United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 160 WASHINGTON, MONDAY, JULY 21, 2014 No. 114

House of Representatives

The House was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Tuesday, July 22, 2014, at 12 p.m.

Senate

MONDAY, JULY 21, 2014

The Senate met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the Honorable TIM KAINE, a Senator from the Commonwealth of Virginia.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal Lord, Your mercy and loving kindness endure forever. Thank You for the favor You have given our Nation, for blessing us in seasons of prosperity and privation.

May our lawmakers this day renew their commitment to seek first Your will as they strive to do what is best for America and live to honor You. Lord, help them to search for priorities that will unite and not divide them, remembering that unity brings strength. Provide them with the perspective of taking victory and defeats in stride, knowing that their steps each day are only part of the long journey of progress. Shield them from discouragement.

Lord, please be with the families of the victims of Malaysia flight 17.

We pray in Your merciful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

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

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

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

The bill clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, July 21, 2014.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable TIM KAINE, a Senator from the Commonwealth of Virginia, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

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

BRING JOBS HOME ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 453, the Bring Jobs Home Act.

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 453, S. 2569, a bill to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America.

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 5:30 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided and controlled in the usual form.

At 5:30 p.m. the Senate will proceed to executive session and vote on confirmation of the following nominations: Julie E. Carnes to be U.S. circuit judge for the Eleventh Circuit; Michael Lawson to be Ambassador on the Council of the International Civil Aviation Organization; and Eunice Reddick to be Ambassador to the Republic of Niger. We expect a rollcall vote on the Carnes nomination and voice votes on the Lawson and Reddick nominations.

It is such a shame that we have had to go through this stalling on Michael Lawson for the International Civil Aviation Organization. A terrible tragedy has taken place in the world—the shooting down of the Malaysian airplane with 290 totally innocent people on board, killing every one of them. That is his job. We tried to get him confirmed last week. No, they could not do that. We have tried to get him confirmed for months. They have held him up every step of the way. It is untoward that this is happening. They are holding up these nominations out of spite. That is too bad. This is a perfect example.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—S. 2631

Mr. President, it is my understanding that S. 2631 is at the desk and due for a second reading.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the bill by title for the second time.

The bill clerk read as follows:

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

Printed on recycled paper.

A bill (S. 2631) to prevent the expansion of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals Program unlawfully created on August 15, 2012.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I would object to any further proceedings with respect to this bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

BORDER CRISIS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we are facing a humanitarian crisis on our southern border. Thousands of migrants—the vast majority of them are children—fled to our border and other countries in the region to escape the growing violence in Central America. Most of these boys and girls come from three countries—Honduras, El Salvador, and Guatemala—where crime and lawlessness have resulted in chaos and anarchy. Honduras is the murder capital of the world, with more murders per capita than any nation on the planet. El Salvador and Guatemala are right behind. These statistics are stunning. In fact, we know that virtually all the homicides in these countries take place in the same cities these kids are leaving. Migration has spiked in the neighboring countries, not just the United States, as people try to escape this untoward violence.

Citizens of these three nations, though, are also imperiled by high rates of human trafficking, drug trafficking, sexual assaults, and widespread corruption. It is an understatement to say these are not safe places in which to live or to survive. Here is an article out of the New York Times, written by a woman by the name of Sonia Nazario, July 11—a new article. Here are just a few of the things she said:

Cristian Reyes, an 11-year-old sixth grader in the neighborhood of Neuva Suyapa, on the outskirts of [the capital], tells me he has to get out of Honduras soon—''no matter what.''

He is an 11-year-old boy.

In March, his father was robbed and murdered by gangs while working as a security guard protecting a pastry truck. His mother used the life insurance payout to hire smugglers to take her to Florida. She promised to send for him quickly, but she has not.

Three people he knows were murdered this year. Four others were gunned down on a nearby corner in the span of two weeks at the beginning of this year. A girl his age resisted being robbed of $5. She was clubbed over the head and dragged off by two men who cut a hole in her throat, stuffed her panties in it, and left her body in a ravine across the street from Cristian's house.

''I'm going this year,'' he said.

Think about what this woman wrote. Think about what this boy said. After hearing this, can anyone blame these boys and girls and their families for doing everything they can to stay alive? One of the easiest ways to stay alive, even though it is really hard, is to leave.

One can imagine how bad things are in these squalid homes and neighborhoods if these children and their families are willing to trek across dangerous terrain with little food, little water, putting themselves at the mercy of bandits, thieves, coyotes, and cartels.

These kids are so desperate that when they reach our border, they immediately surrender themselves to the first person they encounter. They are not sneaking over the border. They are getting there for safety. They are desperate.

The truth is that we have taken steps to secure our border. So regardless of what the American people may hear from the Republicans, this is not an issue about bigger walls or more barbed wire or more drones or more helicopters or more personnel on the ground or National Guardsmen. We have doubled the number of Border Patrol agents. We have drones patrolling the air—I think there are six of them. We are catching undocumented immigrants and drug traffickers in record numbers.

After visiting the Rio Grande Valley, one FOX News reporter—FOX—said: ''There is some evidence that border security, as it stands now, is actually working pretty good, pretty well.'' This is FOX, not a friend of President Obama's. They never give him the benefit of the doubt. But they said it is working pretty well, pretty good.

But if you do not want to take FOX News's word for it, just this past weekend two Democratic Senators and a Republican Senator went down to look around, to see the crisis firsthand. One Senator asked a senior Border Patrol official, ''Is it true that border security is better than ever?'' That is a quote. He responded, ''It is true.''

How does this assessment compare to what we have heard from the Republican Congress? This morning the Republican leader disagreed with our border enforcement official, claiming that the current crisis further illustrates how insecure the border is.

I repeat: These children are not sneaking over the border. They look to the border for safety. So whom would one believe—our Border Patrol officials out their on the frontlines, a FOX News reporter who was there on the frontlines, or the Republican leader? It is pretty clear where the weight of evidence is.

Finally, our border security is working so much better, but our Border Patrol infrastructure is not equipped to care for tens of thousands of children. Barbed wire does not do that. High fences do not do that. Virtual fences do not do that. Drones do not do that. Helicopters do not do that. What we need now are resources to temporarily house and feed those children, administer deportation or asylum proceedings, and give border agents the necessary tools to keep our borders secure. They need to be temporarily taken care of until a decision is made on what should happen to them. It has to be done in a humane fashion.

Our challenge is to treat these children as children should be treated, consistent with American values. The White House emergency supplemental request does just that. If the Departments of Homeland Security and Health and Human Services do not get these resources, they are going to run out of money in a few weeks—out of money.

All we hear from the Republican Congress is blame. It is all the fault of Barack Obama. It is his fault. It is his fault these kids are coming. It is his fault the border, I guess, is secure. They are coming and turning themselves in.

Congressional Republicans are suggesting that the thousands of young migrants have come to America as a result of President Obama's 2012 deferred action plan. They are saying that is the reason for all of this trouble. But that is nonsense. This article I held up—a long article—does not mention a word from anybody she interviewed that they are coming because of deferred action. They are coming because of fathers being robbed and murdered by gangs while they are working as security officers and the other vile things that are happening to human beings.

We need the resources to temporarily house and feed these children, to legally administer whatever proceedings are necessary, and give border agents the necessary tools to keep our borders secure. I repeat: If they do not get the resources, they are going to be out of money. Then what are we going to do? I guess the Republicans will blame Obama. It is our job—our job. He cannot do it alone.

We have 45 obstinate Republicans who are not letting us get anything done about anything, certainly not anything dealing with immigration.

Cristian, the boy from this New York Times article, as I said, does not mention DACA at all. He does not mention DREAMers. He talks about the violence he sees as a boy—with his eyes. These kids are fleeing Honduras, El Salvador, and Guatemala and are heading anywhere they can to escape the violence. They are not just fleeing to the United States; they are going anyplace they can. They are heading to Panama, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, and Belize. In those countries I have just mentioned, asylum claims have spiked 712 percent over the past several years. Think of all the children who don't make it.

This crisis—the humanitarian crisis on our border—has nothing to do with DREAMers—children who have lived most of their lives as Americans even though they were brought here illegally. Yet Republicans would have us believe the two are inseparably connected. This is clearly not true.

The junior Senator from Texas is trying so hard to link these two groups of children. In fact, the junior Senator from Texas is saying that before he will agree to the White House supplemental request, which would give our Border Patrol the resources it needs to

care for these refugee children, President Obama must end the deferred action program.

We just read some legislation on the floor a few moments ago. That is what it is—no money for these poor boys and girls until, I guess, you deport them—hundreds of thousands of people who are here because they deserve to be here.

Republicans, in attacks such as this, are resorting to ransoming children to get their way, and that is shameful. The assistant Republican leader, the senior Senator from Texas, who has authored legislation to prevent any meaningful hearing process for migrant children, appears to support the junior Senator's plan. The bill put forward by the senior Senator from Texas implements a process that will send these children back to dangerous places without some minimal concern for their health and well-being. If people were treating animals the way these boys and girls are being treated, they wouldn't send an animal back to this, let alone a little boy or girl.

Neither of the plans put forward by the junior or senior Senators from Texas address the underlying issues. And what is the real issue?

The Presiding Officer has lived in South America. He is one of the few Senators who speaks fluent Spanish. He is a member of the Foreign Relations Committee.

So what is the real issue?

The Presiding Officer could tell us what the real issue is if he were able to speak now.

Why are these children arriving at our southern border. As Nobel laureate Oscar Arias, who was President of Costa Rica and did a good job in an overwhelmingly bad situation, said yesterday in the Washington Post: ''The root cause is the violence and poverty that make these children's lives at home intolerable.''

We hear that from the schoolboy's message to us. Deporting DREAMers already here or speeding up the process for sending children who need protection back to their crime-ravaged homes does not address the root cause.

In fact, it will only break up families who are already here and ensure that we see these migrant children again in a few months if they survive, because they are not going to stay there. Many of them won't survive, but if they do, they will try to come back again until things become tolerable. Instead of playing a game of hot potato with thousands of innocent children, let's address the pressing needs we have now, which is to treat these kids humanely.

I have had the good fortune of traveling in every country in South America except Belize and Uruguay. Cuba is sending huge numbers of physicians all over South and Central America; China has a lot of money and projects there.

We—because of the stringency of what is happening with our appropriations bills—took months and months to get a Peace Corps Director. The Peace Corps helps, but without the Director it was kind of wobbly. The Agency for International Development has a good program, but it doesn't have much money at all. We do very little to help those countries.

We have Venezuela. Chavez ships hundreds and hundreds of teachers and oil to those countries, and we do nothing. For a fraction of what we spend on our border, we could help those countries stabilize.

We need to get resources to our Border Patrol agents and others who are caring for these children from Central America. We need judges to hear these kids' cases and decide whether they need protection or need to be sent back home.

The world is watching how this great democracy of ours responds to this crisis. Congress must act now and give the administration the funding it needs to temporarily house and feed these boys and girls and reinforce the infrastructure to process thousands of asylum deportation claims.

We had a big show not long ago where we provided $35 billion to help veterans. We have spent trillions of dollars in two wars—unpaid for, by the way. That is what President Bush wanted, and that is what he got. He squandered the surplus we had—a surplus of over 10 years when he took office that was trillions of dollars. But now we are being asked to spend a few dollars to take care of these people who have come back in need—as our veterans. Senator SANDERS has been working for well more than 1 month to get them to try to agree to something, and it looks to me as if they are going to come back with nothing.

The conference has not been completed. Why? Because they have to spend money on these people on whom they were glad to spend money to take them to war. But now they are back. They are missing limbs. They have many post-traumatic stress problems, a lot of medical issues, and no money is there.

I am afraid that is where we are headed with this other situation. I am afraid we are headed to the place where either Republicans get to deport all these DREAMers—what the Texas Senators obviously want—or just give these kids no hearings at all and just shove them back. It is not fair.

The American people want these kids to be treated fairly. If the kids don't belong here, let's have somebody decide they don't belong here and have somebody do what needs to be done. But to just ignore the issue and run out of money—what do we do?

What we should do is legislate. We are not doing that.

I have said on the floor a number of times—I repeat—for 5½ years Republicans have opposed everything that President Obama has wanted—everything. That is what they set out to do 3 days after he was elected, and they have stuck by that. Scores of ambassadors' positions are not filled, and legislation has gone wanting.

They want to be able to show there is a Democrat in the White House and Democrats control the Senate, but the American people are not realizing a small minority can stop us from doing everything—and that is what they have done with the so-called filibuster, hundreds of them. I only hope this November people will respond, as I believe they will, and say: This is enough.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

Would the Chair announce the business of the day.

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

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 5:30 p.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.

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

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

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

45-YEAR ANNIVERSARY OF THE LUNAR LANDING

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, 45 years ago yesterday the entire world was riveted to their television sets—often a television image that was grainy, black and white, and flickering—as we heard the report, ''The eagle has landed.'' Then we saw Neil Armstrong come down the ladder of the lunar lander, and that is when he made the famous statement, ''That's one small step for man, one giant leap for mankind.''

In the context of that day 45 years ago, unless one was of sufficient youth to not have a memory, anyone will remember exactly where they were and what they were doing, because that was an extraordinary time for the entire planet. This Senator at the time was an Army lieutenant. At the lift-off 4 days earlier, I had been in Belgrade, Yugoslavia, and had gone to the embassy asking if they had a television so I could watch the lift-off in my hometown area of Brevard County where, from this launch pad, my family had homesteaded under the old Homestead Act in 1913, working the land for years, eking out a living which, under the Homestead Act, was a way of populating the country—particularly the westward expansion but that was also the southward expansion, into unsettled lands like Florida. I have a

copy of that deed of 160 acres of land, signed by Woodrow Wilson to my grandparents in 1917. That land sits today at the north end of the space shuttle runway at the Kennedy Space Center. It is only a few miles from the launch pad where Apollo 11 launched, and years later in the early part of the Space Shuttle Program I had the privilege of launching with the crew of STS–61C.

But at that moment 45 years ago, I had gone into the embassy in Belgrade, and they did not have a television set that would show the lift-off. I asked if there was any way of getting a communication. They said: Go outside of the city on those high hills and stick up your shortwave radio antenna and get the BBC from London. My friends and I did exactly that. When that rocket, the Saturn V, lifted off, there were three young Americans screaming at the top of our lungs: ''Go, baby, go.''

Four days later, I was on my way back to the United States and was staying overnight in a London hotel. I got the desk to call me in the middle of the night, somewhere around 3:00, and turned on that flickering black-and-white television set to see Neil Armstrong come down the ladder and issue that famous statement.

Today at the Kennedy Space Center is a ceremony commemorating that event 45 years ago yesterday. I happened to bump into Buzz Aldrin yesterday at the Orlando airport as he was on his way to join with Mike Collins, who was the third of the three Apollo astronauts. They are there today to dedicate the operations and checkout building at the Kennedy Space Center to be named for the commander of that mission and the first one to set foot on the Moon—Neil Armstrong. It is that very same building where those astronauts were in quarantine before they went to the launch pad, it is that very same building where so many of the space missions have been prepared, and it is that very same building, now named for Neil Armstrong, which is preparing the spacecraft that will be the forerunner of taking us in our next journey to another celestial body—this time the planet Mars.

That spacecraft, Orion, will be tested at the end of this year in a ballistic reentry, going out some 30,000 miles, to come back in at a very steep descent to test the new protective materials on the heat shield. In the old days we had an ablative material on the blunt end of the capsule that would burn up on reentry coming through the fiery heat of reentry, 3,000 degrees Fahrenheit. Part of the heat shield would burn up. Today, they have much more high-technology techniques that will repel the heat in order to save the crew, and that test will come at the end of the year.

When we shut down the Space Shuttle Program, most Americans felt as though the human space program was shut down. That is not the case. We have an orbiting national laboratory that is part of the International Space Station, with two American astronauts and an international crew—a total of six astronauts onboard, doing research right now, as they have been.

As a matter of fact, to give a visual mind's-eye idea of how big this International Space Station is, it is 120 yards long. Visualize from one goalpost and one end zone to the other goalpost, and that is how big the International Space Station is, and six humans are on board right now.

We are already developing the rockets that are delivering cargo—American rockets—and those rockets are now in a competition in NASA as to which ones will be selected to carry humans, and then all of the redesign, the redundancies of systems, the escape mechanisms, will be incorporated in order to make it safe for humans. We are expecting that first American launch of Americans onboard American rockets to be in 2017. Then the American people will realize that we have been in space all along.

We can speak of the wonders of our space program—the Hubble space telescope that has been on orbit carried by a human crew that has now unlocked the secrets of the universe. The follow-on telescope named after the first NASA Administrator James Webb will peer back in time to the very beginning of the universe and will bring us additional knowledge about how we got here and how it all started in this incredibly infinite thing called the universe, of which the cosmos as we look out is so large we can't comprehend it.

Our space program is vigorous, and now we will move into a new era starting right there in the building that is being dedicated today in memory of Neil Armstrong, a building that will assemble the spacecraft called Orion which will launch with Americans in 2021 for the beginning of a mission that will capture a distant object—an asteroid—fly to it, rendezvous, explore it, as we start the systems, the methods, building and creating the new technologies that will then allow us to take a human crew all the way to the planet Mars, land them, and bring them back safely to planet Earth.

So this is a day that we remember, and we remember an astronaut who was taken way too early from us, because Neil was only 82 years old.

Although of the original seven, which Neil was not a part of, we only have one left; that is, John Glenn, the first American to orbit the Earth, a former Senator of this body in his nineties. He looks terrific.

After the Mercury Program came the Gemini Program and then came the Apollo Program, and that is the celebration that has just occurred, celebrating 45 years. It is hard to believe it has been that long. Yet that was a day the world stopped as they gazed, fixed on their television sets, as a human from planet Earth set foot on another celestial body. That was quite an accomplishment, but there is a lot more to come.

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

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

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

BRING JOBS HOME ACT

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to join with Senator WALSH from Montana as he is leading us in the effort to pass the Bring Jobs Home Act, which is pretty basic in terms of where our values and priorities are in terms of our tax policy.

I know we are in the process of determining whether to bring that up. Hopefully we will do that. The American people say it is a no-brainer to bring up this bill and pass it. The reason, first of all, would be the fact that people understand that we need a middle class. We essentially started the middle class 100 years ago. We started it with some pretty basic policies in my State in 1914 when Henry Ford decided to invest in Detroit and Michigan and America and double the salary of his employees so that they could afford to buy his automobiles. He was really doubling down on America and on manufacturing in America. We have seen multiple ways in which that took off and literally created the middle class of our country.

Today we see the middle class under assault, folks working hard trying to hold on. People who felt in the past that if they worked really hard they could get into the middle class now feel as if the system is rigged against them.

We are really in a fight as to whether we are going to move forward and have a strong middle class. Every other country wants what we have. Too many countries have a few very wealthy people and a lot of extremely poor people, and they envy the middle-class economic engine we have had in this country.

As we look at how we move forward to keep and expand the middle class, we have to look for ways in which we can support our workers and our businesses that are investing in America. I believe our workers can outcompete anybody as long as the rules are fair.

