meeting.”

(b) CLOSED MEETINGS.—Section 302(i)(3) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation

and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1852(i)(3)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B), by striking the second sentence; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) For any closed meeting, or portion thereof, of a Council, of the Council coordination committee established under subsection (1), and of the scientific and statistical committees or other committees or advisory panels established under subsection (g) that is closed under this paragraph on the basis that the meeting concerns matters or information that pertains to employment matters, the Council, committee, or panel shall maintain detailed minutes as described in paragraph (2)(E) and complete transcripts. Such minutes and transcripts shall be available to any court of competent jurisdiction.”.

SA 3377. Mr. LEVIN (for himself, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, and Mr. COBURN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title XVI, add the following:

SEC. 1647. ACTIONS TO ADDRESS ECONOMIC OR INDUSTRIAL ESPIONAGE IN CYBERSPACE.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on foreign economic and industrial espionage in cyberspace during the 12-month period preceding the submission of the report that—

(A) identifies—

(i) foreign countries that engage in economic or industrial espionage in cyberspace with respect to trade secrets or proprietary information owned by United States persons;

(ii) foreign countries identified under clause (i) that the President determines engage in the most egregious economic or industrial espionage in cyberspace with respect to such trade secrets or proprietary information (in this section referred to as “priority foreign countries”);

(iii) technologies or proprietary information developed by United States persons that—

(I) are targeted for economic or industrial espionage in cyberspace; and

(II) to the extent practicable, have been appropriated through such espionage;

(iv) articles manufactured or otherwise produced using technologies or proprietary information described in clause (iii)(II); and

(v) to the extent practicable, services provided using such technologies or proprietary information;

(B) describes the economic or industrial espionage engaged in by the foreign countries identified under clauses (i) and (ii) of subparagraph (A); and

(C) describes—

(i) actions taken by the President to decrease the prevalence of economic or industrial espionage in cyberspace; and

(ii) the progress made in decreasing the prevalence of such espionage.

(2) DETERMINATION OF FOREIGN COUNTRIES ENGAGING IN ECONOMIC OR INDUSTRIAL ESPIONAGE IN CYBERSPACE.—For purposes of

clauses (i) and (ii) of paragraph (1)(A), the President shall identify a foreign country as a foreign country that engages in economic or industrial espionage in cyberspace with respect to trade secrets or proprietary information owned by United States persons if the government of the foreign country—

(A) engages in economic or industrial espionage in cyberspace with respect to trade secrets or proprietary information owned by United States persons; or

(B) facilitates, supports, fails to prosecute, or otherwise permits such espionage by—

(i) individuals who are citizens or residents of the foreign country; or

(ii) entities that are organized under the laws of the foreign country or are otherwise subject to the jurisdiction of the government of the foreign country.

(3) FORM OF REPORT.—Each report required by paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may contain a classified annex.

(b) IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The President may, pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.), block and prohibit all transactions in all property and interests in property of each person described in paragraph (2), if such property and interests in property are in the United States, come within the United States, or are or come within the possession or control of a United States person.

(2) PERSONS DESCRIBED.—A person described in this paragraph is a foreign person the President determines knowingly requests, engages in, supports, facilitates, or benefits from the significant appropriation, through economic or industrial espionage in cyberspace, of technologies or proprietary information developed by United States persons.

(3) EXCEPTION.—The authority to impose sanctions under paragraph (1) shall not include the authority to impose sanctions on the importation of goods.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, the Committee on Finance, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Homeland Security, the Committee on Financial Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Ways and Means, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

(2) CYBERSPACE.—The term “cyberspace”—

(A) means the interdependent network of information technology infrastructures; and

(B) includes the Internet, telecommunications networks, computer systems, and embedded processors and controllers.

(3) ECONOMIC OR INDUSTRIAL ESPIONAGE.—The term “economic or industrial espionage” means—

(A) stealing a trade secret or proprietary information or appropriating, taking, carrying away, or concealing, or by fraud, artifice, or deception obtaining, a trade secret or proprietary information without the authorization of the owner of the trade secret or proprietary information;

(B) copying, duplicating, downloading, uploading, destroying, transmitting, delivering, sending, communicating, or conveying a trade secret or proprietary information without the authorization of the owner of the trade secret or proprietary information; or

(C) knowingly receiving, buying, or possessing a trade secret or proprietary information that has been stolen or appropriated, obtained, or converted without the authorization of the owner of the trade secret or proprietary information.

