

Agencies such as the Environmental Protection Agency and the U.S. Forest Service have a history of interfering with the use of private property. These agencies have fined and bullied landowners throughout the West. Too often the goal of the bureaucrats is to protect their own turf, not to protect the land or to serve the people. Honest, hard-working taxpayers get crushed beneath the resources of a Federal legal system that operates without oversight. The Western Caucus favors conservation through local cooperation and partnership, not through intimidation and an attitude that "Washington knows best."

This report's four principles and the ideas it discusses are based on what members in the Western Caucus hear back home. These are the topics I hear from people as I travel around Wyoming. These principles promote responsible energy, food and timber production, while preserving what makes the West a unique place in America.

Last year more than 10 million people from around the world visited Wyoming. They are drawn by its beauty and natural splendor. The people of Wyoming and all Western States know they have a responsibility to manage and protect the land and waters in a way that allows all of us to enjoy them. The goal of the Senate and Congressional Western Caucus is to preserve and protect everything that is special about the West so that families who have lived there for generations can continue to live there for generations in the future.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant Democratic leader.

25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE AIRLINE SMOKING BAN

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, today marks the 25th anniversary of a law that has affected millions of Americans. It was a law that came about because of a dare. It happened in an airport in Phoenix, AZ. I was catching a flight from Phoenix to St. Louis—I think to Chicago—and I was late. I ran up to the United Airlines counter, and the ticket agent started processing my ticket to get on the flight.

She said to me, "Here is your boarding pass," and I looked at it and noticed she had put me in the smoking section on the airplane.

I said to her, "I don't want to sit in the smoking section. Isn't there something you can do about this?"

She said, "You came here too late. And incidentally, Congressman, there is something you can do about it."

I got on that airplane and got stuck in the middle seat in the smoking section in the back of the plane, surrounded by smokers, wedged in there, and I looked around the plane and thought: This makes no sense at all. There is an older person who may have a pulmonary problem. There is a moth-

er with a baby sitting in a nonsmoking section two rows away from me. And I thought to myself: I am going to do something to change this.

I went back to the House of Representatives. I was a relatively new Member of Congress. I introduced a bill to ban smoking on airplanes. My staff thought it was crazy. Nobody had ever beaten the tobacco lobby at anything. To take them and most of the airline industry on was a fool's errand, but I did it anyway. I got a lot of help along the way from some amazing colleagues. I finally got a chance to bring it to the floor for a vote, and to the shock and surprise of the tobacco lobby, we won. We banned smoking on airplane flights of 2 hours or more.

I called my friend Frank Lautenberg, who was a Senator from New Jersey, and I asked him if he would take up the cause in the U.S. Senate. He agreed to, and he passed the same measure.

So this day marks the 25th anniversary of the signing into law a ban on smoking on airplanes. It is obvious why it passed. Members of Congress are part of the largest frequent flyer program in the world, and they hated it as much as I did on that flight from Phoenix to Chicago. But it did something I never imagined. Malcolm Gladwell wrote a book called "The Tipping Point." It turns out that moment was a tipping point because people all across America 25 years ago started asking a very basic question: If second-hand smoke is dangerous in an airplane, isn't it dangerous in a train, on a bus, in an office, in hospitals, in restaurants, in a tavern, in a bingo hall—and the list went on and on. All across the United States, States started changing laws and banning smoking.

Today, if you walked into the doors of the Capitol here smoking a cigarette, somebody would stop you and say: Wait a minute, we don't do that here. In the old days, nobody would think twice and there were ashtrays all over.

When I first came to the Senate, there were no rules when it came to smoking—none. We developed them after I made a few points to those in charge. But that was the culture and the situation 25 years ago.

I think that effort to take smoking off airplanes has led to a lot of other dramatic efforts to protect Americans from secondhand smoke and from dangerous situations. I think lives have been saved. There are so many of us who can tell family stories about losses related to lung cancer and pulmonary disease. I can tell my story.

I was 14 years old when my father died of lung cancer. He was 53 years old and smoked two packs of Camels a day. He died an early death. I didn't stand by his bed at the hospital and say "I will get even with that tobacco lobby," but I remembered him as I started this ban.