There are a lot of ways we need to deal with the rules, but right now we have a tax code that really puts a thumb on the scales against our workers. At this point in time, after the last 10 years where we have actually seen 2.4 million jobs shipped overseas, we still have a tax code where American taxpayers are footing the bill for this movement, which is stunning. I think every time I have talked to people about the fact that when a company packs up and moves, the workers, the

community, the taxpayers pay for that through write offs in the Tax Code, people say: You have got to be kidding. Why did we let that happen?

Well, the Bring Jobs Home Act is a way to address that and to stop it from happening. Let me talk about the very specific and very simple ways we do that. We would stop the taxpayer subsidies that pay for moving costs. We instead would say to companies: If you are coming back, you can write off those costs. If you want to move back, you can write off those costs, and we will add an additional 20 percent tax credit for the cost of moving, so you get an additional tax cut. So if you want to come home, we are all for it. You can write off those costs. You will get an additional tax cut. But if you want to leave this country, you are on your own.

It is very simple. That is what this does.

Are there other things we need to do in the Tax Code? You bet. We have very serious issues. More and more of our companies are using this process called inversion. It seems to me that a good place to start a full discussion about how we have a tax code for America, that invests in America, that rewards American business and American workers, families, communities, is to start with the Bring Jobs Home Act. Surely everybody on both sides of the aisle ought to be able to agree that we would not pay for the cost of shipping jobs overseas through the Tax Code.

I also wish to commend a lot of companies right now that are actually bringing jobs home. It is exciting for me, being from a major manufacturing State, to see that we are having a resurgence in manufacturing. For a number of reasons—including lower energy costs, transportation costs, and a resurgence in manufacturing—we are seeing jobs come home. We are seeing manufacturers such as Ford and Caterpillar and GE, which have announced major investments in the United States, bringing jobs back from Japan and Mexico and China. This is good. We want that. There are smaller manufacturers that are taking advantage of our skilled and ready workforce. Over 80 percent of the companies actually bringing jobs back are companies with less than $200 million in sales.

Companies are taking a look and they are coming back. We want to reward that. When they look at the Tax Code, we want them to see the right message. We want folks to see that, hey, you know what, if you are one of the good guys and you are bringing jobs home, we want to give you some extra help—to pay for that with an extra tax credit. But we also want to send a message to those who are thinking about leaving: Our Tax Code will no longer reward your leaving America.

I do not know how many times I have heard from workers saying they not only are insulted by paying for the cost of the move through the Tax Code, but oftentimes they are training their replacements from other countries. The replacements come over and they train them. I mean, this is craziness.

At a time when too many people have lost their jobs and are looking for that fair shot—what is the next job, what is the next opportunity for them—how do we make sure the Tax Code, our laws, and our investments work for Americans and give everybody a fair shot? That is what this is about. It is very much about making sure we have a fair shot for every American. Part of that is making sure that we have good-paying jobs in America and that our Tax Code is rewarding the creation of those good jobs and rewarding the companies that are bringing jobs home.

I again thank Senator WALSH for his leadership. He has been very clear about how this affects his State of Montana and his concerns about this issue. I thank all of those who are cosponsors and working with us on this bill. I hope it will be brought up as soon as possible. This is really an opportunity for all of us to show the American people that we get it, that we are willing to work together on a bipartisan basis to do something that is very simple and very straightforward and say: As an American we are no longer going to pay for the move, and when you move jobs overseas, the Tax Code is not going to pay for that. But we will stand together in supporting those efforts that help companies bring jobs home.

I hope when we do have the vote on this issue we will see a resounding yes from everyone. I know the American people would love to see a strong bipartisan vote right now that would actually address something they care about deeply, which is the ability to have a good-paying job, to work hard, play by the rules, and have a fair shot to get ahead, which is what America has been all about. That is who we are as opposed to other places—the ability to have the opportunity to work hard and get ahead. Everybody needs to know that fair shot is still available to them. The Bring Jobs Home Act is part of letting people know it is.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

EXECUTIVE ACTIONS

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, a few weeks ago I wrote my colleagues a letter that had a serious front line about policies being executed, we are told, by the President that would seriously undermine the constitutional structure of our Republic and give to the President powers that would allow him to take powers he had never been given.

Subsequent to that, a George Washington law professor, Mr. Jonathan Turley, remarked during recent congressional testimony:

> When President Obama pledged to circumvent Congress [he was referring to his State of the Union Address] he received rapturous applause from the very body that he was proposing to make practically irrelevant.

Professor Turley emphasized that the ''most serious violations, in my view, are various cases where he went to Congress, as in the immigration field, as in the health care field, asked for very specific things and was rejected and then decided just to order those on his own.''

He testified before a House committee. Professor Turley I think has been known as a Democrat. I think he said he supported President Obama's election. He is not a partisan person. He is an observer who has testified before Congress many times and is well respected, and that statement should cause concern on the part of every Member of Congress.

Is it so? Is it so that he asked for the very specific things that were rejected by Congress and he decided to just order them with his pen on his own?

The primary immigration action Professor Turley was referring to was the President's decision to implement the DREAM Act by fiat, providing administrative amnesty and work permits to an entire class of illegal immigrants.

Professor Turley described it as '' . . . the clear circumvention of Congress. And for Congress not to act in my view borders on self-loathing.''

Is that a serious comment? I think it is exactly right. He is exactly right on this. Has Congress no gumption at all?

Multiple news reports have now made it clear that the President is now considering an Executive immigration action on a scale so far and indeed beyond our own imagination. Here is how that action was described by the National Journal, a prestigious publication in our country. This is the poster. This is what the National Journal reported: ''President Plans To Expand Unilateral Executive Amnesty.''

Executive amnesty means the Chief Executive, the President, expanding Executive amnesty including work permits for illegal immigrants and visa overstays.

> Obama made it clear he would press his executive powers to the limit.

I would say well beyond the limit, according to Professor Turley. The article continues:

> He gave quiet credence to recommendations from La Raza and other immigration groups that between 5 million to 6 million adult illegal immigrants could be spared deportation under a similar form of deferred adjudication he ordered for the so-called Dreamers in June 2012.

The article is referring to the DREAM Act that the President executed. One of the things that I think is extremely important, colleagues, is that what they are suggesting is that 5

million to 6 million people will be given a document that basically provides them legal status in America. The article continues:

Obama has now ordered the Homeland Security and Justice departments to find—

Ordered them to find—

Executive authorities that could enlarge that non-prosecutorial umbrella by a factor of 10.

That is all with the DREAM Act. 10 times that which was done. Continuing:

Senior officials also tell me Obama wants to see what he can do with executive power to provide temporary legal status to undocumented adults.

This is 5 million to 6 million. That is what a factor of 10 means. That is maybe more than half of the people who are illegally in the country today. Congress has considered these matters at great length and Congress set the law as to how someone enters the country lawfully and how someone enters the country, in effect, unlawfully and what is acceptable and what is not acceptable.

The President is the chief law enforcement officer in America. The FBI, DEA, Border Patrol officers, ICE officers, Attorney General all work for him, and the leaders of those organizations serve at his pleasure. He can remove them at will if they don't carry out his policies.

He has ordered the Homeland Security and Justice Departments, to find Executive authorities—not to see if they could find them but to find them—because he has a policy he wants to carry out and Congress doesn't agree with him.

I will read another poster quoting Professor Turley. He talks about the danger, colleagues. This is dangerous.

Does anybody not respect this institution? Do we not respect the House of Representatives, the Senate? Have we become so partisan that we don't care what the President does to diminish Congress? Don't we have an institutional responsibility, a constitutional responsibility to defend the legitimate powers of Congress?

Sure, we can disagree sometimes, but this one is not a matter of disagreement, it seems to me. This is an overreach of dramatic proportions.

Professor Turley said:

The President's pledge to effectively govern alone is alarming, and what is most alarming is his ability to fulfill that pledge. When a president can govern alone, he can become a government unto himself, which is precisely the danger the framers sought to avoid.

Certainly they sought to avoid that. They were very suspicious and aware that the tendency of chief executive officers is to assume more power than they are given. So they created a strong Congress and they gave certain powers to Congress that could not be delegated to the executive branch.

Professor Turley, in his most recent testimony before the House Rules Committee—I believe last week—said:

What we're witnessing today is one of the greatest crises that members of this body will face . . . It has reached a constitutional tipping point that threatens a fundamental change in how our country is governed.

No matter what somebody thinks about immigration issues or health care issues, there are limits on what the President can do without Congress.

So the President says: Congress will not act; therefore, I have to act.

Have you ever heard that? They used to say Federal judges would say that. They would say: The legislature will not act. Governor King will not act. The court has to act.

That is not so. That is so bogus. If a Governor decides not to act, if a Congress decides not to act, if a State legislature decides not to act and do what some President would like to see done, that is a decision. It is every bit as real and firm a decision as if they had passed a law. If they are asked to pass a law and they say no, that is a decision reached through the legislative branch by people duly elected from all over this country who come to this Congress to pass laws.

I am very frustrated that my Democratic colleagues are not sufficiently concerned about it, and we certainly need more discussion from the loyal opposition, the Republicans on this question.

Do my Democratic colleagues express concern about it? Not that I have seen. They seem to celebrate it.

The newspaper, El Diario, quotes New Jersey Senator BOB MENENDEZ, saying:

Sen. Bob Menendez (D–N.J.) said Friday that he has ''no doubt'' that President Barack Obama will deliver on his promise to take executive action on immigration despite the current attention on the unaccompanied minors crisis.

It goes on to be quoted there as saying:

One executive action that Senator Menendez and other Democrats are pushing for is the expansion of Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program, which provides deportation reprieve and work permits to undocumented youth.

Colleagues, it is one thing to be less than vigorous in carrying out deportations as the law requires; it is quite another class of action to give people who are unlawfully in the country a document from the President that says you can work and stay in the country—to give them legal status when Congress has considered this and rejected it. It is beyond the power of the President.

I wrote a letter to my colleagues, Democrat and Republican, before this testimony about these planned executive actions that I had been reading about. I said they would amount to an—

. . . executive nullification of our borders as an enforceable national boundary, [guaranteeing] that the current illegal immigration disaster would only further worsen and destabilize.

We cannot provide continuous amnesty on a regular basis and ever expect everybody not to attempt to come to the country if they believe they, too, in a manner of years—maybe now even fewer years—will be rewarded for their unlawful act by being put on a path to citizenship or permanent status.

So I therefore make two requests today:

I believe any border legislation that is sent to the Senate by the House of Representatives should include specific language denying the President any funds to execute his planned work permits. Congress clearly has that power. We can appropriate or not appropriate money. We can say that money cannot be spent for this or that thing. So we have every right to say the President should not spend money delivering work permits to people whom Congress has declared to not be lawfully able to work in America. I believe the President's actions are in clear contravention of the law, and I feel strongly about that.

Second, I am calling on every Senate Democratic colleague to stand up and be counted. Senator CRUZ has a bill that would stop this Presidential overreach. It is very simple. It lays out that we won't spend money providing legal documents to people unlawfully in the country as defined by the law of America and as defined by the Congress of the United States.

So I ask: Will you cosponsor Senator CRUZ's bill, and let us defend our constituents? Or, will our congressional colleagues remain complicit in the nullification of our laws and basically the nullification of border enforcement?

I would make a final note on what we owe to the citizens of this country. President Obama's illegal work permits add to the already huge flow of lawful work permits issued by the Federal Government. Between 2000 and 2013, we lawfully issued almost 30 million work and immigration visas. To put that number in perspective, 30 million is about the entire population of El Salvador, Honduras, and Guatemala combined.

This matter and our situation today are in disarray as a result of confused and politically driven thinking by this administration. It just is. I wish it weren't so, but it is. Obama administration officials have gone so far as to describe amnesty as a civil right. That is an argument against the very idea of a nation-state and the idea of a nation's borders. Of course there is, and can be, no civil right to enter a country unlawfully and then to demand lawful status and even citizenship. Of course there is not. How could this possibly be, that the Attorney General of the United States of America would assert that people have a constitutional right to enter unlawfully and be given amnesty? That is the kind of thinking which has got us into this fix, and it has encouraged the flow of unlawful immigration.

The actual legal rights that are being violated here today I suggest are the rights of the American citizens.

As Civil Rights Commission Member Peter Kirsanow warned, our African-American citizens often are the ones who are hurt the most, as well as recent immigrant arrivals and working Americans. What about their rights? They have sweat and bled and died for this country, been called on to serve and responded, paid their taxes, raised their children, tried to do the right thing day after day. What about their rights? What about the right of every citizen to the protections our immigration laws afford? Will no one rise to their defense?

We need an immigration policy that helps all residents—including millions of immigrants who have come to America. We want to help them rise into the middle class and above. We need rising wages, not falling wages. We can't help those living here today if we keep bringing in record numbers of new workers to compete for their jobs, to drive up unemployment, and then pull down wages. That is just a fact.

After decades of large-scale immigration, and with large illegal immigration flows in addition, we need to get serious and establish a principled policy of immigration and consistently enforce it, a policy that is honorable, that we can be proud of, and that serves the interests of all Americans—especially working Americans. These are the people who have made our country great. They deserve our attention and compassion, too. Middle America has been decent and right on this issue from the beginning.

For 40 years American people have called on Congress and called on their Presidents to create a lawful immigration system they can be proud of that serves the national interests and serves their interests. But what have they gotten? Nothing but more illegality and more demands for amnesty. The leaders of their country have not listened to them, and they aren't listening now. It appears to me the leaders of this country are not very interested in what the American people think.

The President plans to dramatically exceed his powers. It is the latest example of rejecting what the American people have asked for and it is a breathtaking violation of congressional power. It cannot be allowed to happen. We need to defend our Constitution, we need to defend the rule of law, and we need to defend the powers of Congress—and, at bottom, to defend legitimate rights, interests, and desires of the people who sent us here.

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. SESSIONS. 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. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I know the Chair serves as a member of the Budget Committee, as I am the ranking Republican on that committee. We have gotten a CBO, Congressional Budget Office, analysis—our official scorekeeper of spending—on the part of the proposal the President has presented to spend $4.346 billion to deal with the Southwest border crisis. What CBO has done is provided its cost estimates of the President's recent supplemental request for the Southwest border.

Significantly, CBO's analysis suggests that only $25 million of the $4.346 billion request will be spent this year. This indicates clearly that the agencies are not in dire need of supplemental funding from this Congress, certainly not in the degree asked for.

Again, CBO's analysis suggests that only $25 million out of the $4.3 billion request will be spent this year. What does that mean? It means we ought to slow down. There is no basis to demand a $4.3 billion increase in emergency spending. Every dollar borrowed—because we are already in debt. To spend $4 billion more is to borrow every penny of it. We should not do that until we find out more about what is happening at our border.

Twenty-five million dollars is a lot of money in itself. The Homeland Security and other agencies, Health and Human Services, have monies they can apply to these problems.

I am not saying no money is needed now, because we want to treat children and be helpful and treat them in a humanitarian way and a compassionate way. But we don't need $4 billion. That is clear. And we are not to be doing that. Thank goodness, the House of Representatives is looking at it carefully. They need to reject this request out of hand.

Colleagues, the fundamental problem here is that when the President of the United States did his DACA bill, when he did his DREAM Act Executive order, what did he do? He basically said: We are not going to deport young people. Then we began to see this surge of young people coming to America, and we are not deporting them effectively. They are being taken in, turned over to HHS, found housing, turned over to whoever comes and picks them up even if they are not citizens and not lawfully here. They are not being deported. So more have come in record numbers.

I guess, first of all, the very idea that we would spend—I guess for that project—$3.7 billion is a stunning amount of money. It is a huge amount of money at a time when we don't need to be borrowing money more than we have to. So I believe and would say to our colleagues, this plan does not call for the expenditure of money this year except for $25 million, and therefore we are not in a crisis that demands us to produce billions of dollars in revenue for this President to continue to carry out policies that only encourage more people to come to America and cost us even more in the time to come.

Mr. President, I thank the Chair and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

IMMIGRATION

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, from the beginning of our Nation we have had our challenges. We have had big challenges and little challenges, and somehow, some way, America has always risen to those challenges and addressed those in a way that was in the best interest not only of the present generation but future generations as well.

During those times, it was not true that our leaders always saw things the same way or agreed with each other 100 percent, but they saw greater value in trying to solve the Nation's problems rather than just saying: This is too hard; we can't agree, so we quit. That is not our tradition. That is not our heritage.

But looking at the present situation here in Washington, DC—and in particular the Senate—I find myself sometimes wondering whether those days have passed us by. I hope not, but I sometimes wonder whether the youth of America will witness in their lives some of the great attempts to address our Nation's challenges they read about in their history books.

Right now we know we have an urgent humanitarian crisis on the U.S.-Mexico border, more specifically in the State of Texas. I was back in McAllen, TX, on Friday, and I was grateful to see a number of our colleagues who were there: Senator HIRONO, Senator BLUMENTHAL, Senator MURKOWSKI, as well as a number of House Members, seeing for themselves what the crisis consists of and exploring what might be some of the possible solutions.

I was meeting with Congressman CUELLAR, who is from Laredo, TX, and with a number of local officials in the Rio Grande Valley. Many of them have expressed the same wish that I had expressed and Congressman CUELLAR had expressed. They wished the President would come down to the Rio Grande Valley and see for himself what we have seen. We know he had an opportunity to do that a couple weeks ago and chose not to do so, but they said the invitation is still outstanding. They would love to see him. The least you think the President might consider doing is congratulating the professional efforts of our Border Patrol and other law enforcement specialists who were down there doing an amazing job. Of course, FEMA and other Federal agencies are on the ground as well. That invitation is still outstanding, and I think the President would benefit from seeing this crisis for himself.

What I saw were children packed into detention facilities that were filled to overflowing, some with only a single toilet in the room, and conditions you would not want your children to be in. We learned even more about the horrific journey from Central America

through Mexico up to South Texas that many of these children had endured, and the truth is some of them didn't make it. Some of them who started this horrific journey from Central America simply died in the process. Those who did not die were subjected to horrific abuse, kidnapped, being held for ransom, women and girls being sexually assaulted enroute, because these corridors are controlled by transnational criminal organizations is what we call them—in other words, gangs, cartels—that view these children and migrants as commodities.

For a long time they have been selling drugs because drugs make them a lot of money. Now they realize they can transport children and adults because they make them a lot of money too. And if you just figure it out, if they can figure a way to move tens of thousands—or so far 57,000 children since October of last year—at $5,000 each, that is a lot of money. So these criminal organizations are reaping riches as a result of this sordid trafficking of human beings, and communities are being overrun and government resources are being strained.

The administration has said there is a humanitarian crisis, and I agree. They have also said—and this is Secretary Johnson among others—that a loophole in a law passed in 2008 is one source of the problem. Is it the only source of the problem? No, I don't think that is true. I think there is also an impression that somehow the United States and this administration are less than fully committed to enforcing our immigration laws.

If you read the intelligence gathered by the Department of Homeland Security from many of the migrants, including children who have been detained, many of them report being told there would be a permiso or basically a permission slip or visa issued to them if they were able to make it to the United States. So there is the combination of lack of detention facilities and the requirement of the Department of Homeland Security to turn these children and others over to Health and Human Services, but then they would be released based upon their promise to return at a future court date. This is what has been interpreted as permission to enter the country and stay.