(4) KNOWINGLY.—The term “knowingly”, with respect to conduct, a circumstance, or a result, means that a person has actual knowledge, or should have known, of the conduct, the circumstance, or the result.

(5) OWN.—The term “own”, with respect to a trade secret or proprietary information, means to hold rightful legal or equitable title to, or license in, the trade secret or proprietary information.

(6) PERSON.—The term “person” means an individual or entity.

(7) PROPRIETARY INFORMATION.—The term “proprietary information” means competitive bid preparations, negotiating strategies, executive emails, internal financial data, strategic business plans, technical designs, manufacturing processes, source code, data derived from research and development investments, and other commercially valuable information that a person has developed or obtained if—

(A) the person has taken reasonable measures to keep the information confidential; and

(B) the information is not generally known or readily ascertainable through proper means by the public.

(8) TECHNOLOGY.—The term “technology” has the meaning given that term in section 16 of the Export Administration Act of 1979 (50 U.S.C. App. 2415) (as in effect pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.)).

(9) TRADE SECRET.—The term “trade secret” has the meaning given that term in section 1839 of title 18, United States Code.

(10) UNITED STATES PERSON.—The term “United States person” means—

(A) an individual who is a citizen or resident of the United States; or

(B) an entity organized under the laws of the United States or any jurisdiction within the United States.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Finance Committee be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 24, 2014, at 10 a.m., in Room SD-215 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled “Less Student Debt from the Start: What Role Should the Tax System Play?”

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

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 24, 2014, at 2:15 p.m.

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

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. REID. 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 June 24, 2014, at 2:30 p.m., in room SD-106 of the

Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "Moving Toward Greater Community Inclusion—Olmstead at 15."

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

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on June 24, 2014, at 10:15 a.m., in room SD-226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "Judicial Nominations."

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

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 24, 2014, at 2:30 p.m.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ANTITRUST, COMPETITION POLICY, AND CONSUMER RIGHTS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Antitrust, Competition Policy, and Consumer Rights, be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on June 24, 2014, at 2:30 p.m., in room SD-226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "The AT&T/DIRECTTV Merger: The Impact on Competition and Consumers in the Video Market and Beyond."

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL OPERATIONS AND ORGANIZATIONS, HUMAN RIGHTS, DEMOCRACY, AND GLOBAL WOMEN'S ISSUES

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 24, 2014, at 9:45 a.m., to hold an

International Operations and Organizations, Human Rights, Democracy, and Global Women's Issues subcommittee hearing entitled, "Combating Violence and Discrimination Against Women: A Global Call to Action."

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—H.R. 803

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the previous order with respect to H.R. 803 be modified as follows: that at noon tomorrow, Wednesday, June 25, the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 803, with the time until 2:30 p.m. equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with Senators FLAKE and LEE controlling 5 minutes each of the Republican's time; that the provisions regarding 10 minutes of debate prior to voting on the amendments listed in the order and on the bill be vitiated; and that all provisions of the previous order remain in effect.

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

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, JUNE 25, 2014

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, June 25, 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 be in a period of morning business until 12 noon, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes

each, with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with the Republicans controlling the first 30 minutes and the majority controlling the final 30 minutes; and that following morning business, the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 803 under the previous order.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. REID. Madam President, there will be four rollcall votes at 2:30 p.m. tomorrow.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. REID. Madam 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 5:02 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, June 25, 2014, at 9:30 a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 24, 2014:

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

LEON RODRIGUEZ, OF MARYLAND, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE UNITED STATES CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION SERVICES, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY.

THE JUDICIARY

PAUL G. BYRON, OF FLORIDA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA.

CARLOS EDUARDO MENDOZA, OF FLORIDA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA.

BETH BLOOM, OF FLORIDA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA.

GEOFFREY W. CRAWFORD, OF VERMONT, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF VERMONT.