So I just wanted to make a note in the RECORD today in the Senate to salute the memory of my friend Frank

Lautenberg, who was my partner in passing this important legislation, and to remind us there are other things we can do to make this world a little better and a little safer. One of those things relates to e-cigarettes, a new invention tobacco companies are jumping up and down to market to children in America. We have seen in a short period of time the number of kids using these electronic cigarettes double. It has a chemical in it, the same one that is in cigarettes—nicotine—that is addictive. Tobacco companies know that if they can lure children into cigarettes or e-cigarettes, they are going to create an addiction in these young people that will be tough to break and won't be healthy at all.

I hope the Food and Drug Administration will step up and do their job and regulate these products and these e-cigarette products to protect the children across America.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY FUNDING

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, this week we are deciding whether we are going to shut down the Government of the United States of America again. Again. I think it was about a year and a half ago that the Senator from Texas on the other side of the aisle took to the floor and called for shutting down the Government of the United States of America, protesting President Obama's Affordable Care Act. He did it, and the hardship that created for people all across the United States who relied on essential government services is well documented. The impact it had on the men and women who work in our government was also documented. It cost our economy. It was a bad thing to do. It was a political strategy which on reflection was the absolute worst, to shut down our government.

Well, this week we face another shutdown, and this time it is the Department of Homeland Security. This Department is the one Department that is charged with keeping America safe from the threat of terrorism. It was created after 9/11 because we wanted to make sure we put together 22 agencies that worked together to protect us. You see them in so many different places. This agency runs the Coast Guard. Its cutters are patrolling Lake Michigan and our coastline—the Atlantic and Pacific and the Gulf of Mexico as well. You see them when you go to the airport—TSA is under the supervision of the Department of Homeland Security. You may not know it, but your local fire department is depending on grants from this same agency so they can buy new equipment and train the people who are responding to fires in their community.

Over and over again the Department of Homeland Security invests in the safety of America. So why in God's name would we have a political strategy to stop funding the Department of Homeland Security? That is exactly

what we are faced with—exactly. Come the end of this week, this Department will basically lose its funding and be on emergency status. Why would we do that at a time when we have been warned about terrorist groups attacking malls across America? We are going to shut down the agency, stop funding the agency that protects us against terrorism in the streets of America.

At a time when ISIS is kidnapping people from all over the world, beheading them, burning them to death, killing them by execution, we are going to drop our guard and say: Well, we are not going to fund the Department of Homeland Security. Why in the world would any politicians in either House of Congress think this is a wise tactical move?

It turns out this funding bill was sent to us by the House of Representatives on the condition that we take up the debate over immigration policy in America. I think we need to debate that policy. I have no objection to it. I feel very strongly about some aspects of it. But why would we make the Department of Homeland Security play the role of hostage over this debate on immigration? The right thing to do to protect America and the people who live here is to fund the Department of Homeland Security.

I offered a unanimous consent on the floor 2 weeks ago asking the Republicans to join the Democrats in funding this Department. Senator MCCONNELL, the majority leader, objected. I think that was a mistake. Now I think we understand, as we reach this deadline of shutting down this valuable agency of our government, that we cannot let this happen.

What is it about this immigration debate that has driven some politicians in Congress to the point where they are threatening to shut down this Department, to cut off its funding? It turns out they object to some of the Executive orders issued by the President on immigration.

Remember, it was the Senate that passed a comprehensive immigration bill 2 years ago. I was part of the group that wrote it. We passed it on the floor with 68 votes, and the Republican House of Representatives refused to even call the bill, or any bill, on the subject. And when they failed to do anything to fix our broken immigration system, the President said: I am going to issue some Executive orders to deal with this problem if Congress refuses to act, and he did.

The Republicans hated those Executive orders by President Obama like the devil hates holy water. They hate them so much that they would shut down the Department of Homeland Security in protest over the President's action. One of the things that troubles them the most is something called DACA. DACA is a shorthand description of the President's Executive order which allows those who would qualify under the DREAM Act to stay in the United States and not be deported.