So I know Secretary Johnson of the Department of Homeland Security understands the problem, although the President has a political problem. Many of the President's most ardent supporters are saying: We hope the President will just request money, but in the end we hope he will go even further with the deferred action Executive order that he issued in 2012 for the so-called DREAMers. Those are kids who obviously came into the United States at a young age with their parents but are boxed in; while they can get an education, they cannot get a job.

Rather than asking for a solution to this problem, the President has indeed asked for a blank check, and I for one am not for giving it to him. I am for doing what is compassionate. I am for treating these children and all immigrants and all human beings, for that matter, with the dignity and respect they deserve by virtue of their status as human beings. But we also need to realize that America cannot endlessly accept a flood of humanity from countries around the world who want to come to the United States, especially through an illegal smuggling system that does not respect their dignity as human beings or our laws. We simply cannot absorb or assimilate into America an uncontrolled flow of people from around the world.

Americans are the most generous people in the world when it comes to our immigration policies. We naturalize about 800,000 people a year, accept them into this great country and accept them as American citizens. But we simply cannot allow this sort of uncontrolled wave of humanity and expect to be able to deal with them in a dignified and appropriate way. We simply cannot continue to feed this business model of transnational criminal organizations and cartels that profit from their own criminality and for exploiting these children and other migrants.

I know in this political environment putting forth a solution is tough because usually what happens is you get attacked from the right and the left, which usually tells you that you are probably doing the right thing. But it is worth the effort to try to find a solution to this problem. It requires all of us to take our responsibilities when it comes to serving the public seriously; and it requires us to put forward solutions knowing that we are not going to come up with a perfect solution, but if we can come up with one that moves the ball 80 percent down the field, that is not bad. That is not a bad day's work. Certainly if we can help make somebody's life a little bit better or protect them from some of the horrific consequences of inaction, it is worth it.

I have—as the Presiding Officer knows—partnered with one of my colleagues in the House who happens to be a Democrat, HENRY CUELLAR, in a bipartisan, bicameral solution to this human crisis. If somebody has a better idea, we are all ears. But all I can hear is crickets. I don't hear a lot of other ideas. There are some and we ought to consider those, but mainly I haven't heard anybody come up with another solution to this loophole that is being exploited by these transnational criminal cartels other than the one that Congressman CUELLAR and I have proposed.

There have been some who have expressed concerns about the legislation. On the right there are some who have said this bill would make it easier for unaccompanied minors to achieve legal and asylum status. That is wrong. The HUMANE Act, which is what we call this legislation, would not change current law at all with regard to either a claim for asylum or achieving legal status. It would, however, make sure that current law is actually enforced by speeding up court dates and the removal process for unaccompanied children who don't satisfy some of these exceptions.

It is also worth reminding the American people that there are a number of fraud prevention measures in our current asylum laws that the HUMANE Act would not change, and—and this is important—more than 70 percent of those seeking asylum in the United States last year—more than 70 percent of those seeking asylum last year in the United States were ultimately not awarded that status. In other words, this is a rather narrow provision.

Some have also argued that the HUMANE Act would somehow expunge the removal orders that were issued to minors who came to the country illegally during the current surge and have already been released to State-based family members or sponsors. What our bill would actually do is allow the U.S. Government to replace those removal orders with new nonappealable orders that would allow for an expedited repatriation process for the children who were not qualified for asylum status or were not a victim of human trafficking.

On the left we have heard the claim that many of these children will not obtain the necessary legal representation they need. Wrong again. The HUMANE Act would not change current law which requires Health and Human Services to ensure to the greatest extent practicable that legal representation is provided for unaccompanied children.

I have not heard many of my friends on the other side of the aisle who actually supported the 2008 law unanimously complain about this aspect; in other words, what they are complaining about now in terms of inadequate legal representation they actually voted for in 2008.

Some worry that this bill would be a vehicle for comprehensive immigration reform, to which I would ask: Have you witnessed the dysfunction in the U.S. Senate? Do you actually think there is any real chance we will pass comprehensive immigration reform through both Houses of Congress this year?

Well, some have said there is also concern there are not enough protections in the bill for children. Yet we have added protections that don't already exist under current law, such as an expedited court hearing before a judge and for those credible claims, stronger safeguards to ensure children are not released in the hands of dangerous criminals or those who would abuse them. So after identifying a problem and a cause, one would think it would be easy for Republicans and Democrats, Congress and the White House, to come together on a solution. You would think that would be something we would do at a minimum in

fulfilling our job description. Sadly, the President has not seen fit to come forward to embrace the solution that is in front of him. Indeed, from press accounts we have learned that while he understands the nature of the problem, as does Secretary Johnson, and what would be necessary to fix it, the President simply does not want to disappoint some of the more radical activists who essentially say we ought to open the floodgates to people from anywhere around the world and let them come in at their will.

Well, I am discouraged to hear the remarks of the majority leader where he said he is not optimistic that we will be able to address this issue constructively and find a solution before we recess in August. I would think that would be a matter of some urgency because as we have seen since 2011, these numbers seem to double every year. In other words, they start out relatively low. They doubled from 2011 to 2012, from 2012 to 2013, and from 2013 to 2014. It is estimated there could be as many as 90,000 unaccompanied children detained at our southern border this year. So if it is 90,000 this year and we don't do anything about it, what will it be next year—180,000?

This is a bad situation that we have within our capacity to address if we can find a way somehow to do so, but it is going to take a President, it is going to take a majority leader, and it is going to take all of us who choose not to just take the easy way but to take the hard way, one that will lead to a solution to this humanitarian crisis. It won't happen just by throwing money at it without offering any real reforms that will actually fix what is broken in the 2008 law.

I close on this note, again, to plead with my colleagues: If you have a better idea, please come and tell us about it. We may want to embrace it. Is this perfect? No. Does this solve all that is broken in our immigration laws? No, it does not. This is a narrowly targeted solution to a national crisis and one that will, hopefully, positively impact thousands of children.

For those who want to see more, I would say this is a moment to do what we can, when we can and to show we are serious about the job of governing and coming up with responsible solutions.

If we can demonstrate to the American people we can actually do that on a bipartisan basis and fix this, relatively speaking, smaller but nevertheless urgent problem, maybe we can earn their trust enough to tackle some bigger problems in the future.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

INFRASTRUCTURE

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, as the Senate begins debate on transportation funding this week, it is clear to me that all sides—Democrats and Republicans—agree that what is needed most is a long-term plan for rebuilding our country's infrastructure.

The reality is we simply cannot have big league economic growth with little league infrastructure. Unfortunately, all over our country, we have potholes and sinkholes, and one of the reasons we are not seeing them filled is because there is no long-term plan or a plan that provides certainty and predictability for all sides—local government and businesses and developers and others—to know the funding will be there.

As we start the discussion that is going to go through the week about a bipartisan plan to go forward on transportation funding—as Senator HATCH and I and the Finance Committee have brought before the Senate today—I want all sides to know it is our view that to get to the long-term road, you have to have a short-term path, and that short-term path is what Senator HATCH and I have pulled together on a bipartisan basis which we hope our colleagues will support before the week is out.

I think all of the Senators understand what is at stake here. Allowing the highway trust fund to run dry would slam the brakes on critical infrastructure projects across the land. Let's be clear: It is nonnegotiable that Congress will prevent that from happening. No Senator wants State and local governments to have to pick and choose which projects move forward and which ones are to be set apart because Congress didn't do its job before the August break.

The reality is a transportation shutdown would be horrendous news for tens of thousands of construction workers facing layoffs. The damages would ripple throughout our economy. Businesses would have a tougher time getting products to market and customers through their doors. Commuters would spend more time sitting in traffic and burning through gas. Car owners would have to fork over more cash to replace their tires and fix their broken suspensions.

With all Americans having something at stake, Congress must act, and that is why it is so important, in my view, to pass the bipartisan PATH Act—Preserving America's Transit and Highways Act—this week.

As I have indicated, the Finance Committee came together on a bipartisan basis to advance this legislation to the Senate floor. Senator HATCH and I met regularly on this matter throughout the spring to reach a solution. When I first proposed a draft of a chairman's mark and announced a committee markup, Senator HATCH and the Finance Committee's Republicans asked for more time to reach a bipartisan consensus, and I agreed. We continued to talk almost each day, with our staffs in constant contact. Every member of the committee pitched in. When the committee reconvened to consider the modified legislation, it passed with virtual unanimity. This is a truly bipartisan plan.

Our colleagues in the other body have offered their own legislation. I wish to take a brief moment to highlight some of the differences between the two bills that, in my view, are quite important. As part of our effort to reach a bipartisan agreement, the Finance Committee agreed to adopt several of the funding sources proposed by the Ways and Means Committee. Those sources included customs user fees and pension smoothing. The Finance Committee's bill leaves room for customs user fees to continue to support vital trade programs. In the committee's view, that is an important tradition to protect.

The Finance Committee's legislation also leaves room for revenue from the pension smoothing provision to help secure multi-employer pension plans that face insolvency.

Finally, the Finance Committee's legislation draws some revenue by improving the enforcement of tax laws that are now on the books. I bring this up because I have seen some inaccurate accusations about what these enforcement provisions would do. Let's be clear: These are not new taxes. They are not tax increases. In fact, the Finance Committee even received a letter from Grover Norquist and the group Americans for Tax Reform saying so. Mr. Norquist is not soft on the question of tax increases, and he has indicated that these provisions are not tax hikes. What these provisions do is crack down on tax cheats and ensure that mortgage lenders provide homeowners with more tax information than they are usually getting today.

By contrast, it is my view that the other body not only missed an opportunity to strengthen tax compliance, but also weakened the solvency of pension plans and leaves no funds in reserve to address that problem down the road. The House approach for paying for transportation funding creates another funding problem for pension plans that Congress will have to solve in the future. In effect, as one colleague indicated to me, we have one challenge on our hands in terms of transportation, and if we now take the House approach, we will have two challenges on our hands: transportation and pension.

The Finance Committee, on a bipartisan basis, decided through the PATH Act to come to the Senate floor as the transportation shutdown approaches with tens of thousands of jobs on the line and advance a bipartisan proposal.

What is needed next after this legislation has passed and is safely in the rearview mirror is what I touched on at the outset: a long-term plan that would rebuild America's infrastructure and end the cycle of stopgap funding. That will require more than the bare minimum of fixing the highway trust fund. Even in the best of times when there is no threat of a transportation shutdown—we are making a little league infrastructure investment of less than 2 percent of our gross domestic product.

Our big league competitors are going a different route. In parts of Canada they put 10 percent of GDP into infrastructure projects, and China invests almost as much.

With such a small investment, it is getting harder for our country to maintain the transportation system it has, much less take up new projects that would help America compete with the world's other heavyweight economies.

For example, in our State the poor condition of many roads costs the average driver almost $175 per year. There are more than 1,300 bridges functionally obsolete, and more than 400 bridges are structurally deficient. The bill for repairs will only grow and grow as Congress waits to get serious about infrastructure.

We ought to look at managing the transportation system like owning a car. Responsible car owners don't let them fall into disrepair. They change the oil, rotate the tires, and fix the transmission when it is needed. It is all part of responsible ownership. Some day, if you want to resell the car or give it to your child, the car will be in good shape. It is time for this generation to be responsible owners of America's transportation system.

The challenge in the weeks and months ahead will be to find policies that can sustain the highway trust fund for good while finding new ways to draw investment dollars into American infrastructure. Priority one, in my view, ought to be to bring private capital off the sidelines and into the game on transportation. With interest rates as low as they are today, now is the time to act.

In that regard, I wish to commend my colleague from North Dakota, Senator HOEVEN, who has joined me in just such an effort. We call them TRIP bonds, transportation and regional infrastructure projects, to get more private capital into infrastructure. Senators WARNER, BLUNT, and BENNET have tried another approach.

As Chair of the Senate Finance Committee, I say to colleagues that all of the long-term approaches will be on the table when we get over this short-term challenge this week.

Our colleague from Kentucky, Senator PAUL, has a very important idea with respect to transportation, which is to look at repatriation. Senator SCHUMER, my seatmate on the Finance Committee, has another approach. The point is that all of these promising ideas—each of which has the opportunity for bipartisan support—deserves consideration, and as Chair of the Finance Committee, I commit this afternoon to do that.

When the Committee approved the PATH Act, there was unanimous agreement to work together on a long-term solution to our infrastructure challenge. I have talked with a number of Senators on both sides, and the message is clear: The Senate is ready to act. This will not become another extender issue with Congress kicking the can down a crumbling road again and again.

I will close with this. We have an important job to do this week. I hope we will continue the Finance Committee's bipartisan work and pass the PATH Act so we can protect thousands of construction jobs and end the threat of a transportation shutdown.

Some people have said there is no time and no room for compromise with our colleagues in the House—that the House is saying, it's our way or no highway. I disagree. By working together, our colleagues in the House and the Senate can reach a bipartisan agreement very quickly, and then we will move on to the next challenge and solve our infrastructure crisis for the long term.

I yield the floor.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 5 minutes.

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

The Senator from North Dakota.

UKRAINE

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I wish to start with my support of the comments of the Senator from Oregon. We need to get a highway bill done this week, and I look forward to working with him, particularly on a long-term plan with some of the concepts he has put forward. We need it for our infrastructure across this great Nation. Again, I look forward to working with the Senator in that endeavor and express my thanks.

I rise to speak on the issue of Ukraine and the need to address that situation and address it with a long-term strategy.

Last week Russian separatists shot down a Malaysian airliner with 298 souls on board. Innocent people were killed because Russia wants to control Ukraine—if not all of Ukraine, certainly Eastern Ukraine.

The Obama administration is struggling to respond. President Obama talks about the need for Vladimir Putin and Russia to be accountable. Meanwhile, Russia continues to deny what is going on. Putin continues to arm Russian separatists in Eastern Ukraine, separatists led by Russian special forces, military operatives armed and directed by Moscow.

We need to respond. Our country needs to respond, and we need to respond with a long-term strategy and not just talk and not a short-term strategy, and that is something we can do. We can respond, and we need to respond with a long-term strategy.

We can lead with strong sanctions against Russia—sanctions that would truly affect the banking sector and other sectors of their economy in a meaningful way. We can help Europe follow us with these same sanctions. We can help them by providing energy to the European Union.

Europe is dependent on Russia for its energy. I brought some charts to depict the situation. The first chart shows countries in Europe and how many of them get all or a very large share of their natural gas from Russia. So they are dependent on Russia for their energy, and that is an incredible source of strength for the Putin regime.

Here we see—I know it is somewhat difficult—all of these pipelines coming out of Russia through Ukraine and into the European Union, supplying all of that energy to these European countries. Because of that, we see all of these countries that are dependent on Russia. That is an incredible source of strength and power for Russia, and it is holding up Europe from engaging in the kinds of sanctions that could really stop Russia—stop the Russian economy and stop President Putin in his tracks.

We can break that trend and we can break that stranglehold by allowing more LNG—liquefied natural gas—exports from our country. We have the companies right now, today, that want to build LNG export facilities, but they are being held up from doing so.

I wish to go to my third chart. This isn't all of them, but right here there are 16 companies—13 on our coast, 3 in Canada—and 1 of these actually has received conditional approval. But here are 13 applications for companies that want to build LNG facilities to export natural gas, and they are being held up. All of these have been held up somewhere between 1 and 2 years. They can't even get permitted or approved by the Department of Energy to build those facilities.

What are we talking about? Let me give a specific example of one of them—a company my colleagues have probably heard of—ExxonMobil. They want to build a $10 billion facility at Sabine Pass in Texas. I just pointed this one out on this chart right here, in this area on the gulf. They are ready to go right now. They have been in the application process for maybe 1 or 2 years, and they think they are maybe halfway through it. So they have another year or 2 years before they can build a $10 billion facility that will move natural gas. They will bring it right into the UK, right into Europe. Why aren't we green-lighting this right now, today? Why do we continue to hold this up?

Some critics say it is going to take them some time to build it. Well, of course it is going to take some time to build, but the faster we get these projects permitted, the sooner they are going to get built. The reality is they will not only have an impact as they are able to move gas into the market, they will have an impact today because those European countries will know these other sources of supply are coming.

Also, Vladimir Putin knows we are serious about providing alternative energy to Europe, and I think that will make a big difference in terms of strengthening the European countries' readiness to join us with the kinds of sanctions we need to truly make a difference.

Two weeks ago I introduced legislation to do exactly what I am talking about—the North Atlantic Energy Security Act. The cosponsors include Senator MCCAIN, Senator BARRASSO, and Senator MURKOWSKI, who is the ranking member on the energy committee. Senator BARRASSO worked to put a lot of the legislation together. Senator MCCAIN has always been very active in the Ukrainian situation. Together we put together this bill with a lot of pieces of this legislation that have already been passed in the House—already passed the House. Quite simply, it will enable us to produce more natural gas, move it to market, and export it to our allies. It increases onshore production of natural gas. It allows us to gather it and move it to market, and it allows it to be exported.

Quite simply, what does that enable us to do? Well, States such as mine today are flaring off, burning off $1.5 million a day of natural gas because we don't have a market for it. So we just burn it. We just burn it because we can't get the kind of legislation we have developed passed. We can't get it to the floor for a vote. So instead of taking that natural gas—millions of dollars a day—that is going up in smoke and moving it down to these facilities and over to our allies, we are burning it.

It would be better for our economy. It would create jobs. It would be better for our environment. It would create jobs. It would certainly be better for our economic growth. It would create revenues to deal with the debt and deficit without raising taxes—just through economic growth. It would make a big difference for the national security of our country and our allies. It is common sense. What are we waiting for? Let's get beyond just talking about what needs to be done in Ukraine and let's get going. Let's get going with a long-term strategy.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. WICKER. I ask unanimous consent to speak for 5 minutes.

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

HEALTH CARE

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, I wish to subscribe to the views of my colleague from North Dakota on the importance of developing our great resource of natural gas and turning it into a liquefied form and solving a lot of the problems we face around the world. I also commend Senator HOEVEN and Senator WYDEN for the exchange they had briefly a few moments ago on a bipartisan approach to funding our infrastructure problems in the immediate and in the long-term sense.

I note, as I move to the topic of ObamaCare, the absence of any such bipartisan accord during 2009 when the Affordable Care Act was being debated in the Senate. Thus, we have what in April of 2003 Senate Finance Committee Chairman Baucus called a huge train wreck. He was right in seeing the train wreck coming on the rollout of the Web site, but it also has turned out to be a train wreck in far more ways than the Web site glitches and the ultimate fiasco.

The train wreck of the affordable health care act continues in the way the law is affecting health care coverage and the way it is affecting the pocketbooks of American families. These families were flatly told their health care premiums would go down. They were not told their health care premiums would moderate; they were told their health care premiums would go down. Instead, we have all of the problems we are facing with regard to ObamaCare in the way it affects women, in the way it affects wage-earners, and in the way it affects people who are looking for full-time employment. Frankly, the ObamaCare law continues to drag down our economy and our chances for economic growth.

Instead of seeing premiums drop by $2,500 on average each year as President Obama promised, families and individuals are spending more of their hard-earned dollars on health care costs under this so-called Affordable Care Act. The sticker shock will only worsen, and it is going to happen right around the corner.

In recent weeks several States have announced preliminary estimates for next year's premiums. The Wall Street Journal reports that many of these States' largest health insurers plan to increase premiums by between 8.5 percent and 22.8 percent. These are annual increases coming up right around the corner of 8.5 percent up to 22.8 percent. For many Americans, this means either paying a lot more or simply not being able to have coverage at all. The administration is trying to downplay the costs, but it is clear that once again ObamaCare is failing to live up to its billing.

Some States are particularly vulnerable to higher rates next year because of low enrollment among young adults or because few insurers have joined the exchanges. For example, in my home State of Mississippi 94 percent of enrollees are eligible for Federal subsidies, which means we have little competition to drive down rates. According to this year's numbers, my home State of Mississippi already has the third highest premiums in the Nation, and we can't afford them. Competition cannot flourish when the government is involved in setting mandates for benefits and controlling rates. Without a market-based approach, which I advocated in 2009, consumers lose out on choice and cost.

Particularly hardhit by the President's health care law are women and younger wage earners. With regard to women, for example, they are more likely to pay higher out-of-pocket costs under ObamaCare with plans with high deductibles because they typically visit the doctor more. As 57 percent of the part-time workforce, women are also more likely to have their hours cut because of the employer mandate.

I note that the employer mandate is increasingly unpopular among Democrats and Republicans.

Additionally, the law's limited physician networks have forced many women to choose different specialists for themselves and their children, thus making it less convenient for these women to get care for themselves and their children.

Stories from women across the country underscore these difficult realities. Last year a woman from Columbus, MS, wrote to tell me that her original health care plan was $500 per month before it jumped to $1,500 a month because of the ACA.

One woman from North Carolina gave this reaction to unaffordable premiums. She said:

> I've never worked this hard in my life. But I'm gonna continue working every day and keep hitting the books at night. I'm just trying to keep my head above water.

Another woman from Texas who could not find an obstetrician who would accept her insurance said this:

> It was mind-numbing, because I was just sitting there thinking, I'm paying close to $400 just for me to have insurance that doesn't work. So what am I paying for?

Women make approximately 80 percent of the health care decisions in America. More choices and lower costs would give them the flexibility they need to get the right insurance plan.

With regard to younger workers, they are generally healthier but earn less, and they are faced with daunting realities because of the health care law. Specifically, younger workers are forced to pay higher premiums to subsidize coverage for older Americans.

I was contacted by a constituent from Greenville, MS, whose healthy 27-year-old son lost his health insurance because of ObamaCare. The cost of his coverage went from $70 per month to nearly $350 per month even though the benefits improved only slightly. Although this young man had health insurance for 7 years, since he was 20 years of age, he is now questioning whether he can afford it.

Finally, all Americans are affected by a health care law that destroys jobs. Last month the economy added 288,000 jobs, but only a fraction of them were full time, as we know. The Obama economy is a part-time economy. Millions of Americans want full-time work.

The President's health care law was pushed through with no bipartisan input and in defiance of public opinion. After the Massachusetts special election, this Senate should have gotten the message that we needed to regroup and rethink this disastrous law, but the majority party pushed forward regardless. So it is no surprise that the law remains deeply unpopular today. According to a recent poll, 55 percent

of Americans wish it had never passed and 44 percent said America is now worse off because of the ACA.

In summary, under the affordable health care act women are worse off, younger workers are worse off, and people seeking full-time jobs are worse off.

Elections have consequences, and November will be no different. The American people have an opportunity to change the course of this disastrous law in 106 days.

I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 5 minutes.

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

HELSINKI COMMISSION

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I have the honor to chair the U.S. Helsinki Commission, which is well known for its commitment to human rights. It is also our participating arm in the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, the OSCE.

Starting when I first joined the Helsinki Commission almost 20 years ago, I worked on the issues of antisemitism and trying to deal with combating antisemitism. This is overt actions against Jews and Jewish institutions, which were on the rise. We tried to do something about it. In the early 2000s, working with Congressman HOYER and Congressman HASTINGS and Congressman SMITH and others, we made a commitment in the Helsinki Commission to bring up the increasing episodes of antisemitism and what we needed to do about it.

We saw increased episodes of violence against Jews and Jewish institutions. We saw that world events were used to try to justify antisemitic activities. As a result of the work of the U.S. Helsinki Commission, the OSCE determined that it was important enough to do a special conference on antisemitism. In 2004, we had the Berlin conference on antisemitism under the leadership of the United States and Germany.

I was proud to be a member of the U.S. delegation to the Berlin conference. Good work was done in that conference. We developed best practices, from dealing with Holocaust education, to police training to deal with identifying hate crimes. We had the first uniform collection of hate crimes statistics in the OSCE region, the responsibility of leaders to speak up against antisemitic activities. We provided technical assistance to countries to deal with antisemitism and to share their best practices. We also recommended a special representative to the chair in office, to put a spotlight on antisemitism and ways to combat it.

Today Rabbi Andrew Baker is that special representative to the chair in office. The chair in office this year is the Swiss chair in office.

Tomorrow, I will chair a Helsinki Commission hearing that deals with antisemitism, racism, and discrimination in the OSCE region. There are now three special representatives, one to combat antisemitism, one to deal with discrimination against Muslims, and one to deal with racism, xenophobia, and other forms of religious intolerance. They are all related. We find that hate crimes are hate crimes; that if a community is susceptible to antisemitic activities, it is also susceptible to anti-Muslim activities or activities against a person because of their race.

There is reason to be concerned. There is reason to be concerned about the rise of antisemitism today. This is 10 years after the Berlin conference. Last year the EU's Fundamental Rights Agency surveyed all of the EU countries. The results were alarming. Forty to forty-eight percent of the Jewish respondents felt it was not safe for them to remain in their country. We are talking about in Hungary, France, and Belgium. In those three countries, ranging between 40 and 48 percent, they were considering emigrating to Israel because they did not feel safe in their own country.

These fears are not without justification. The Anti-Defamation League surveyed over 100 countries and documented persistent antisemitic prejudice. In the EU elections extremist parties espousing antisemitic activities made remarkable progress. In Hungary and Greece extremist parliamentary parties associated with street militias were successful in elections.

In Hungary the extremist party Jobbik is the second most significant party and had erected a monument to a wartime leader and a self-declared antisemite. We also found laws passed in Europe that make it more difficult for Jews to practice their religion because of restrictions on being able to make kosher foods and making it difficult to wear head coverings.

We have seen, unfortunately, violent acts. In Kansas, in the United States, three people were murdered outside of a JCC. In May, in Brussels, three people were murdered at a Jewish museum. I mention this because even as we visit Europe today, we see signs of antisemitism. It is troubling to all of us.

This is the 10th anniversary of the Berlin conference coming up this year. We will be reconvening the OSCE states in order to evaluate the progress we have made over the last 10 years and additional progress that needs to be made. The Helsinki hearing tomorrow will give us an opportunity to concentrate on how the United States can continue to be a leader on this very important issue.

I wanted to share those comments with my colleagues.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak in morning business for up to 5 minutes.

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

CARNES NOMINATION

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, in a few moments the Senate will be called upon to confirm the nomination of the Honorable Julie Carnes to the 11th Circuit U.S. Court of Appeals in Georgia. I stand, along with my colleague Senator SAXBY CHAMBLISS, the senior Senator from Georgia, to commend Ms. Carnes to the entire body as an outstanding appointment.

I thank the President. Senator CHAMBLISS and I recommended Ms. Carnes when the openings took place on the 11th Circuit Court. He, with the advice of Kathy Ruemmler, his able assistant in the judicial part of his advisory board, brought the nomination forward to the Judiciary Committee of the Senate. I thank PAT LEAHY, the Senator from Vermont, the chairman of that committee, and CHUCK GRASSLEY from Iowa, the ranking member of that committee, for doing a judicious hearing, for giving all sides a chance to be heard, and for commending unanimously, on a voice vote, Julie Carnes to the Senate.

I am not going to talk for a long time, but I want to make a couple of very special points. Julie Carnes is a very special lady. For 22 years she has been a judge for the Northern District of Georgia, and the last 5 years she has been the senior judge. Before that she was on advisory panels for judicial sentencing and many other technical and judicial issues.

Her nomination is the nomination of someone with immense capacity, outstanding integrity, and outstanding ability. She is just the type of person the Presiding Officer and I would want to go to the bench. She is, as we call them in Georgia, a ''double dog.'' She graduated from the University of Georgia with her undergraduate degree and got her juris doctor degree from University of Georgia Law School, whose emblem is a bulldog. We call her a ''Double dog.'' She is an outstanding individual and will be an outstanding judge on the bench.

But there is a point of personal privilege I want to take for a minute. Up in heaven right now, at a sunset, Charlie Carnes is looking down, about to see his daughter Julie confirmed to the United States 11th Circuit Court.

Charlie Carnes was my mentor in the Georgia General Assembly for 12 years before he was appointed to be a State court judge in Fulton County, the largest county in the State of Georgia. Charlie is looking down on the daughter he is so proud of, and he is so proud that she is going to be confirmed by the Senate to one of the highest court appointments she could possibly achieve.

She is a chip off the old block. She is proof that an apple does not fall far

from the tree. Charlie was an outstanding Georgian, an outstanding American, an outstanding member of our State and our bar and our bench. I am so proud to be a part of those who recommended this nominee to the President of the United States.

I yield for my colleague, Senator CHAMBLISS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, I rise with my colleague Senator ISAKSON today in support of Judge Julie Carnes, who has been nominated by the President to serve as a circuit court judge for the 11th Judicial Circuit.

Judge Carnes has been a Federal district court judge for the Northern District of Georgia since 1992. She has been the court's chief judge since 2009. Her time on the district court has prepared her well for going to the 11th Circuit.

However, her preparation started long before she was confirmed to her current seat on the Northern District bench. For starters, being a judge is in her blood. As Senator ISAKSON referenced, her father Charlie Carnes was many things to many people. He was a Navy veteran, a State legislator, and a loving father. But for those of us in the Georgia legal community, from whence I came, we remember him best for his 20 years of service as a Fulton County State court judge, the last 17 years of which he served as chief judge.

After growing up in Atlanta, Judge Julie Carnes attended the University of Georgia where she earned both her bachelor and her law degrees. She then went on to clerk for Judge Lewis Morgan on the old Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals. Once she finished her clerkship, she served as an assistant U.S. attorney for more than a decade before assuming her position on the Northern District court bench. It is difficult to imagine a more qualified circuit court nominee than Julie Carnes.

The Senate Judiciary Committee appears to share my confidence. She was reported out by voice vote without a single objection to her nomination.

Moreover, this is a seat that needs to be filled, and it needs to be filled quickly. The 11th Circuit is the third busiest circuit in the country. Senator ISAKSON and I have been working very closely with the White House to address this vacancy since it came on 2 years ago.

Julie Carnes is my dear friend. I have known her for many years. She is the consummate trial court judge, receiving accolades from every single sector of the bar that regularly appears before her. Senator ISAKSON and I worked very closely with the President, as he indicated. We also worked with Senator LEAHY and Senator GRASSLEY and Kathy Ruemmler, the White House counsel, whom I particularly commend, someone who was very persistent. She was very professional in all of her dealings with us. It was a real pleasure to work with the White House securing a number of nominees, the first of which to come to this floor for confirmation is Judge Julie Carnes. This has been a long and arduous process, but there is no questioning its results.

I am pleased to recommend this highly qualified nominee. I urge my colleagues to support her confirmation.

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

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF JULIE E. CARNES TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

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

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Julie E. Carnes, of Georgia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eleventh Circuit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the prevous order, there will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided between the two leaders or their designees prior to a vote on the nomination.

Mr. CARDIN. I yield back our time.

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

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Julie E. Carnes, of Georgia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eleventh Circuit?

Mr. ISAKSON. 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 Alaska (Mr. BEGICH), the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU), the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL), and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), are necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER).

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

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

[Rollcall Vote No. 233 Ex.]

YEAS—94

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

NOT VOTING—6

Begich	McCaskill	Rubio
Landrieu	Menendez	Vitter

The nomination was confirmed.

NOMINATION OF MICHAEL ANDERSON LAWSON FOR THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR DURING HIS TENURE OF SERVICE AS REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA ON THE COUNCIL OF THE INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION ORGANIZATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Michael Anderson Lawson, of California, for the rank of Ambassador during his tenure of service as Representative of the United States of America on the Council of the International Civil Aviation Organization.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote on confirmation of the nomination.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I yield back any time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, all time is yielded back.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Michael Anderson Lawson, of California, for the rank of Ambassador during his tenure of service as Representative of the United States of America on the Council of the International Civil Aviation Organization?

The nomination was confirmed.

NOMINATION OF EUNICE S. REDDICK TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF NIGER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Eunice S. Reddick, of the District of Columbia, 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 Niger.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate equally divided.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that time be yielded back.

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

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Eunice S. Reddick, of the District of Columbia, 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 Niger?

The nomination was confirmed.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

BRING JOBS HOME ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will resume legislative session.

The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I now move to proceed to S. 2569. Is that pending?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct; the motion is pending.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have a cloture motion on that matter at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to report the motion.

The assistant 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 motion to proceed to calendar No. 453, S. 2569, a bill to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America.

Harry Reid, John E. Walsh, Debbie Stabenow, Amy Klobuchar, Patty Murray, Bernard Sanders, Tom Harkin, Richard J. Durbin, Tom Udall, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Christopher Murphy, Tammy Baldwin, Jon Tester, Mark Begich, Sheldon Whitehouse, Carl Levin, Christopher A. Coons.

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

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

The Senator from California.

INFRASTRUCTURE

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I am very proud to be on the floor this evening with colleagues for whom I have a great deal of respect. We have been working so hard across party lines to call the Nation's attention to the problems we are facing funding our transportation system. We all know there are many things in the world we cannot control and many things that are causing tremendous frustration.

I went home this weekend and my constituents came up to me and said: Senator, we cannot even look at our television sets with the tragedies that are unfolding. They feel, as I do and I know our President does, that the tragedies we are witnessing have been born out of historic animosities, and it is very difficult. If we could wave our wand and make things better in all of these areas, we would do so. We will try, and we will push. We are having a meeting with the Foreign Relations Committee, and we are going to move to speak sanity to the world. There is a crisis we can avert and there is a problem we can solve, and that is fixing the highway trust fund shortfall.

For those who don't know, the highway trust fund was created by President Dwight Eisenhower in 1956. He created the trust fund, and it was a brilliant move because he realized and said that we are developing an Interstate Highway System. He said, this is one country, and we have to be united, a physically united country, so we can move goods and people and make this country work. Since then, we have always had bipartisan support for the trust fund.

Why is it in trouble? The trust fund is in trouble because the Federal tax gas receipts have not kept pace with inflation and the rising cost of keeping highways and bridges safe. Some of our bridges are well over 50 years old. I have lived a while, and I can tell you that when you get a little older, you need a little attention, and the fact is our infrastructure is aging and we have to pay attention to it. This is not the time to walk away from this crisis.

Some may wonder why Senator BOXER is showing a photo of a football stadium. This is actually a picture of one of the Super Bowls. There are 100,000 people in this photograph. Do you know there are 700,000 unemployed construction workers? They would fill seven of these stadiums. The good news is there used to be 2 million unemployed construction workers at the height of the recession. We have gotten it down to 700,000, but we still cannot afford this.

What is the economic impact of the failure to act? It is pretty simple—millions of jobs. Because you have the construction jobs, and then you have all the benefits to communities when we have the workers around there—whether it is our cities, being able to have restaurants that are filled, and all the kinds of things which happen when you put people to work in a community.

Millions of jobs and thousands of businesses depend on the highway trust fund and those businesses and those workers are counting on us. You may say: Is there really a problem? Well, 70,000 of our bridges are structurally deficient. Keep these numbers in mind in case you are asked about it at a party—70,000 bridges are deficient and 700,000 construction workers are unemployed and 50 percent of our highways are in less than good condition.

Is this a frivolous issue we are talking about here? The 2012 Urban Mobility Report from Texas A&M said the financial cost of traffic congestion in 2011 was $121 billion, or about $818 per commuter. Of that total, about $27 billion was wasted time and diesel fuel from trucks moving goods on the system.

A 2013 survey by the National Association of Manufacturers says 65 percent answered that our infrastructure is insufficient.

I will tell you some of the ideas to fix it. I am not just out here saying words. I have ideas on how to fix it. One of the ideas was put forth by Senators MURPHY and CORKER. We will hear from Senator CORKER in a moment.

One of their suggestions was to modify the gas tax to meet current needs, and that is pretty straightforward. We have been doing this forever. It is very simple and supported by the Chamber of Commerce and supported by just about everybody.

There is another way to do it that was thought of by the Republican Governor of Virginia. I support this. Let me be clear, I will support all of these measures.

The second suggestion is to replace the existing cents-per-gallon gas tax with a fee on the wholesale price of gasoline from the refinery. I like that because it is a broader way to pay for it.

I drive an electric hybrid, and as a result, I don't fill my car very often. In 2 years we filled it up 4 times. I am not paying my fair share. This would be a more broad-based fee.

The third suggestion is repatriation, which is a very interesting concept, and I know Senator PAUL supports it. It is complicated in terms of the way it scores, but the fact is it would bring in $23 billion over the first couple of years, and it would give a break to some of our businesses.

So many of my colleagues spent so much time on this. I will not go on except to read the names of the supporters of this legislation.

The supporters of the proposal that Senators MURPHY and CORKER have

proposed are the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, AAA, the American Trucking Association. This is huge.

Also, we have received letters from so many people.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have a letter I received today from Transportation Secretary Anthony Foxx and 11 of his predecessors who served 7 Republican and Democratic Presidents—Johnson, Ford, Reagan, George H.W. Bush, Clinton, George W. Bush, and Obama—printed in the RECORD. They all wrote an open letter saying that we need to pass a long-term transportation bill.

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

[From the U.S. Department of Transportation Office of Public Affairs, July 21, 2014]

OPEN LETTER FROM SECRETARY FOXX AND 11 FORMER DOT SECRETARIES URGING CONGRESS TO ADDRESS LONG-TERM TRANSPORTATION NEEDS

(By Ryan Daniels)

WASHINGTON.—As Congress considers legislation to avoid a shortfall of the Highway Trust Fund, Transportation Secretary Anthony Foxx and 11 of his predecessors offered the following open letter to Congress. In addition to Secretary Foxx, Secretaries Ray LaHood, Mary Peters, Norman Mineta, Rodney Slater, Frederico Peña, Samuel Skinner, Andrew Card, James Burnley, Elizabeth Dole, William Coleman and Alan Boyd all signed the letter. Their message: Congress' work doesn't end with the bill under consideration. Transportation in America still needs a much larger, longer-term investment. The text of the letter is below:

This week, it appears that Congress will act to stave off the looming insolvency of the Highway Trust Fund The bill, if passed, should extend surface transportation funding until next May.

We are hopeful that Congress appears willing to avert the immediate crisis. But we want to be clear: This bill will not ''fix'' America's transportation system. For that, we need a much larger and longer-term investment. On this, all twelve of us agree.

Taken together, we have led the U.S. Department of Transportation for over 35 years. One of us was there on day one, at its founding. We've served seven presidents, both Republicans and Democrats, including Lyndon Johnson, Gerald Ford, Ronald Reagan, George H.W. Bush, Bill Clinton, George W. Bush, and Barack Obama.