The DREAM Act is a bill I introduced 14 years ago. I introduced it because I learned there were children brought to America by their undocumented parents, who grew up in this country, went to school in this country, were good citizens in America, but had no future because they had no home. My DREAM Act said if you were one of those children brought here by your parents, we are not going to hold you responsible for your parents' decision. We will give you a chance to become legal in America. That is what the DREAM Act said. That is all it said. The President's Executive order said: We are not going to deport these young children now growing up in America. We are going to give them a chance to stay here, to study here, and to work here. Many of the Republicans hate the idea of giving these young people a chance. Sadly, what they are doing is turning down an opportunity for America to benefit from some of these extraordinary young people.

Time and again I have come to the floor of the Senate to tell the stories of these young DREAMers, and I will tell another one today.

This lovely young woman is Mithi Del Rosario. Her parents brought Mithi to the United States from the Philippines when she was 5 years old. There was no question about whether she was going to come; she was part of the family.

She grew up in California. She was an excellent student and her lifetime goal was to be a medical doctor. In high school she was on the principal's honor roll and an AP scholar. She received a Golden State Seal Merit Diploma and a Governor's Scholar Award. She was quite the student.

Mithi was admitted to the University of California at Los Angeles, one of the Nation's top universities. At UCLA she volunteered as a research assistant. She wanted to get into a lab that studied the high risk of infants to develop autism.

Mithi also volunteered, while a student at UCLA, as a crisis counselor for their peer helpline, advising students who were the victim of rape, child abuse, and substance abuse. She eventually became a trainer for new counselors. Mithi also volunteered as a mentor and tutor for at-risk middle school children in the city of Los Angeles.

She graduated from UCLA with a degree in psychology. Her options were limited in terms of medical school because she is undocumented. She was unable to pursue her dream to become a doctor. Then in 2012, President Obama issued an Executive order establishing the DACA Program, allowing students such as her a chance to stay in America and not be deported. Her whole world changed.

She began working as a research assistant at the UCLA School of Medicine, and she has applied to attend medical school. She still volunteers at the autism research lab where she

started her research career 7 years ago. Her ambition is to be part of the treatment and research effort to help children with autism. She also has served as peer mentor to 10 undergraduate students at UCLA.

She wrote me a letter and asked that I relay a message to the Members of Congress who are engaged in the debate on whether to shut down the DACA Program which gives her a chance to stay in the United States. These are her words:

Please, please listen to our stories. This is my home, and the only country I know. DACA gives us greater opportunities to give back to the country we love.

This young lady, and millions like her, grew up in the classrooms of America pledging allegiance to that flag. It is the only flag they have ever known. They can only sing one national anthem—the national anthem that is closest to their heart for the United States of America. But now there is an effort underway by some politicians in Congress to deport her and send her back to the Philippines, and to say: Despite all you have done with your young life, despite all the talents which you bring to Los Angeles and to California, despite your promise to enter into the medical profession and to serve in a cause that all of us realize is so important, autism research—despite all of that, leave America. That is the message that comes through in this bill sent to us by the House Republicans.

They want to deport Mithi Del Rosario. They want to send her out of this country and toss her away despite all of the investment we made, and she has made, in her life. Mithi, and other DREAMers like her, have so much to contribute.

The Republican bill that is before us would deport hundreds of thousands of young people just like her, and it would stop the President's effort to give the parents of citizens—American citizen children—a chance to work temporarily and legally in the United States.

It is hard to imagine that so many on the other side of the aisle have lost sight of who we are as a nation. We are a nation of immigrants, and that immigrant spirit has made us different in this world we live in.

The people who risked everything to come to the United States, to a country where they may not have even spoken the language and gave up everything and came here—they are a special brand of risk takers, and we have a little bit of their DNA in our blood.

My mother was an immigrant. She was brought here at the age of 2, and her son now serves in the U.S. Senate. As I have said so many times on the floor, that is my story, it is my family's story, and it is America's story.

I cannot believe my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have forgotten America's history and America's story and are willing to turn their backs on a young woman such as this and say:

We don't need you. You can leave. In fact, we are going to make you leave. We are going to force you out of this country.

America won't be a stronger country if we deport Mithi and others like her. We are not going to be a better country if we tear apart American families. We are not going to be safer when we should be deporting criminals, not those who aspire to be medical researchers.