Suffice it to say, we've been around the block. We probably helped pave it. So it is with some knowledge and experience that we can write: Never in our nation's history has America's transportation system been on a more unsustainable course.

In recent years, Congress has largely funded transportation in fits and starts. Federal funding bills once sustained our transportation system for up to six years, but over the past five years, Congress has passed 27 short-term measures. Today, we are more than a decade past the last six-year funding measure.

This is no way to run a railroad, fill a pothole, or repair a bridge. In fact, the unpredictability about when, or if, funding will come has caused states to delay or cancel projects altogether.

The result has been an enormous infrastructure deficit—a nationwide backlog of repairing and rebuilding. Right now, there are so many structurally deficient bridges in America that, if you lined them up end-to-end, they'd stretch from Boston to Miami. What's worse, the American people are paying for this inaction in a number of ways.

Bad roads, for example, are costing individual drivers hundreds of dollars a year due to side effects like extra wear-and-tear on their vehicles and time spent in traffic.

Simply put, the United States of America is in a united state of disrepair, a crisis made worse by the fact that, over the next generation, more will be demanded of our transportation system than ever before. By 2050, this country will be home to up to 100 million new people. And we'll have to move 14 billion additional tons of freight, almost twice what we move now.

Without increasing investment in transportation, we won't be able to meet these challenges. According to the American Society of Civil Engineers, we need to invest $1.8 trillion by 2020 just to bring our surface transportation infrastructure to an adequate level.

So, what America needs is to break this cycle of governing crisis-to-crisis, only to enact a stopgap measure at the last moment. We need to make a commitment to the American people and the American economy.

There is hope on this front. Some leaders in Washington, including those at the U.S. Department of Transportation, are stepping forward with ideas for paying for our roads, rails, and transit systems for the long-term.

While we—the twelve transportation secretaries—may differ on the details of these proposals, there is one essential goal with which all twelve of us agree: We cannot continue funding our transportation with measures that are short-term and short of the funding we need.

On this, we are of one mind. And Congress should be, too.

Adequately funding our transportation system won't be an easy task for our nation's lawmakers. But that doesn't mean it's impossible. Consensus has been brokered before.

Until recently, Congress understood that, as America grows, so must our investments in transportation. And for more than half a century, they voted for that principle—and increased funding—with broad, bipartisan majorities in both houses.

We believe they can, and should, do so again.

Mrs. BOXER. We did it in the Environment and Public Works Committee. Senator CARPER and I led the charge with Senators VITTER and BARRASSO. We did our job. We were able to come together with Senator SESSIONS, Senator VITTER, Senator WHITEHOUSE, and Senator SANDERS—left to right—in our committee. They came together to agree on a 6-year bill.

So what is the problem? It is ridiculous. Unfortunately, the House—and this is not good—decided to kick the can down the road—I know it is a cliche, but it is true—until the end of May. Do you know what it means? It means we will not do anything until then, and it will be right up against the new construction season. Nobody will enter into a long-term contract between now and then. And so we are hoping we can change the way the House and the Finance Committee thought about it, and my colleagues have been leading on this issue.

I am on the Carper-Corker-Boxer amendment that would say: Instead of funding this highway bill through next year, get our work done this year. Who is supporting getting it done this year? The U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, the American Road and Transportation Builders Association, National Association of Manufacturers, Associated General Contractors, American Trucking Associations, International Union of Operating Engineers, and LiUNA.

If anybody knows politics, they know these groups hardly ever agree on a darn thing, and they agree we should act this year.

I am proud of my friend here, for whom I will yield shortly.

I support their efforts wholeheartedly and will do everything I can to ensure we don't just do smoke-and-mirrors. Explain to me when you do the smoke-and-mirrors—taking the pension and controlling how people get coverage through their pensions—how that has anything to do with transportation.

The gas tax? Yes. A tax on oil? Yes.

Let's think about this. Let's step to the plate and do what is right.

I am very proud to be in concert with my friend, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I thank the leader for her comments and her ability to build consensus around the reauthorization as she did in the committee.

This is the fifth time since 2008—I have been here since January of 2007—that we have done a temporary extension. It is an absolute embarrassment. Not only do we not get the benefit of the economic growth that would come from people knowing there is a program in place where they can enter into long-term contracts and they can buy construction equipment, in addition to that, this is a tremendous problem of absolutely being generational theft.

I will get to those comments, and I thank the Senator from Delaware for his leadership and for being here on the floor. I will be fairly brief and will yield the floor for him.

I think if every Senator were asked if they were opposed to using budget gimmicks, they would say yes. I am sure the Presiding Officer would say the same. They say the budget should not be used as an offset to pay for spending. Time and time again, Congress avoids the tough decision and instead throws our kids under the bus so we can tell people back home that the legislation was passed and paid for. I have long been against the disgraceful practice of spending money today and paying for it in the future. It is shameful, it is irresponsible, and it is generational theft. Yet here we are this week looking for a way to pass a bill that would pay for spending that is already happening by using a blatant budget scheme called pension smoothing.

Pension smoothing is one of the worst kinds of budget gimmicks. Not

only does it allow Congress to spend money today and pay through savings accrued in the future, but the gimmick actually loses money. Let me say that one more time. The gimmick actually loses money and drives our Nation deeper into debt.

Pension smoothing is Congress cooking the books. It shifts tax revenue that Treasury would collect in the future to the present. It starts losing money when the smoothing ends and continues beyond the 10-year window—combining a highway trust fund bailout that spends 10 years of revenue in 10 months. Let me say that one more time. What we are going to be voting on this week spends 10 years' worth of revenue in 10 months.

I just want to say that my friends, my Republican friends—all of us—had problems when the President was trying to pass this health care bill because he used 6 years' worth of costs and 10 years' worth of revenues, which is orders of magnitude better than what is getting ready to happen in this bill this week—again, 10 months' worth of spending, 10 years' worth of revenues.

Pension smoothing also increases the chances that taxpayers will be on the hook for the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation bailout sometime in the future because it weakens the corporate pension system. So here we are weakening our balance sheet and simultaneously weakening the PBGC. The PBGC deficit already exceeds $30 billion. At the expense of taxpayers and workers who rely on pension plans, this budget scheme benefits big businesses while allowing Congress to avoid real spending decisions.

I understand the conventional wisdom is that in the haste to leave town this August, enough Senators will be here to support the House bill with the pension smoothing gimmick included and not even try to do better. That is the conventional wisdom. I also understand that some will try to scare Members into voting for the House bill by claiming the House cannot pass anything except this short-term patch endorsed by the President with $11 billion in gimmicks to extend the highway funding until June. Although 367 House Members voted for this rushed package, it is the responsibility of the Senate to weigh in and offer an alternative.

As I have done in previous years, I will continue to oppose these short-term patches to the highway trust fund that allow Congress to avoid doing its job in passing a long-term, sustainable solution to reform and pay for the program. At the very least we should cut the gimmicks in this bill by $3 billion and do away with pension smoothing.

I rarely use exhibits, but this is the gimmick of all gimmicks. Look at what happens when we use it to pay for a short-term bill: We collect the money during the window that it is counted, and then from then on we are losing money. This is a double loser.

It is amazing that we could even come up with these kinds of schemes to pay for an already insolvent program, and we do it by putting our country further in debt in the future and, candidly, weakening our corporate pension system.

I am pleased there is bipartisan momentum to change this. I hope my colleagues will support the amendment Senators CARPER, BOXER, and I are offering that would reject the budget gimmicks in this bill and force Congress to stop shirking its responsibility so we can work toward passing a long-term transportation bill.

There is going to be a push by some to say that we shouldn't take up anything the rest of this year. I would think every Member of this Congress who realizes we have allowed ourselves to get into the jam we are in would want to show the responsibility of actually dealing with this this year. We have a number of Members who are retiring. Many of them spent a lot of time on issues such as this. I would like to see them have the opportunity to come up with a long-term solution. I would imagine that if we did that, the House would want to support a more fiscally conservative alternative, which is what our amendment achieves.

I hope we will all back our words with actions and reject this irresponsible pay-for once and for all and do something far more responsible.

Before I yield the floor, I want to say I really appreciate Senator CARPER's continual effort as a former Governor to try to do those things that are common sense, that are pragmatic, and that make our country stronger along the way.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, before the Senator from Tennessee leaves, I wish to thank him very much for joining Senator BOXER and me in this Senate to create a dynamic that will enable us to do our job. He shows time and again the courage to keep out of step when everybody else is marching to the wrong tune. So does BARBARA BOXER. She has shown extraordinary leadership in the Environment and Public Works Committee, on which I serve. I serve as chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation and Infrastructure. She and Senator VITTER and Senator BARRASSO, with a little help from me, were able to guide through committee and report a secure transportation bill—a plan for the transportation for our country, including roads, highways, bridges, transit systems—and report it out of committee without amendment, without a dissenting vote, and bring it to the floor of the Senate.

If it were that easy, we wouldn't all be here tonight. There is other legislation, companion legislation that came out of the commerce committee for, among other things, freight railroads, passenger railroads. They have jurisdiction over aviation as well. The banking committee has jurisdiction over transit systems. So there is a shared responsibility here, and there is a shared responsibility to figure out how to pay for all of this. How do we pay for this?

We are spending somewhere around $17 billion, $18 billion a year for the Federal share for transportation projects. That is roughly about half of what we are spending if we add in State and local monies during the course of the year. We have run out of money. We literally run out of money next month for the Federal Government to do its share.

So what do we do? Well, I will tell my colleagues what we do. We are not going to continue to put it on our credit card, and we are not going to keep turning to countries such as China and saying: How about loaning us some more money so we can replenish the general fund, which will replenish the transportation trust fund.

Why do we want to be beholden to China? I don't think we want to be in that situation.

What we need to do is summon the courage to do what people sent us to do, and that is to make tough decisions.

Senator CORKER is—I call him a recovering mayor from Chattanooga. I was the Governor for some years in Delaware. We are a bunch of former Governors and mayors here and some county executives, and we bring those experiences with us. When we are in our State or our city or our county and we are trying to plan and fund and permit contracts for roads, highways, and bridges or transit projects, it takes a long time. People are watching and wondering, why do we need a 6-year bill or why do we need predictability and certainty that the money is going to be there for these projects? It is because they take a long time. It is not uncommon to spend years planning a project.

The problem is, as the Senator from Tennessee said, five times we have done stop-and-go. I think it has actually been 11 times in the last 5 years that we have done stop-and-go funding and we haven't provided the certainty and predictability that State and local governments are begging for and that transportation authorities around the country are pleading for. The road contractors and folks who build these systems and transit systems, the folks who work on them, the labor unions—everybody is pleading with us to do our job. And what we have done—the House, God bless them, reported out a bill that was, unfortunately, a straight party-line vote. They reported out a bill that funds the transportation trust fund to allow projects to be built through May 31 of next year.

Some people say: Well, that is fine.

That is not fine. It is not 6 years, and, frankly, Senator BOXER called it kicking the can down the road. We have done that again and again—11 times over the last 5 years. There is a good chance that when we get to next

May 31, we will say: Well, it is too hard to make these tough decisions as to how we are going to pay for this stuff, and we will kick the can down the road again, providing more uncertainty, more unpredictability.

It is wasteful. It is inefficient. It is foolish. We look impotent. It is not the way for us to do business.

What Senator CORKER and I and a number of others who are going to be joining us in this cause will call for doing is pretty simple. Instead of providing $11 billion for the transportation trust fund from what I will call a bunch of different sources of revenue—some of them more equal than others but some of them pretty questionable; but in some cases we are stealing revenues over the next 10 years for stuff that has nothing to do with transportation projects and using that money to fund transportation projects for, I don't know, 7, 8, 9, 10 months instead of actually doing what we have done for years—have a user-pay system where those who use our roads, highways, and transit systems pay for them. That is what we ought to be doing. But the problem with what the House has suggested we do is we will never—maybe never—get back to providing the certainty and predictability we need. We continue to drive up costs and say to all of the folks who are ordering us to do our job: Well, we don't have the courage to do it now. Maybe we will have it next year.

I think that will be a huge mistake.

I like to think of our Nation's economy as a car at the bottom of a steep hill, and 5 years ago our Nation's economy was at the bottom of the steep hill. We could have literally dropped off a cliff. Between July 1 and December 31, 2008, we lost 2.5 million jobs. In the first 6 months of 2009 we lost 2.5 million jobs. Literally the week Barack Obama and JOE BIDEN were sworn in as President and Vice President, we had 628,000 people file for unemployment insurance. In 1 week 628,000 filed for unemployment insurance. We know that anytime that number is over 400,000 people filing for unemployment insurance in a week, we are losing jobs in the economy. And that number stayed over 600,000 for too long. But it started to drop, and it dropped down to 550,000, then 500,000, eventually 450,000, and then 400,000, and a year or so ago we got under 400,000, and that number now is about 300,000. We are adding jobs.

Some would say: Well, they are not the kinds of jobs we want or need. But some are—a lot of them. Almost any job is better than nothing. And some of these jobs are very good and pay a fair amount of money. Here is where we were.

We were that car at the bottom of a very steep hill 5 years ago and trying to climb up the hill. It was slow going. We kept going. We kept going. We have added jobs; sometimes, some months, 50,000, some months 100,000. Now we are up to over 250,000 new jobs a month. But that car—if you will, we are that car—is climbing that hill. We are making it to the top. We are at the crest of the hill. As we look at it we can say it is downhill now.

As we add more and more jobs every month, we have the option of doing two things: One, we can mash down on the accelerator, kick it into high gear, kick this economy into high gear, where it needs to go or we can start tapping on the brakes—start tapping on the brakes, slow things down, introduce uncertainty, lack of predictability. What we offer in our amendment, Senator CORKER and Senator BOXER and myself and others, is a better likelihood that we are going to be pushing down on the accelerator next year.

We are not going to just put hundreds of thousands of people to work across our country building roads, highways, bridges and transit centers, but we are actually going to make our transportation system more efficient, which in the long haul is most important, to move product, whether it is from one coast to the other, north to south or just around our States. That is the key. How do we do this in a more efficient way? How do we make our economy work better? So this works at couple of different levels.

If we say we are going to kick the can down the road into next year and we will fund these programs until May 31, I do not know what is going to give us the courage next May 31 to fund a 6-year transportation program. As Senator CORKER said, we have seven or eight people who are leaving at the end of this year. They are not running for reelection. They are retiring. They want to leave, saying: We did this on our watch. It was our job to get this done and we did. That is exactly why people send us in the first place, to make those kinds of decisions.

This is not something Democrats can do by ourselves. This is not something Republicans can do by themselves. What I am very proud of, in both committees, is that the Democrats and Republicans voted for it—the Finance Committee voted for a similar proposal, not quite a majority but a very respectable showing. We have been working and gaining support literally by the day for what we are going to do.

Senator BOXER ran through some of the folks, some of the organizations that are supporting this, a lot of State and local governments, State departments of transportation, folks who build roads, folks who run the road-building companies, folks who do the actual labor for these projects, the American Trucking Associations, AAA, you name it. There is a huge bunch of people out there who want us to do our job. They do not want us to wait until some other time. They want us to do it now. We can do that.

We are not here tonight to say this is how we are going to fund a 6-year plan. There are a lot of good ideas, and Senator BOXER ran through some of those. The idea is to create a situation where we are going to be compelled and we will actually figure out, of all those options—and there may be some other ones—how do we get this done. The idea that we continue to borrow money, to borrow money over the next 10 years—revenue streams have nothing to do with transportation, nothing to do with transportation. If we pretend that is going to fund our transportation budget for 5 or 6 months, that is just laughing stock. We look so foolish doing that. It is also highly inefficient, as I said.

I wish I could remember exactly what Mark Twain once said—maybe the Presiding Officer can help me on this later—but he once said something like this: Do the right thing. You will please your friends and amaze your enemies—something along those lines. For the record we will correct it. But please your friends and amaze or confound your enemies. Why do we not try that for a change. That would be a great way to finish this year.

I again thank Senator BOXER. I thank Senator CORKER for joining me in what I think is a noble mission. I never take anything for granted, but I think if we work it hard enough, we may surprise some people in a good way.

I see my friend from Texas—whose mother was born in Wilmington, DE, 1 of 17 children—is rising for recognition.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

VENEZUELA

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I rise to discuss the ongoing crisis in Venezuela. With so many crises happening around the globe these days, political turmoil in Venezuela has slipped from the headlines and sometimes seems easy to forget. The situation commands our attention. In Venezuela the protests against oppression go on, with 6,369 recorded rallies this year, the most in over a decade.

When Hugo Chavez's death was confirmed 15 months ago, there were hopes that his hand-picked successor Nicolas Maduro would prove more moderate and friendly to the United States. These hopes quickly proved groundless, as Maduro doubled down on his predecessor's disastrous socialist economic policies and his close partnership with Castro's Cuba, not to mention Khamenei's Iran.

Earlier this year, as Venezuela endured shortages of basic goods from baby formula to caskets, from beginning of life to end and everything in between, while an increasingly authoritarian regime trampled their constitutional rights, the people finally took to the streets to protest Maduro's corrupt and unjust rule. Demanding freedom, they marched peaceably while Maduro's Cuban-trained militia tried to incite violence.

Following the wide-ranging protests of February 12, 2014, Maduro's regime claimed that opposition leaders were

personally responsible for the violence that Maduro's regime had deliberately provoked. Six days later, the leader of the Voluntad Popular Party Leopoldo Lopez demonstrated his respect for rule of law when he voluntarily surrendered to the authorities.

He could have stayed in hiding, he could have gone into exile, but he believes it is only through taking action that change can come to Venezuela. Here is Mr. Lopez. As he surrendered to the authorities to be thrown in prison, hundreds of thousands of supporters accompanied him to the police van. Mr. Lopez has been held in the Ramo Verde military prison ever since. In early June a judge ordered him held for trial, which will begin this week.

His wife Lilian Tintori is in Washington today to draw attention to his case. She spoke powerfully at the National Press Club about how she and her children have missed their dad, have missed Leopoldo while he has been in prison, but they know their daddy is doing what he must to fight for the men and women of Venezuela.

Maduro's so-called evidence against Mr. Lopez includes the claim that he was somehow sending secret subliminal messages inciting violence, when he in fact explicitly called on his followers to protest peacefully. Let me repeat that. Mr. Lopez explicitly asked his followers to protest peacefully against the oppressive regime of Maduro. What does Maduro say? That apparently Leopoldo has the power to subliminally suggest violence when his words say, ''Don't engage in violence.''

This would be comical and absurd were it not the basis for an indictment that Maduro is seeking to lock Leopoldo up for 10 years in prison for daring to speak out against oppression. It is important to understand the trial scheduled this week is no trial in the ordinary term. There will be no jury. There will be no evidence for the defense—not for lack of trying. Mr. Lopez is denied any opportunity to refute these bogus charges about his supposed subliminal powers because Mr. Lopez's defense team asked to submit the testimony of 60 witnesses.

The trial court denied all 60, said no witnesses will be allowed for the defense. Mr. Lopez's team asked to submit 13 videos. The trial court denied all 13. Mr. Lopez's defense team asked to submit the testimony of 12 experts. The trial court denied all 12. So in this so-called trial, which is nothing but a sham, the defense will have no evidence because the trial court has already decided they will allow no evidence in support of someone speaking for freedom, someone speaking for the people. The evidence will be kept out of this show trial.

That is not an unusual path. Dictators, totalitarian regimes from Stalin to Castro throughout the ages have engaged in the same show trials that they use to brutally silence any who would dare to speak out against them. The undeniable fact is that Nicolas Maduro has no interest in justice in this case or in the nation of Venezuela.

The official charges are public incitement, property damage, and criminal conspiracy, but Mr. Lopez's real crime is quite simply the exercise of his rights provided by article 57 of the Constitution of Venezuela, which states:

> Everyone has the right to express freely his or her thoughts, ideas or opinions orally, in writing or by any other form of expression, and to use for such purpose any means of communication and diffusion, and no censorship shall be established.

That is what the Constitution of Venezuela says, but Nicolas Maduro says Leopoldo Lopez goes to prison and wants him to stay there for 10 years because he spoke out and spoke the truth. Mr. Lopez freely expressed his criticism of Maduro's failed leadership, and for that he has been unceremoniously thrown in jail and faces a sham trial that could rob his 4-year-old daughter and his 1-year-old son of having a daddy for the next 10 years.

As his wife Lilian wrote today in the Washington Post:

> No one should doubt why Leopoldo is in prison: Venezuelan President Nicolas Maduro is afraid of him, and he has great reason to be. Chavez did not deliver and Maduro has not delivered on their promises, and they have systematically dismantled our fundamental freedoms—free speech, freedom of association, freedom of the press and freedom to vote for candidates of our choosing.

The most basic foundational human rights, and for advocating for those Leopoldo Lopez is in prison.

Every American should take an interest in Mr. Lopez's fate. Not only is he a good friend to our country, having attended both Kenyon College and Harvard, he also advocates the sort of political and economic reforms that would return Venezuela to its historic place as a close partner to the United States, a development that would be of great advantage in our hemisphere.

Mr. Lopez's case also reminds us of the precious freedoms we enjoy in the United States that can all too quickly be taken away.

Article 57 should have particular resonance for us as our right to free speech is enshrined in the First Amendment of our Constitution:

> Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances.

There is a reason the Framers chose this subject for the First Amendment in the Bill of Rights, because upon these rights all of our liberties are built. No freedom is more vital to true democracy than the freedom to worship God according to the dictates of our conscience and the freedom to speak as we choose without government censors, for when these freedoms are restricted citizens lose their ability to express their opposition to the government.

As Venezuela shows us, this process can take place slowly, over time, but the eventual result is that a citizen who speaks out is silenced and punished.

I have to say Leopoldo Lopez's situation is one that has resonance in my family. Fifty-seven years ago my father was in a prison in another Latin American country, the country of Cuba. My dad was 17 when he was imprisoned and tortured in a Cuban jail. Leopoldo is 43, the very same age I am today.

Leopoldo Lopez's case is, unfortunately, not an isolated case in Maduro's Venezuela. Forty-six people have been killed, thousands have been detained, and more than 100 are still in prison.

His fellow opposition leader, Maria Corina Machado, recently discovered that she too had been charged last month with incitement to violence related to the February protests. She had never been informed there was a criminal case against her and now she faces potentially 6 years in prison as well.

Maduro's actions are those of a dictator who knows he is deeply unpopular, that his policies are a dismal failure, and that to survive he has to silence the voices of those who oppose him and offer a viable alternative, who oppose him and offer freedom.

The people of Venezuela showed in February that they are ready for a change from the long slog into totalitarian socialism that was begun by Chavez and is being continued by Maduro. Now Maduro is trying to use a cloud of censorship to isolate Venezuelans from each other and from the rest of the world. We should not look the other way.

Again, from Lillian's Washington Post op-ed today:

> We need to send a message to the government that it cannot trample on the rights of its people with impunity. Accordingly, I call on President Maduro to release my husband and the more than 100 political prisoners being held in Venezuela. But my actions alone are not enough. My husband needs the support of all countries that stand for freedom.

In this, the United States should lead the way. America should speak with a clarion voice: Free Leopoldo Lopez. As the hashtag #SOSVenezuela has rocketed around the globe, it shows the power of speaking the truth: Free Leopoldo Lopez.

The United States should do everything it can to shine the bright light of truth and freedom on this repression by highlighting Leopoldo Lopez's case.

President Obama should stand and lead, demanding the freedom of Leopoldo Lopez.

Secretary Kerry should stand and lead, demanding the freedom of Leopoldo Lopez.

Every Member of this body should join in bipartisan unison demanding the freedom of Leopoldo Lopez.

We should not and cannot let this unjust persecution pass unnoticed but, rather, we should help the people of

Venezuela choose a different path, a path of freedom, a path of prosperity, and a path of friendship that will return this one-time enemy, the nation of Venezuela, to its traditional role of America's partner and friend. All of us should join in demanding and working for the freedom of Leopoldo Lopez.

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

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

TRAGEDY IN EASTERN UKRAINE

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I rise to address the horrific series of events which have occurred in Eastern Ukraine within the last week. The shooting down of a civilian Malaysian airliner and the killing of 298 innocent people is an unspeakable tragedy and one that, frankly, speaks out for us to address in terms of the responsibility.

In this situation in Eastern Ukraine there are armed thugs who are in control of the territory where this plane was shot down. They have been armed, financed, and inspired by Vladimir Putin and the Russians. That is the grim reality. All signs point to the fact that Putin, the Russians, and their supporters in Eastern Ukraine are responsible for this terrible tragedy—the loss of 298 lives.

I was in Ukraine a few weeks ago with Senator MCCAIN and others, and it was at a time when Crimea was about to fall. It was clear then the Ukrainians did not have the capacity to stop this effort by Putin to take over territory—and he did. Then that wasn't enough. He had to reach into Eastern Ukraine for even more territory, stirring up problems, creating havoc, and, sadly, bloodshed in the process.

It is bad enough the Ukrainian citizens themselves were victims, but now 298 innocent people on a civilian airliner were shot down over this territory. As I have said, the evidence points directly to Moscow and its complicity in this horrible event.

This is a photo which has been distributed showing pro-Russian separatists holding up some of the personal effects of the victims of the Malaysian airline flight that was shot down. What is happening there since the crash is also nothing short of horrific.

At this moment in time in virtually any other place in the world, save perhaps North Korea, international inspectors would be on the scene determining the cause of that plane's crash and, of equal or even greater importance, making certain the recovery effort of the victims of this crash was done by the standards of civilized nations. But the Eastern Ukrainian separatists, inspired by Putin and Moscow, have refused to allow these people in.

What we are hearing in reports is horrible. The corpses of these victims are being taken and placed in refrigerator cars on trains. Imagine the anguish of the families associated with those victims as they hear this—a loved one shot out of the sky in a civilian airliner apparently because of some folly by Eastern Ukrainian, Russian-inspired thugs and now they cannot even recover the remains of the people they love—let alone a serious objective investigation about the cause of that crash.

It is hard to imagine that Vladimir Putin could let it reach this point and harder still to imagine that he doesn't own up to his responsibility. It is horrifying that we have reached this point where this terribly tragic scene goes from bad to worse as Putin's thugs go through the personal effects of the people who were shot down.

There is a list of those who were lost. I know the Presiding Officer from the State of Indiana has a particular attachment to one of the victims—this one—Karlijn Keijzer, a student at Indiana University. This was well publicized in the Midwest—that we lost this beautiful woman, a victim of this tragic crash.

There were more—297 more—who died. They included Quinn Lucas Schansman, a 19-year-old U.S.-Dutch citizen who was born in the United States but whose family moved back to the Netherlands when he was young. He was on his way to visit his grandfather in Indonesia.

This is Joep Lange, a renowned Dutch AIDS researcher traveling with his partner to the International AIDS conference in Australia.

I mentioned Karlijn Keijzer, doctoral student at Indiana University in Bloomington. She was going on vacation with her boyfriend when this plane was shot down.

Sister Philomene Tiernan was a 77-year-old Roman Catholic nun who was returning to her school in Australia where she had taught thousands of students over her 30-year vocation.

Andrei Anghel, 24, was a Canadian medical student going on vacation with his girlfriend.

Sri Siti Amirah, an 83-year-old, was step-grandmother of Malaysia's prime minister. She was heading to Indonesia to celebrate the end of Ramadan.

Shazana Salleh, 31 years old, was a flight attendant on the plane. Her father told the media this was her dream, to be a flight attendant.

And this heartbreaking photo is of Shuba Jaya, 38 years old, Paul Goes, and their 1-year-old daughter Kaela. Shuba was a Malaysian actress, her husband a Dutch businessman. They were returning to Malaysia from Holland after showing their daughter to her husband's parents.

These victims of Mr. Putin's recklessness and their grieving families deserve more than the tragic and revolting actions occurring now in Eastern Ukraine. The Russian people—not the leadership but the people of Russia—deserve better.

The Russian people have a proud history of accomplishment in so many different fields. But President Putin has created a climate of fear in his country, where those who dissent to his policies will be punished. His use of Soviet-style propaganda and intimidation, shutting down of independent media and voices, and his strong-arming of other peaceful nations are, sadly, an insult to the great achievements and legacy of the Russian people.

I hope Mr. Putin still sees the importance of being a responsible world leader. There is little evidence of it in recent weeks. He can start almost immediately by calling off his shameful proxies who are so disrespecting the victims and their families at this crash site—the site for which he is most certainly responsible.

My thoughts and prayers go out to the families of the victims.

To our Dutch friends who suffered such an overwhelming loss of life in this crash, I express my deepest condolences. And to the people of Ukraine, the Baltics, Poland, and everywhere else facing Russian bullying, we stand with you in your desire for democracy and peaceful relations with the West and Russia.

Earlier this evening we considered three nominations and two passed by voice vote. One of those passed by voice vote was Michael Lawson of California for the rank of Ambassador during his tenure of service as representative of the United States of America on the Council of the International Civil Aviation Organization.

The reason I bring that to the attention of the Senate is he was nominated last September and reported out of the Foreign Relations Committee in May. Mr. Lawson has been sitting on the calendar. There was no objection to him. No one had any objection to him, but he was sitting on the calendar because of objection on the Republican side of the aisle. Why was his name called today? Because of this tragedy—because this tragedy pointed out the fact that the United States would not have its representative before this important organization which investigates these airline crashes.

It has reached a point where almost 30 Ambassadors to organizations and nations are being held up on the floor of the Senate over and over until something happens—an upheaval, a tragedy—and then they are brought for a vote.

The United States of America is a better nation than that. We shouldn't be holding up in the Senate these fine men and women who are willing to serve our Nation. I urge my colleagues to reconsider this approach. Let us release these ambassadorial appointments by President Obama. For those that are controversial, so be it; let's hold them. But the vast majority of these are not controversial. Let's give them a chance to serve our Nation.

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

INNOVATIVE MOVIEMAKING

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, during the past few years, Marcelle and I have come to know Christopher Nolan and his wife Emma Thomas, both of whom are extraordinarily talented and have made breakthrough movies.

One of the things that we have enjoyed talking about with both of them is the concept of what movies can be as real entertainment, and that movie theaters provide an audience an experience they would not have otherwise. Recently, Chris wrote an op-ed in the Wall Street Journal explaining just how movie theaters will survive. That was music to my ears, as I too want them to survive. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

CHRISTOPHER NOLAN: FILMS OF THE FUTURE WILL STILL DRAW PEOPLE TO THEATERS

When Movies Can Look or Sound Like Anything, Says the 'Dark Knight' Director, Extraordinary Work Will Emerge.

In the '90s, newly accessible video technology gave adventurous filmmakers (such as Lars von Trier and his colleagues in the filmmaking movement Dogme 95) an unprecedented wedge for questioning the form of motion pictures. The resulting 20-year process of radical technical and aesthetic change has now been co-opted by the very establishment it sought to challenge.

Hungry for savings, studios are ditching film prints (under $600 each), while already bridling at the mere $80 per screen for digital drives. They want satellite distribution up and running within 10 years. Quentin Tarantino's recent observation that digital projection is the ''death of cinema'' identifies this fork in the road: For a century, movies have been defined by the physical medium (even Dogme 95 insisted on 35mm film as the presentation format).

Savings will be trivial. The real prize the corporations see is the flexibility of a nonphysical medium.

MOVIES AS CONTENT

As streams of data, movies would be thrown in with other endeavors under the reductive term ''content,'' jargon that pretends to elevate the creative, but actually trivializes differences of form that have been important to creators and audiences alike. ''Content'' can be ported across phones, watches, gas-station pumps or any other screen, and the idea would be that movie theaters should acknowledge their place as just another of these ''platforms,'' albeit with bigger screens and cupholders.

This is a future in which the theater becomes what Tarantino pinpointed as ''television in public.'' The channel-changing part is key. The distributor or theater owner (depending on the vital question of who controls the remote) would be able to change the content being played, instantly. A movie's Friday matinees would determine whether it even gets an evening screening, or whether the projector switches back to last week's blockbuster. This process could even be automated based on ticket sales in the interests of ''fairness.''

Instant reactivity always favors the familiar. New approaches need time to gather support from audiences. Smaller, more unusual films would be shut out. Innovation would shift entirely to home-based entertainment, with the remaining theaters serving exclusively as gathering places for fan-based or branded-event titles.

This bleak future is the direction the industry is pointed in, but even if it arrives it will not last. Once movies can no longer be defined by technology, you unmask powerful fundamentals—the timelessness, the otherworldliness, the shared experience of these narratives. We moan about intrusive moviegoers, but most of us feel a pang of disappointment when we find ourselves in an empty theater.

The audience experience is distinct from home entertainment, but not so much that people seek it out for its own sake. The experience must distinguish itself in other ways. And it will. The public will lay down their money to those studios, theaters and filmmakers who value the theatrical experience and create a new distinction from home entertainment that will enthrall—just as movies fought back with widescreen and multitrack sound when television first nipped at its heels.

These developments will require innovation, experimentation and expense, not cost-cutting exercises disguised as digital ''upgrades'' or gimmickry aimed at justifying variable ticket pricing. The theatrical window is to the movie business what live concerts are to the music business—and no one goes to a concert to be played an MP3 on a bare stage.

BACK TO THE FUTURE

The theaters of the future will be bigger and more beautiful than ever before. They will employ expensive presentation formats that cannot be accessed or reproduced in the home (such as, ironically, film prints). And they will still enjoy exclusivity, as studios relearn the tremendous economic value of the staggered release of their products.

The projects that most obviously lend themselves to such distinctions are spectacles. But if history is any guide, all genres, all budgets will follow. Because the cinema of the future will depend not just on grander presentation, but on the emergence of filmmakers inventive enough to command the focused attention of a crowd for hours.

These new voices will emerge just as we despair that there is nothing left to be discovered. As in the early '90s, when years of bad multiplexing had soured the public on movies, and a young director named Quentin Tarantino ripped through theaters with a profound sense of cinema's past and an instinct for reclaiming cinema's rightful place at the head of popular culture.

Never before has a system so willingly embraced the radical teardown of its own formal standards. But no standards means no rules. Whether photochemical or video-based, a film can now look or sound like anything.

It's unthinkable that extraordinary new work won't emerge from such an open structure. That's the part I can't wait for.

REMEMBERING CHARLEY GREENE DIXON, JR.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I am saddened to report to my Senate colleagues the passing of a fellow Kentuckian, Mr. Charley Greene Dixon, Jr., who lost his battle with cancer on June 23 of this year. Charley was a consummate public servant who spent his life working to better his community. Knox County, and the entirety of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, is poorer for his loss.

The overriding ambition in Charley's life was to help others. His wife Marcia Dixon said, ''He believed that if he could make one life better he was a success.'' This is a bar for success that Charley cleared time and time again.

Born in Barbourville on November 19, 1964, Charley lived in Kentucky his whole life, mostly in his hometown in Knox County. He attended Union College in Barbourville and earned his juris doctorate from Northern Kentucky's Salmon P. Chase College of Law.

Charley started his career working as the Barbourville city attorney, later becoming the Knox County school board and Barbourville city school board attorney.

His most recent position was of Knox County attorney, one that he had held since 2003. In that capacity he played a leading role in creating juvenile, family and adult drug courts in Knox County. Through these courts, Charley helped countless individuals reclaim their lives from the clutches of drug addiction.

Outside of his official duties, Charley continued to work tirelessly to better Knox County. He chaired the Knox County UNITE Coalition an organization that combated illicit drug use through education, law enforcement, and rehabilitation. As chairman he spearheaded events, such as ''Hooked on Fishing Not on Drugs,'' where kids and their families could enjoy themselves in a drug-free environment.

For his selfless work in the community, Charley was named the 2013 Man of the Year by the Knox County Chamber of Commerce a fitting award for a man who helped so many.

Charley is survived by his wife Marcia, his daughter Callie Ann, and his son Charleston Arthur. Knox County was undoubtedly bettered by his life's work, and he will be sorely missed by all who loved and knew him.

I ask that my U.S. Senate colleagues join me in honoring the life of Charley Greene Dixon, Jr.

The Mountain Advocate recently published an article chronicling Dixon's life. I ask unanimous consent that the full article be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Mountain Advocate, June 26, 2014]

''HOMETOWN HERO'' LOSES BATTLE WITH CANCER

(By Melissa Newman)

John Ray Gray sat quietly in the waiting area at the Knox County Attorney's Office Monday morning. He wasn't there because he needed help—at least not this time.

A confessed recovered drug addict, Gray, now 27, first met former Knox County Attorney Charley Greene Dixon six years ago in drug court.

Gray said without Dixon and the drug court program, he'd ''probably be dead.''

''He was good to me,'' Gray's voice quivered as he spoke. ''He went beyond his job to help me.''

Gray came to ''check on'' staff members and offer tight hugs, his tears contagious and shared among the group. His story is only one of the many dozen that include some selfless act or shattered belief that work should end at 5 p.m. Dixon, as most have said, was different.

Dixon, who helped hundreds, like Gray, win battles against drugs, poverty, and domestic violence, lost his own battle to colon cancer early Monday morning.

The former county attorney first learned he was ill while on vacation in May 2013. Not long after, on June 30, he resigned his position to then assistant county attorney Gilbert Holland, to focus on getting better. The community he had served so valiantly came together in prayer vigils around the courthouse square, hoping for a miracle.

''The loss will be felt by this community for a long time,'' Holland said. ''Charley dedicated his life to bettering the lives of the people of Knox County. His efforts were never contained by the traditional role of his office. He invented ways to reach out to the community.''

Along with Dixon's successful drug court program that has graduated thousands, he was well-known for a long list of community-minded projects—many of which he initiated. Reaching youth was at the forefront of his vision for a successful Knox County—Hooked on Fishing Not on Drugs, Faith-Based Basketball Cheerleading, Anti-Drug Abuse Poster Contest, a Car/Bike Show for Youth, and a Prevention Camp.

A new youth-related program will take place next fall one of the last requests Dixon made of long-time friend and colleague Claudia Greenwood, who worked with Dixon on grants and public relations.

''He's already told me that next year he would like for us to do a pumpkin patch event and have a pumpkin decorating contest and display the pumpkins in the banks,'' Greenwood said. ''He was always so creative, coming up with things to do with the kids and the community,'' Greenwood said. ''He thought of that while he was sick and wanted to make sure he told us about it.''