Instead of trying to deport DREAMers and mothers and fathers, congressional Republicans should support a clean appropriations bill. Let's do that. Let's pass a bill to fund the Department of Homeland Security. Let's get that done so once again we don't have a Republican shutdown of any branch of our Federal Government. Let's get that part done. And then if we are going to engage in a real debate on immigration, let's do it. The majority is controlled by the Republicans in the House and the Senate and they can do that any time they want. Let's engage in that debate and let's do it in an honest fashion. Let's do it in a hopeful and positive view of what America's future will be when young people such as Mithi Del Rosario have their chance to become part of an America that embraces talent and skill and thanks young people for the sacrifice they made to make a better life for all of us who live in this Nation.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RECESS SUBJECT TO THE CALL OF THE CHAIR

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess for 5 minutes subject to the call of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 10:27 a.m., recessed subject to the call of the Chair and reassembled at 10:29 a.m. when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. COTTON).

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate

resumes the motion to proceed to H.R. 240 following morning business today, that Senators be permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2015—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, Senators are permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes.

The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed such time as I may consume as in morning business.

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

THE MIDDLE EAST AND UKRAINE

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, a lot of us are deeply concerned about the situation in the Middle East, in Ukraine, in China, to which we have paid very little attention to as they expand their territory.

I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to engage in a colloquy with the Senator from South Carolina.

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

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, there is a huge credibility gap. The Washington Post probably said it better than I probably could, and it is entitled "A credibility gap," in the Washington Post, by Fred Hiatt, editorial page editor, February 22. He says: "If his negotiators strike an agreement next month, we already know that it will be far from ideal," talking about the Iranian nuclear deal.

He continues:

The partisanship needs no explanation, but the record of foreign-policy assurances is worth recalling:

This is very interesting and I think deserves the attention of all Americans.

In 2011, when he decided to pull all U.S. troops out of Iraq, Obama belittled worries that instability might result. Iraq and the United States would maintain "a strong and enduring partnership," Obama said. Iraq would be "stable, secure and self-reliant," and Iraqis would build a future "worthy of their history as a cradle of civilization."

Today [as we know] Iraq is in deep trouble, with a murderous "caliphate" occupying much of its territory and predatory Shiite militia roaming through much of the rest.

The same year, Obama touted his bombing campaign in Libya as a model of U.S. intervention and promised, "That's not to say that our work is complete. In addition to our NATO responsibilities, we will work with the international community to provide assistance to the people of Libya."

My friends, we all know what has happened in Libya and the reason is—despite what Senator GRAHAM and our then-former colleague Senator Lieberman said—we had to do some things in Libya to make sure there was stability in Libya. Obama then walked away.

Continuing from the article:

Obama also said then, "Some nations may be able to turn a blind eye to atrocities in other countries. The United States of America is different. And as president, I refused to wait for the images of slaughter and mass graves before taking action." That was before Syrian dictator Bashar al-Assad's barrel bombs, systematic and well-documented prison torture and other depredations of civil war killed 200,000 of his compatriots, and drove millions more from their homes.

In August 2011, Obama declared that Assad must "step aside." In a background briefing a senior White House official added, "We are certain Assad is on the way out." In August 2013 came Obama's statement that "the worst chemical attack of the 21st century . . . must be confronted . . . I have decided that the United States should take military action against Syrian regime [military] targets."

As a personal aside, the Senator from South Carolina came over to the White House, and the President of the United States assured us that he was going to take military action and we were going to degrade Bashar al-Assad and upgrade the Syrian Army, and, obviously, the article states that "no military action was taken, and Assad remains in power."

Defeating the Islamic State is one we have successfully pursued in Yemen and Somalia for years—successful in Yemen and Somalia that we have pursued for years. Just last month in the State of the Union Address, President Obama presented his Ukraine policy as a triumph of ". . . American strength and diplomacy. We are upholding the principle that bigger nations can't bully the small by opposing Russian aggression supporting Ukraine's democracy," he said.

We all know. We have watched Ukrainians slaughtered, slaughtered with the most modern equipment that Vladimir Putin has. That great national bloodletting is going on, and we are watching, thanks to the assistance of the Chancellor of Germany and the President of France—in the finest traditions of Neville Chamberlain—we are standing by and watching that country be dismembered.

What the Senator from South Carolina and I are trying to say is what General Keane said the other day:

. . . al Qaeda and its affiliates exceeds Iran and is beginning to dominate multiple countries. In fact, al-Qaeda has grown fourfold in the last five years.