Finding time to grieve in a busy office hasn't been easy for Dixon's staff. The phone calls keep coming—clients and the public are priority as usual. Among the foot traffic, phone calls, and full email boxes, ''it hits'' them that Dixon's guidance is gone. And though the quiet moments are few, that's when the staff members feel the waves of emotion and loss wash over them.

''Yesterday, when the media wanted statements, it hit me hard,'' Greenwood said. ''My first thought was that I needed to ask Charley what to say.''

Dixon, expected to do great things for his community, succeeded in filling the large shoes of his grandfather John Dixon who served as Knox County attorney for several decades. When elected, the younger Dixon brought his grandfather's legacy and one of his employees into office with him.

''I've worked for Charley this October will be 19 years,'' Sherry Vaughn said. ''I worked for his grandfather five and a half years before that until he passed away. I went to school with Charley; he's been just like a brother to me.''

''He loved kids,'' Vaughn said. ''He did everything he could for the children in Knox County. His own children were his whole world. Words can't describe how we feel about the situation. He has struggled for a year and now he's a lot better off. He's up there now looking down at us.''

Dixon's wife, Marcia, like her husband, is active in community service. Often, the couple worked together and at times involved the entire family—the children, Callie Ann and Charleston Arthur, included. The late Dixon's wife knows her community, their hometown, is better off for having had her husband as a leader.

''Charley was very dedicated not only to our family but to our Knox County community as well,'' Marcia Dixon said. ''His goal was to help others, and he believed that if he could make one life better he was a success. I feel blessed to have shared many joyful years with him and want everyone to be able to say as an old Hebrew proverb says, ''Say not in grief: He is no more,' but live in thankfulness that he was.''

Knox County's Chamber of Commerce members named Dixon Knox County's Man of the Year last fall and tagged him a ''hometown hero.''

Dixon's introduction as Man of the Year heralded a long list of community-minded projects that he participated in, implemented, or, in some cases, created.

Dixon served as the chair of the Knox County UNITE (Unlawful Narcotics Investigation, Treatment, and Education) Coalition since May 2005. The former county attorney was also instrumental in securing grant funding through the Foundation for a Healthy Kentucky; a grant from PRIDE; a Coal Severance Grant; a Fatherhood Grant and a EUDL Grant to fund programs for young people that promoted prevention for underage drinking.

Dixon made sure his office staff actively participated in Back to School Expos, PRIDE Pick-Up, Relay for Life, the Child Identification Program, the Knox County Reading Celebration, the local August Arts Adventure, and the annual Redbud festival.

Dixon was an active military advocate—photos of local service men and women lined the hallways leading to his office. He called it ''Faces of Freedom.''

Funeral services for Dixon are at Barbourville First Baptist Church, Friday, June 27 at 2 p.m. Burial will follow in the Barbourville Cemetery.

Visitation is at Barbourville First Baptist Church, Thursday from 5 to 9 p.m. and Friday after 10 a.m. until the funeral hour at 2 p.m. Hopper Funeral Home is in charge of arrangements.

Dixon's family requests contributions be made to the Knox County Chapter of the American Cancer Society in loving memory of Charley Greene Dixon, Jr.

TRIBUTE TO JIM SHARPE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise to honor the long and distinguished career of Jim Sharpe. Now retired, Mr. Sharpe opened his first business in Somerset, KY, in 1947. Since that time he has opened several more, pioneered the houseboat business, and has become an irreplaceable fixture in his community.

Lake Cumberland is known by many as the ''houseboat capital of the world''—a designation that is owed in no small part to Jim Sharpe. Jim was one of the first to pioneer the industry—building his first houseboat in 1953. Much has changed since he sold that first 10-by-24-foot steel boat, and Jim has been there for it all, often leading the way. Houseboats are now much bigger—up to 20 by 100 feet—and are made of aluminum and have onboard heating and cooling systems. One thing that never changed, though, is Jim's passion for building his customer's dream boat.

Despite being one of the founding fathers of the industry, houseboats do not constitute the totality of his life's work. Jim has owned and operated several other businesses in Somerset in addition to Sumerset Marine. In 1966, he developed Food Fair groceries, which he grew into a chain of 13 stores. Two year later, he opened up Somerset's first fried chicken restaurant, Kettle Fried Chicken, and in 1974 he bought a car dealership, Pulaski Motor Company.

Although he's now retired, Jim still has plenty to keep him busy. Jim has four children and nine grandchildren, and he has also found time to pick up golf and travel the country. Jim's family is all the stronger for the influence of Jim's dear departed wife, Mary Jo, who left us in 2008. Married in 1950, they were one of the most thriving and generous entrepreneurial couples that Kentucky has ever seen, with distinguished careers in the grocery and food retail business, automobile dealerships, marinas, restaurants, and most notably the houseboat industry which I have already mentioned.

Jim Sharpe's drive and determination in his business, his commitment to his community, and his love of his family can serve as an example to us all. Jim is also a proud veteran of the U.S. Navy, and we are grateful for his service. I ask that my U.S. Senate colleagues join me in honoring this upstanding and patriotic Kentucky citizen and veteran.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO BRUCE BLACKWOOD

• Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Bruce Blackwood, a 2013 summer intern in my Washington, DC, office for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the people of the State of Florida.

Bruce is a graduate of Southern Methodist University, having majored in history. Bruce is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I would like to extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Bruce for all the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.•

TRIBUTE TO ALEX CARAMES

• Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Alex Carames, a 2013 summer intern in my Washington, DC, office for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the people of the State of Florida.

Alex is a rising senior at Columbia University in New York, NY. Currently, Alex is majoring in economics

and political science. Alex is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I would like to extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Alex for all the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO BLAKE MURPHY

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Blake Murphy, a 2013 summer intern in my Washington, DC, office for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the people of the State of Florida.

Blake is a student at the University of Florida. Currently, Blake is majoring in finance. Blake is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I would like to extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Blake for all the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO ALYSSA NIEVES

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Alyssa Nieves, a 2013 summer intern in my Washington, DC, office for all of the hard work she has done for me, my staff, and the people of the State of Florida.

Alyssa is a rising senior at the University of Florida in Gainesville, FL. Currently, Alyssa is majoring in public relations. She is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of her internship experience.

I would like to extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Alyssa for all the fine work she has done and wish her continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO AUSTIN SCHNELL

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Austin Schnell, a 2013 summer intern in my Washington, DC, office for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the people of the State of Florida.

Austin is a junior at Southern Methodist University in Dallas, TX. Currently, Austin is majoring in economics, public policy, and political science. Austin is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I would like to extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Austin for all the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO ANDREW SHADID

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Andrew Shadid, a 2013 summer intern in my Washington, DC, office for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the people of the State of Florida.

Andrew is a junior at Wheaton College in Wheaton, IL. Currently, he is majoring in interdisciplinary studies. Andrew is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I would like to extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Andrew for all the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

CONGRATULATING MOOREMART

● Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate MooreMart, a New Hampshire nonprofit organization that sends care packages to servicemembers and children overseas, as it celebrates its 10th anniversary.

MooreMart was born from Moore family members Paul, Carole, and Beverly's desire to send supplies to Brian Moore and his fellow soldiers stationed in Iraq. In the early years of their effort, they strove to send 10 packages a month to U.S. troops overseas. Today, MooreMart ships more than 1,000 packages every 10 weeks. Its mission has grown over the years, and now MooreMart also sends school supplies, toys, and clothing to local children in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Over the last decade, MooreMart has built and shipped more than 61,000 care packages and nearly 8 tons of relief supplies to troops in conflict zones, including to every Armed Forces unit deployed from New Hampshire. Each package includes toiletries, food items like s'mores and Girl Scout cookies difficult to find overseas, and letters and cards from schoolchildren and volunteers. All of the packages are assembled by volunteers and individually addressed to a servicemember.

MooreMart has successfully reached out to organizations both public and private, involving State and local agencies, faith communities, and businesses in its work. More than 11,000 volunteers have helped build the care packages, among them veterans, families of active servicemembers, and families who have lost loved ones in service to our country.

MooreMart represents the very best of New Hampshire, bringing comfort to those who selflessly defend our Nation. I am proud to congratulate this organization and the volunteers who carry out its mission on their 10th anniversary.●

HONORING VANCE HOME GUN

● Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I wish to honor Vance Home Gun, an emerging leader in Montana and member of the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes.

As I travel around Indian Country in Montana, I see a lot of challenges that still need to be addressed, but I also see a lot of cause for hope. Vance Home Gun embodies that hope.

Vance was first introduced to a Salish language camp at the age of 11. Inspired by elders and other community members, Vance resolved himself to become a fluent Salish speaker and to encourage his peers to get involved in the preservation of the Salish language.

Vance has taken a leadership role within his tribe to revitalize Native languages through his organization called Yoyoot Skwkwimlt, or Strong Young People, that utilizes peer-to-peer methods to teach language and culture.

I also want to congratulate Vance on receiving a scholarship to attend the University of Oregon this coming fall. On behalf of all Montanans, I wish him luck and look forward to his return home when he finishes his studies to continue making a difference for Montana and his tribe.

Since joining the Senate 5 months ago, I have cosponsored two important pieces of legislation that promote and preserve Native languages for generations to come.

I know that support for comprehensive and culturally-relevant language programs will set our Native children on a path for success in school and life and allows them to reach their full potential.

Vance encapsulated the urgency behind Native language preservation when he stated, ''Time is of the essence, and our young Native people are the key to revitalizing our language. Helping them is revitalizing our identity.''

It will take leaders like Vance to implement these vital language programs for the benefit of cultural preservation and revitalization.

I stand with Vance to help preserve the Native languages and traditions for generations to come.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

S. 2631. A bill to prevent the expansion of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals

program unlawfully created by Executive memorandum on August 15, 2012.

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–6502. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Coco alkyl dimethyl amines; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance'' (FRL No. 9911–54–OCSPP) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 16, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–6503. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Global Strategic Affairs), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Cooperative Threat Reduction Annual Report to Congress for Fiscal Year 2015''; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–6504. A communication from the Acting Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Suspension of Community Eligibility'' ((44 CFR Part 64) (Docket No. FEMA–2014–0002)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 15, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–6505. A communication from the Chair of the Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Board's semiannual Monetary Policy Report to Congress; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–6506. A communication from the President and Chief Executive Officer, Federal Home Loan Bank of Seattle, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Bank's 2013 management report and statement on the system of internal controls; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–6507. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Energy Conservation Program for Consumer Products and Certain Commercial and Industrial Equipment: Test Procedures for Residential and Commercial Water Heaters'' (RIN1904–AC53) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 15, 2014; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–6508. A communication from the Acting General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Reliability Standard for Geomagnetic Disturbance Operations'' (RIN1902–AE80) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 15, 2014; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–6509. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Connecticut; Control of Visible Emissions, Record Keeping and Monitoring'' (A–1–FRL–9910–12–Region 1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 16, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6510. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maryland; Section 110(a)(2) Infrastructure Requirements for the 2008 Lead National Ambient Air Quality Standards'' (FRL No. 9913–62–OAR) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 16, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6511. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Illinois, Michigan, Minnesota, Wisconsin; Infrastructure SIP Requirements for the 2008 Lead NAAQS'' (FRL No. 9913–59–Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 16, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6512. A communication from the Acting Director of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Regulatory Treatment of Non-Safety Systems for Passive Advanced Light Water Reactors'' (NRC–2014–0000) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 16, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6513. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Joseph E. Martz, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–6514. 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 July 16, 2014; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–6515. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the establishment of the danger pay allowance for Kenya; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–6516. A communication from the Senior Vice President and Chief Financial Officer, Potomac Electric Power Company, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Company's Balance Sheet as of December 31, 2013; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–6517. A communication from the Director of External Affairs, Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Aged Beneficiary Designation Forms'' (5 CFR Part 1651) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 16, 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–6518. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department's fiscal year 2013 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act); to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–6519. 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; United States and Canadian Military Exercise Jump Training, Lake Erie, Hamburg, NY'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2014–0260)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6520. 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; Meridian Health Fireworks, Navesink River, Rumson, NJ'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2014–0353)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6521. 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 Zones; Fourth of July Fireworks Displays within the Captain of the Port Charleston Zone, SC'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2014–0471)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6522. 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; Independence Day Celebration Fireworks, Lake Ontario, Oswego, NY'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2014–0473)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6523. 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 Zones; Annual Events in the Captain of the Port Zone Buffalo'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2014–0081)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6524. 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; Freeport Chamber of Commerce Fireworks Display, South Oyster Bay; Freeport, NY'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2014–0240)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6525. 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: San Francisco Independence Day Fireworks Display, San Francisco Bay, San Francisco, CA'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2014–0283)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6526. 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 Zones; Fireworks Displays in Captain of the Port Puget Sound Zone'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2014–0485)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6527. 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; City of Menominee Fireworks; Green Bay, Menominee, MI'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2014–0539)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6528. 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 Ocean; Ocean City, NJ'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–

2014–0494)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6529. 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; Swim Around Charleston, Charleston, SC'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2014–0160)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6530. 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, Delaware River; Chester, PA'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2014–0511)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6531. 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; Summer Fireworks Displays in the Captain of the Port Lake Michigan Zone'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2014–0476)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6532. 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, Metedeconk River; Brick Township, NJ'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2014–0522)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6533. 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; Bullhead City River Regatta; Bullhead City, AZ'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2014–0359)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6534. 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; Water Ski Show, Fox River, Green Bay, WI'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2014–0536)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6535. 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–2014–0377)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6536. 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; Beaufort Water Festival, Beaufort, SC'' ((RIN1625–AA08) (Docket No. USCG–2014–0005)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6537. 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 Regulation; Tennessee River, Miles 255.0 to 256.5, Florence, AL'' ((RIN1625–AA08) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0753)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6538. 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 Regulation; Tennessee River, Mile 256.0 to 257.5, Florence, TN'' ((RIN1625–AA08) (Docket No. USCG–2014–0277)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6539. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Notice of Arrival Exception'' ((RIN1625–AC12) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0797)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6540. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries Off West Coast States; Modifications of the West Coast Commercial Salmon Fisheries; Inseason Actions #4, #5, #6, #7, #8, and #9'' (RIN0648–XD329) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 15, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6541. 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 of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Sea Scallop Fishery and Northeast Multispecies Fishery; Framework Adjustment 25'' (RIN0648–BE07) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 15, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6542. A communication from the Trial Attorney, Federal Railroad Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Signal Systems Reporting Requirements'' (RIN2130–AC44) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 15, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6543. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Chief Counsel for Safety, Federal Railroad Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Vehicle/Track Interaction Safety Standards; High-Speed and High Cant Deficiency Operations'' (RIN2130–AC09) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 15, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6544. A communication from the Assistant Chief Counsel for Hazardous Materials Safety, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Hazardous Materials: Compatibility with the Regulations of the International Atomic Energy Agency (RRR)'' (RIN2137–AE38) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 15, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

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–312. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of California urging the Congress of the United States to support legislation reauthorizing the Export-Import Bank of the United States; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 37

Whereas, The Export-Import Bank of the United States (Ex-Im) is the official export credit agency of the United States and exists for the purposes of financing and insuring foreign purchases of United States goods for customers unable or unwilling to accept the credit risk; and

Whereas, The mission of the Ex-Im is to create and sustain United States jobs by financing sales of United States exports to international buyers; and

Whereas, The Ex-Im is the principal government agency responsible for aiding the export of American goods and services, and thereby creating and sustaining United States jobs, through a variety of loan, guarantee, and insurance programs for small and large businesses; and

Whereas, The Ex-Im has supported more than $400 billion in United States exports in the past 70 years and helps to cover critical trade finance gaps by providing loan guarantees, export credit insurance, and direct loans for United States exports in developing markets where commercial bank financing is unavailable or insufficient. In Fiscal Year 2012, Ex-Im financing of United States exports exceeded $35 billion, assisting more than 3,400 United States companies and supporting approximately 255,000 export-related American jobs; and

Whereas, The Ex-Im is a self-sustaining agency, which operates at no cost to the taxpayer and, between the 2008–09 to 2011–12 fiscal years, inclusive, the Ex-Im has generated $1.6 billion in excess revenue for United States taxpayers; and

Whereas, The Ex-Im enables United States companies large and small to turn export opportunities into sales that help to maintain and create in the United States jobs and contribute to a stronger national economy. On average, more than 85 percent of the Ex-Im's transactions support United States small businesses; and

Whereas, Exports are particularly important to the California economy as California is currently ranked second in exports among all states. If California's manufacturing base is to grow, we must continue to expand our ability to export goods from California facilities. Given the key role the Ex-Im plays in facilitating export sales, failure to reauthorize it would be devastating to existing industry and to those that we hope to create in the future; and

Whereas, Over the past five years, the Ex-Im has assisted more than 900 California companies to export their products. Nearly 200 of those companies are women or minority owned and 668 are small businesses. These companies export their products and services around the globe totaling more than $19 billion in sales. Fifty-two of the 53 congressional districts in California had companies benefit from the Ex-Im loans; and

Whereas, A reauthorization of the Ex-Im is critical to the ability of many United States exporters to compete on a level playing field in a commercial market where current and future competitors continue to enjoy aggressive support from their countries' export credit agencies; and

Whereas, A failure to reauthorize the Ex-Im would amount to unilateral disarmament in the face of other nations' aggressive trade finance programs that favor their domestic companies over American companies; and

Whereas, Economic growth depends on increasing exports from both small and large

manufacturers and service providers in California and reauthorization means support for California exports and California jobs: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California, jointly, That the Legislature urges Congress to support legislation reauthorizing the Export-Import Bank of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That the Chief Clerk of the Assembly transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Majority Leader of the Senate, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States.

POM–313. A resolution adopted by the California State Lands Commission opposing S. 2094, the Vessel Incidental Discharge Act; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

POM–314. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Rhode Island urging the United States Congress to support a peaceful unification of Ireland using all possible diplomatic means; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SENATE RESOLUTION 3124

Whereas, Ireland and the Irish people are an ancient nation that have contributed much to western culture, particularly within the spheres of literature, art, music, dance, theater, theology and philosophy: and

Whereas, Ireland is an island nation that eventually evolved into 32 counties. Tragically, in 1922 it was divided against the wishes of a majority of the Irish people who desired a united nation, into the Irish Republic, consisting of 26 counties, and Northern Ireland, composed of the remaining six counties, and

Whereas, A peacefully united and independent Ireland would be the most effective way to grow the economy and would lead to a wealthier nation, with more influence in regional and world affairs. It would also be the best way to ensure that all citizens of Ireland have a just and equal chance at happiness and prosperity; and

Whereas, A united and independent Ireland, with a unified and independent police force and justice system, is more likely to dispense justice in an impartial and fair way, and it would be far more likely to have the trust and respect of its citizenry, including citizens from all socio-economic spheres of life: and

Whereas, The Good Friday Agreement of 1998, negotiated with strong American support, ratified by the British and Irish governments and approved by a vote with the overwhelming support of the entire island of Ireland, provides a framework by which a united Ireland might he achieved through peaceful and democratic means. It also provided for the development and strengthening of North/South institutions and for there to be cross border cooperation amongst the two entities; and

Whereas, The United States and the State of Rhode Island have benefited enormously from the rich contributions Irish immigrants have made to our nation and state; Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That this Senate of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations hereby respectfully requests that the United States Congress strongly supports a peaceful unification of Ireland using all possible diplomatic means; and be it further,

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be and hereby is authorized and directed to transmit duly certified copies of this resolution to the Rhode Island Congressional Delegation, the President and Vice President of the United States, the United States Secretary of State, and the Taoiseach (Prime Minister) of Ireland, Enda Kenny.

POM–315. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Rhode Island requesting that the United States Congress and the United Nations work together towards finding a peaceful solution to the problems in Cyprus; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SENATE RESOLUTION 3118

Whereas, This year marks the fortieth anniversary of the illegal Turkish invasion and continued occupation of Cyprus: and

Whereas, The Republic of Cyprus has been divided and occupied by foreign forces since 1974, in violation of numerous United Nations' Resolutions; and

Whereas, The Republic of Cyprus is the only internationally recognized and legal entity on the Island of Cyprus and is a member of the United Nations and the European Union. United States Vice President Joseph Biden re-affirmed these facts and the United States' support for the Republic of Cyprus on his recent visit to the Island of Cyprus; and

Whereas, The international community, with the support of the United States, has repeatedly supported the Republic of Cyprus in this dispute. It has called for the removal of the 43,000 Turkish troops from the Island, the return of all illegal settlers, and has continuously urged the government of Turkey to engage in good faith negotiations to achieve these ends; and

Whereas, A peaceful, just and lasting solution to the Cyprus problem would greatly benefit the security and the political, economic and social well-being of all Cypriots, as well as contribute to improved relations between Greece, Turkey and the European Union: Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That this Senate of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations hereby marks the fortieth anniversary of the unlawful Turkish invasion and occupation of Cyprus. We furthermore respectfully request that the President of the United States and the United States Congress fully support all United Nations efforts to create a peaceful and democratic solution that will be based on European law and will guarantee all Cypriot citizens equal human rights; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be and hereby is authorized and directed to transmit duly certified copies of this resolution to President Barack Obama, Vice President Joseph Biden, Jr., Secretary of State John Kerry, the Rhode Island Delegation to the United States Congress, Speaker of the House of Representatives John Boehner, House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi, United States Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid, United States Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell, and United Nations Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon.

POM–316. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of California calling upon the United States Congress to enact legislation that would establish reasonable deadlines for the prohibition of the testing and marketing of cosmetic products that have been tested on animals, and urging the federal government to mandate alternative methods to animal testing of cosmetic products; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 22

Whereas, For more than 50 years, animals have been used in painful tests to assess the safety of certain chemicals used in cosmetic products; and

Whereas, Modern alternatives to harmful animal testing are increasingly less expensive, faster, and more accurate at predicting human reactions; and

Whereas, Mandating and promoting the use of accepted alternative methods to animal testing has, and will continue to have, a huge positive impact on animal welfare; and

Whereas, Careful evaluation of alternative methods to animal tests ensures that their proper use supports the equal or better protection of people, animals, and the environment; and

Whereas, In 2000, California became the first state in the nation to pass a law restricting the use of animals in product testing by making it unlawful to use animals for testing when an appropriate, validated, alternative method is available; and

Whereas, Our nation's largest trading partner, the European Union, which accounts for nearly half of the global cosmetics market worth an estimated $90 billion a year, prohibits the importation and sale of cosmetics that have been tested on animals as of March 2013; and

Whereas, Norway, India, Israel, and the state of Sao Paulo, Brazil have also banned all animal testing for cosmetics; and

Whereas, Harmonizing international laws that encourage modern science and respond to consumer expectations benefits businesses and consumers in today's global marketplace; and

Whereas, Polls show that the American public overwhelmingly supports alternatives to testing cosmetics on animals. A recent poll conducted by ORC International, a leading global market research firm, found that 72 percent of American adults surveyed believe that testing cosmetics on animals is unethical: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California, jointly, That the Legislature urges the United States Congress to enact legislation that would establish reasonable deadlines for the prohibition of the testing and marketing of cosmetic products that have been tested on animals; and be it further

Resolved, That the Legislature urges the federal government to mandate alternative methods to animal testing of cosmetic products, whenever those scientifically satisfactory methods are available, and to prioritize the validation and acceptance of additional nonanimal tests; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Majority Leader of the Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, to the Governor of California, and to the author for appropriate distribution.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MENENDEZ, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment:

S. 2577. A bill to require the Secretary of State to offer rewards totaling up to $5,000,000 for information on the kidnapping and murder of Naftali Fraenkel, a dual United States-Israeli citizen, that began on June 12, 2014 (Rept. No. 113–213).

H.R. 4028. A bill to amend the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 to include the desecration of cemeteries among the many forms of violations of the right to religious freedom (Rept. No. 113–214).

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. JOHANNS (for himself and Mrs. FISCHER):

S. 2633. A bill to require notification of a Governor of a State if an unaccompanied alien child is placed in a facility or with a sponsor in the State and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Ms. MIKULSKI (for herself and Mr. CARDIN):

S. Res. 509. A resolution honoring the extraordinary and courageous life of Mattie Stepanek; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 119

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 119, a bill to prohibit the application of certain restrictive eligibility requirements to foreign nongovernmental organizations with respect to the provision of assistance under part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

S. 162

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 162, a bill to reauthorize and improve the Mentally Ill Offender Treatment and Crime Reduction Act of 2004.

S. 315

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 315, a bill to reauthorize and extend the Paul D. Wellstone Muscular Dystrophy Community Assistance, Research, and Education Amendments of 2008.

S. 375

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 375, a bill to require Senate candidates to file designations, statements, and reports in electronic form.

S. 607

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 607, a bill to improve the provisions relating to the privacy of electronic communications.

S. 759

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 759, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income tax for amounts paid by a spouse of a member of the Armed Forces for a new State license or certification required by reason of a permanent change in the duty station of such member to another State.

S. 822

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 822, a bill to protect crime victims' rights, to eliminate the substantial backlog of DNA samples collected from crime scenes and convicted offenders, to improve and expand the DNA testing capacity of Federal, State, and local crime laboratories, to increase research and development of new DNA testing technologies, to develop new training programs regarding the collection and use of DNA evidence, to provide post conviction testing of DNA evidence to exonerate the innocent, to improve the performance of counsel in State capital cases, and for other purposes.

S. 865

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 865, a bill to provide for the establishment of a Commission to Accelerate the End of Breast Cancer.

S. 1011

At the request of Mr. JOHANNS, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1011, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the centennial of Boys Town, and for other purposes.

S. 1040

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN), the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER), the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) and the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) were added as cosponsors of S. 1040, a bill to provide for the award of a gold medal on behalf of Congress to Jack Nicklaus, in recognition of his service to the Nation in promoting excellence, good sportsmanship, and philanthropy.

S. 1153

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1153, a bill to establish an improved regulatory process for injurious wildlife to prevent the introduction and establishment in the United States of nonnative wildlife and wild animal pathogens and parasites that are likely to cause harm.

S. 1349

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1349, a bill to enhance the ability of community financial institutions to foster economic growth and serve their communities, boost small businesses, increase individual savings, and for other purposes.

S. 1690

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1690, a bill to reauthorize the Second Chance Act of 2007.

S. 1861

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1861, a bill to save taxpayer money and end bailouts of financial institutions by providing for a process to allow financial institutions to go bankrupt.

S. 2030

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2030, a bill to reauthorize and amend the National Sea Grant College Program Act, and for other purposes.

S. 2151

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2151, a bill to enhance the early warning reporting requirements for motor vehicle manufacturers.

S. 2253

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2253, a bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to provide for a temporary shift in the scheduled collection of the transitional reinsurance program payments.

S. 2305

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2305, a bill to amend the method by which the Social Security Administration determines the validity of marriages under title II of the Social Security Act.

S. 2309

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2309, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to authorize the Director of the Bureau of Prisons to issue oleoresin capsicum spray to officers and employees of the Bureau of Prisons.

S. 2329

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2329, a bill to prevent Hezbollah from gaining access to international financial and other institutions, and for other purposes.

S. 2360

At the request of Mr. LEVIN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2360, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the rules relating to inverted corporations.

S. 2366

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2366, a bill to amend the Richard B.

Russell National School Lunch Act to establish a permanent, nationwide summer electronic benefits transfer for children program.

S. 2373

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2373, a bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention for conducting or supporting research on firearms safety or gun violence prevention.

S. 2449

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2449, a bill to reauthorize certain provisions of the Public Health Service Act relating to autism, and for other purposes.

S. 2483

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2483, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect more victims of domestic violence by preventing their abusers from possessing or receiving firearms, and for other purposes.

S. 2508

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor 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. 2541

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2541, a bill to allow additional appointing authorities to select individuals from competitive service certificates.

S. 2547

At the request of Ms. HEITKAMP, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2547, a bill to establish the Railroad Emergency Services Preparedness, Operational Needs, and Safety Evaluation (RESPONSE) Subcommittee under the Federal Emergency Management Agency's National Advisory Council to provide recommendations on emergency responder training and resources relating to hazardous materials incidents involving railroads, and for other purposes.

S. 2569

At the request of Mr. WALSH, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2569, a bill to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America.

S. 2598

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2598, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to clarify and expand Federal criminal jurisdiction over Federal contractors and employees outside the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 2624

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2624, a bill to provide additional visas for the Afghan Special Immigrant Visa Program, and for other purposes.

S. 2625

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. WALSH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2625, a bill to establish certain duties for pharmacies to ensure provision of Food and Drug Administration-approved contraception, and for other purposes.

S. 2630

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2630, a bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to require disclosure to States of the basis of determinations under such Act, to ensure use of information provided by State, tribal, and county governments in decisionmaking under such Act, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 489

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 489, a resolution supporting the goals and ideals of ''Growth Awareness Week''.

S. RES. 498

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 498, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding United States support for the State of Israel as it defends itself against unprovoked rocket attacks from the Hamas terrorist organization.

S. RES. 502

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the names of the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) and the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 502, a resolution concerning the suspension of exit permit issuance by the Government of the Democratic Republic of Congo for adopted Congolese children seeking to depart the country with their adoptive parents.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 509—HONORING THE EXTRAORDINARY AND COURAGEOUS LIFE OF MATTIE STEPANEK

Ms. MIKULSKI (for herself and Mr. CARDIN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 509

Whereas Matthew ''Mattie'' Joseph Thaddeus Stepanek, was born on July 17, 1990, in Rockville, Maryland;

Whereas Mattie Stepanek was born with a rare form of Muscular Dystrophy—Dysautonomic Mitochondrial Myopathy;

Whereas the siblings of Mattie Stepanek—Katie, Stevie, and Jamie—were diagnosed with the same rare disease;

Whereas Mattie Stepanek began writing poetry, short stories, and essays to deal with grief over the death of his siblings;

Whereas the writings of Mattie Stepanek reflected his deep understanding of our ever-evolving world and the need for hope and peace;

Whereas Mattie Stepanek became a 7-time New York Times best-selling author;

Whereas Mattie Stepanek gave inspiration and educational speeches to audiences ranging from school children to business leaders and politicians;

Whereas Mattie Stepanek spoke about spirituality, disability, education, and health care, delivering a message of hope and peace to his audiences;

Whereas the words of Mattie Stepanek inspired millions of people around the world, including the 39th President of the United States, who was a friend of Mattie and delivered his eulogy;

Whereas Mattie Stepanek engaged in public service, working with Children's Hospice International to improve guidelines for the health and hospice care of children and serving as a 3-term National Goodwill Ambassador for the Muscular Dystrophy Association;

Whereas Mattie Stepanek has been honored with numerous awards, during his lifetime and posthumously, including the Children's Hope Medal of Honor and induction into the Kids Hall of Fame;

Whereas Mattie Stepanek passed away on June 22, 2004, at Children's National Medical Center in Washington, D.C.;

Whereas the mother of Mattie continues to raise awareness about the message of hope and peace that Mattie delivered and led the effort to create the Mattie J.T. Stepanek Park in Rockville, Maryland;

Whereas the Mattie Stepanek Foundation celebrates July 17th as ''Mattie Stepanek World Peace Day''; and

Whereas recognizing the 24th birthday of Mattie Stepanek honors the compassion and dedication to hope that Mattie embodied: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate honors the extraordinary life and legacy of Matthew ''Mattie'' Stepanek.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 3570. Mr. WICKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2094, to provide for the establishment of nationally uniform and environmentally sound standards governing discharges incidental to the normal operation of a vessel; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

SA 3571. Mr. WICKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2094, supra; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

SA 3572. Mr. WICKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2094, supra; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

SA 3573. Mr. RISCH 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.

SA 3574. Mr. TOOMEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 5021, to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 3570. Mr. WICKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2094, to provide for the establishment of nationally uniform and environmentally sound standards governing discharges incidental to the normal operation of a vessel; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation; as follows:

On page 22, line 11, strike ''60 days'' and insert ''1 year''.

SA 3571. Mr. WICKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2094, to provide for the establishment of nationally uniform and environmentally sound standards governing discharges incidental to the normal operations of a vessel; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation; as follows:

On page 13, line 7, strike ''living organism'' and insert ''organism that is living or has not been rendered harmless''.

SA 3572. Mr. WICKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2094, to provide for the establishment of nationally uniform and environmentally sound standards governing discharges incidental to the normal operation of a vessel; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation; as follows:

On page 13, line 4, strike ''living organism'' and insert ''organism that is living or has not been rendered harmless''.

SA 3573. Mr. RISCH 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 A of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1213. PROHIBITION ON FOREIGN ASSISTANCE TO GOVERNMENTS DEVELOPING GROUND-LAUNCHED NUCLEAR-CAPABLE MISSILE SYSTEMS WITH THE CAPABILITY OF STRIKING THE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES.

Section 102(b) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2799aa–1(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''device, or'' and inserting ''device,'';

(B) in subparagraph (D), by inserting ''or'' after ''device,''; and

(C) by inserting after subparagraph (D) the following new subparagraph:

''(E) is in the process of developing or acquiring a ground-launched nuclear-capable missile system with an assessed range capable of striking the continental United States, and is not a permanent member of the United Nations Security Council,'';

(2) in paragraph (4)(A), by striking ''required under paragraph (1)(A) or (1)(B)'' and inserting ''required under paragraph (1)(A), (1)(B), or (1)(E)'';

(3) in paragraph (5)—

(A) by striking ''this subsection, if the Congress'' and inserting the following: ''this subsection—

''(A) if the Congress'';

(B) by striking ''required under paragraph (1)(A) or (1)(B) if he'' and inserting ''required under paragraph (1)(A), (1)(B), or (1)(E) if the President'';

(C) by striking ''security. The President shall transmit'' and inserting ''security, and transmits''; and

(D) by striking ''therefor.'' and inserting the following: ''therefor; and

''(B) if the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence, certifies to Congress that the government of a country subject to sanctions under paragraph (1) solely on the basis of subparagraph (E) of such paragraph is no longer in the process of developing or acquiring a missile system described under such subparagraph, the President may waive such sanctions.''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(9)(A) Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of the Carl Levin National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, and annually thereafter, the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on any countries determined in accordance with subparagraph (E) of paragraph (1) to be in the process of developing or acquiring a missile system described under such subparagraph.

''(B) In this paragraph, the term 'appropriate congressional committees' means—

''(i) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Select Committee on Intelligence, and the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

''(ii) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.''.

SA 3574. Mr. TOOMEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 5021, to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title I, add the following:

SEC. 10____. EMERGENCY EXEMPTIONS.

Any road, highway, railway, bridge, or transit facility that is damaged by an emergency that is declared by the Governor of the State and concurred in by the Secretary of Homeland Security or declared as an emergency by the President pursuant to the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.) and that is in operation or under construction on the date on which the emergency occurs—

(1) may be reconstructed in the same location with the same capacity, dimensions, and design as before the emergency; and

(2) shall be exempt from any environmental reviews, approvals, licensing, and permit requirements under—

(A) the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.);

(B) sections 402 and 404 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1342, 1344);

(C) the National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 470 et seq.);

(D) the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (16 U.S.C. 703 et seq.);

(E) the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1271 et seq.);

(F) the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (16 U.S.C. 661 et seq.);

(G) the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.), except when the reconstruction occurs in designated critical habitat for threatened and endangered species;

(H) Executive Order 11990 (42 U.S.C. 4321 note; relating to the protection of wetland); and

(I) any Federal law (including regulations) requiring no net loss of wetland.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mrs. DaMara Belson, a NASA fellow, be granted floor privileges.

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

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Alex Rosenberg, an intern on the Judiciary Committee staff, be granted floor privileges for July 22, 2014.

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

HONORING THE LIFE OF MATTIE STEPANEK

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 509, which was submitted earlier today.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 509) honoring the extraordinary and courageous life of Mattie Stepanek.

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

Mr. DURBIN. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 509) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, JULY 22, 2014

Mr. DURBIN. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m. on Tuesday, July 22, 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 10:45 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; that at 10:45 a.m. the Senate proceed to executive session as provided under the previous order; further, that following the vote on the deGravelles nomination, the time until 12:30 p.m. be equally divided and controlled in the usual form; and finally, that the Senate recess from 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m. to allow for the weekly caucus meetings.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. DURBIN. At 10:45 a.m. there will be a series of three cloture votes on the following nominations: Andre Birotte, Jr., to be United States district judge for the Central District of California; Robin L. Rosenberg, of Florida, to be United States district judge for the Southern District of Florida; and John W. deGravelles to be United States district judge for the Middle District of Louisiana.

If cloture is invoked on these nominations, at 2:15 p.m. the Senate will proceed to vote on confirmation of each of the nominations.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. DURBIN. 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 7:24 p.m, adjourned until Tuesday, July 22, 2014, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

MORRIS K. UDALL AND STEWART L. UDALL FOUNDATION

JAMES L. HUFFMAN, OF OREGON, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE MORRIS K. UDALL AND STEWART L. UDALL FOUNDATION FOR A TERM EXPIRING OCTOBER 6, 2014, VICE MICHAEL BUTLER, TERM EXPIRED.

JAMES L. HUFFMAN, OF OREGON, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE MORRIS K. UDALL AND STEWART L. UDALL FOUNDATION FOR A TERM EXPIRING OCTOBER 6, 2020. (REAPPOINTMENT)

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

CHARLES H. FULGHUM, OF NORTH CAROLINA, TO BE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY, VICE MARGARET ANN SHERRY, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

BARBARA A. LEAF, 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 UNITED ARAB EMIRATES.

VIRGINIA E. PALMER, 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 REPUBLIC OF MALAWI.

WILLIAM V. ROEBUCK, OF NORTH CAROLINA, 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 KINGDOM OF BAHRAIN.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

ADRI DAVIN JAYARATNE, OF MICHIGAN, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF LABOR, VICE BRIAN VINCENT KENNEDY.

UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE

MICKEY D. BARNETT, OF NEW MEXICO, TO BE A GOVERNOR OF THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 8, 2020. (REAPPOINTMENT)

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 21, 2014:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

EUNICE S. REDDICK, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, 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 NIGER.

MICHAEL ANDERSON LAWSON, OF CALIFORNIA, FOR THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR DURING HIS TENURE OF SERVICE AS REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA ON THE COUNCIL OF THE INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION ORGANIZATION.

THE JUDICIARY

JULIE E. CARNES, OF GEORGIA, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT.