United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015 No. 32

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

We acknowledge today, O Lord, Your power, mercy, and grace. We need Your power, for the challenges we face require more than human wisdom and strength. We need Your mercy, for we transgress Your law and fall short of Your glory. We need Your grace, for we cannot offer anything to merit Your favor or gain Your love.

Empower our Senators for today's journey. Lord, give them confidence to draw near to You, that they may find grace to help them in this time of need. In an unstable world, where freedom lovers are challenged to live courageously, guide our lawmakers to be models of courage. May they send the right signals to an unstable and dangerous world.

We pray in Your merciful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAUL). The majority leader is recognized.

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

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to H.R. 240.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 5, H.R. 240, a bill making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, yesterday President Obama took the extreme step of vetoing good American jobs. He sided with partisan extremists and powerful special interests over the middle class.

It says a lot about the priorities of this administration. But if the White House thinks this is the end of the new Congress's push for American jobs, it is wrong. I will soon have more to say about this and what the Senate plans to do.

For the moment, the Senate is focused on overcoming another extreme idea: the Democrats' Homeland Security filibuster to defend Executive overreach.

Many Senate Democrats led their constituents to believe they would do something about the kind of Executive overreach President Obama referred to as ''unwise and unfair'' and ignoring the law. Those are the words of the President of the United States. We have since heard excuses from Democrats to cover for their refusal to do so. But the time for excuses has now passed. Democrats will soon have another chance to prove they were serious.

Later this week, the Senate will consider a bill from the senior Senator from Maine that is about as reasonable as you can get. Obviously, President Obama was right to refer to the kind of overreach he took in November as ignoring the law. Senator COLLINS' sensible bill focuses simply on preventing the most egregious example of Executive overreach from taking effect. It is as simple as that.

The Collins bill is not tied to funding of DHS, either. So there are no excuses left. Democrats should join us in voting for this commonsense legislation.

In the meantime, we have offered Democrats a chance to prove they were serious about something else, and that is funding the Department of Homeland Security.

It is really something to watch Democrats vote and block funding for this Department one day and then hold a hypocritical press conference the next. Democrats need to end their weeks-long filibuster of Homeland Security funding and end it right now.

We have continually offered them sensible opportunities to do so. Yesterday, we offered them yet another. But it will require their cooperation to achieve.

The dual-pronged approach I have outlined—allowing the Senate to stop unwise and unfair overreach on the one hand and to fund DHS through the fiscal year on the other—is a sensible way forward, but it can't be achieved without cross-partisan cooperation.

The onus continues to be on the Democratic Party to keep the Department of Homeland Security funded. Democrats can fund DHS now—not by holding more hypocritical press conferences but by ending their senseless filibuster and cooperating across the aisle.

That is what Americans expect. That is what Democrats can finally work together with us on to get done now.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business for 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, and with the majority controlling the first half and the Democrats controlling the final half.

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

Printed on recycled paper.

The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, it is my understanding that we are in morning business with permission to speak for up to 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

WASTEFUL SPENDING

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, when I reran for the Senate in 2010, there were two major issues that dominated the campaign and that continue to dominate the discussion and debate in the Senate postelection. One was the Affordable Care Act, now called ObamaCare, which was pushed through without any bipartisan support. There was a lot of concern among the American people about the impact this would have on their lives. That was an issue of intense discussion and debate during that campaign.

The second was the plunge into debt at a level Americans had never seen before in the history of the country. It took nearly 200 years, from the beginning of our Nation until 1981, to reach the $1 trillion debt mark. That is a lot of governing. That is a lot of growth of America. But we were essentially on a path—including expenditures for war and so forth—that didn't take us deeply into debt relative to our gross domestic product.

All of a sudden, in 2010, there was the revelation that debt held by the public was rapidly nearing the $10 trillion mark—a tenfold increase in less than 30 years. It took 190 plus years to get to the first $1 trillion and only 30 years to add ten times that amount. That was a hot topic of debate during the 2010 election. During that election, the American people came out in significant numbers and said: Get to Washington and do something about this.

In the background, a debt clock was ticking away, and not only on my website but clocks around the country at different times, and people were astonished at how fast those numbers were churning.

That led to a pretty intense effort on the part of both parties and on the part of many organizations. I can remember Simpson-Bowles—a former Chief of Staff of President Bill Clinton along with a former distinguished Senator from Wyoming, a Republican and a Democrat together—Simpson-Bowles. The public was getting behind this—a $4 trillion, over 10 year fix to the problem. It was pretty dramatic, yet there was a lot of momentum for it. That was shot down, unfortunately, by the President when it was presented.

Following that, we had the Gang of 6, a bipartisan effort, and the Joint Committee on Deficit Reduction—the group of 12, 6 Democrats and 6 Republicans working diligently to try to put something together, along with outside organizations, to fix the debt. There were any number of these—the Domenici Rivlin task force—proposals that were worked on together in a bipartisan way, realizing that as the debt was continuing to accumulate it was going to have major negative consequences to the future of our children and grandchildren and perhaps even our own generation.

We stand here today, having gone through all that—the Vitter committee, which I was a part of; eight of us agreeing with the President, with no staff and no press, closed room, months and months and months of negotiation—only once again to come up short. Ultimately, we sacrificed so many things we thought we needed to do just to get something going. But once again it was shot down in the end by a President who really wasn't willing to accept even the provisions he had proposed in his budget proposal that was publicly proposed. We took those and said: Can we at least do these, Mr. President? You have announced this is your initiative. But it was a no go.

Well, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I then tried to work with various agencies. They all had to come before us to make their requests known for the coming year. I asked them: Do you have a plan B in place? What do you mean plan B? What is plan B all about?

Plan B is the fact that mandatory spending is running away with our budget and the available amount of money for your discretionary spending is shrinking every year. So what is your plan B in terms of having less money available, whether it is for health care, for education, for building roads? All of the discretionary issues that fall under the discretionary spending that we are in control of, we no longer have control of. That is shrinking and you are going to have to do more with less. And I asked that they provide a plan B before they could get my clearance in terms of supporting their requests.

They never came forward. No, we have to stay with what the President's budget is and so forth. So here we are now, over $8 trillion more than where we were in 2010, and an $18 trillion-plus deficit.

Everyone knows this is unsustainable. Everyone in America knows we are careening toward insolvency, with an inability to cover even some of the most basic functions of government.

I talk to agencies about a policy of triage. I suggested they separate out what they absolutely essentially have to do and we will fund it. Then part B is what they would like to do if they had the money to do it. Part C is their asking: Why are we doing that in the first place or that program is long past its need, its existence or it hasn't worked. Let's start there, with part C, and let's get rid of excess spending that has no real function going forward or it is duplication or fraud or waste or whatever.

That leads me now to this poster. I have kind of gone from acting like the President's Chief of Staff to the co-chair of the ''go big guy'' in terms of what we need to do. We can't go there, but maybe we can go a little. And we are all the way down now to what I call ''waste of the week.''

Let us at least identify those things that the Government Accountability Office and the Congressional Budget Office have identified as those things we know don't work, that we know are a waste, that we know are duplication, and let's see if we can get at least some start in terms of dealing with this debt.

Senator Coburn took the lead on that in the last several sessions of Congress. We are going to miss him because no one can do it better than he did in pointing out and really embarrassing a lot of us in asking: Why are we funding that? I am not trying to take his place. But I did, with my staff, come up with the idea to at least let our colleagues know—those who say we can't cut a penny more, we have cut too much—that, yes, we can cut more. We can at least do something to address this debt or have money to offset a needed funding program.

So we are going to inaugurate ''waste of the week'' today. In its debut, I will go back to something I tried to amend when we were addressing the unemployment insurance issue. Ultimately, I was not able to offer the amendment thanks to the majority leader's filling of the tree and not allowing any amendments. I made a big stink about it. I didn't understand why we could not at least take that up.

So waste of the week this week is the cost to the taxpayer for those in the safety net receiving Social Security Disability Insurance or unemployment insurance and getting checks from both agencies.

Now, if you can prove to the appropriate government agency that you can't work, you can be eligible if you go through the process for Social Security Disability Insurance. But if you go to the Social Security Disability Insurance agency and make your claim, you can't then go to the unemployment insurance agency and say you can't work, that you can't find work, that you are able to work but that you need to get that check from that agency. What has been documented now is the fact that there are very significant numbers of people who are gaming this issue and receiving checks from both agencies.

Either you can work or you can't work. You are eligible for one safety net program or the other, but not both. That totals $5.7 billion of duplication.

My amendment that I had offered under the unemployment insurance extension in the last Congress was simply to say you can't do both, and we are going to put procedures in place so we can find out who is doing both.

One would think this would be pretty simple, even in the paper age, but we are in the digital age. I don't understand why the people administering

this can't simply take the Social Security number and plug it into unemployment insurance and say: Do you have this person's name with this Social Security number? Are they receiving unemployment insurance? Or vice versa. It ought to be the push of a button on a computer so that it is not all that costly and makes a great deal of sense.

The worst they would have to do is pick up the phone and say: I have John Doe here whose Social Security number is X. He is applying for Social Security Disability Insurance. Do you have him on the unemployment role? Or vice versa. I am sorry, Mr. Doe, but you can't do both, and you are gaming the system. This duplication of benefits costs $5.7 billion. That is a pretty good savings.

This is the first of what will be a weekly presentation of programs that are no longer needed, that are duplicative, where there is fraud or waste involved. I am going to bring this forward every week, and we are going to try to add it all up.

We start here with $5.7 billion, and I have my spending thermometer going up to $100 billion. I think we can go much higher than that. Tom Coburn said we could, through his Wastebook and the work he has done.

So we have already inked it in here. We are going to start filling this in by coming here every week.

People may say: Well, that is small change. Look, $5.7 billion is not small change. In comparison to our debt, does it solve the problem? Absolutely not. It is at least a start. Can we at least not come together in sensible things such as this and at least get started in the right direction?

In the meantime, I think we are still going to be pushed into situations by crisis, when no longer the countenance of the investment world in America in terms of the rate of return is acceptable, because the debt continues to accumulate.

So here we are, back to 2010, back to where we were. I know it is not talked about very much at this stage. We have foreign policy issues and domestic issues we have to engage in. But the clock is ticking away, minute after minute, second after second, and it is a continued plunge of the deficit spending—borrowing money we don't have in order to pay for things we need, but also paying for things we don't need.

So I will be here every week with a new proposal. We will be filling in this chart, and hopefully at least start us on the process once again of getting through to one major challenge we have here in this Senate, the Congress, and the executive branch, and that is dealing with our debt. It is generational theft. It is putting the burden on our children and grandchildren, and even on workers here today. It is holding down our economy. It is one of the major challenges this Congress has not successfully addressed and which this administration has not successfully addressed. It is kicking the can down the road to the extreme, and we do not need to forget that. We need to emphasize it. This is my small step, after many large steps that have failed, to try to continue to alert the American people and alert my colleagues that there is money we can save and spend and run a much more efficient, effective government.

I yield the floor.

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

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

PRINCIPLED STEWARDSHIP OF THE AMERICAN WEST

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, over the past week while I was home in Wyoming traveling around our State, I had a chance to talk with students about their hopes for the future, and I talked with many small business owners about their efforts in trying to create jobs.

The people of Wyoming work hard and take seriously the Western values of family and community. They are committed—they are committed—to preserving the West's role in providing natural resources that improve the lives of millions of people all across America.

This commitment is shared by the Senate Western Caucus—a caucus which I chair in the Senate—as well as is shared by the Congressional Western Caucus under the leadership of Wyoming Congressman CYNTHIA LUMMIS.

Recently, we released a joint report titled ''Principled Stewardship of the American West.'' This new report has details about specific things we should be doing right here in Congress, specific things Washington should let the people in the West do for themselves. The whole report is available on my Web site, Barrasso.senate.gov.

Now I want to talk about four specific principles that guide the work of the Western Caucus that are contained in this very report. These principles are based on the idea that the people who live on the land are the best stewards of the land. Our main goal is to empower the residents, the workers, and the leaders in the West and local leaders throughout the country to make the decisions that best serve their families and their communities. These principles stand in stark contrast to the failed approach Washington has taken for far too long.

The first principle in our report has to do with energy. The members of the Western Caucus are united. We will promote access to our Nation's abundant, affordable, secure, diverse, and reliable energy and mineral resources. That means increasing energy security for the United States. We can do that by producing more energy responsibly right here at home. It also means opening access to international markets so we can help the energy security of our allies as well.

The second principle we talk about in the report ''Principled Stewardship of the American West'' focuses on environmental stewardship in the West. We take very seriously our commitment to ensuring the health of the land, the wildlife, and the environment. Thousands of people are working across the West to protect our communities. These are people who live in the West, not bureaucrats in Washington, DC. Nobody is better qualified than the people who actually walk the land and breathe the air they are trying to protect.

Our report encourages locally led conservation partnerships to build on the work being done by people who rely on the health and the safety of the land. This means making sure regulators base their decisions on science, not on personal ideology, and that their work is done out in the open. On this front I will be introducing legislation to stop the Environmental Protection Agency's takeover of the waters of the United States.

The third principle in this report focuses on agriculture and forestry. As an environmental stewardship, the Western Caucus believes the States are better equipped than Washington to develop good farm policies. Crops, breeds of livestock, soil types, and the growing seasons vary greatly across this country. These factors come together in the West very differently from what might be seen in the Northeast or in the South. A bureaucrat in Washington simply cannot write regulations that cover every part of the country with any hope of success. Western States must be allowed to make these decisions for themselves to help the farming and ranching way of life continue to thrive in America.

One task we can do at the national level is to promote active management of our forests to ensure that our forests remain healthy. As many as 82 million acres of our National Forest System need treatment to deal with the threats of fire, insects, and invasive species. When forests deteriorate, they are more vulnerable to wildfire. Fires cause erosion and threaten water quality. When forests get overgrown and unhealthy, they stifle habitats critical for deer, elk, wild turkeys, and other animals. The members of the Western Caucus know how important it is to responsibly manage our national forests, and we will push for legislation to make sure that continues to happen.

Finally, the report focuses on a Western approach to judicial and regulatory reform. This includes stopping the lawsuit abuse that special interest groups have used to set public policy without the public actually being involved. It includes protecting private property owners from excessive Washington regulations.

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 mother 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 secondhand 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 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.

Radical Islam is clearly on the rise, and I think our policy of disengaging from the Middle East has contributed to that rise.

So there is no policy in Iraq, there is no policy in Syria, there is no combating or assisting even the Ukrainians as they attempt to defend themselves against the wholesale slaughter of their countrymen by Vladimir Putin.

My friends, we have had ample testimony before the Armed Services Committee, people who served this country with distinction for many years—Republican and Democratic administrations. All of them have said they have never seen the world in more turmoil, and these things don't happen by accident. It is not like hurricanes or earthquakes, it is a matter of a failed, feckless foreign policy that began in 2009 and the chickens are coming home to roost.

May I mention—my friend from South Carolina—this is where we are with the Islamic State. We are hearing from the administration, I believe, that we are gaining. Look at the Islamic State, January 10, of Syria in red—this is the Islamic State and contested places—and look at August 31. Obviously, there are significant gains. One more chart, please.

Looking at this chart, these are the areas of all of that part of the world that are now controlled or under attack by ISIS, including, by the way, we now see ISIS gaining a foothold in Libya.

Mr. GRAHAM. I thank the Senator from Arizona.

What I would like the body to recognize is that our Presiding Officer, who just left, Senator COTTON, was an infantry officer in Iraq, and I can't imagine how he must feel. Our current Presiding Officer is a reservist in the Marine Corps who has served in harm's way in battlefield areas, and he was a commander in the Marine Corps. It is great to have people in the Senate who have worn the uniform and they understand what is at stake here.

Senator MCCAIN and I have tried to be consistent, if nothing else, about this situation. Here is the first question America has to answer: Is this someone else's war? I have heard very prominent commentators on cable television say: I am tired of fighting other people's wars.

Does ISIL represent a threat to our homeland? I think it does. And more importantly, they indicate they mean to hit us here. The head of ISIL, the Islamic State and the Levant is what I want to call it, served time in a military prison in Camp Bucca in Iraq, where I did some reserve duty, and when he was released from the camp and turned over to the Iraqis he told the colonel in charge of his release: I will see you in New York.

They are recruiting foreign fighters coming in by the thousands. They hold passports that would allow them to go to Europe and come back to our country, and their goal is not only to purify their religion, to kill or convert every Christian they find, but also to attack us.

So to those who say this is not our fight, I think you are making a huge mistake, as we did before 9/11.

Regional forces have to be part of the mix. The goal to degrade and destroy ISIL is the right goal. The strategy will fail as currently being considered unless we visit this issue.

As Senator MCCAIN said, what you see on this map is not an accident. It is a predictable outcome of three things. The President's decision in 2011 not to leave a residual force behind in Iraq to secure our gains has come back to haunt us. The military command infrastructure of this country advised a minimum of 10,000 troops to be left behind as a residual force.

I visited Baghdad, along with Senators MCCAIN and Lieberman, to try to persuade the Iraqi political leadership to enter into an agreement to allow us to have a residual force. Prime Minister Maliki said: I am willing to do it if the other groups in Iraq are willing to do it. They were all willing to do it. He asked me: How many troops are you talking about? I turned to our ambassador and our commander at the time, and they tell him and me: We are still working on that.

Press reports simultaneously were suggesting the White House, led by the Vice President, by the way, was driving the residual force to below 3,000—a number incapable of making a difference.

So when the President of the United States says he was willing to leave a residual force behind, that is not accurate. In a debate with Governor Romney, Governor Romney suggested he would support a residual force of 10,000, as President Obama was contemplating, and President Obama interrupted him and said: No, I am not contemplating that.

He held our departure in Iraq as the fulfillment of a campaign promise. He said: We can leave with our heads held high. We have accomplished our task.

Here is what I said on April 3, 2011:

> If we're not smart enough to work with the Iraqis to have 10,000 to 15,000 American troops in Iraq in 2012, Iraq could go to hell. I'm urging the Obama administration to work with the Maliki administration in Iraq to make sure we have enough troops—10,000 to 15,000—beginning in 2012 to secure the gains we have achieved. This is a defining moment in the future of Iraq, and in my view they are going down the wrong road in Iraq.

I am referring there to the Obama administration when I say ''they are going down the wrong road.''

No voice was louder than that of Senator MCCAIN. Senator MCCAIN advocated, above all others, the surge when Iraq was slipping away under the Bush administration. When Senator MCCAIN told President Bush his strategy was not working, President Bush, to his great credit, adjusted his strategy.

Senator MCCAIN, 3 years ago, was the leading voice in this country to argue for a no-fly zone in Syria so that Assad, who was on the ropes, could be taken down, and to train a Free Syrian Army at a time when it really would have mattered. The President ignored the advice not only of Senator MCCAIN and myself but his entire national security team.

So the President got the answer he wanted in Iraq. He pulled the plug on troops. And what we hoped wouldn't happen did happen. When he said no to a no-fly zone and the training of a Free Syrian Army, the vacuum that had been created in Syria was filled by ISIL. ISIL is a direct result of Al Qaeda in Iraq, which was on its knees in 2010, being able to come back because we withdrew troops and we allowed a safe haven to be formed in Syria.

So, President Obama, this map is the result of bad policy choices on your part, and you are doubling down on bad policy choices.

The third thing that was a huge mistake is drawing a redline when Assad used chemical weapons against his own people and virtually doing nothing about it. I am glad the chemical weapons have been taken out of Syria—at least we think all of them have been taken out—but 220,000 Syrians have been killed with initial forces by Assad, and Assad is stronger than ever. He is nowhere near going or leaving.

Between Assad and ISIL, they represent the dominant military force inside Syria. Syria is truly hell on Earth, and all of this is going to come back to haunt us here at home.

So the reason we are here on the floor today is to learn from the past. I have made mistakes. Everybody has made mistakes. But the key is to adjust when you make mistakes. The strategy President Obama is employing to degrade and destroy ISIL will fail, and let me tell you why.

If you could liberate Mosul with the Iraqi security forces and the Kurds, we are going to need more than 3,000 U.S. forces to accomplish that task, because they do not have the capability that our military possesses to ensure victory.

Once you liberate Mosul, you have to hold and build Mosul. Anbar Province has yet to be liberated. We have to convince the Sunni tribal leaders in Anbar to disassociate with ISIL and join us, and they are not going to do that unless we are part of a team on the ground. They don't trust the Iraqi security forces that are mainly Shia. So unless we get more capacity on the ground to ensure success, we will fail in Iraq. But Syria is the weak link in the chain.

Mr. MCCAIN. Before my colleague leaves Iraq, is it not true that the only real fighting being done now is the Peshmerga Kurds but also the Shia militia, who are inflicting human rights violations on the Sunni, and the same people we fought against during the surge that my colleague talked about before, which is Iranian backed and Iranian trained?

Mr. GRAHAM. Right. The Iraqi security forces have crumbled. The most

dominant power on the ground is the Shia militia, backed by Iran and the Kurds in the north. And by the way, the aid we are providing to the Kurds never gets up to Erbil, and we need to fix that.

Iran has inordinate influence in Baghdad. So to get the Sunni tribes to pull off of ISIL, they have to believe that Baghdad is going to be a better venue for them in terms of their political grievances, but they also need to see Americans on the ground to make sure this thing will work. They are not going to pull off ISIL unless we are there. They do not trust the Iraqi security forces.

As to Syria, Syria is the biggest problem of all. That is where most of ISIL resides. That is where their leadership resides. That is where they have the largest number of fighters. There is no ground game in Syria. There is no Kurdish presence that has the capability to dislodge ISIL. The Free Syrian Army are being killed as fast as we can train them.

Here is the flaw. The goal is to train the Free Syrian Army's young men throughout the region and send them into Syria to destroy ISIL. The problem with that is the moment we send them into Syria to defeat ISIL, Assad will attack them because he knows one day they will turn on him.

So we have asked the question, under the authorization to use military force that is being sent over from the White House, could we stop an air attack by Assad's forces so they will not kill the people we train to fight ISIL, and they said no.

So we are training people to go into Syria to fight ISIL who will be slaughtered by Assad if we do not have the ability under this authorization to protect the people we train. Senator MCCAIN said this over and over again. That is immoral and militarily unsound. There is no strategy indeed to deal with Syria that has any chance of success. And if we don't get Syria right, we can't hold the gains we make in Iraq.

So the President, after all these years, with 220,000 people being killed, having the largest terrorist army in the history of terrorism occupying a space the size of Indiana, with 30,000 to 50,000 fighters, depending on who you believe, still hasn't come to grips with a strategy that will protect this nation. He doesn't understand the mistakes he has been making for the last 3 or 4 years. He is not self-correcting. He is perpetuating what I think is a military fraud.

The longer it takes to destroy ISIL, the more exposed we are here. And at the end of the day, the Iranians are sizing us up and they see us as a paper tiger.

The last thing I would say about Ukraine is that Russia has invaded Ukraine. When they say they have no weapons inside Ukraine, when they say they have no troops, they are liars.

Russia has dismembered their neighbor, Ukraine. We in the Western world have sat on the sidelines and watched this happen. They have trampled all over the Budapest memorandum, where we persuaded Ukrainians to give up their nuclear weapons in the late 1990s and we would guarantee their sovereignty. When they need us to provide defensive weapons, we are absolutely absent at their time of dire need. The Iranians are watching our response to Putin. How could they feel we are serious about stopping their nuclear program when we seem not to be serious about anything else?

The reason we will not be more aggressive in Syria is because President Obama doesn't want to deal with Assad, who is a puppet of Iran. He doesn't want to jeopardize the negotiations we have ongoing with the Iranians regarding their nuclear ambitions. His desire to get a deal with Iran is preventing us from degrading and destroying ISIL, and we will pay a heavy price for these mistakes.

How would my colleague sum up where we are?

Mr. MCCAIN. Could I just mention to my colleague—and it has been made perhaps larger than it should have been, with all of the crises and the tragedies that are transpiring, but the President of the United States refuses to refer to this as radical Islam. Why that is is hard to understand because it is clearly radical Islam. It is a perversion of an honorable religion, but everything they are doing is based on their perverted interpretation of the Koran. They are Islamic. While we respect the religion and we respect the people, we don't respect radical Islam and we have to recognize it for what it is.

Let me read this, from February 24:

> Scores of Syrian Christians Kidnapped by Islamic State—Islamic State militants swept into several of Assyrian Christian villages in northeastern Syria in recent days, taking scores of hostages, including both civilians and fighters, according to numerous interviews with residents. . . . The attacks have displaced hundreds of families and sharpened Middle Eastern Christians' fears of the Islamic State.

Which the President of the United States refuses to recognize as radical Islam. When you don't even recognize it or identify it for what it is, how in the world are you going to be able to combat it?

Finally, I would say to my friend one more time, if he would respond, that the Ukrainians wanted to defend themselves. One of the richest and proudest aspects of American history is that we have helped people who are struggling for freedom, whether it be in Afghanistan after Russia's invasion or others. And others have helped us, going all the way back to our Revolution when the French and Polish and others came in and helped us. How can we rationalize our failure to give them weapons to defend themselves by saying: Well, they can't beat the Russians anyway.

Why don't we listen to their pleas for help? Why don't we listen to their cries? Why don't we listen to the fact they have lost 5,000; that right now the most sophisticated weaponry the Russians provided these ''separatists'' is being used to slaughter them?

To me it is the most unbelievable view, that somehow we don't want to provoke Vladimir Putin, who has taken Crimea—they have written that off—shot down an airplane, at least with Russian equipment; moved and dislocated eastern Ukraine; and has caused an economic crisis. And we don't want to provoke Vladimir Putin? It is staggering.

Mr. GRAHAM. In conclusion, in 1998 we were a signatory to Budapest memorandum that asked the Ukrainian people to give up over 2,000 nuclear weapons housed on their soil in return for a guarantee of their sovereignty.

Mr. MCCAIN. That included the State of Crimea as part of the territorial integrity of Ukraine.

Mr. GRAHAM. Exactly. The Russians were a signatory to that Budapest memorandum.

Clearly, the Russians have stepped all over it, and we are not doing anything. So in the future, would you give up your nuclear weapons relying on a promise by the United States?

This is important because we want to deter Iran from trying to get a nuclear weapon. I think this emboldens them to get a nuclear weapon.

As to radical Islam, it is hard to defeat an enemy if you don't understand what motivates them.

The Nazis did not want just the German-speaking regions surrounding Germany. It wasn't about the Sudetenland. It wasn't about the Rheinland. It wasn't about the issues Hitler claimed at the time. He wrote a book telling us what he wanted to do. People should have read the book. It was about creating a master race to govern other races. The Aryan race would be the dominant race on the planet—with some people not worthy of living, such as the Jews, and others would be slaves.

When we listen to what ISIL is saying and what motivates them, they want a master religion for the world, not a master race. If you are a Christian, you can pay a tax and convert or die. If you are a Muslim outside of their view of the faith, you just die. If you are an agnostic, you die. If you are a libertarian, you die. If you are an American—Republican or Democrat; they could care less—you die.

They are taught by their interpretation of the Koran literally to kill all that stands in their way of the caliphate. We can close Gitmo tomorrow. We could throw the Palestinians under the bus or give the Palestinians everything they want and throw Israel under the bus. It wouldn't matter.

We didn't bring this war on ourselves. These people are motivated by religious doctrine not widely accepted in the faith. But that doctrine requires them to kill everything in their path and to turn the world into a religion where they dominate, and there is no alternative to their religion.

That may sound crazy to you. It sounds a little crazy to me. Hitler is crazy to me. I can't explain why somebody wants to kill all the Jews. I can't explain why somebody believes that one race should rule the world and everybody else be under their boot. I can't explain what makes these people tick. I can only tell you what they do and why they do it. There is no appeasement with radical Islam, any more than there would be an appeasement with Hitler. We tried that in the 1930s, and 50 million people got killed.

So here is our choice: Face the enemy as it is, degrade and destroy in a way that will work; or accept the fact that they are coming here, not to conquer America—that is not going to happen—but to hit us hard and break our will so they can have that part of the world for which they have been longing for over 1,000 years.

Here is what I would say to America. Every time we have chosen to sit on the sidelines and watch other people suffer and did nothing about it, it wound up hurting us too. If you think we can live in a world where Christians over there are being raped, tortured, and crucified, and it won't affect Christians here, you are kidding yourself. If you think you can allow a force this evil to go unchecked because it is over there and it won't affect us here, you are making the mistake of a lifetime.

My biggest fear is that radical Islam—which is exactly what it is—will get a weapon of mass destruction one day and do a lot of harm to us here. Every day that goes by over there, that they get stronger, the more exposed we are here.

Finally, on 9/11, 3,000 Americans died only because they didn't have the ability to kill more. If they could have killed 3 million of us, they would have. Every day we let this problem grow unchecked they are closer to having the technology to kill millions of people here and elsewhere. So the sooner we deal with this, the safer we will be.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article titled ''Credibility Gap'' from the Washington Post and also the International New York Times article ''Scores of Syrian Christians Kidnapped by Islamic State'' be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the International New York Times, Feb. 24, 2015]

SCORES OF SYRIAN CHRISTIANS KIDNAPPED BY ISLAMIC STATE

(By Anne Barnard)

ISTANBUL.—Islamic State militants swept into several Assyrian Christian villages in northeastern Syria in recent days, taking scores of hostages, including both civilians and fighters, according to numerous interviews with residents and representatives of the many factions fighting in the area.

The attacks have displaced hundreds of families and sharpened Middle Eastern Christians' fears of the Islamic State, which considers non-Muslims, along with many Muslims who disagree with its tenets, infidels.

The extremist group displaced entire Christian communities from northern Iraq when it swept through Mosul and the surrounding area last year.

The new attacks came as some Christians in northeastern Syria, seeking to avoid the fate of northern Iraq's Christians and other minority sects like the Yazidis that were singled out by the Islamic State, had taken a more assertive role, fighting alongside Kurdish and other militias.

The latest fighting took place in a string of villages along the Khabur River, a tributary of the Euphrates. The central village, Tel Tamer, is a strategic crossroads, with a bridge over the river that connects northeastern Syria with the country's northern hub, Aleppo; residents reported that Islamic State militants bombed the bridge on Tuesday.

The area has long been controlled by Kurdish militias but has lately come under attack from the Islamic State, also known as ISIS or ISIL.

In recent weeks, villages have changed hands several times as the Kurdish groups, some Arab Muslim factions and a Christian group called the Syriac Military Council have joined forces against the Islamic State.

In the chaos Tuesday, the exact number of hostages seized remained unclear, with estimates ranging from several dozen to more than 100. Nuri Kino, an Assyrian-Swedish activist with family ties to northeastern Syria, said that Islamic State fighters were holding about 60 women and children in the village of Tel Shamiran, and that they had taken 90 men up into a mountainous area they control, perhaps seeking to exchange them for Islamic State prisoners.

Mr. Kino, who founded A Demand for Action, a group that advocates for religious minorities in Iraq and Syria, said he had gleaned the information by talking to residents over Skype from Los Angeles.

Dawoud Dawoud, the deputy president of the Assyrian Democratic Party in the area, reached in Hasaka, said that the villages had long been largely left alone, but that in early February, Islamic State fighters had demanded that crosses be removed from churches.

The jihadists raided the village of Tel Hermez, driving away a local group, the Guardians of Khabur, that had protected churches there, said Omar Abd al-Aziz, a local antigovernment activist who uses a nom de guerre for his safety. Called to help, Kurdish militias entered the town with fighters from the Syriac Military Council, who filmed themselves retaking the area and leading away bound men they said were Islamic State members.

Now, the Islamic State appears to be retaliating with even greater numbers and heavy weapons.

''It's the new Kobani,'' said Mr. Kino, referring to the Kurdish enclave bordering Turkey whose encirclement by the Islamic State prompted American-led airstrikes that helped drive the group back. He called for United States intervention to prevent massacres and displacements.

The threats to minority enclaves, as in Kobani and the attacks on Yazidis in Iraq's Sinjar mountains last summer, have galvanized international action when other fighting did not.

Another activist in the area, who gave only his first name, Siraj, because of concern for his safety, accused the Kurds of leaving the Assyrians vulnerable in order to provoke a Kobani-like international reaction.

But Nawaf al-Khalil, a spokesman for the Kurdish Democratic Union, a political party, tried to find a bright side, saying the events were ''a good sign of stronger ties between the Kurds, the Arabs and the Christians'' against the Islamic State.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 22, 2015]

A CREDIBILITY GAP

(By Fred Hiatt)

If his negotiators strike an agreement next month, we already know that it will be far from ideal: Rather than eradicating Iran's nuclear-weapons potential, as once was hoped, a pact would seek to control Iran's activities for some limited number of years.

Such a deal might be defensible on the grounds that it is better than any alternative, given that most experts believe a military ''solution'' would be at best temporary and possibly counterproductive.

But making that kind of lesser-evil defense would be challenging in any circumstances. Three conditions will make it particularly hard for Obama to persuade Congress and the nation to accept his assurances in this case: the suspicious, poisonous partisanship of the moment here, with Israeli politics mixed in; worries that he wants a deal too much; and the record of his past assurances.

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

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 Iraq is in deep trouble, with a murderous ''caliphate'' occupying much of its territory and predatory Shiite militia roaming through much of the rest.

That 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.''

The United States and its NATO allies promptly abandoned Libya, which today is in the grip of civil war, with rival governments in the east and west and Islamist terrorists in between.

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 targets.''

No military action was taken, and Assad remains in power.

In September, the president said his strategy for defeating the Islamic State ''is one that we have successfully pursued in Yemen and Somalia for years.'' Shortly thereafter, an Iran-backed rebellion deposed Yemen's pro-U.S. government, forcing the United States to abandon its embassy and much of its anti-terror operation.

Just last month, in the State of the Union address, Obama presented his Ukraine policy

as a triumph of ''American strength and diplomacy.

''We're upholding the principle that bigger nations can't bully the small by opposing Russian aggression and supporting Ukraine's democracy,'' he said.

Since then Russian forces have extended their incursion into Ukraine, now controlling nearly one-fifth of its territory. Russia's economy is hurting, but Ukraine's is in far worse shape.

This litany of unfulfilled assurances is less a case of Nixonian deception than a product of wishful thinking and stubborn adherence to policies after they have failed. But inevitably it will affect how people hear Obama's promises on Iran, as will his overall foreign policy record.

That record includes successes, such as the killing of Osama bin Laden, warming ties with India and a potentially groundbreaking agreement with China on climate change. By most measures, though, the world has not become safer during Obama's tenure. Islamist extremists are stronger than ever; democracy is in retreat around the globe; relations with Russia and North Korea have worsened; allies are questioning U.S. steadfastness.

Openings as well as problems can appear unexpectedly in foreign affairs, but the coming two years offer only two obvious opportunities for Obama to burnish this legacy: trade deals with Europe and with Pacific nations, and a nuclear agreement with Iran. That limited field fuels worries that administration negotiators will accept the kind of deal that results from wanting it too badly.

Whatever its contours, Obama would be making a big mistake to try to implement such a momentous pact, as administration officials have suggested he might, without congressional buy-in. But it's not surprising that he would be tempted to try.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I appreciate the patience of my friend and colleague from the State of Texas.

It is with a heavy heart that we see the events transpiring according to this chart.

It is with a heavy heart that we see our friends in Ukraine, who only want to be like us, being slaughtered, and we are refusing to assist them. I have assured them that I will never give up—ever—until we see a free, prosperous, democratic Ukraine which is part of the community of nations, which we would admire, and in which we include them.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, when given the opportunity four times over the last few weeks to fully fund the Department of Homeland Security, while at the same time rolling back the President's unconstitutional Executive action on immigration, four times our Senate Democratic friends have filibustered this funding. At the same time, they have been pointing to this side of the aisle and saying: If there is a shutdown of the Department of Homeland Security, you are at fault. It is hypocrisy, to say the least.

But of all the Democrats who voted to filibuster the funding of the Department of Homeland Security—which, again, expires at midnight on this Friday night—there are 11 of our Senate Democratic colleagues who come from States which are parties to a lawsuit in Brownsville, TX, where the Federal judge issued a temporary injunction just last week saying that what the President did in his Executive action was illegal—illegal.

So how our colleagues on the other side of the aisle can filibuster the Department of Homeland Security funding because they say it includes a disapproval of the President's action at the same time the States they represent are parties to a lawsuit complaining about the illegality of the President's actions—how they can reconcile that is beyond me. Perhaps they can come to the floor and talk about that. But I think they should be asked that question, and I would be very interested in their answer.

Of course, as we all know, now the Obama administration—after the Federal judge agreed with what the President said 22 different times, that he didn't have the authority to do what he did—and, obviously, he changed his mind. But after the Federal judge agreed with what he said the first 22 times, that he didn't have the authority, now they have asked for a stay of that temporary injunction.

If the reports in the press are correct, Judge Hanen in Brownsville, in the Southern District of Texas, has given the States, the plaintiffs in the lawsuit, until March 2 to respond to this request for emergency stay.

One by one, the folks who criticized what the President was doing in one fashion or another came to the floor and have voted in effect to affirm what he did. As I said yesterday, in justifying these votes we heard a common refrain from several of our Democratic colleagues, including some of those 11 whose States have joined the lawsuit against the President's Executive action. They have said to us: We don't necessarily agree with the President's action, but you shouldn't attach that to an appropriations bill to fund the Department of Homeland Security.

Similarly, from Senate Democratic leadership came the demands for a ''clean bill''—a clean funding bill for the Department of Homeland Security—without these provisions addressing the Executive action attached.

Just 2 days ago here on the floor, the Democratic leader himself called for the Senate to vote on such a bill. A press release issued from Senator REID's office was unequivocal: ''REID Remarks Calling On Senate GOP To Avoid A Shutdown By Passing A Clean DHS Funding Bill.''

Monday wasn't the first time we heard this from Democratic leadership. We heard it over and over and over, as the Democrats, in lockstep, filibustered the Department of Homeland Security funding bill.

So imagine my surprise when Senator MCCONNELL, the Senate majority leader, offered to consider two bills, one that would address the President's Executive action from last November—the Collins bill—and a separate one that would fully fund the Department of Homeland Security.

You would, I guess, if logic prevailed in this place, expect that the Democratic leader would embrace that wholeheartedly, instantaneously, saying: That is exactly what we have been demanding, and now we have been offered it. We will take it.

Well, that didn't happen. This place can be very confusing sometimes, and you would be wrong if you thought the Democratic leader embraced what he had been demanding for the last few weeks. So after spending weeks demanding a clean funding bill for the Department of Homeland Security, including as recently as Monday, 24 hours have passed and the Democratic leader has still refused to agree to hold a vote on a so-called clean Department of Homeland Security funding bill.

Let me just repeat that so I am absolutely clear. The Democratic leader has so far refused to agree to vote on a clean funding bill for the Department, even after he called on Senate Republicans to pass exactly that as recently as Monday.

So I don't know how to sugar coat it. Call it a flip-flop, call it disingenuous. I don't know what to call it. But when you are offered exactly what you have been demanding and you don't accept it, it tells me you are not particularly serious about wanting to solve the problem. It is this kind of doubletalk which I think causes the Senate to be held in low regard by the American people, where they think that what you say doesn't necessarily translate into action. It is becoming abundantly clear that our friends across the aisle do not seem to have gotten the message from the last election on November 4.

I mentioned this yesterday, and I will repeat it, with reference to some of the gamesmanship that appears to be going on here, at the time when the clock is ticking and the Department of Homeland Security funding runs out at midnight on Friday. Recently, the senior Senator from New York told the Huffington Post that ''it's really fun to be in the Senate Minority,'' as if creating obstacles, slowing things down, and impeding progress toward a goal that we all hold in common—funding the Department of Homeland Security—is somehow having fun. But filibustering critical funding for the men and women that protect us every day and protect the homeland is not what I call fun.

At the end of the day, the Senate will make sure that those who protect our borders, our ports, and our skies get paid. That is what the American people voted for last November. They were sick and tired. If I heard it once, I heard it 100 times: We are sick and tired of the dysfunction in Washington, DC, and that is why we are voting for a change.

That is why we have nine new colleagues in the Senate—to break that logjam of dysfunction.

So I would implore the Democratic leader to heed his own call for a clean Department of Homeland Security funding bill and to quit playing games. Quit playing games with the lives of

the people who work at the Department of Homeland Security. Quit playing games with the American people, whose security is on the line if for some reason the ability of the Department to perform its important functions is disrupted because of the lack of funding. Quit playing games with the funding that pays the salaries of the men and women who protect our ports, who protect our airports, and who protect our border from transnational drug cartels.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

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. MARKEY. 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. MARKEY. Mr. President, everyone agrees that our immigration system is broken. The immigration system we have now hurts our economy, and it hurts our national security. The Senate passed a bipartisan immigration bill; the House of Representatives chose not to act. Again, the Senate passed a comprehensive immigration bill. That is why I supported the Executive action by President Obama to address our immediate immigration crisis. We cannot wait for the House of Representatives' Republicans to act, and that is because immigration is one of our country's greatest strengths. Immigrants are a vital part of the fabric of Massachusetts and of our country. They start businesses, they create jobs, and they contribute to our communities.

The President's Executive order recognizes the value of immigrants to our country. President Obama's Executive order will bring millions of law-abiding immigrants out of the shadows and help to keep those families together. The order allows law enforcement to focus its resources where they belong: reinforcing security at our borders and prosecuting and deporting dangerous criminals who pose threats to public safety. This Executive action cannot and should not be viewed as the final word on the matter of immigration reform. It is the beginning of an effort to permanently fix our broken immigration system.

What unites us in Massachusetts and all across America is the unshakable belief that no matter where you come from, no matter what your circumstances, you can achieve the American dream. The immigration system we have now doesn't reflect those values.

Unfortunately, instead of working to fix the problems with our immigration system, the majority of the Senate has been manufacturing a government shutdown of the Department of Homeland Security, even as our Nation faces real threats to our safety and to our national security if we don't fully fund the Department of Homeland Security. The majority seems more interested in undermining President Obama's border policy than funding actual border protection in our country.

Let's look at what could happen if Homeland Security funding lapses.

No. 1, FEMA efforts. FEMA is a part of the Department of Homeland Security. FEMA efforts in Massachusetts to develop a preliminary damage assessment for disaster relief funding may be interrupted.

The people in my home State of Massachusetts are suffering from the second snowiest winter in our history. We have endured more than 8 feet of snow. Those snow piles are climbing even higher. Seawalls that protect our shores are crumbling. Roofs are collapsing. Homes are being destroyed. Small businesses are shuttered while owners struggle to make ends meet. Cities and towns across the Commonwealth have overspent their budgets by tens of millions of dollars responding to one snowstorm after another.

But instead of the relief that should come with the assurance that FEMA assistance is on the way, the people of Massachusetts have to worry that this Republican-manufactured government shutdown threat is jeopardizing this critical assistance. The last thing the people of Massachusetts should have to worry about is whether their disaster assistance will be delayed by the politics of immigration reform. This is absolutely outrageous. Massachusetts needs the disaster relief today.

No. 2, an estimated 30,000 Homeland Security employees would have to be furloughed, including those who process Federal grants for local police, fire, and other first responders. Firefighters might not get the best oxygen masks. Bomb squads might not get the right equipment they need. These are hardworking people who help protect our Nation and help our first responders do their jobs.

No. 3, a Department of Homeland Security shutdown would compromise our national security by stopping command and control activities at Department of Homeland Security headquarters, disrupting important programs such as detecting weapons of mass destruction. Homeland Security employees remaining on the job will not get paid, and those who are furloughed will be left to wonder whether they will ever be paid for the work they missed. This uncertainty hurts morale and puts families in financial jeopardy.

It is time for Republicans to end this brinkmanship and help pass a clean Homeland Security budget free of unrelated policy riders. Then we should get to work on comprehensive immigration reform. The immigration system we have now doesn't reflect our time-honored values as a melting pot of diversity and innovation. It hurts our economy and national security. In short, our immigration system is broken.

But for millions of immigrants who are living in the shadows, who are working every day to support their families, who have been brought up here from a young age, who are serving our country in the military or pursuing the dream of higher education—these people deserve a path that allows them to earn citizenship. That is why we need to work together on comprehensive immigration reform. It will give more families and individuals a real shot at the American dream. It will encourage immigrants who are educated here to innovate here.

This is an important debate, and we should have it, and we should not have it at the expense of the safety and the security of our Nation.

I call on my Republican colleagues to bring forward a clean Department of Homeland Security funding bill, free of unrelated policy riders dealing with immigration. Let's give the people of our country the confidence that the Department of Homeland Security is going to protect against al-Shabaab launching a successful attack against the Mall of America, that a terrorist group cannot now be put together, thinking, perhaps erroneously, that the Department of Homeland Security has taken its eye off the ball while worrying about the funding levels that are necessary in order to secure our country.

I lived through this in Boston. Mohamed Atta and the other nine who hijacked the two planes on September 11, 2001, thought they could find an opening—and they did—in our airline security. In 2013 the Tsarnaev brothers thought they could find a hole in our security, and they attacked again in Boston.

We should not have any question raised about the Department of Homeland Security being on the job protecting our citizens and providing the security our country needs. That is where we are right now, and the Republicans are holding up the funding of this vital agency under the misguided notion that they are going to be able to write the entire comprehensive immigration bill inside a Department of Homeland Security budget. It is not going to happen. Everyone in this country knows it is not going to happen. The Republicans are playing a dangerous game with the security of our country.

I ask all who make the decisions in the Republican Party to please tell their most radical Members that the Department of Homeland Security must be funded. It must be funded this week. We must not only pay those who work for us, but we should thank them every day for the security they provide to our country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I would say to the Senator from Massachusetts, Amen. Amen. We can't play around with our national security by holding somebody's legislative ideal as

a means of holding up the national security and holding the national security of this country hostage.

ELECTRONIC DEVICES AND PRIVACY RIGHTS

Mr. President, I came to talk about another issue. In the first part of the week, the Washington Post had an article that followed a series of articles in other newspapers, such as the Wall Street Journal and the New York Times, about a device that was given certification by the Federal Communications Commission called a stingray.

This device, when used properly by law enforcement—specifically, the FBI—not only can locate and absorb the content of communications over cell phones but can also locate the specific location of that cell phone. It does so by making the cell phone think that it, the device, is the cell phone tower. So instead of the cell phone radio waves going to the normal cell phone tower, they would come to this device called a stingray. If used properly, it can be used to go after the bad guys—terrorists and criminals. Of course, that is one of the reasons this device was created and certified by the Federal Communications Commission.

Part of the protections, as used by the FBI and local law enforcement, to get content is to treat it as if they were going to break into somebody's home to get evidence. Our constitutional protections regarding the right of privacy require that the law enforcement agency go to a judge—an impartial part of the judicial branch—in order to get a court order to show probable cause that a crime has been committed and therefore the constitutional right of privacy is trumped, and with this court order, law enforcement can go in and get the evidence.

Well, as technology continues to evolve and explode, of course, questions about our constitutional right of privacy get a lot more difficult, and so now law enforcement wants to pinpoint the location of a cellphone so they can go in and grab that person. Again, it would seem that the constitutional right of privacy needs to have the protection of a judge's order, and it is this Senator's belief that the FBI, when employing this type of device, would, in fact, use those constitutional protections.

Different news articles have raised questions about how this device is handled once it is turned over to local law enforcement and whether they are being adequately trained on judicial protections, and indeed, are they employing those protections. The news articles, as evidenced by the Washington Post this past Monday, would indicate that those judicial protections are not being employed.

So this Senator, as one of the coleaders of the commerce committee, along with the chairman of the committee, JOHN THUNE, has written to the FCC and asked them what information they have about the rationale behind the restrictions placed on the certification of the stingray—the device that was certified by the FCC—and whether those similar restrictions have been put in place for other devices. As technology continues to improve, we are going to see a lot more of these types of devices.

We need to know whether the FCC has inquired about the oversight that may be in place in order to ensure that the use of the devices complies with the manufacturer's representations to the FCC at the time of the certification. We are asking for a status report of the task force that was previously formed so we can look at these questions surrounding the use of the stingray.

This is not the last time we are going to be asking these questions—not necessarily about this device, the stingray. There is a multiplicity of devices that are coming out on the market, and the question is: What about our privacy? Of course we are reminded about this issue every day because every day we read about another data breach in the newspaper.

I have filed legislation with regard to data breaches to ensure that at least the company has the obligation to notify the poor customers that their data is suddenly out there in the Internet ether because of that data breach. A lot of these questions are going to continue to be asked.

What about the device called the Pineapple? I had no idea this device existed. Here is what it does: If I go into a Starbucks and use their wireless Internet, someone could be sitting outside of that Starbucks in their car, or at one of the outside tables, with this device called a Pineapple, and instead of my wireless device using Starbucks' Internet system, it is on that Pineapple device and all of my communications are going directly to that person, and that person is able to steal all of my private information. That is a major theft. This is scary. Yet that device has been around for several years.

We have major privacy questions. The Presiding Officer, who is a member of the commerce committee, knows that we are going to be grappling with these issues, along with other committees, such as judiciary, on the right to privacy.

In the meantime, we have raised these issues with the FCC on this most recent detailed expose about this device called the stingray. If it is employed for our national security and our personal safety, which is the job of the government, then it is a good thing; however, if it is employed for other reasons, such as invading our constitutional right of privacy, that is another thing.

It is time for us to stand up for the individual citizens in this country and their right to privacy.

I yield the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Missouri.

PRESIDENT'S EXECUTIVE ORDER

Mr. BLUNT. Madam President, last week I was glad to see that a Federal judge in Texas issued a preliminary injunction against the President's Executive order on immigration. This ruling, if upheld—and I believe it will be—reaffirms that President Obama was right when he said at least 22 times that he didn't have the authority to take the action he now has taken on immigration.

In December of last year I joined in an amicus brief with Senator CRUZ and Senator CORNYN and, I believe, the attorneys general from 26 States—not the State of Missouri but 26 States. I was glad that my joining allowed Missouri to be represented in support of this lawsuit brought by the State of Texas against President Obama's illegal decision to allow amnesty to be established. The brief states the Obama administration exceeded its constitutional authority and disrupted the delicate balance of power between the Congress, whose job it is to pass the law, and the President, whose job it is to carry out the law.

Executive means just that. The job of the Executive is to execute the law. It is not to pass the law. There is no constitutional provision anyone has been able to show me or that I have ever been able to find that says if the Congress doesn't do something, the President can decide it needs to be done and the President just does it on his own. There is certainly no law that suggests the President can just willfully ignore the law.

The brief we joined asserts that the Obama administration exceeded the bounds of its so-called prosecutorial discretion. The idea that they can have some discretion about how vigorously they enforce certain laws is, both in this case and in the court ruling, held up to the standard it really should be allowed to meet. The idea that the President can say that there is too much law here to enforce and we can't afford to enforce the law—but then by not enforcing the law, it creates substantially more economic burden on the States and the Federal Government than enforcing the law would have created—by any standard makes no sense. This is not a determination that at some level there are just too many violations of some law that is not very significant that you could have some prosecutorial discretion. This is the law that impacts whether people can come into the country or not and whether they can stay in the country not being legally here.

The bill that Leader MCCONNELL introduced this week will put every Senator on record on this topic. I look forward to a chance to vote on that bill

and to see my colleagues vote on this bill. Who will stand with the President's clear power grab on immigration, and who will stand by the rule of law? At least half a dozen Democrats and perhaps more have said they disagree with what the President did with this November action. A vote on Senator MCCONNELL's bill will give them a chance to show whether they really disagree or not. It is specific to the November action. It is specific to the action the Federal judge in Texas said puts undue burdens on the State and exceeded the President's authority.

As I have said a number of times, I would like to see our friends on the other side of the aisle be willing to debate this issue. I have also admitted a number of times that if I were them and if the President of the United States had said 22 times he couldn't do something, I would have some reluctance—I suppose as they clearly do—to come to the floor and defend why now those 22 statements don't matter.

If the Democrats would simply allow the Senate to begin debating the bill, Members on both side of the aisle could offer amendments, and we could actually be doing the job we are expected to do as legislators. Unfortunately, they decided to repeatedly say: No, we don't want to debate this bill. No, we are not going to go forward. No, we are not going to let the normal process work. No, we are not going to deal with the bill sent over by the co-equal branch of the Congress, the House of Representatives. Hopefully, we will see what happens as this debate moves forward and the President's activities are held not only now to a standard of law but also to his own standard.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a list of the 22 times the President has said he didn't have the authority to do what he has now done.

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

22 TIMES PRESIDENT OBAMA SAID HE COULDN'T IGNORE OR CREATE HIS OWN IMMIGRATION LAW

1. The biggest problems that we're facing right now have to do with [the president] trying to bring more and more power into the executive branch and not go through Congress at all. And that's what I intend to reverse when I'm President of the United States of America.'' (3/31/08)

2. ''We've got a government designed by the Founders so that there'd be checks and balances. You don't want a president who's too powerful or a Congress that's too powerful or a court that's too powerful. Everybody's got their own role. Congress's job is to pass legislation. The president can veto it or he can sign it. . . . I believe in the Constitution and I will obey the Constitution of the United States. We're not going to use signing statements as a way of doing an end-run around Congress.'' (5/19/08)

3. ''Comprehensive reform, that's how we're going to solve this problem. . . . Anybody who tells you it's going to be easy or that I can wave a magic wand and make it happen hasn't been paying attention to how this town works.'' (5/5/10)

4. ''[T]here are those in the immigrants' rights community who have argued passionately that we should simply provide those who are [here] illegally with legal status, or at least ignore the laws on the books and put an end to deportation until we have better laws. . . . I believe such an indiscriminate approach would be both unwise and unfair. It would suggest to those thinking about coming here illegally that there will be no repercussions for such a decision. And this could lead to a surge in more illegal immigration. And it would also ignore the millions of people around the world who are waiting in line to come here legally. Ultimately, our nation, like all nations, has the right and obligation to control its borders and set laws for residency and citizenship. And no matter how decent they are, no matter their reasons, the 11 million who broke these laws should be held accountable.'' (7/1/10)

5. ''I do have an obligation to make sure that I am following some of the rules. I can't simply ignore laws that are out there. I've got to work to make sure that they are changed.''

6. ''I am president, I can't do these things just by myself. We have a system of government that requires the Congress to work with the Executive Branch to make it happen. I'm committed to making it happen, but I've got to have some partners to do it. . . . The main thing we have to do to stop deportations is to change the laws. . . . [T]he most important thing that we can do is to change the law because the way the system works—again, I just want to repeat, I'm president, I'm not king. If Congress has laws on the books that says that people who are here who are not documented have to be deported, then I can exercise some flexibility in terms of where we deploy our resources, to focus on people who are really causing problems as a opposed to families who are just trying to work and support themselves. But there's a limit to the discretion that I can show because I am obliged to execute the law. That's what the Executive Branch means. I can't just make the laws up by myself. So the most important thing that we can do is focus on changing the underlying laws.'' (10/25/10)

7. ''America is a nation of laws, which means I, as the President, am obligated to enforce the law. I don't have a choice about that. That's part of my job. But I can advocate for changes in the law so that we have a country that is both respectful of the law but also continues to be a great nation of immigrants. . . . With respect to the notion that I can just suspend deportations through executive order, that's just not the case, because there are laws on the books that Congress has passed. . . . [W]e've got three branches of government. Congress passes the law. The executive branch's job is to enforce and implement those laws. And then the judiciary has to interpret the laws. There are enough laws on the books by Congress that are very clear in terms of how we have to enforce our immigration system that for me to simply through executive order ignore those congressional mandates would not conform with my appropriate role as President.'' (3/28/11)

8. ''I can't solve this problem by myself. . . . [W]e're going to have to have bipartisan support in order to make it happen. . . . I can't do it by myself. We're going to have to change the laws in Congress, but I'm confident we can make it happen.'' (4/20/11)

9. ''I know some here wish that I could just bypass Congress and change the law myself. But that's not how democracy works. See, democracy is hard. But it's right. Changing our laws means doing the hard work of changing minds and changing votes, one by one.'' (4/29/11)

10. ''Sometimes when I talk to immigration advocates, they wish I could just bypass Congress and change the law myself. But that's not how a democracy works. What we really need to do is to keep up the fight to pass genuine, comprehensive reform. That is the ultimate solution to this problem. That's what I'm committed to doing.'' (5/10/11)

11. ''I swore an oath to uphold the laws on the books. . . . Now, I know some people want me to bypass Congress and change the laws on my own. Believe me, the idea of doing things on my own is very tempting. I promise you. Not just on immigration reform. But that's not how our system works. That's not how our democracy functions. That's not how our Constitution is written.'' (7/25/11)

12. ''So what we've tried to do is within the constraints of the laws on the books, we've tried to be as fair, humane, just as we can, recognizing, though, that the laws themselves need to be changed. . . . The most important thing for your viewers and listeners and readers to understand is that in order to change our laws, we've got to get it through the House of Representatives, which is currently controlled by Republicans, and we've got to get 60 votes in the Senate. . . . Administratively, we can't ignore the law. . . . I just have to continue to say this notion that somehow I can just change the laws unilaterally is just not true. We are doing everything we can administratively. But the fact of the matter is there are laws on the books that I have to enforce. And I think there's been a great disservice done to the cause of getting the DREAM Act passed and getting comprehensive immigration passed by perpetrating the notion that somehow, by myself, I can go and do these things. It's just not true. . . . We live in a democracy. You have to pass bills through the legislature, and then I can sign it. And if all the attention is focused away from the legislative process, then that is going to lead to a constant deadend. We have to recognize how the system works, and then apply pressure to those places where votes can be gotten and, ultimately, we can get this thing solved.'' (9/28/11)

In June 2012, President Obama unilaterally granted deferred action for childhood arrivals (DACA), allowing ''eligible individuals who do not present a risk to national security or public safety . . . to request temporary relief from deportation proceedings and apply for work authorization.'' He then argued that he had already done everything he could legally do on his own:

13. ''Now, what I've always said is, as the head of the executive branch, there's a limit to what I can do. Part of the reason that deportations went up was Congress put a whole lot of money into it, and when you have a lot of resources and a lot more agents involved, then there are going to be higher numbers. What we've said is, let's make sure that you're not misdirecting those resources. But we're still going to, ultimately, have to change the laws in order to avoid some of the heartbreaking stories that you see coming up occasionally. And that's why this continues to be a top priority of mine. . . . And we will continue to make sure that how we enforce is done as fairly and justly as possible. But until we have a law in place that provides a pathway for legalization and/or citizenship for the folks in question, we're going to continue to be bound by the law. . . . And so part of the challenge as President is constantly saying, 'what authorities do I have?' '' (9/20/12)

14. ''We are a nation of immigrants. . . . But we're also a nation of laws. So what I've said is, we need to fix a broken immigration system. And I've done everything that I can on my own[.]'' (10/16/12)

15. ''. . . I am the head of the executive branch of government. I'm required to follow the law. And that's what we've done. But

what I've also said is, let's make sure that we're applying the law in a way that takes into account people's humanity. That's the reason that we moved forward on deferred action. Within the confines of the law we said, we have some discretion in terms of how we apply this law.'' (1/30/13)

16. ''I'm not a king. You know, my job as the head of the executive branch ultimately is to carry out the law. And, you know, when it comes to enforcement of our immigration laws, we've got some discretion. We can prioritize what we do. But we can't simply ignore the law. When it comes to the dreamers, we were able to identify that group and say, 'These folks are generally not a risk. They're not involved in crime. . . . And so let's prioritize our enforcement resources.' But to sort through all the possible cases of everybody who might have a sympathetic story to tell is very difficult to do. This is why we need comprehensive immigration reform. To make sure that once and for all, in a way that is, you know, ratified by Congress, we can say that there is a pathway to citizenship for people who are staying out of trouble, who are trying to do the right thing, who've put down roots here. . . . My job is to carry out the law. And so Congress gives us a whole bunch of resources. They give us an order that we've got to go out there and enforce the laws that are on the books. . . . If this was an issue that I could do unilaterally I would have done it a long time ago. . . . The way our system works is Congress has to pass legislation. I then get an opportunity to sign it and implement it.'' (1/30/13)

17. ''This is something I've struggled with throughout my presidency. The problem is that I'm the president of the United States, I'm not the emperor of the United States. My job is to execute laws that are passed. And Congress right now has not changed what I consider to be a broken immigration system. And what that means is that we have certain obligations to enforce the laws that are in place even if we think that in many cases the results may be tragic. . . . [W]e've kind of stretched our administrative flexibility as much as we can[.]'' (2/14/13)

18. ''I think that it is very important for us to recognize that the way to solve this problem has to be legislative. I can do some things and have done some things that make a difference in the lives of people by determining how our enforcement should focus. . . . And we've been able to provide help through deferred action for young people. . . . But this is a problem that needs to be fixed legislatively.'' (7/16/13)

19. ''My job in the executive branch is supposed to be to carry out the laws that are passed. Congress has said 'here is the law' when it comes to those who are undocumented, and they've allocated a whole bunch of money for enforcement. And, what I have been able to do is to make a legal argument that I think is absolutely right, which is that given the resources that we have, we can't do everything that Congress has asked us to do. What we can do is then carve out the DREAM Act folks, saying young people who have basically grown up here are Americans that we should welcome. . . . But if we start broadening that, then essentially I would be ignoring the law in a way that I think would be very difficult to defend legally. So that's not an option. . . . What I've said is there is a there's a path to get this done, and that's through Congress.'' (9/17/13)

20. ''[I]f, in fact, I could solve all these problems without passing laws in Congress, then I would do so. But we're also a nation of laws. That's part of our tradition. And so the easy way out is to try to yell and pretend like I can do something by violating our laws. And what I'm proposing is the harder path, which is to use our democratic processes to achieve the same goal that you want to achieve. . . . It is not simply a matter of us just saying we're going to violate the law. That's not our tradition. The great thing about this country is we have this wonderful process of democracy, and sometimes it is messy, and sometimes it is hard, but ultimately, justice and truth win out.'' (11/25/13)

21. ''I am the Champion-in-Chief of comprehensive immigration reform. But what I've said in the past remains true, which is until Congress passes a new law, then I am constrained in terms of what I am able to do. What I've done is to use my prosecutorial discretion, because you can't enforce the laws across the board for 11 or 12 million people, there aren't the resources there. What we've said is focus on folks who are engaged in criminal activity, focus on people who are engaged in gang activity. Do not focus on young people, who we're calling DREAMers. . . . That already stretched my administrative capacity very far. But I was confident that that was the right thing to do. But at a certain point the reason that these deportations are taking place is, Congress said, 'you have to enforce these laws.' They fund the hiring of officials at the department that's charged with enforcing. And I cannot ignore those laws any more than I could ignore, you know, any of the other laws that are on the books. That's why it's so important for us to get comprehensive immigration reform done this year.'' (3/6/14)

22. ''I think that I never have a green light [to push the limits of executive power]. I'm bound by the Constitution; I'm bound by separation of powers. There are some things we can't do. Congress has the power of the purse, for example. . . . Congress has to pass a budget and authorize spending. So I don't have a green light. . . . My preference in all these instances is to work with Congress, because not only can Congress do more, but it's going to be longer-lasting.'' (8/6/14)

Mr. BLUNT. Let me mention a few of those, but I will submit all 22 for the RECORD. As early as March of 2008, the President said: I take the Constitution very seriously. The biggest problems that we are facing right now are things that don't go through Congress at all.

In November of 2010 the President said: I am the President, not a king. I can't do these things just by myself. I have to have partners to do it.

In January of 2013, the President, again, still believes he is not a king, because he says: I am not a king. He says that at two different events on that day. He says: We can't simply ignore the law.

The truth is, in November of 2014 the President does decide we can simply ignore the law. The 22 times the President said we couldn't ignore the law I agree with him. For those who believe I don't find enough opportunities to agree with the President, here are 22 times I agree with the President's view that he cannot do these kinds of things on his own and by himself.

On February 14, 2013—2 years ago—the President said: The problem is that I am the President of the United States.

I could actually quit right there and maybe that would say all I need to say, but of course he said:

> The problem is that you know I'm the president of the United States. I'm not the emperor of the United States . . . we have certain obligations to enforce the laws that are in place.

It goes on. I get to that point, and I don't know quite how to explain—as I am sure the President doesn't know how to explain—what he has said and what he has now done.

On September 2013: ''My job in the executive branch is supposed to be to carry out the laws that are passed,'' still in full agreement with what the President said his job is.

As late as August of this last year, the President said: There are some things we can't do. Congress has the power of the purse, for example. Congress has to pass a budget and authorize spending. So I don't have a green light.

He goes on to suggest to do whatever the President might like to do. That is basically what this debate is about right now. It is not about whether the Department of Homeland Security would continue to function. In fact, what I wish to see is the President engaged as the principal officer responsible for the administration of the government.

I think something like that is what President Kennedy said after the Bay of Pigs, when he said: I am responsible here because I am the principal officer responsible for the administration of the government.

The President created this problem. He created this funding problem for States, he created this funding problem for the Federal Government, and he created this problem of exceeding his authority as President of the United States. But the President, once again, is missing from the discussion of how to solve the problem.

That could very well be, as is often the case, the person who would know how to solve the problem is the person who created it. But we are not hearing anything from that person because clearly people at the White House believe it is to their temporary political advantage to act as though the people in the Congress don't want the government to function, rather than to act as though people in the Congress believe the President was right the 22 times he said he couldn't do what he has now done.

I have heard several of my colleagues in the last few days—in fact, even one or two this morning on early news shows—say: We need a way for Congress to settle these kinds of disputes outside of the appropriations process.

One way to do that would be to pass a law I filed in the last Congress that the House of Representatives passed in a bipartisan way—the Senate was not allowed to vote on it and I would like to see us vote on it in this Congress—which is the ENFORCE the Law Act, which simply does allow the Congress, if a majority of the Members of the House or Senate believes the President is not enforcing the law as written, to go to a judge and seek an early determination, rather than wait for some aggrieved citizen who disagrees with a rule or regulation to have to hire their own lawyer after the rule is in effect,

and in the 2 years or so it might take to get that case to the Supreme Court, other individuals impacted by the rule or regulation are trying to comply with it, only to find out later, as the Court ruled a handful of times during the recent years of this Presidency that, no, the President doesn't have the authority to do that.

They said: No, you don't have the authority to appoint people to the National Labor Relations Board when the Senate is in session just because you have decided somehow the Senate is not in session. You don't get to decide whether the Senate is in session, Mr. President, if they have met all the requirements to be in session. You particularly don't get to decide whether the Senate is in session if that same session of the Senate approves some things that you thought needed to be done and that was good enough for you.

Then they said: Mr. President, by the way, when you appoint these people illegally, whatever rules and regulations they put forward aren't legal either.

So the couple of years of businesses trying to comply with the National Labor Relations Act rules and regulations, all of that is to the wayside. Those rules are all gone, but that doesn't restore the time, effort, money, and needless compliance that happens when the President exceeds his authority or when the President's agencies, such as the Environmental Protection Agency, decide they could do something they would like to do without ever arguing before the Congress that we would like the authority to do this.

So passing the ENFORCE the Law Act would be a way to seek an earlier or quicker remedy. It does appear to me that the Federal judges are likely to decide pretty quickly—Federal judges, the court of appeals level and then the circuit level—that, no, Mr. President; you have gone beyond where you were in fact. You were right the first 22 times, not the November 2014 time that you decided if you don't like the law, you don't have to enforce the law.

I think we should move forward with that ability that the Congress currently doesn't have, but also I think we should continue to express our desire for this process to work the way it is supposed to work.

The House of Representatives, which is supposed to initiate spending bills, has done that. It is the job of the Senate to debate those spending bills. It is the job of Senators to offer amendments if they don't like them, and so far our friends on the other side have insisted they don't want to do that part of this job. Maybe we all should understand why they don't want to defend what the President has done because of all the times he said he couldn't do it.

RECESS

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now stand in recess until 2 p.m. today.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 12:51 p.m., recessed until 2 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. HOEVEN).

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I want to commend both of our leaders, Leader MCCONNELL and Leader REID, for coming to the floor and agreeing to a path forward to fully fund Homeland Security, and I want to speak for a moment about how critical this is and how really—if we cannot get the House of Representatives to agree, if they are not willing to move forward and support this path—we have actually not one shutdown but the possibility of two different kinds of shutdowns that will happen within 3 days.

I am talking about the fact there are 3 days left before the funding for the Department of Homeland Security expires—on February 27, at the end of the day on Friday. We are in a situation where those who protect us from terror threats all around us will be in a situation where they either aren't at work or are working without pay. We will be working with pay but they won't be working with pay, which of course is an outrageous situation for us to put them in.

Every week we know there is a new terrorist threat. That is literally true now, and it is shocking, as we turn on the television and we read the papers and listen to the radio. The most recent threat we know is from al-Shabaab, a Somali terrorist group with ties to Al Qaeda. A video appeared this last week where we know they called for an attack at the Mall of America near Minneapolis, as well as at other shopping centers in the United States and Canada and Great Britain.

We also know that an attack on that mall would endanger as many as 100,000 people—men, women, and children. That is how many people come to that mall, that big mall, every single day. Al-Shabaab terrorists have attacked a mall before so we know this is not an idle threat. In 2013, they attacked the Westgate Mall in Nairobi, Kenya, where 63 innocent people were killed.

On February 14, a shooter at a synagogue in Copenhagen killed three people. In late January, an American was 1 of 10 people killed in a terrorist attack in Libya. Earlier in January, in Paris, an attack by a terrorist claimed 16 lives. I could go on and on. In October alone, gunmen attacked the Canadian Parliament in Ottawa, killing a Canadian soldier.

Michigan has the busiest northern border crossing in the country between Detroit and Windsor. Every day over $1 billion in goods and people are crossing that border—every single day. We actually have three crossings—two of the busiest in the country—and we count on border and Customs security. We count on our Homeland Security people to be on the job doing their job every single day.

We also count on the people at the airports—all of us. Most of us are on planes one or two times a week. We all understand the critical importance of the airport. And for those of us who are surrounded by water, the Coast Guard is absolutely critical.

I could go on and on with all of the ways in which the men and women of Homeland Security, border security, Customs, the Coast Guard, as well as police and firefighters, our first responders, are keeping us safe every single day.

If the House does not agree to what we are doing here, in 3 days we will see the Department of Homeland Security shut down—an entire infrastructure put together after 9/11, which we all worked together on in a bipartisan way because we saw and we felt what had happened in terms of the threats to our country and the loss of lives.

It is critical this not be just a game. This can't be just a trick, where we are somehow voting straight up on Homeland Security funding without other riders on immigration or other things where there are differences with the President. If it is straight-up funding, then we vote, and then it goes to the House and it gets completely changed again, that is not going to work. We are going to stand with the men and women who stand with us, put their lives on the line, and work hard every single day to keep us safe. It is critical the House decide to join us if in fact the Senate acts today to fully fund Homeland Security, which I hope we will.

There is another thing I am deeply concerned about, and that is the fact we have heard a lot of people talk about we will just do a continuing resolution from last year. That is effectively a shutdown of the first responders, because when we look at the list—immigration, Customs enforcement, detention, antitrafficking, smuggling—of those things that are funded under a continuing resolution, which is a fancy word for last year's funding, those things don't continue.

The new grants that keep firefighters in Michigan and across the country going—in Detroit alone we have 150 firefighters—were supposed to start in October. Because we haven't fully funded Homeland Security, they have been waiting. We have people who will be laid off—police officers, firefighters in Michigan and across the country under a CR—under a continuing resolution. It is effectively a first responders shutdown.

So that is the second shutdown I am concerned about. We could see Customs and Border Protection unable to award new contracts for new video surveillance. How many times do we talk about the need to protect the borders? But if we don't fully fund Homeland

Security, if we do what it sounds like may happen from the House, some short-term funding from last year, we will stop first responders, we will stop surveillance equipment, we will stop the ability to upgrade our Coast Guard, and we prevent and delay contracts for police and fire.

Also without a fully funded Homeland Security, nuclear detection equipment can't be replaced. That deals with our enemies trying to smuggle nuclear devices or dirty bombs into this country.

And what about emergency communications? Think about the malls or think about things such as FEMA and the unprecedented storms and snow that we have seen in parts of our country, the cold.

The idea we would somehow not fund upgrades to emergency equipment and effectively have a first responder shutdown is outrageous. I can't imagine the public, and rightly so, will understand this. I certainly don't understand it. We have all heard concerns about the Secret Service and the ability to upgrade those operations. I could go on and on as it relates to first responder funding.

So I am, on the one hand, pleased that it appears we may in fact have a path forward to separate the debate on fully funding our Homeland Security, our protections at the borders and airports, and so on, as well as police and fire and first responders across the country from a debate on immigration. I appreciate the differences, and we can have that debate. I appreciate that has been proposed to be separated. But we have to make sure there are no tricks and no doublecrosses when it comes to the House of Representatives, because we are not going to support an effort to go back again and hold Homeland Security funding hostage to other policies and disagreements with the President.

Finally, let me stress if the House does less than what the Senate is going to do on fully funding Homeland Security, they are shutting down first responders in this country. That is what they are doing. If we see a funding bill that has last year's numbers, they are putting in place a shutdown of our first responders in this country with threats all around us and new threats every day.

People in this country deserve a lot better. We can do better than that. So I hope we will come together today to do the right thing: Fund Homeland Security fully so our police and firefighters are available and on the streets, and we are securing our borders and our homeland operations. I dearly hope the House of Representatives will step up and join us in getting this done.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Michigan has made an eloquent speech about the importance of fully funding the Department of Homeland Security. What is astonishing to me is that she didn't listen to her own speech the first time the Republican majority leader brought up the House-passed bill to fully fund the Department of Homeland Security and the Democrats blocked it; and why she didn't listen to that speech the second time the Republican majority leader brought up the House-passed bill to fully fund the Department of Homeland Security and the Democrats blocked it; and why she didn't listen to that speech the third time the Republican majority leader brought up the House-passed proposal to fully fund the Department of Homeland Security and the Democrats blocked it; and why not the fourth time the Republican leader brought up a bill passed by the House of Representatives to fully fund the Department of Homeland Security and the Democrats blocked it.

This is the fifth vote to fully fund the Department of Homeland Security, which we want to do, and which we voted to do four times. So let us not confuse the issue here. I am amazed that Senate Democrats come up with this stuff on the other side. One would think they were living in a different world than we are.

The House has passed legislation to fully fund the Department of Homeland Security. Senate Republicans have brought up a bill to fully fund the Department of Homeland Security four times. The Presiding Officer knows that. Four times we voted yes and four times they voted no. This is the fifth opportunity they will have to fully fund the Department of Homeland Security, and I hope we can do that.

But let us not recreate events that never happened. Let us recognize the fact that for 2 weeks Senate Republicans have been prepared to fully fund the Department of Homeland Security and the Democrats themselves have blocked it not once, not twice, not three times, but four times.

HIGHER EDUCATION

Now, Mr. President, if I may switch gears, I came to the floor to talk on another subject which fortunately has bipartisan support. I am glad to speak about something like that because I think the people of this country gave us and the Republican majority an opportunity this year to come to Washington and shake things up, but also get things done.

In the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee, we are working hard to do just that with Senator MURRAY, the ranking Democrat on the committee, and just as I worked with Senator Harkin in the last Congress when our committee reported out 25 different pieces of legislation which became law. So we got things done in the last Congress, and I am fully confident that Senator MURRAY and I and the other members of our committee can do that in this Congress.

That doesn't mean we agree on everything. We don't agree on a lot of things. If you had to pick a group of liberals and a group of conservatives and line them up, our committee would probably have as much difference as any committee in the Congress. But we also have about 30 percent of the jurisdiction in the Congress. That is what Senator Ted Kennedy used to say when he was in the Senate. And we know it is our responsibility to get things done.

We are working hard on fixing No Child Left Behind. We are working with Secretary Burwell and the President on finding ways to move discoveries and devices through the National Institutes of Health and the Food and Drug Administration into the medicine cabinets.

I see the Senator from Maryland on the floor. Yesterday we worked together to receive a report that Senator MIKULSKI from Maryland and I, Senator BENNET from Colorado, and Senator BURR from North Carolina, asked for 2 years ago to take a look at all the Federal regulations governing our 6,000 colleges and universities and give us an assessment of how much they cost, and how much confusion and duplication there is since the eight different times we have reauthorized the Higher Education Act of 1965. We asked how often we failed to weed the garden, how often we instead just dumped new laws and regulations on top of old ones, and to tell us exactly what to do.

Chancellor Zeppos of Vanderbilt University and Chancellor Kirwan of the University System of Maryland gave us this report. Senator MIKULSKI was there, I was there, and Senator MURRAY, Senator BURR, and Senator BENNET were there. It was a very impressive report. I won't speak for long about it because I see the Senator from Maryland would like to speak, but I wish to take 5 minutes and say these things. It is sometimes best to tell a story to underscore a point, and here is the first story. Vanderbilt University hired the Boston Consulting Group to tell the university how much it spent complying with Federal rules and regulations for higher education in a single year.

According to the Boston Consulting Group, Vanderbilt University spent $150 million complying with Federal rules and regulations last year. That is 11 percent of Vanderbilt's non-hospital expenditures. That adds up to about $11,000 of the tuition for each one of the 12,000 students at the university. It is absolutely absurd that somehow or another that could happen.

A second example is the student aid form 20 million families fill out every year. It is 108 questions long. Our committee has been told that two questions would provide all the necessary information for 95 percent of families: What is your income from two years ago and what is your family size? A bipartisan group of Senators have introduced a bill to do just that. This would save millions of hours and dollars across the country.

Here is a third example. Surveys conducted by the National Academy of

Sciences found that 42 percent of a principal investigator's time on a research project is spent on administrative tasks instead of research.

I asked the head of the National Academy of Sciences what would be a reasonable time?

He said about 10 percent.

We spend 30 billion in taxpayer dollars a year on research and development at colleges and universities. If we could save $1 billion of that $30 billion by reducing that 42 percent to closer to 10 percent, then we could fund a 1,000 more multiyear grants to investigate cancer research, Ebola research, and vaccines, and we should do that.

This is an enormously promising report.

Ten years ago the Senator from Maryland and I worked on a report called ''Rising Above the Gathering Storm.'' We asked a group of distinguished Americans to tell us the 20 things that we might do in Congress to help make our country more competitive in the world. They gave us the 20 things, which formed a blueprint, and we passed most of them and eventually funded most of them.

So I think this report we received yesterday has the opportunity to be as important as ''Rising Above the Gathering Storm,'' which later helped establish the America COMPETES Act. It is a blueprint for how we can reduce overregulation, simplify rules, save money, make consumer protection clear, keep tuition down, find more money for research, and let colleges and universities spend their time and money educating students instead of filling out forms.

I thank Senator MIKULSKI from Maryland, Senator BENNET from Colorado, Senator BURR from North Carolina, and my partner Senator MURRAY on the HELP Committee.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my opening statement from yesterday's hearing, followed by pages 1 through 6 of the report presented to us yesterday, be printed in the RECORD.

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

TASK FORCE ON GOVERNMENT REGULATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of my remarks at the Senate Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee hearing earlier this week be printed in the RECORD.

TASK FORCE ON GOVERNMENT REGULATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION

This morning we are holding our first hearing this Congress on the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act which will focus on the final report from the Task Force on Government Regulation of Higher Education.

Over a year ago, Vanderbilt University hired the Boston Consulting Group to determine how much it costs the university to comply with federal rules and regulations.

The answer: $150 million, or 11 percent of the university's total non-hospital expenditures last year.

Vanderbilt Chancellor Nick Zeppos says that this adds about $11,000 in additional tuition per year for each of the university's 12,757 students.

Each year, 20 million American families fill out a complicated, 108-question form called the FAFSA (Free Application for Federal Student Aid) to obtain a grant or loan to help pay for college. Several experts testified before our committee that just two questions would tell the Department of Education 95 percent of what it needs to know to determine a student's eligibility for a grant or loan: One, what is your family size? And, two, what is your family income?

So, in January a bipartisan group of six Senators introduced legislation to simplify the student aid application and repayment process, including reducing the 108-question FAFSA form to just two questions. If our legislation becomes law, then families, guidance counselors, and admissions officers would save millions of hours.

Most important, according to financial aid expert Mark Kantrowitz, the complicated, 108-question form discourages up to 2 million Americans each year from applying for aid. Last fall, the president of Southwest Tennessee Community College in Memphis told me that the complex form turns away from his campus 1,500 students each semester.

Tennessee has become the first state to make community college tuition-free for qualifying students. But first, each student must fill out the FAFSA. Now that tuition is free, the principal obstacle for a qualified Tennessee student to obtain two more years of education after high school is not money: it is this unnecessarily complicated federal form. Ten years ago, then again three years ago, surveys by the National Academy of Sciences found that principal investigators spend 42 percent of their time associated with federal research projects on administrative tasks instead of research.

I asked the head of the National Academies what a reasonable percent of time would be for a researcher to spend on administrative tasks. He replied: perhaps 10 percent or even less.

How many billions could we save if we reduced the administrative burden?

Taxpayers spend more than $30 billion a year on research and development at colleges and universities.

This year, the average annual cost of an NIH research project grant is $480,000. If we reduce spending on unnecessary red tape by $1 billion, the an NIH could potentially fund more than a thousand multi-year grants.

These should not be excused as normal, run-of-the-mill problems of government. These examples, and others like them, represent sloppy, inefficient governing that wastes money, hurts students, discourages productivity, and impedes research.

Such waste should be an embarrassment to all of us in the federal government.

And let me make clear: let's not just blame President Obama and Education Secretary Arne Duncan. They have contributed to the problem, but so has every President and every education secretary—and that includes me—since 1965 when the first Higher Education Act was enacted.

And the list of those embarrassed should also include the Congress of the United States for year after year adding to and tolerating a pile of conflicting, confusing regulations.

The Higher Education Act totals nearly 1,000 pages; there are over 1,000 pages in the official Code of Federal Regulations devoted to higher education; and on average every workday the Department of Education issues one new sub-regulatory guidance directive or clarification.

No one has taken the time to ''weed the garden.''

The result of this piling up of regulations is that one of the greatest obstacles to innovation and cost consciousness in higher education has become—us, the federal government.

So if all of us created this mess, then it is up to all of us to fix it.

That is why more than a year ago, four members of this committee—two Democrats and two Republicans—asked a group of distinguished educators to examine the current state of federal rules and regulations for colleges and universities. We asked them not just to tell us the problem, but to give us specific solutions.

They have done so in a remarkable document entitled ''Recalibrating Regulation of Colleges and Universities,'' in which they outline 59 specific regulations, requirements and areas for Congress and the Department of Education to consider—listing 10 especially problematic regulations.

I thank Vanderbilt University Chancellor Nick Zeppos and University System of Maryland Chancellor Brit Kirwan for leading the effort.

In their own words, America's 6,000 colleges and universities live in a ''jungle of red tape'' that is expensive and confusing and unnecessary.

The report makes clear that colleges and taxpayers expect appropriate regulation. But neither taxpayers nor colleges are well-served by the jungle that exists today. Consumer information that is too complicated to understand is worthless.

Colleges must report the amount of foreign gifts they receive; disclose the number of fires drills that occurred on campus. ''Gainful employment'' disclosures require 30 different pieces of information for each academic program subject to the regulation.

When a student withdraws from college before a certain time period, a student's federal money must be returned to the government. This is a simple concept.

Yet the regulations and guidance implementing this are ridiculously complex—200 paragraphs of regulatory text accompanied by 200 pages in the Federal Student Aid handbook.

The University of Colorado reports that they have two full-time staff devoted to this issue. One to do the calculation and the other one to recheck the other's work. Ohio State University estimates that it spends around $200,000 annually on compliance for this regulation.

Institutions offering distance education are subject to an additional set of bureaucracy that can result in additional costs of $500,000 to a million dollars for compliance.

All of these are examples of colleges and universities spending time and money on compliance with federal rules and not on students.

Senator Murray and I will discuss how to develop a bipartisan process to take full advantage of the recommendations in this report and to include many of them in reauthorization of the High Education Act, which we plan to do this year.

We will schedule additional hearings to gather comment on the report from institutions not directly involved with the report and consumers of higher education, including parents, students, and taxpayers.

Some of the recommendations require a change in the law. Many can be fixed by the Department itself.

I have talked with Secretary Duncan more than once about this effort and he is eager to do his part to solve the problem. I look forward to working with him and with President Obama on eliminating unnecessary red tape, saving students money, and removing unnecessary regulatory obstacles to innovation in the best system of higher education in the world.

This is not a new subject for me. One of the first things I did as a Senator was try to simplify student aid and the Free Application

for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA). And I'm told the net result was the reduction of approximately 7 questions. Those have been replaced by many more now.

Although I voted against the final reauthorization of the Higher Education Act of 2008, I authored a provision in the bill that required the Secretary of Education to publish a ''compliance calendar'' so schools can see all of their deadlines.

Unfortunately, 7 years later, the Department of Education has yet to implement this provision.

With bipartisan support and this groundbreaking report we have today, I'm counting on this effort to get farther than that one.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The federal government's substantial fiscal investment in higher education recognizes that postsecondary education is a linchpin in the nation's social and economic strength. Through that support, the government helps ensure that colleges and universities continue to contribute broadly to the fabric of American society. To ensure prudent stewardship of federal support for higher education, the Department of Education is charged with developing procedures to carry out laws passed by Congress in regard to higher education and with overseeing institutional compliance. Institutions of higher learning recognize the important role regulations play in the oversight of federal investments.

Over time, oversight of higher education by the Department of Education has expanded and evolved in ways that undermine the ability of colleges and universities to serve students and accomplish their missions. The compliance problem is exacerbated by the sheer volume of mandates—approximately 2,000 pages of text—and the reality that the Department of Education issues official guidance to amend or clarify its rules at a rate of more than one document per work day. As a result, colleges and universities find themselves enmeshed in a jungle of red tape, facing rules that are often confusing and difficult to comply with. They must allocate resources to compliance that would be better applied to student education, safety, and innovation in instructional delivery. Clearly, a better approach is needed.

In 2013, a bipartisan group of U.S. Senators recognized that the pending reauthorization of the Higher Education Act (HEA) creates an opportunity to consider these issues in depth. They established a task force of college and university presidents and chancellors to study federal regulation of higher education broadly and identify potential improvements.

Looking at the landscape of regulation of colleges and universities writ large, the Task Force on Federal Regulation of Higher Education identified a number of challenges that are particularly problematic. As described in Section II of this report, we concluded that many rules are unnecessarily voluminous and too often ambiguous, and that the cost of compliance has become unreasonable. Moreover, many regulations are unrelated to education, student safety, or stewardship of federal funds—and others can be a barrier to college access and innovation in education.

Based on extensive discussions, consultations with experts, and site visits to campuses, the Task Force identified specific regulations that are of major concern to higher education institutions. Section III details those concerns, which include problematic financial responsibility standards, confusion and inconsistency in reporting requirements for campus crime, overreach in authorization of distance education programs, inefficient rules concerning verification of financial aid eligibility, counterproductive micromanagement of the accreditation process, and policies that result in consumers being inundated with information of questionable value.

The Task Force also reviewed the processes by which higher education regulations are developed and implemented, and offers several specific ideas for improvement. Section IV outlines recommendations that include asking the Government Accountability Office to review the Department of Education's methodology for estimating institutional costs of compliance with regulations; the creation of clear ''safe harbors'' for institutional compliance; the recognition of ''good faith'' efforts to comply; and several proposals for better practices by the Department.

To help policy makers think about the most effective and efficient way to regulate higher education, the Task Force developed the following Guiding Principles to govern the development, implementation, and enforcement of regulations by the Department:

Regulations should be related to education, student safety, and stewardship of federal funds.

Regulations should be clear and comprehensible.

Regulations should not stray from clearly stated legislative intent.

Costs and burdens of regulations should be accurately estimated.

Clear safe harbors should be created.

The Department should recognize good faith efforts by institutions.

The Department should complete program reviews and investigations in a timely manner.

Penalties should be imposed at a level appropriate to the violation.

Disclosure requirements should focus on issues of widespread interest.

All substantive policies should be subject to the ''notice-and-comment'' requirements of the Administrative Procedure Act.

Regulations that consistently create compliance challenges should be revised.

The Department should take all necessary steps to facilitate compliance by institutions.

The Task Force believes that adherence to these principles would help improve regulation of higher education, and urges their adoption.

Again, to be clear: Regulations serve an important role in ensuring institutional accountability. But requirements that have an excessive reach, or that are unnecessarily costly and difficult to implement—or worse still, that hinder student access to college and drive costs up—are counterproductive. Smarter rules are needed. In the context of the forthcoming reauthorization of the HEA, this report from the Task Force on Federal Regulation of Higher Education proposes many specific avenues to improve the regulation of higher education.

THE TASK FORCE ON FEDERAL REGULATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION

The pending reauthorization of the Higher Education Act (HEA) provides an opportunity for Congress to examine how institutions of higher education are regulated and to identify ways to streamline and simplify regulatory policies and practices. With that goal in mind, a bipartisan group of U.S. Senators—Lamar Alexander (R–TN), Barbara Mikulski (D–MD), Richard Burr (R–NC), and Michael Bennet (D–CO) created the Task Force on Federal Regulation of Higher Education in the fall of 2013 and directed it to consider these issues in depth.

The Senators articulated a three-part charge for the group:

1) Provide specific recommendations to consolidate, streamline, and eliminate burdensome, costly, and confusing regulations, laws, and reporting requirements;

2) Review and quantify the extent of all federal requirements with which institutions must comply, including estimates of the time and costs associated with specific regulations; and,

3) Provide recommendations for reform to ensure future regulations are promulgated in a manner that appropriately considers existing law and accurately examines the costs and benefits to taxpayers, institutions, and students.

The Senators appointed Task Force members representing institutions from across all sectors of higher education, and named Chancellors William E. Kirwan of the University System of Maryland and Nicholas S. Zeppos of Vanderbilt University (TN) as co-chairs. In addition to Chancellors Kirwan and Zeppos, the Task Force includes these members:

William L. Armstrong, President, Colorado Christian University

Bruce D. Benson, President, University of Colorado

Molly Corbett Broad, President, American Council on Education (DC)

Thomas V. Chema, President Emeritus, Hiram College (OH)

Margaret L. Drugovich, President, Hartwick College (NY)

Dana G. Hoyt, President, Sam Houston State University (TX)

Brice W. Harris, Chancellor, California Community College System

Jonathan A. Kaplan, Chief Executive Officer, Laureate Online Education (MD)

Cornelius M. Kerwin, President, American University (DC)

J. Michael Locke, Former CEO, Rasmussen College (IL)

Harold L. Martin Sr., Chancellor, North Carolina Agricultural and Technical State University

Claude O. Pressnell Jr., President, Tennessee Independent Colleges and Universities Association

Thomas W. Ross, President, University of North Carolina

Robert G. Templin Jr., President, Northern Virginia Community College

In addition, the Senators asked the American Council on Education (ACE) to support the work of the Task Force.

SCOPE OF WORK AND TASK FORCE ACTIVITIES

The word ''regulation'' can be viewed broadly or narrowly. Narrowly defined, federal regulation means only a requirement imposed on institutions through the Code of Federal Regulations, the codification of all the regulations promulgated by federal agencies. Considered more broadly, it means any requirement placed on colleges and universities in order to participate in the federal student aid program. For the purposes of this Task Force and our report, we use ''regulation'' in this broader sense.

The Task Force engaged in extensive consultations for this project and solicited insights from higher education associations, campus officials, and other organizations and stakeholders. To gather input from individuals on campuses who are responsible for implementing regulations, ACE staff conducted extensive site visits and met with representatives from more than 60 institutions around the country.

Our aim was not simply to reduce the number of regulations imposed by the Department of Education, but rather to foster more effective and efficient rules that still meet federal objectives. To that end, we sought to accomplish these goals:

Summarize the increasing burden of federal regulation on higher education.

Identify regulations of particular concern to institutions of higher education, explain why they are problematic, and recommend changes to ameliorate them.

Offer longer-term process improvements that would minimize similar concerns about regulations in the future.

Section I of this report frames the current regulatory landscape for higher education. Section II describes specific current challenges. Section III details 10 regulations that colleges and universities find especially problematic, and recommends solutions. Finally, Section IV proposes ways to improve the regulatory process.

Effective oversight can help colleges and universities keep costs down, keep students safe, focus on educating students, and be good stewards of federal funds. In that spirit, the Task Force developed the following Guiding Principles to help govern the development, implementation, and enforcement of regulations by the Department:

Regulations should be related to education, student safety, and stewardship of federal funds.

Regulations should be clear and comprehensible.

Regulations should not stray from clearly stated legislative intent.

Costs and burdens of regulations should be accurately estimated.

Clear safe harbors should be created.

The Department should recognize good faith efforts by institutions.

The Department should complete program reviews and investigations in a timely manner.

Penalties should be imposed at a level appropriate to the violation.

Disclosure requirements should focus on issues of widespread interest.

All substantive policies should be subject to the ''notice-and-comment'' requirements of the Administrative Procedure Act.

Regulations that consistently create compliance challenges should be revised.

The Department should take all necessary steps to facilitate compliance by institutions.

We believe that these principles would help improve the regulation of higher education, and we urge their adoption.

While the primary focus of this report is on requirements imposed by the Department of Education, institutions of higher education are also regulated by every Cabinet-level agency, as well as many sub-Cabinet-level agencies. In that regard, we acknowledge the important work by other groups and organizations, including the National Research Council of the National Academy of Sciences and the National Science Board, to examine regulations stemming from other agencies, particularly in connection with federally funded research.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I come to the floor to speak about the issue of funding for Homeland Security. However, I wish to note and acknowledge the comments just made by my colleague from Tennessee, Senator ALEXANDER, the chair of the HELP Committee. I couldn't agree with him more.

Hello, America. Two Senators, different parts of the country, different political parties, different political views on some social issues or whatever, but I couldn't agree more with this outstanding report whose original idea came from the gentleman from Tennessee.

When we worked on the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act about 5 years ago now, we agreed upon goals to make college more accessible, to make college more affordable, to always insist that that college offer a quality education and that students on the campus be safe and secure so they could be in a true learning environment.

I am a student loan/student grant person, so I was focusing on the students. I taught at Loyola University in Baltimore, in the community college, but my colleague, who was the president of a university, said: We ought to look at regs. Regulation could have a tremendous impact.

So we put our heads together. Our cochairs came from Tennessee. The Maryland cochair was Dr. Kirwan, a retiring but very able chancellor. And it is a terrific report. It is exactly what we wanted.

Where are the regs that, No. 1, are duplicative—the same darned report after report, and then you do a report on the reports so that then they can ask you questions and ask for a followup addendum. Then there are also instances where the requirements are contradictory. So there they are, the administrators of both the colleges and universities themselves or of an individual grant program. So we want to clarify that.

Not only under Senator ALEXANDER's leadership did we go for what were the top 10 concerns that were really burdensome, duplicative, or contradictory, they gave us a checklist on what would constitute criteria for a good reg. I think they gave us a great roadmap, and now it is our part to use the report. So we are not like everybody else where we got them to do a report and we don't do anything with it.

When we did ''Rising Above the Gathering Storm,'' which I was so excited to be part of, it was truly a bipartisan effort. It led to legislation, and it led to other executive branch input.

So I thank my colleague from Tennessee. I think this is the way we should be working together—put our heads together, get the best advice from what is out there in the real world, and then let's put our shoulders to the wheel and get it done.

Does the Senator have a sense of when he would like to move or the timetable to implement this?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Maryland for her comments and her leadership.

I would say to the Senator from Maryland that I will need to sit down and talk to the Senator from Washington, Mrs. MURRAY, which we plan to do in March. My hope would be that in April we could begin five or six hearings aligned with the recommendations in the report, and on other matters such as accreditation, form working groups within our committee, and then by the fall move ahead with the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act and complete it by the end of the year.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I thank the Senator from Tennessee and look forward to working with him.

Mr. President, this is the way it ought to be, where Senators come together and bring our best ideas. We also bring our concerns and we put them all on the table. But we began with civility, we began with respect, and we established what were agreed-upon goals and how each one of us thought we could get to the roadmap to do that. This is the way I would hope we would work.

Now, as we come to almost a crisis with the funding for Homeland Security running out on Friday, this is the time for us to put our party differences aside, put our pet projects aside, and focus not on what is good for our politics but what is good for America.

I understand that our leadership on both sides of the aisle—Senator MCCONNELL and Senator REID—have arrived now at a framework where we will go through a set of parliamentary procedures, which is our way, to then arrive at a point where we could be voting on a full year's funding for Homeland Security without any additional riders that could derail the bill placed on it. I wish to compliment the leadership for beginning a communication and establishing a parliamentary choreography where we could actually get the job done. The leaders have been working on this. We know they will be coming here on the floor in a few minutes to share with us that idea and begin the procedures where every Senator can exercise their will and their judgment.

But I just want to say this as the ranking member or the vice chair of the Appropriations Committee: We have to fund the Department of Homeland Security. We just have to do it. We have to do it, and we have to do it now. I hope we can do it in the Senate this afternoon and that the House really follows what we are doing here.

This is so crucial because of the very nature of what the bill is—homeland security. This isn't about a new agency that might be duplicative of another. This isn't about new programs. It is not even about great big new sums of money. This Appropriations Committee arrived at its recommendations when we were working on the omnibus.

The Presiding Officer is the chair of the Subcommittee on Homeland Security. I know that in the way he does his due diligence, he has reviewed this bill. So the money part I don't think is controversial and it actually does the job. And the job is to do the full funding to protect the homeland.

I really worry about our country. Here we are, and we have ISIL making additional threats to the United States about the security of our malls. While

we were all pondering what our strategy would be and parsing what the politics would be, our great Federal agents were on the scene making sure that four Americans didn't go to join ISIL to fight against us and perhaps organize predatory attacks against us. Our people are on the job, and now it is time that we do our job and fully fund this agency.

America is at risk. We face terrorism. We face the consequences of natural disasters, which FEMA and the Coast Guard are really helping us with right now. We face cyber threats. We need the Department of Homeland Security funded in a way to prevent and respond to these situations.

When I look at this, it is really standing sentry in terms of all we need to do in terms of port security, airport security, guarding our borders through our Border Patrol agents, 23,000 Border Patrol agents. But I also look at the first responders. If anything happens in our country, it is local law enforcement and local firefighters who are the first to respond. We have helped them with this response by providing them with Federal funds. I am really proud of what we have done on this.

I want to speak particularly about the Fire Grant Program. Now think about what they do. Every day when they report to duty, our first responders don't know what they will face. In my own home State of Maryland, will they face a train derailment? We have had those. Will they face a Metro fire? We have had that. Will we have a multiple-vehicle accident on 95 that could involve a horrific accident that requires rescue from hazardous and toxic waste? Because of who we are, with our airports and our seaports, we also are a big threat for a terrorist attack. Our first responders are asking us to give them the money they need to pay the bills and also help them with these necessities.

Over 10 years ago I joined with one of my Republican counterparts, Senator Kit Bond of Missouri. We were both concerned with what was happening to our volunteer fire departments. As he crisscrossed Missouri and I crisscrossed Maryland, we were shocked to find out that a new firetruck could cost as much as $1 million, that wonderful SCBA protective gear that would be fire retardant or fire resistant could cost $2,000, that the special breathing apparatus that is being developed can cost over $5,000. When we put our heads together and listened to our firefighters, we realized you could not fund that on tip jars, pancake breakfasts, crabcake dinners, or oyster fries in my own State. We wanted to help them. We wanted to make sure we helped them so they could protect us.

So we looked at the Fire Grant Program. It has been a tremendous success in my own State in the decades since we passed it. Over 600 fire departments have been helped with the new equipment they need. When I travel my State, I have people who defend and protect me in my community shake my hand. The Presiding Officer knows what the volunteer firefighters do. I am sure it is the same situation in North Dakota as it is western Maryland. They say: You have helped me be able to do the job. Volunteer fire departments do all of this on their own time and on their own dime.

So what happens if we don't fund Homeland Security? It means that those $2 billion grants for emergency firefighters, port security, for local efforts and so on will not be funded. Make no mistake. For those people perhaps in the Senate or in the House that say that we just do a continuing resolution, a continuing resolution means that grants cannot be funded.

Under current law, for any program with an agency that is on a CR, it cannot issue grant money at all. So that means right now they are getting ready to take the Fire Grant Program proposals. Secretary Jeh Johnson can't put out communication to say it is now the annual time for fire chiefs to come in with their requests.

So we are placing America at risk—not only with the really big picture stuff. Often the big picture comes back home. On that terrible, terrible day of 9/11, who ran up into those burning buildings? Who ran up those steps of the World Trade Center? It was our firefighters.

I am flinching, flagging, abashed at their heroism and their desire to rescue. And every day—right this minute—one of them somewhere is doing something. Certainly we can fund the grant program so they can have the truck they need, so they have the breathing apparatus they need, so they have the protective gear they need, so we can protect them while they are protecting us—rather than protecting our political butts. We have got to get off our butts and fund this bill.

I look forward to the leadership on both sides of the aisle coming forward with a program to do it. I hope we have a sense of urgency. There is a saying from Tip O'Neill that ''all politics is local,'' but ultimately, all homeland security is local.

I yield the floor.

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

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

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I appreciate our Democrat colleagues joining us and proceeding to the House-passed bill. I have spoken to the Democratic leader and my colleagues on the Republican side and commit to offering an amendment to the House bill to fully fund the Department of Homeland Security, while addressing the President's Executive actions on a separate adjacent track through consideration of the Collins bill.

When the Senate proceeds to H.R. 240, I will offer a clean substitute and work to expedite consideration of the bill, as amended, to get it back over to the House this week. I would welcome bipartisan cooperation to pass the DHS funding bill as well as the commonsense Collins bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the majority leader and I have had very good discussions in the last 24 hours or so. We have agreed that, in order to pass a clean Homeland Security appropriations bill for the remainder of this fiscal year, the Democrats will support getting on the House Homeland Security funding bill. In exchange, the majority leader will provide that the only amendment will be a clean Homeland Security funding substitute, which he just outlined. The substance of this amendment is the same as the bill that was introduced by Senators MIKULSKI and SHAHEEN about a month ago.

The Senate will adopt that amendment and send the amended bill to the House in an expedited fashion. The Senate will then vote on cloture on the motion to proceed to the Collins bill.

Personally, I don't believe the Collins bill is a compromise. It would undermine law enforcement and tear families apart. So until full-year funding for the Homeland Security Department is enacted, I will vote against going to the Collins bill.

After a clean bill is signed into law, I will be happy to have a vigorous debate on immigration and the best way to fix our broken system.

I want to be very clear that Democrats would be willing to expedite the plan we have before us by consent.

In conclusion, I thank the majority leader for working with Democrats to come to a solution of this impasse that we have been faced with for the last 4 weeks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to the motion to reconsider vote No. 53, the vote by which cloture was not invoked on the motion to proceed to H.R. 240.

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

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to H.R. 240.

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

The motion was agreed to.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The senior 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, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to H.R. 240, making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015.

Mitch McConnell, Thad Cochran, Tom Cotton, Roger F. Wicker, David Vitter, Jerry Moran, Daniel Coats, Michael B. Enzi, Mike Crapo, Bill Cassidy, John Boozman, John Thune, Tim Scott, John Hoeven, James Lankford, Jeff Sessions.

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

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to H.R. 240, an act making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close, upon reconsideration?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 98, nays 2, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 58 Leg.]

YEAS—98

Alexander	Fischer	Murray
Ayotte	Flake	Nelson
Baldwin	Franken	Paul
Barrasso	Gardner	Perdue
Bennet	Gillibrand	Peters
Blumenthal	Graham	Portman
Blunt	Grassley	Reed
Booker	Hatch	Reid
Boozman	Heinrich	Risch
Boxer	Heitkamp	Roberts
Brown	Heller	Rounds
Burr	Hirono	Rubio
Cantwell	Hoeven	Sanders
Capito	Isakson	Sasse
Cardin	Johnson	Schatz
Carper	Kaine	Schumer
Casey	King	Scott
Cassidy	Kirk	Shaheen
Coats	Klobuchar	Shelby
Cochran	Lankford	Stabenow
Collins	Leahy	Sullivan
Coons	Lee	Tester
Corker	Manchin	Thune
Cornyn	Markey	Tillis
Cotton	McCain	Toomey
Crapo	McCaskill	Udall
Cruz	McConnell	Vitter
Daines	Menendez	Warner
Donnelly	Merkley	Warren
Durbin	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Enzi	Moran	Wicker
Ernst	Murkowski	Wyden
Feinstein	Murphy	

NAYS—2

Inhofe	Sessions

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TOOMEY). On this vote, the yeas are 98, the nays are 2.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion, upon reconsideration, is agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I just want to applaud the vote we just had. A 98-to-2 vote shows very clearly that our colleagues in the Senate want to see funding for Homeland Security. Everybody understands that the risks to this country are too great for us not to provide the resources the Department needs so they can continue to do their jobs.

We just heard that the Department of Homeland Security was involved with the FBI in the case of three people in Brooklyn who were threatening this country because they wanted to go to the Middle East and join ISIS. We need to make sure DHS has the funding they need. This is real progress. I applaud Senators MCCONNELL and REID for their efforts to get to this point.

I hope we can continue down this road to get funding for the Department, and that when we send the bill over to the House, the House will also work together in a bipartisan way to get a clean funding bill before the resources run out, before the money runs out for the Department of Homeland Security this Friday. We have a little bit of time. We need to get this done. The Senate took a giant step forward today to do that. I applaud my colleagues. I hope we can keep this going and that we can get this done very soon.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

INCOME INEQUALITY

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I do not agree with Speaker of the House JOHN BOEHNER on very much, but I do agree that it is an excellent idea for there to be a joint session of Congress in the fall to hear from Pope Francis. To my mind, in the last few years the Pope has played an extraordinary role in speaking out on issues of enormous consequence that impact every man, woman, and child, not just in our country but on the planet. He has shown great courage in raising issues that we very rarely discuss here in the Congress or in parliaments around the country.

What I want to do briefly this afternoon is quote and discuss some of the statements that the Pope has made that I think we need to listen to. I think it is a wonderful idea that Speaker BOEHNER has invited the Pope, but I think it is important we also listen to what he has said. This is from Pope Francis.

> We have created new idols. The worship of the golden calf of old has found a new and heartless image in the cult of money and the dictatorship of an economy which is faceless and lacking any truly humane goal.

On another occasion what he says is: ''Man is not in charge today, money is in charge, money rules.''

Then he says in another quote:

> Today everything comes under the laws of competition and the survival of the fittest, where the powerful feed upon the powerless. As a consequence, masses of people find themselves excluded and marginalized: without work, without possibilities, without any means of escape.

Then he says this on an issue that is, I think, very relevant to this body:

> In this context, some people continue to defend trickle-down theories which assume that economic growth, encouraged by a free market, will inevitably succeed in bringing about greater justice and inclusiveness in the world. This opinion, which has never been confirmed by the facts, expresses a crude and naive trust in the goodness of those wielding economic power and in the sacralized workings of the prevailing economic system.

Then he says:

> . . . these things become the norm: that some homeless people die of cold on the streets is not news. In contrast, a ten point drop on the stock markets of some cities, is a tragedy.

In other words, when people die because they are poor and hungry and cold, that is not news. But a 10-point drop in the stock market becomes a tragedy.

Then he says:

> We must say ''we want a just system! A system that enables everyone to get on''. We must say: ''we don't want this globalized economic system which does us so much harm!''

Here we have the leader of the Catholic Church raising profound issues about the state of the economy—certainly not just to the United States but all over the world. I don't want to paraphrase him, but my interpretation of what he is saying is that money cannot be an end in itself. The function of an economic system is not just to let the marketplace reign and end up in a situation where a small number of people have incredible wealth while so many people have virtually nothing.

That is true not just of the United States, but it is even more true around the world. We have a situation right now—incredible as it may sound—where the wealthiest 85 people in the world own more wealth than the bottom half of the world's population. So 85 phenomenally wealthy billionaires are here, and half of the world's population are over here—over 3 billion people. Does anybody in the wildest stretch of their imagination think this is anything close to a just world economic system?

Oxfam recently told us that within the global economy within a year or two, the top 1 percent of the world's wealthiest people will own more wealth than the bottom 99 percent. What religion condones this type of economic disparity? What political party should condone this type of economic disparity?

What the Pope is essentially saying is we need to pay attention to those people who are hurting—not just the homeless, not just the hungry, but those people who are working longer hours for low wages and at exactly the same time when in this country we have seen a proliferation of millionaires and billionaires. Is that what our economy is supposed to be about?

Let me just amplify what the Pope was saying by giving you some cold statistics in terms of what is going on in the United States of America. I am not talking about the global economy. I am not talking about Greece, where unemployment is 25 percent and where their economy has contracted by a quarter in the last 6 years. I am talking about the American economy.

Since 1999 the median middle-class family—that family right in the middle of the American economy—has seen its income go down by almost $5,000 after adjusting for inflation. Incredibly, that family earned less income last year than it did 26 years ago, back in 1989.

Do you want to know why people in America are angry? Whether they are in the Occupy Wall Street movement and consider themselves progressive, whether they are in the tea party movement and consider themselves conservative, the median male worker—that man right in the middle of the American economy—earned $783 less last year than he did 42 years ago. In other words, you have seen an explosion of technological productivity, but the male worker in the middle of the economy—inflation adjusted for dollars—made $783 less last year than he did 42 years ago, while the median female worker—the woman in the middle of the American economy—earned $1,300 less last year than she did in 2007.

All over this country we are seeing men and women working longer hours for lower wages. We are seeing people working not one job but two jobs or three jobs in order to cobble together the income they need and maybe some health care as well. But while the middle class continues to disappear on a 40-year trajectory, the wealthiest people and the largest corporations are doing phenomenally well. The gap between the very, very rich and everybody else is growing wider.

This is what the Pope means, I think, when he says this:

> While the income of a minority is increasing exponentially, that of the majority is crumbling. This imbalance results from ideologies which uphold the absolute autonomy of markets and financial speculation, and thus deny the right of control to States, which are themselves charged with providing for the common good.

This is from Pope Francis. So what does he mean when he talks about the income of a minority increasing exponentially while the majority is crumbling? Let me give you some examples. I talked about male wages, female wages, and median family income. Let me talk about what is going on in the top 1 percent.

Today the top 1 percent in America now own about 41 percent of the entire wealth of our country while the bottom 60 percent own less than 2 percent. Let me repeat that. The top 1 percent own over 40 percent of the wealth. The bottom 60 percent own less than 2 percent. Today, incredibly, the top one-tenth of 1 percent now own almost as much wealth as the bottom 90 percent—one-tenth of 1 percent. So 16,000 families own almost as much wealth as the bottom 300 million people in our country. Today the Walton family—the owners of Walmart and the wealthiest family in America—is now worth $153 billion. That is more wealth in one family than the bottom 40 percent of Americans. Over the past decade, the net worth of the top 400 billionaires in this country has doubled, up to an astronomical $1 trillion in just 10 years.

In terms of income as opposed to wealth, almost all of the new income generated in recent years, since the Wall Street crash, has gone to the top 1 percent. In fact, the last information that we have indicates that over 99 percent of all new income generated in this country goes to the top 1 percent.

The top 25 hedge fund managers on Wall Street made more than $24 billion in 2013, equivalent to the full salaries of more than 425,000 public school teachers. What we are seeing in this country is growing income and wealth inequality. What we are seeing around the world is the same.

What troubles me very much is that in the midst of a disappearing middle class, at a time when we have more people living in poverty today than at almost any time in recent history, I believe my Republican colleagues on the Budget Committee will bring forth a budget in the next few years which will move us in exactly the wrong direction. When the rich get richer, their proposal will be let's give more tax breaks to millionaires and billionaires.

When large corporations are enjoying huge profits, and major corporation after major corporation is paying nothing in Federal income tax, their proposal will be let's give more tax breaks to large multinational corporations.

Then after giving tax breaks to the rich and large corporations, they say: Well, we want a balanced budget, and the way we are going to balance the budget is on the backs of a disappearing middle class, on the backs of millions of working families, and on the backs of the poorest and most vulnerable people in this country.

This is the Robin Hood principle in reverse. This is taking from the poor and working people and giving it to the millionaires and billionaires.

I would hope the American people say: Enough is enough. We don't need more tax breaks for the rich and large corporations. We don't need to cut Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, education, nutrition programs for hungry people, and Pell grants so the kids can go to college. That is not what we should be doing. In fact, we should be moving in exactly the other direction.

From 1983 to a few years ago, what we have seen in this country is an incredible transfer of wealth from the bottom 90 percent to the top 1 percent. We are talking about trillions of dollars in wealth going from the bottom 90 percent to the top 1 percent. Most Americans are saying: Enough is enough. We don't need more austerity for the middle class. We don't need to cut Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid. Maybe it is time for some austerity for the top 1 percent.

I hope when we come together to discuss the budget, Members of the Senate will listen to what Pope Francis has been talking about and give us a budget which works for the most vulnerable people in this country, which works for tens of millions of working families, and does not simply work for large campaign donors.

With that, I yield the floor.

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. LEAHY. 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. LEAHY. Mr. President, somebody asked me a little while ago, shouldn't we be voting on the mishmash on Homeland Security that the House of Representatives sent over because of the immigration matters in it.

I reminded them that the Senate in the last Congress voted by a 2-to-1 margin, on a bipartisan comprehensive immigration bill which we sent to the House of Representatives and the Speaker refused to bring the bill up. It probably would have passed.

Had it passed, it would have been signed into law and President Obama would not have issued any Executive orders. There would be no need to. We had everything from border security, which Republicans and Democrats voted for, to minors and the DREAMers, which Republicans and Democrats voted for.

In fact, we had hundreds of hours of hearings and markups. We had around 140 amendments that were brought up, and I would call for one Republican amendment and one Democratic amendment. We went back and forth day after day, night after night. We did 140 or 141 amendments.

All but one of them passed by a bipartisan vote. We then had dozens of amendments on the floor, all of which passed with bipartisan votes. The final bill got 68 votes.

We have done the work on immigration. Let's not play games and endanger the needed funding for the Department of Homeland Security at a time when we face all kinds of dangers in this country. Let's not close down Department of Homeland Security on a made-up mission of doing something for immigration.

We passed an immigration bill. They could take out the draft of that old bill, vote it up, and vote it down. Sixty-eight Senators, Republicans and Democrats alike, voted for it. Let's bring up something similar. Let's have a real debate. Let's have amendments. Let's go to immigration. Then in the meantime, let's pass the Department of Homeland Security bill.

Millions upon millions of taxpayer dollars are being wasted even today as they prepare for a shutdown, not knowing whether these tactics are going to close down the Department, that major part of our government, or not. They have to spend the money. That is money wasted, to say nothing about the job that's not being done.

I refer to my speech about Groundhog Day because we have seen this one.

Our friends across the way in the Capitol closed down the government before.

In just 2 days, unless Congress acts, the doors at the Department of Homeland Security, one of the country's primary national security agencies, will shutter. Unless we act, 30,000 workers will be furloughed without pay. Another 130,000 will be asked to work in defense of our nation's security, without pay.

This is another needless, made-in-Washington crisis. We find ourselves here today because of the House's initial failure to act for more than a year and a half on bipartisan legislation that the Senate passed to help fix our broken immigration system. The House's inaction forced the President to do what he could through the executive authorities available to him. Those actions are welcomed. But they are not permanent, legislative fixes. Now, because Republicans in the House are angry that the President acted where they would not, they are threatening the functions of the very agency that helps protect our borders, our airspace, our waterways, and our communities.

Every State in this country will be affected by a shutdown of the Department of Homeland Security. In the midst of a fiercely cold winter, when the Northeast has been devastated by life-threatening storms, we put at risk important recovery resources available through FEMA. We put at risk counterterrorism efforts and analysis of critical intelligence, as we continue to mount and improve our national security in the face of unprecedented violent threats from enemies overseas. It is appalling that in the face of reports that terrorists want to target such domestic sites as the Mall of America, some in Congress are playing petty politics with the vital operations of the Department of Homeland Security.

A short-term continuing resolution will not solve this problem. A continuing resolution for the Department of Homeland Security recognizes neither the evolving threats to our Nation's security, nor the continuing stresses on our immigration system. A continuing resolution for the Department will tear immigrant families apart, rather than support keeping them together. A continuing resolution will not support an increase of $400 million for the Department. It will freeze FEMA resources at their current levels.

And let's remember one key fact that I do not hear these reckless voices in Congress acknowledging: The funding bill we should be considering—the Shaheen-Mikulski bill—already is a compromise bill. It is far from perfect. For example, I strongly oppose the new funding for family detention. Incarcerating women and children fleeing violence runs contrary to our long history as a nation that offers refuge to those most in need. Nonetheless I am prepared to support the bill, because it will help State and local communities with disaster recovery, with law enforcement activities, and will support our national security and counterterrorism efforts.

The Shaheen-Mikulski bill is the product of bipartisan negotiations between Republicans and Democrats in both the Senate and the House. But for the President's executive actions in November, it would have been included in the omnibus spending bill that was signed into law last year. Now we are on the brink of a potential shutdown of the Department of Homeland Security. This is a fabricated crisis. The solution is simple. The Senate should approve the Shaheen-Mikulski bill, send it to the House, and end this stalemate. The House should promptly consider the bipartisan, comprehensive immigration legislation approved overwhelmingly by the Senate in 2013.

If there is another debate to be had about fixing our immigration system, let's have that debate. But let's stop holding the operations of one of the Nation's key national security agency captive, while asking tens of thousands of hardworking Americans—including more than 2,500 Vermonters—to either work without pay or take an unpaid leave of absence. This is not the way to run a country. Unlike in so many other questions facing our country, the solution to this contrived disaster is easy. Members of Congress just need to have the courage to act.

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

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

UKRAINE

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I rise once again in support of the people of Ukraine in their struggle against Russian aggression. The most recent diplomatic efforts seem to have only emboldened President Putin.

Since Minsk II, which is the last time they came to an agreement with reference to a ceasefire, there have been hundreds of ceasefire violations and the city of Debaltseve has fallen under rebel control. Putin's forces now threaten Mariupol, which would provide a key land bridge to Crimea, and his intentions are clear.

In my view, we need to urgently increase the cost to Putin with tougher sanctions and by providing more security assistance to the Ukrainian military.

At a press conference on February 9 with Chancellor Merkel, the President said that his team was considering options including the provision of defensive military equipment if the diplomatic effort with respect to Russia has failed.

As recent events have shown, Minsk II is clearly dead, and we need to take a different approach.

At so many points in history, there have been opportunities for the international community to deter rogue actors from violating the sovereignty of other countries. Unless bullies such as Putin are confronted, they will always bully, they will always force a response, and they will always be an even greater problem for their neighbors and the broader international community.

Putin took Crimea, then he took Donetsk, then he took Luhansk, and last week he took Debaltseve. While he has paid a price because of the sanctions regime, that price has not changed his behavior. So now is the time to increase the cost to Putin. Now is the time to increase sanctions on Russia and work with Europe to consider additional sanctions in other sectors of the economy. Now is the time for the President to abide by his words on February 9—to provide badly needed defensive weapons to the Ukrainian Government and to rethink our strategic response to Russia's encroachment in Ukraine and across the former Soviet territories.

The international community simply cannot remain passive in the face of such unbridled aggression that will only invite further aggression. So I call upon the administration to fully implement measures this body authorized when it passed the Ukraine Freedom Support Act, which the President signed into law on December 18.

Last month I wrote to Secretary Kerry in the wake of the bloodiest period since the start of this crisis. I urged the administration to fully implement the authorities provided in the law and to comply with the clear reporting deadlines.

The legislation passed with unanimous consent in both Houses of Congress. It authorizes the President to provide much needed military and humanitarian aid to Ukraine, and it imposes additional sanctions against Russia in this time of crisis. The legislation was necessary in December, and it is even more necessary today.

We know the sanctions implemented by the United States and the European Union have had a tangible effect on the Russian economy. Combined with the decrease in global energy markets, they have put unprecedented pressure on President Putin. But he is undeterred. He continues to provide illegitimate and illegal support to separatists in eastern Ukraine, evidenced by OSCE and NATO reports cataloging the growing number of Russian troops and artillery that remain in the region and as evidenced by the spiking violence by so-called Russian-backed separatists against both military troops and civilians. Russian troops and these so-called Russian-backed rebels have carried out deadly attacks on civilians in eastern Ukraine. They have killed scores—they have killed women, they have killed children. They have ignored Minsk I. They have ignored

Minsk II. And now they have gained control of Debaltseve and have made moves towards Mariupol. This must end. The violence must end and the killing must stop.

We must renew our commitment to the people of Ukraine and stand against Putin's blatant aggression. I appreciate the administration's comprehensive efforts to counter Russian aggression, but I also believe it is not enough. We must act immediately to influence the course of events on the ground and urge the President to fully implement the Ukraine Freedom Support Act. The violence threatening Ukraine's territorial integrity is threatening the region. The international community has an obligation to respond to Putin's clear signals that his intention is to escalate tensions in Ukraine and across the region.

Since Senator CORKER and I, along with other committee members, introduced the Ukraine Freedom Support Act, Putin has escalated his belligerent and aggressive tactics. NATO has deployed more than 400 times last year to intercept Russian military flights near members' European airspace.

In July of 2014, Ukrainian pilot Nadiya Savchenko was captured by Russian forces and is being illegally detained in Russia despite Russia's commitment to Minsk to free her.

In September of last year, Russians abducted the Estonian security service officer Eston Kohver from Estonian territory. He was taken from Estonian territory to Moscow where he has been languishing in prison without due process.

In October, Sweden's military discovered what it believed was a Russian submarine outside of Stockholm. In December, about a dozen Russian aircraft, including bombers, flew into the Baltic Sea region. In January, attacks on civilian buses took the lives of 20 Ukrainians. It is time for the international community to say enough is enough.

Fully implementing the sanctions and assistance in the Ukraine Freedom Support Act will help restore its sovereignty, it will help restore its territorial integrity, and it will help deter Russia from further destabilizing the region.

I urge the President to implement these measures immediately, without delay. That said, I understand there are individuals on the European Union and Canadian targeted sanctions list who do not appear on the American list of sanctions. Now why is this the case?

Perhaps the most egregious example is Alexander Bortnikov, the head of the Russian FSB. Mr. Bortnikov is not on the U.S. lists in relation to either Ukraine or the Magnitsky act, but he is on the European Union and Canadian lists. To make matters worse, Mr. Bortnikov was here in the United States last week for President Obama's CVE conference. To say that I am puzzled would be an understatement.

The fact is there are almost 150 individuals and entities on the Canadian and EU sanctions lists that are not on the U.S. lists. If there is no justifiable reason for excluding these individuals, then they should be added.

Yesterday before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Secretary Kerry indicated that these lists will be synced, harmonized, in the coming days, and I will keep a close eye on this process. Clearly, for the international effort to be effective, we need to be in lockstep with our Canadian and European allies. When we passed this legislation last December, it coincided with a Wall Street Journal report about the fortune that Russians were spending to lobby Washington against passing that very bill. They claimed the sanctions would affect the West's willingness to invest in Russia, and I say that is exactly what these sanctions should do.

Putin is using his military power to impose his will in Ukraine, but he is also using every economic tool at his disposal, and we must do the same. We must make it clear to Mr. Putin that there will be consequences for his actions.

This is not only obviously important in the context of Ukraine, which it certainly is in the first instance, but it is also about sending a very clear global message that if you violate and upend the international order, there will be consequences for doing so. Because in the absence of real consequences to doing so, there are other actors in the world who are looking at what is happening in Ukraine who will say, well, what did the United States, what did the West do to stop the aggression of Russia? And if the answer is not very much, at the end of the day—certainly not enough to stop that aggression—then other actors in the world who may be more powerful than their neighbors, who may have nuclear weapons in their possession, such as North Korea, will think about what they want to do. And whether that is China in the South China Sea which has had territorial disputes with our allies South Korea and Japan, or whether it is the challenge we have in North Korea of a nuclear armed North Korea, whether it is Maduro in Venezuela oppressing his people—I can go through a list of global actors who will wonder that if, at the end of the day, there isn't much consequence for violating the international order, then I will do what I wish to do because I have the power to do it without consequences. That is an incredibly risky world to live in.

So I urge the President to implement our bill now. The military situation on the ground is clear. The Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, NATO, the Ukrainian National Security Defense Council, have all reported on the presence of Russian military convoys and troops in eastern Ukraine.

As a matter of fact, I was there last year in the midst of the invasion—and I call it an invasion, because last time I checked, where I come from, if you have Russian troops crossing from Russia into another sovereign country, if you have surface-to-surface missiles, if you have armored vehicles and tanks and all of them are crossing without provocation, then you clearly have an invasion—and that has only mounted. You can take a soldier and take his Russian insignia off and put something else on, but they are still Russian soldiers coming into Ukraine from Russia.

Fear is mounting in Mariupol that pro-Russian rebels with Russian support will conduct further attacks to ease land access to Crimea from Russia. If Russia gets its land access to Crimea, despite all of our talk that we will not forget that Crimea was taken by force illegally in violation of international law, Crimea is gone. If Russia continues down this path, its illegal occupation will be solidified and Putin clearly intends to continue to play his game.

Prior to Minsk II, Oleksandr Zakharchenko, the head of the separatists in Donetsk, said ''there will be no ceasefires'' and that the separatists will not stop their attacks until they have ''reached the borders of the former Donetsk region.''

He has stayed true to his word. There are no more ceasefires. He issued an order to ''take no prisoners,'' claiming that the separatists were no longer interested in prisoner swaps.

So I say to my colleagues, the situation is dire and it is becoming increasingly clear we are not doing enough to change it. We must raise the costs to Putin and his cronies by providing Ukraine with the assistance it needs to defend itself. The world is watching and waiting and the time is now. The Ukraine Freedom Support Act explicitly authorizes the provision of defensive military assistance. Let's provide it.

We have sent over night vision goggles, and I guess those are great to see the enemy, but if they can't stop the enemy, what good is that? What good is that?

Let's provide anti-tank and anti-armor weapons, crew weapons, and ammunition. Let's provide counterartillery radar to identify and target artillery batteries, fire control, range finder, and optical and guidance control equipment. Let's provide tactical troop-operated surveillance drones and secure command and communications equipment.

The administration was required to report to Congress on February 15 regarding its plan for increasing military assistance to the Government of Ukraine. Ten days later, we are still waiting on this report. I urge the President to impose the more stringent sanctions on Russia's defense and energy sectors that we outlined in the law. I urge him to enact further sanctions on Rosoboronexport and other Russian defense firms that we know contribute to the instability in Ukraine, Moldova, Georgia, and Syria. These firms outfit pro-Russian rebels and Russian troops who have invaded

eastern Ukraine and established illegitimate republics recognized by no one but President Putin. It is time to enact those sanctions. It is time that we put an end to the chaos and violence these firms spread around the world. It is time to impose additional targeted sanctions on the Russian energy sector to add to existing sanctions that are already costing the Russian economy about $140 billion a year, or about 7 percent of its economy.

By imposing the energy sanctions called for in the act, the administration will tighten restrictions on shale deposits, arctic drilling, and offshore drilling.

The Ukraine Freedom Support Act calls for the administration to impose sanctions on other defense industry targets as well as on special Russian crude oil projects by January 31. We are still waiting to see the administration's response.

On September 18, Petro Poroshenko, the President of Ukraine, addressed a joint session of Congress. We applauded his message of solidarity. Now it is time to move past the applause. Now is the time to stand together in solidarity with the people of Ukraine. President Poroshenko asked for defensive arms, he asked us for aid, and he asked us for tougher sanctions on Russia. We all want a diplomatic solution to this problem, but I believe this can only come about when Putin believes the cost of continuing to ravage Ukraine is simply too high. We have a responsibility to increase that cost.

I ask the President to heed our call and to fully exercise the authority granted by the Ukraine Freedom Support Act and to do it now.

If we do that, not only do we save a key country that is presently bleeding—the eastern part of Ukraine is one of the most productive parts of the country. It is tough to keep providing financial support to it when it cannot openly stabilize itself because of the violence and the economic bleeding that goes on by virtue of the war in the East. This is about a country that is looking westward toward democracy, toward the European Union. We should be helping countries that want to make that decision and have made that decision by themselves be able to achieve their sovereign right to do so. We should be sending a clear international message about not violating the international order, and we should be sending a clear and powerful message that when you do, there are repercussions.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

MORNING BUSINESS

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, the Senate Appropriations Committee has adopted rules governing its procedures for the 114th Congress. Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 2, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, on behalf of myself and Vice Chairwoman MIKULSKI, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the committee rules be printed in the RECORD.

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

SENATE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

COMMITTEE RULES—114TH CONGRESS

I. MEETINGS

The Committee will meet at the call of the Chairman.

II. QUORUMS

1. Reporting a bill. A majority of the members must be present for the reporting of a bill.

2. Other business. For the purpose of transacting business other than reporting a bill or taking testimony, one-third of the members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum.

3. Taking testimony. For the purpose of taking testimony, other than sworn testimony, by the Committee or any subcommittee, one member of the Committee or subcommittee shall constitute a quorum. For the purpose of taking sworn testimony by the Committee, three members shall constitute a quorum, and for the taking of sworn testimony by any subcommittee, one member shall constitute a quorum.

III. PROXIES

Except for the reporting of a bill, votes may be cast by proxy when any member so requests.

IV. ATTENDANCE OF STAFF MEMBERS AT CLOSED SESSIONS

Attendance of staff members at closed sessions of the Committee shall be limited to those members of the Committee staff who have a responsibility associated with the matter being considered at such meeting. This rule may be waived by unanimous consent.

V. BROADCASTING AND PHOTOGRAPHING OF COMMITTEE HEARINGS

The Committee or any of its subcommittees may permit the photographing and broadcast of open hearings by television and/or radio. However, if any member of a subcommittee objects to the photographing or broadcasting of an open hearing, the question shall be referred to the full Committee for its decision.

VI. AVAILABILITY OF SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

To the extent possible, when the bill and report of any subcommittee are available, they shall be furnished to each member of the Committee thirty-six hours prior to the Committee's consideration of said bill and report.

VII. AMENDMENTS AND REPORT LANGUAGE

To the extent possible, amendments and report language intended to be proposed by Senators at full Committee markups shall be provided in writing to the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member and the appropriate Subcommittee Chairman and Ranking Minority Member twenty-four hours prior to such markups.

VIII. POINTS OF ORDER

Any member of the Committee who is floor manager of an appropriations bill is hereby authorized to make points of order against any amendment offered in violation of the Senate Rules on the floor of the Senate to such appropriations bill.

IX. EX OFFICIO MEMBERSHIP

The Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the full Committee are ex officio members of all subcommittees of which they are not regular members but shall have no vote in the subcommittee and shall not be counted for purposes of determining a quorum.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, the Select Committee on Intelligence has adopted rules governing its procedures for the 114th Congress. Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 2, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, on behalf of myself and Senator DIANNE FEINSTEIN, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of the Committee rules.

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

RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

RULE 1. CONVENING OF MEETINGS

1.1. The regular meeting day of the Select Committee on Intelligence for the transaction of Committee business shall be every other Tuesday of each month, unless otherwise directed by the Chairman.

1.2. The Chairman shall have authority, upon notice, to call such additional meetings of the Committee as the Chairman may deem necessary and may delegate such authority to any other member of the Committee.

1.3. A special meeting of the Committee may be called at any time upon the written request of five or more members of the Committee filed with the Clerk of the Committee.

1.4. In the case of any meeting of the Committee, other than a regularly scheduled meeting, the Clerk of the Committee shall notify every member of the Committee of the time and place of the meeting and shall give reasonable notice which, except in extraordinary circumstances, shall be at least 24 hours in advance of any meeting held in Washington, D.C. and at least 48 hours in the case of any meeting held outside Washington, D.C.

1.5. If five members of the Committee have made a request in writing to the Chairman to call a meeting of the Committee, and the Chairman fails to call such a meeting within seven calendar days thereafter, including the day on which the written notice is submitted, these members may call a meeting by filing a written notice with the Clerk of the Committee who shall promptly notify each member of the Committee in writing of the date and time of the meeting.

RULE 2. MEETING PROCEDURES

2.1. Meetings of the Committee shall be open to the public except as provided in paragraph 5(b) of Rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate.

2.2. It shall be the duty of the Staff Director to keep or cause to be kept a record of all Committee proceedings.

2.3. The Chairman of the Committee, or if the Chairman is not present the Vice Chairman, shall preside over all meetings of the Committee. In the absence of the Chairman and the Vice Chairman at any meeting, the ranking majority member, or if no majority member is present the ranking minority member present, shall preside.

2.4. Except as otherwise provided in these Rules, decisions of the Committee shall be by a majority vote of the members present and voting. A quorum for the transaction of Committee business, including the conduct of executive sessions, shall consist of no less than one third of the Committee members, except that for the purpose of hearing witnesses, taking sworn testimony, and receiving evidence under oath, a quorum may consist of one Senator.

2.5. A vote by any member of the Committee with respect to any measure or matter being considered by the Committee may be cast by proxy if the proxy authorization (1) is in writing; (2) designates the member of the Committee who is to exercise the proxy; and (3) is limited to a specific measure or matter and any amendments pertaining thereto. Proxies shall not be considered for the establishment of a quorum.

2.6. Whenever the Committee by roll call vote reports any measure or matter, the report of the Committee upon such measure or matter shall include a tabulation of the votes cast in favor of and the votes cast in opposition to such measure or matter by each member of the Committee.

RULE 3. SUBCOMMITTEES

Creation of subcommittees shall be by majority vote of the Committee. Subcommittees shall deal with such legislation and oversight of programs and policies as the Committee may direct. The subcommittees shall be governed by the Rules of the Committee and by such other rules they may adopt which are consistent with the Rules of the Committee. Each subcommittee created shall have a chairman and a vice chairman who are selected by the Chairman and Vice Chairman, respectively.

RULE 4. REPORTING OF MEASURES OR RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1. No measures or recommendations shall be reported, favorably or unfavorably, from the Committee unless a majority of the Committee is actually present and a majority concur.

4.2. In any case in which the Committee is unable to reach a unanimous decision, separate views or reports may be presented by any member or members of the Committee.

4.3. A member of the Committee who gives notice of intention to file supplemental, minority, or additional views at the time of final Committee approval of a measure or matter, shall be entitled to not less than three working days in which to file such views, in writing with the Clerk of the Committee. Such views shall then be included in the Committee report and printed in the same volume, as a part thereof, and their inclusion shall be noted on the cover of the report.

4.4. Routine, non-legislative actions required of the Committee may be taken in accordance with procedures that have been approved by the Committee pursuant to these Committee Rules.

RULE 5. NOMINATIONS

5.1. Unless otherwise ordered by the Committee, nominations referred to the Committee shall be held for at least 14 days before being voted on by the Committee.

5.2. Each member of the Committee shall be promptly furnished a copy of all nominations referred to the Committee.

5.3. Nominees who are invited to appear before the Committee shall be heard in public session, except as provided in Rule 2.1.

5.4. No confirmation hearing shall be held sooner than seven days after receipt of the background and financial disclosure statement unless the time limit is waived by a majority vote of the Committee.

5.5. The Committee vote on the confirmation shall not be sooner than 48 hours after the Committee has received transcripts of the confirmation hearing unless the time limit is waived by unanimous consent of the Committee.

5.6. No nomination shall be reported to the Senate unless the nominee has filed a background and financial disclosure statement with the Committee.

RULE 6. INVESTIGATIONS

No investigation shall be initiated by the Committee unless at least five members of the Committee have specifically requested the Chairman or the Vice Chairman to authorize such an investigation. Authorized investigations may be conducted by members of the Committee and/or designated Committee staff members.

RULE 7. SUBPOENAS

Subpoenas authorized by the Committee for the attendance of witnesses or the production of memoranda, documents, records, or any other material may be issued by the Chairman, the Vice Chairman, or any member of the Committee designated by the Chairman, and may be served by any person designated by the Chairman, Vice Chairman or member issuing the subpoenas. Each subpoena shall have attached thereto a copy of S. Res. 400 of the 94th Congress, and a copy of these rules.

RULE 8. PROCEDURES RELATED TO THE TAKING OF TESTIMONY

8.1. NOTICE.—Witnesses required to appear before the Committee shall be given reasonable notice and all witnesses shall be furnished a copy of these Rules.

8.2. OATH OR AFFIRMATION.—At the direction of the Chairman or Vice Chairman, testimony of witnesses shall be given under oath or affirmation which may be administered by any member of the Committee.

8.3. INTERROGATION.—Committee interrogation shall be conducted by members of the Committee and such Committee staff as are authorized by the Chairman, Vice Chairman, or the presiding member.

8.4. COUNSEL FOR THE WITNESS.—(a) Any witness may be accompanied by counsel. A witness who is unable to obtain counsel may inform the Committee of such fact. If the witness informs the Committee of this fact at least 24 hours prior to his or her appearance before the Committee, the Committee shall then endeavor to obtain voluntary counsel for the witness. Failure to obtain such counsel will not excuse the witness from appearing and testifying.

(b) Counsel shall conduct themselves in an ethical and professional manner. Failure to do so shall, upon a finding to that effect by a majority of the members present, subject such counsel to disciplinary action which may include warning, censure, removal, or a recommendation of contempt proceedings.

(c) There shall be no direct or cross-examination by counsel. However, counsel may submit any question in writing to the Committee and request the Committee to propound such question to the counsel's client or to any other witness. The counsel also may suggest the presentation of other evidence or the calling of other witnesses. The Committee may use or dispose of such questions or suggestions as it deems appropriate.

8.5. STATEMENTS BY WITNESSES.—Witnesses may make brief and relevant statements at the beginning and conclusion of their testimony. Such statements shall not exceed a reasonable period of time as determined by the Chairman, or other presiding members. Any witness required or desiring to make a prepared or written statement for the record of the proceedings shall file a paper and electronic copy with the Clerk of the Committee, and insofar as practicable and consistent with the notice given, shall do so at least 48 hours in advance of his or her appearance before the Committee.

8.6. OBJECTIONS AND RULINGS.—Any objection raised by a witness or counsel shall be ruled upon by the Chairman or other presiding member, and such ruling shall be the ruling of the Committee unless a majority of the Committee present overrules the ruling of the chair.

8.7. INSPECTION AND CORRECTION.—All witnesses testifying before the Committee shall be given a reasonable opportunity to inspect, in the office of the Committee, the transcript of their testimony to determine whether such testimony was correctly transcribed. The witness may be accompanied by counsel. Any corrections the witness desires to make in the transcript shall be submitted in writing to the Committee within five days from the date when the transcript was made available to the witness. Corrections shall be limited to grammar and minor editing, and may not be made to change the substance of the testimony. Any questions arising with respect to such corrections shall be decided by the Chairman. Upon request, the Committee may provide to a witness those parts of testimony given by that witness in executive session which are subsequently quoted or made part of a public record, at the expense of the witness.

8.8. REQUESTS TO TESTIFY.—The Committee will consider requests to testify on any matter or measure pending before the Committee. A person who believes that testimony or other evidence presented at a public hearing, or any comment made by a Committee member or a member of the Committee staff, may tend to affect adversely that person's reputation, may request to appear personally before the Committee to testify or may file a sworn statement of facts relevant to the testimony, evidence, or comment, or may submit to the Chairman proposed questions in writing for the cross-examination of other witnesses. The Committee shall take such action as it deems appropriate.

8.9. CONTEMPT PROCEDURES.—No recommendation that a person be cited for contempt of Congress or that a subpoena be otherwise enforced shall be forwarded to the Senate unless and until the Committee has, upon notice to all its members, met and considered the recommendation, afforded the person an opportunity to oppose such contempt or subpoena enforcement proceeding either in writing or in person, and agreed by majority vote of the Committee to forward such recommendation to the Senate.

8.10. RELEASE OF NAME OF WITNESS.—Unless authorized by the Chairman, the name of any witness scheduled to be heard by the Committee shall not be released prior to, or after, appearing before the Committee. Upon authorization by the Chairman to release the name of a witness under this paragraph, the Vice Chairman shall be notified of such authorization as soon as practicable thereafter. No name of any witness shall be released if such release would disclose classified information, unless authorized under Section 8 of S. Res. 400 of the 94th Congress or Rule 9.7.

RULE 9. PROCEDURES FOR HANDLING CLASSIFIED OR COMMITTEE SENSITIVE MATERIAL

9.1. Committee staff offices shall operate under strict precautions. At least one United States Capitol Police Officer shall be on duty at all times at the entrance of the Committee to control entry. Before entering the

Committee office space all persons shall identify themselves and provide identification as requested.

9.2. Classified documents and material shall be stored in authorized security containers located within the Committee's Sensitive Compartmented Information Facility (SCIF). Copying, duplicating, or removing from the Committee offices of such documents and other materials is prohibited except as is necessary for the conduct of Committee business, and in conformity with Rule 10.3 hereof. All classified documents or materials removed from the Committee offices for such authorized purposes must be returned to the Committee's SCIF for overnight storage.

9.3. ''Committee sensitive'' means information or material that pertains to the confidential business or proceedings of the Select Committee on Intelligence, within the meaning of paragraph 5 of Rule XXIX of the Standing Rules of the Senate, and is: (1) in the possession or under the control of the Committee; (2) discussed or presented in an executive session of the Committee; (3) the work product of a Committee member or staff member; (4) properly identified or marked by a Committee member or staff member who authored the document; or (5) designated as such by the Chairman and Vice Chairman (or by the Staff Director and Minority Staff Director acting on their behalf). Committee sensitive documents and materials that are classified shall be handled in the same manner as classified documents and material in Rule 9.2. Unclassified committee sensitive documents and materials shall be stored in a manner to protect against unauthorized disclosure.

9.4. Each member of the Committee shall at all times have access to all papers and other material received from any source. The Staff Director shall be responsible for the maintenance, under appropriate security procedures, of a document control and accountability registry which will number and identify all classified papers and other classified materials in the possession of the Committee, and such registry shall be available to any member of the Committee.

9.5. Whenever the Select Committee on Intelligence makes classified material available to any other committee of the Senate or to any member of the Senate not a member of the Committee, such material shall be accompanied by a verbal or written notice to the recipients advising of their responsibility to protect such materials pursuant to section 8 of S. Res. 400 of the 94th Congress. The Security Director of the Committee shall ensure that such notice is provided and shall maintain a written record identifying the particular information transmitted and the committee or members of the Senate receiving such information.

9.6. Access to classified information supplied to the Committee shall be limited to those Committee staff members with appropriate security clearance and a need-to-know, as determined by the Committee, and, under the Committee's direction, the Staff Director and Minority Staff Director.

9.7. No member of the Committee or of the Committee staff shall disclose, in whole or in part or by way of summary, the contents of any classified or committee sensitive papers, materials, briefings, testimony, or other information in the possession of the Committee to any other person, except as specified in this rule. Committee members and staff do not need prior approval to disclose classified or committee sensitive information to persons in the Executive branch, the members and staff of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and the members and staff of the Senate, provided that the following conditions are met: (1) for classified information, the recipients of the information must possess appropriate security clearances (or have access to the information by virtue of their office); (2) for all information, the recipients of the information must have a need-to-know such information for an official governmental purpose; and (3) for all information, the Committee members and staff who provide the information must be engaged in the routine performance of Committee legislative or oversight duties. Otherwise, classified and committee sensitive information may only be disclosed to persons outside the Committee (to include any congressional committee, Member of Congress, congressional staff, or specified non-governmental persons who support intelligence activities) with the prior approval of the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Committee, or the Staff Director and Minority Staff Director acting on their behalf, consistent with the requirements that classified information may only be disclosed to persons with appropriate security clearances and a need-to-know such information for an official governmental purpose. Public disclosure of classified information in the possession of the Committee may only be authorized in accordance with Section 8 of S. Res. 400 of the 94th Congress.

9.8. Failure to abide by Rule 9.7 shall constitute grounds for referral to the Select Committee on Ethics pursuant to Section 8 of S. Res. 400 of the 94th Congress. Prior to a referral to the Select Committee on Ethics pursuant to Section 8 of S. Res. 400, the Chairman and Vice Chairman shall notify the Majority Leader and Minority Leader.

9.9. Before the Committee makes any decision regarding the disposition of any testimony, papers, or other materials presented to it, the Committee members shall have a reasonable opportunity to examine all pertinent testimony, papers, and other materials that have been obtained by the members of the Committee or the Committee staff.

9.10. Attendance of persons outside the Committee at closed meetings of the Committee shall be kept at a minimum and shall be limited to persons with appropriate security clearance and a need-to-know the information under consideration for the execution of their official duties. The Security Director of the Committee may require that notes taken at such meetings by any person in attendance shall be returned to the secure storage area in the Committee's offices at the conclusion of such meetings, and may be made available to the department, agency, office, committee, or entity concerned only in accordance with the security procedures of the Committee.

RULE 10. STAFF

10.1. For purposes of these rules, Committee staff includes employees of the Committee, consultants to the Committee, or any other person engaged by contract or otherwise to perform services for or at the request of the Committee. To the maximum extent practicable, the Committee shall rely on its full-time employees to perform all staff functions. No individual may be retained as staff of the Committee or to perform services for the Committee unless that individual holds appropriate security clearances.

10.2. The appointment of Committee staff shall be approved by the Chairman and Vice Chairman, acting jointly, or, at the initiative of both or either be confirmed by a majority vote of the Committee. After approval or confirmation, the Chairman shall certify Committee staff appointments to the Financial Clerk of the Senate in writing. No Committee staff shall be given access to any classified information or regular access to the Committee offices until such Committee staff has received an appropriate security clearance as described in Section 6 of S. Res. 400 of the 94th Congress.

10.3. The Committee staff works for the Committee as a whole, under the supervision of the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Committee. The duties of the Committee staff shall be performed, and Committee staff personnel affairs and day-to-day operations, including security and control of classified documents and material, shall be administered under the direct supervision and control of the Staff Director. All Committee staff shall work exclusively on intelligence oversight issues for the Committee. The Minority Staff Director and the Minority Counsel shall be kept fully informed regarding all matters and shall have access to all material in the files of the Committee.

10.4. The Committee staff shall assist the minority as fully as the majority in the expression of minority views, including assistance in the preparation and filing of additional, separate, and minority views, to the end that all points of view may be fully considered by the Committee and the Senate.

10.5. The members of the Committee staff shall not discuss either the substance or procedure of the work of the Committee with any person not a member of the Committee or the Committee staff for any purpose or in connection with any proceeding, judicial or otherwise, either during their tenure as a member of the Committee staff or at any time thereafter, except as directed by the Committee in accordance with Section 8 of S. Res. 400 of the 94th Congress and the provisions of these rules, or in the event of the termination of the Committee, in such a manner as may be determined by the Senate. The Chairman may authorize the Staff Director and the Staff Director's designee, and the Vice Chairman may authorize the Minority Staff Director and the Minority Staff Director's designee, to communicate with the media in a manner that does not divulge classified or committee sensitive information.

10.6. No member of the Committee staff shall be employed by the Committee unless and until such a member of the Committee staff agrees in writing, as a condition of employment, to abide by the conditions of the nondisclosure agreement promulgated by the Select Committee on Intelligence, pursuant to Section 6 of S. Res. 400 of the 94th Congress, and to abide by the Committee's code of conduct.

10.7. As a precondition for employment on the Committee staff, each member of the Committee staff must agree in writing to notify the Committee of any request for testimony, either during service as a member of the Committee staff or at any time thereafter with respect to information obtained by virtue of employment as a member of the Committee staff. Such information shall not be disclosed in response to such requests except as directed by the Committee in accordance with Section 8 of S. Res. 400 of the 94th Congress and the provisions of these rules or, in the event of the termination of the Committee, in such manner as may be determined by the Senate.

10.8. The Committee shall immediately consider action to be taken in the case of any member of the Committee staff who fails to conform to any of these Rules. Such disciplinary action may include, but shall not be limited to, immediate dismissal from the Committee staff.

10.9. Within the Committee staff shall be an element with the capability to perform audits of programs and activities undertaken by departments and agencies with intelligence functions. The audit element shall conduct audits and oversight projects that have been specifically authorized by the

Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Committee, acting jointly through the Staff Director and Minority Staff Director. Staff shall be assigned to such element jointly by the Chairman and Vice Chairman, and staff with the principal responsibility for the conduct of an audit shall be qualified by training or experience in accordance with accepted auditing standards.

10.10. The workplace of the Committee shall be free from illegal use, possession, sale, or distribution of controlled substances by its employees. Any violation of such policy by any member of the Committee staff shall be grounds for termination of employment. Further, any illegal use of controlled substances by a member of the Committee staff, within the workplace or otherwise, shall result in reconsideration of the security clearance of any such staff member and may constitute grounds for termination of employment with the Committee.

10.11. All personnel actions affecting the staff of the Committee shall be made free from any discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, handicap, or disability.

RULE 11. PREPARATION FOR COMMITTEE MEETINGS

11.1. Under direction of the Chairman and the Vice Chairman designated Committee staff members shall brief members of the Committee at a time sufficiently prior to any Committee meeting to assist the Committee members in preparation for such meeting and to determine any matter which the Committee member might wish considered during the meeting. Such briefing shall, at the request of a member, include a list of all pertinent papers and other materials that have been obtained by the Committee that bear on matters to be considered at the meeting.

11.2. The Staff Director and/or Minority Staff Director shall recommend to the Chairman and the Vice Chairman the testimony, papers, and other materials to be presented to the Committee at any meeting. The determination whether such testimony, papers, and other materials shall be presented in open or executive session shall be made pursuant to the Rules of the Senate and Rules of the Committee.

11.3. The Staff Director shall ensure that covert action programs of the U.S. Government receive appropriate consideration by the Committee no less frequently than once a quarter.

RULE 12. LEGISLATIVE CALENDAR

12.1. The Clerk of the Committee shall maintain a printed calendar for the information of each Committee member showing the measures introduced and referred to the Committee and the status of such measures; nominations referred to the Committee and their status; and such other matters as the Committee determines shall be included. The Calendar shall be revised from time to time to show pertinent changes. A copy of each such revision shall be furnished to each member of the Committee.

12.2. Measures referred to the Committee may be referred by the Chairman and/or Vice Chairman to the appropriate department or agency of the Government for reports thereon.

RULE 13. COMMITTEE TRAVEL

13.1. No member of the Committee or Committee Staff shall travel abroad on Committee business unless specifically authorized by the Chairman and Vice Chairman. Requests for authorization of such travel shall state the purpose and extent of the trip. A full report shall be filed with the Committee when travel is completed.

13.2. No member of the Committee staff shall travel within this country on Committee business unless specifically authorized by the Chairman and Vice Chairman.

RULE 14. CHANGES IN RULES

These Rules may be modified, amended, or repealed by the Committee, provided that a notice in writing of the proposed change has been given to each member at least 48 hours prior to the meeting at which action thereon is to be taken.

APPENDIX A

S. Res. 400, 94th Cong., 2d Sess. (1976)[1]

Resolved, That it is the purpose of this resolution to establish a new select committee of the Senate, to be known as the Select Committee on Intelligence, to oversee and make continuing studies of the intelligence activities and programs of the United States Government, and to submit to the Senate appropriate proposals for legislation and report to the Senate concerning such intelligence activities and programs. In carrying out this purpose, the Select Committee on Intelligence shall make every effort to assure that the appropriate departments and agencies of the United States provide informed and timely intelligence necessary for the executive and legislative branches to make sound decisions affecting the security and vital interests of the Nation. It is further the purpose of this resolution to provide vigilant legislative oversight over the intelligence activities of the United States to assure that such activities are in conformity with the Constitution and laws of the United States.

SEC. 2. (a)(1) There is hereby established a select committee to be known as the Select Committee on Intelligence (hereinafter in this resolution referred to as the ''select committee''). The select committee shall be composed of not to exceed fifteen Members appointed as follows:

(A) two members from the Committee on Appropriations;

(B) two members from the Committee on Armed Services;

(C) two members from the Committee on Foreign Relations;

(D) two members from the Committee on the Judiciary; and

(E) not to exceed seven members to be appointed from the Senate at large.

(2) Members appointed from each committee named in clauses (A) through (D) of paragraph (1) shall be evenly divided between the two major political parties and shall be appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate upon the recommendations of the majority and minority leaders of the Senate. Of any members appointed under paragraph (1)(E), the majority leader shall appoint the majority members and the minority leader shall appoint the minority members, with the majority having a one vote margin.

(3)(A) The majority leader of the Senate and the minority leader of the Senate shall be ex officio members of the select committee but shall have no vote in the Committee and shall not be counted for purposes of determining a quorum.

(B) The Chairman and Ranking Member of the Committee on Armed Services (if not already a member of the select Committee) shall be ex officio members of the select Committee but shall have no vote in the Committee and shall not be counted for purposes of determining a quorum.

(b) At the beginning of each Congress, the Majority Leader of the Senate shall select a chairman of the select Committee and the Minority Leader shall select a vice chairman for the select Committee. The vice chairman shall act in the place and stead of the chairman in the absence of the chairman. Neither the chairman nor the vice chairman of the select committee shall at the same time serve as chairman or ranking minority member of any other committee referred to in paragraph 4(e)(1) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate.

(c) The select Committee may be organized into subcommittees. Each subcommittee shall have a chairman and a vice chairman who are selected by the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the select Committee, respectively.

SEC. 3. (a) There shall be referred to the select committee all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following:

(1) The Office of the Director of National Intelligence and the Director of National Intelligence.

(2) The Central Intelligence Agency and the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency.

(3) Intelligence activities of all other departments and agencies of the Government, including, but not limited to, the intelligence activities of the Defense Intelligence Agency, the National Security Agency, and other agencies of the Department of Defense; the Department of State; the Department of Justice; and the Department of the Treasury.

(4) The organization or reorganization of any department or agency of the Government to the extent that the organization or reorganization relates to a function or activity involving intelligence activities.

(5) Authorizations for appropriations, both direct and indirect, for the following:

(A) The Office of the Director of National Intelligence and the Director of National Intelligence.

(B) The Central Intelligence Agency and the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency.

(C) The Defense Intelligence Agency.

(D) The National Security Agency.

(E) The intelligence activities of other agencies and subdivisions of the Department of Defense.

(F) The intelligence activities of the Department of State.

(G) The intelligence activities of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

(H) Any department, agency, or subdivision which is the successor to any agency named in clause (A), (B), (C) or (D); and the activities of any department, agency, or subdivision which is the successor to any department, agency, bureau, or subdivision named in clause (E), (F), or (G) to the extent that the activities of such successor department, agency, or subdivision are activities described in clause (E), (F), or (G).

(b)(1) Any proposed legislation reported by the select Committee except any legislation involving matters specified in clause (1), (2), (5)(A), or (5)(B) of subsection (a), containing any matter otherwise within the jurisdiction of any standing committee shall, at the request of the chairman of such standing committee, be referred to such standing committee for its consideration of such matter and be reported to the Senate by such standing committee within 10 days after the day on which such proposed legislation, in its entirety and including annexes, is referred to such standing committee; and any proposed legislation reported by any committee, other than the select Committee, which contains any matter within the jurisdiction of the select Committee shall, at the request of the chairman of the select Committee, be referred to the select Committee for its consideration of such matter and be reported to the Senate by the select Committee within 10 days after the day on which such proposed legislation, in its entirety and including annexes, is referred to such committee.

(2) In any case in which a committee fails to report any proposed legislation referred to it within the time limit prescribed in this

subsection, such Committee shall be automatically discharged from further consideration of such proposed legislation on the 10th day following the day on which such proposed legislation is referred to such committee unless the Senate provides otherwise, or the Majority Leader or Minority Leader request, prior to that date, an additional 5 days on behalf of the Committee to which the proposed legislation was sequentially referred. At the end of that additional 5 day period, if the Committee fails to report the proposed legislation within that 5 day period, the Committee shall be automatically discharged from further consideration of such proposed legislation unless the Senate provides otherwise.

(3) In computing any 10 or 5 day period under this subsection there shall be excluded from such computation any days on which the Senate is not in session.

(4) The reporting and referral processes outlined in this subsection shall be conducted in strict accordance with the Standing Rules of the Senate. In accordance with such rules, committees to which legislation is referred are not permitted to make changes or alterations to the text of the referred bill and its annexes, but may propose changes or alterations to the same in the form of amendments.

(c) Nothing in this resolution shall be construed as prohibiting or otherwise restricting the authority of any other committee to study and review any intelligence activity to the extent that such activity directly affects a matter otherwise within the jurisdiction of such committee.

(d) Nothing in this resolution shall be construed as amending, limiting, or otherwise changing the authority of any standing committee of the Senate to obtain full and prompt access to the product of the intelligence activities of any department or agency of the Government relevant to a matter otherwise within the jurisdiction of such committee.

SEC. 4. (a) The select committee, for the purposes of accountability to the Senate, shall make regular and periodic, but not less than quarterly, reports to the Senate on the nature and extent of the intelligence activities of the various departments and agencies of the United States. Such committee shall promptly call to the attention of the Senate or to any other appropriate committee or committees of the Senate any matters requiring the attention of the Senate or such other committee or committees. In making such report, the select committee shall proceed in a manner consistent with section 8(c)(2) to protect national security.

(b) The select committee shall obtain an annual report from the Director of National Intelligence, the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, and the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Such reports shall review the intelligence activities of the agency or department concerned and the intelligence activities of foreign countries directed at the United States or its interest. An unclassified version of each report may be made available to the public at the discretion of the select committee. Nothing herein shall be construed as requiring the public disclosure in such reports of the names of individuals engaged in intelligence activities for the United States or the divulging of intelligence methods employed or the sources of information on which such reports are based or the amount of funds authorized to be appropriated for intelligence activities.

(c) On or before March 15 of each year, the select committee shall submit to the Committee on the Budget of the Senate the views and estimates described in section 301(c) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 regarding matters within the jurisdiction of the select committee.

SEC. 5. (a) For the purposes of this resolution, the select committee is authorized in its discretion (1) to make investigations into any matter within its jurisdiction, (2) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate, (3) to employ personnel, (4) to hold hearings, (5) to sit and act at any time or place during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate, (6) to require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance of witnesses and the production of correspondence, books, papers, and documents, (7) to take depositions and other testimony, (8) to procure the service of individual consultants or organizations thereof, in accordance with the provisions of section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and (9) with the prior consent of the government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

(b) The chairman of the select committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

(c) Subpoenas authorized by the select committee may be issued over the signature of the chairman, the vice chairman or any member of the select committee designated by the chairman, and may be served by any person designated by the chairman or any member signing the subpoenas.

SEC. 6. No employee of the select committee or any person engaged by contract or otherwise to perform services for or at the request of such committee shall be given access to any classified information by such committee unless such employee or person has (1) agreed in writing and under oath to be bound by the rules of the Senate (including the jurisdiction of the Select Committee on Ethics) and of such committee as to the security of such information during and after the period of his employment or contractual agreement with such committee; and (2) received an appropriate security clearance as determined by such committee in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence. The type of security clearance to be required in the case of any such employee or person shall, within the determination of such committee in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence, be commensurate with the sensitivity of the classified information to which such employee or person will be given access by such committee.

SEC. 7. The select committee shall formulate and carry out such rules and procedures as it deems necessary to prevent the disclosure, without the consent of the person or persons concerned, of information in the possession of such committee which unduly infringes upon the privacy or which violates the constitutional rights of such person or persons. Nothing herein shall be construed to prevent such committee from publicly disclosing any such information in any case in which such committee determines the national interest in the disclosure of such information clearly outweighs any infringement on the privacy of any person or persons.

SEC. 8. (a) The select committee may, subject to the provisions of this section, disclose publicly any information in the possession of such committee after a determination by such committee that the public interest would be served by such disclosure. Whenever committee action is required to disclose any information under this section, the committee shall meet to vote on the matter within five days after any member of the committee requests such a vote. No member of the select committee shall disclose any information, the disclosure of which requires a committee vote, prior to a vote by the committee on the question of the disclosure of such information or after such vote except in accordance with this section.

(b)(1) In any case in which the select committee votes to disclose publicly any information which has been classified under established security procedures, which has been submitted to it by the Executive branch, and which the Executive branch requests be kept secret, such committee shall—

(A) first, notify the Majority Leader and Minority Leader of the Senate of such vote; and

(B) second, consult with the Majority Leader and Minority Leader before notifying the President of such vote.

(2) The select committee may disclose publicly such information after the expiration of a five-day period following the day on which notice of such vote is transmitted to the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader and the President, unless, prior to the expiration of such five-day period, the President, personally in writing, notifies the committee that he objects to the disclosure of such information, provides his reasons therefore, and certifies that the threat to the national interest of the United States posed by such disclosure is of such gravity that it outweighs any public interest in the disclosure.

(3) If the President, personally, in writing, notifies the Majority Leader and Minority Leader of the Senate and the select Committee of his objections to the disclosure of such information as provided in paragraph (2), the Majority Leader and Minority Leader jointly or the select Committee, by majority vote, may refer the question of the disclosure of such information to the Senate for consideration.

(4) Whenever the select committee votes to refer the question of disclosure of any information to the Senate under paragraph (3), the Chairman shall not later than the first day on which the Senate is in session following the day on which the vote occurs, report the matter to the Senate for its consideration.

(5) One hour after the Senate convenes on the fourth day on which the Senate is in session following the day on which any such matter is reported to the Senate, or at such earlier time as the majority leader and the minority leader of the Senate jointly agree upon in accordance with paragraph 5 of rule XVII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Senate shall go into closed session and the matter shall be the pending business. In considering the matter in closed session the Senate may—

(A) approve the public disclosure of all or any portion of the information in question, in which case the committee shall publicly disclose the information ordered to be disclosed,

(B) disapprove the public disclosure of all or any portion of the information in question, in which case the committee shall not publicly disclose the information ordered not to be disclosed, or

(C) refer all or any portion of the matter back to the committee, in which case the committee shall make the final determination with respect to the public disclosure of the information in question.

Upon conclusion of the consideration of such matter in closed session, which may not extend beyond the close of the ninth day on which the Senate is in session following the day on which such matter was reported to the Senate, or the close of the fifth day following the day agreed upon jointly by the majority and minority leaders in accordance with paragraph 5 of rule XVII of the Standing Rules of the Senate (whichever the case

may be), the Senate shall immediately vote on the disposition of such matter in open session, without debate, and without divulging the information with respect to which the vote is being taken. The Senate shall vote to dispose of such matter by one or more of the means specified in clauses (A), (B), and (C) of the second sentence of this paragraph. Any vote of the Senate to disclose any information pursuant to this paragraph shall be subject to the right of a Member of the Senate to move for reconsideration of the vote within the time and pursuant to the procedures specified in rule XIII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, and the disclosure of such information shall be made consistent with that right.

(c)(1) No information in the possession of the select committee relating to the lawful intelligence activities of any department or agency of the United States which has been classified under established security procedures and which the select committee, pursuant to subsection (a) or (b) of this section, has determined should not be disclosed shall be made available to any person by a Member, officer, or employee of the Senate except in a closed session of the Senate or as provided in paragraph (2).

(2) The select committee may, under such regulations as the committee shall prescribe to protect the confidentiality of such information, make any information described in paragraph (1) available to any other committee or any other Member of the Senate. Whenever the select committee makes such information available, the committee shall keep a written record showing, in the case of any particular information, which committee or which Members of the Senate received such information. No Member of the Senate who, and no committee which, receives any information under this subsection, shall disclose such information except in a closed session of the Senate.

(d) It shall be the duty of the Select Committee on Ethics to investigate any unauthorized disclosure of intelligence information by a Member, officer or employee of the Senate in violation of subsection (c) and to report to the Senate concerning any allegation which it finds to be substantiated.

(e) Upon the request of any person who is subject to any such investigation, the Select Committee on Ethics shall release to such individual at the conclusion of its investigation a summary of its investigation together with its findings. If, at the conclusion of its investigation, the Select Committee on Ethics determines that there has been a significant breach of confidentiality or unauthorized disclosure by a Member, officer, or employee of the Senate, it shall report its findings to the Senate and recommend appropriate action such as censure, removal from committee membership, or expulsion from the Senate, in the case of a Member, or removal from office or employment or punishment for contempt, in the case of an officer or employee.

SEC. 9. The select committee is authorized to permit any personal representative of the President, designated by the President to serve as a liaison to such committee, to attend any closed meeting of such committee.

SEC. 10. Upon expiration of the Select Committee on Governmental Operations With Respect to Intelligence Activities, established by Senate Resolution 21, Ninety-fourth Congress, all records, files, documents, and other materials in the possession, custody, or control of such committee, under appropriate conditions established by it, shall be transferred to the select committee.

SEC. 11. (a) It is the sense of the Senate that the head of each department and agency of the United States should keep the select committee fully and currently informed with respect to intelligence activities, including any significant anticipated activities, which are the responsibility of or engaged in by such department or agency: *Provided*, That this does not constitute a condition precedent to the implementation of any such anticipated intelligence activity.

(b) It is the sense of the Senate that the head of any department or agency of the United States involved in any intelligence activities should furnish any information or document in the possession, custody, or control of the department or agency, or person paid by such department or agency, whenever requested by the select committee with respect to any matter within such committee's jurisdiction.

(c) It is the sense of the Senate that each department and agency of the United States should report immediately upon discovery to the select committee any and all intelligence activities which constitute violations of the constitutional rights of any person, violations of law, or violations of Executive orders, Presidential directives, or departmental or agency rules or regulations; each department and agency should further report to such committee what actions have been taken or are expected to be taken by the departments or agencies with respect to such violations.

SEC. 12. Subject to the Standing Rules of the Senate, no funds shall be appropriated for any fiscal year beginning after September 30, 1976, with the exception of a continuing bill or resolution, or amendment thereto, or conference report thereon, to, or for use of, any department or agency of the United States to carry out any of the following activities, unless such funds shall have been previously authorized by a bill or joint resolution passed by the Senate during the same or preceding fiscal year to carry out such activity for such fiscal year:

(1) The activities of the Office of the Director of National Intelligence and the Director of National Intelligence.

(2) The activities of the Central Intelligence Agency and the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency.

(3) The activities of the Defense Intelligence Agency.

(4) The activities of the National Security Agency.

(5) The intelligence activities of other agencies and subdivisions of the Department of Defense.

(6) The intelligence activities of the Department of State.

(7) The intelligence activities of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

SEC. 13. (a) The select committee shall make a study with respect to the following matters, taking into consideration with respect to each such matter, all relevant aspects of the effectiveness of planning, gathering, use, security, and dissemination of intelligence:

(1) the quality of the analytical capabilities of United States foreign intelligence agencies and means for integrating more closely analytical intelligence and policy formulation;

(2) the extent and nature of the authority of the departments and agencies of the Executive branch to engage in intelligence activities and the desirability of developing charters for each intelligence agency or department;

(3) the organization of intelligence activities in the Executive branch to maximize the effectiveness of the conduct, oversight, and accountability of intelligence activities; to reduce duplication or overlap; and to improve the morale of the personnel of the foreign intelligence agencies;

(4) the conduct of covert and clandestine activities and the procedures by which Congress is informed of such activities;

(5) the desirability of changing any law, Senate rule or procedure, or any Executive order, rule, or regulation to improve the protection of intelligence secrets and provide for disclosure of information for which there is no compelling reason for secrecy;

(6) the desirability of establishing a standing committee of the Senate on intelligence activities;

(7) the desirability of establishing a joint committee of the Senate and the House of Representatives on intelligence activities in lieu of having separate committees in each House of Congress, or of establishing procedures under which separate committees on intelligence activities of the two Houses of Congress would receive joint briefings from the intelligence agencies and coordinate their policies with respect to the safeguarding of sensitive intelligence information;

(8) the authorization of funds for the intelligence activities of the Government and whether disclosure of any of the amounts of such funds is in the public interest; and

(9) the development of a uniform set of definitions for terms to be used in policies or guidelines which may be adopted by the executive or legislative branches to govern, clarify, and strengthen the operation of intelligence activities.

(b) The select committee may, in its discretion, omit from the special study required by this section any matter it determines has been adequately studied by the Select Committee To Study Governmental Operations With Respect to Intelligence Activities, established by Senate Resolution 21, Ninety-fourth Congress.

(c) The select committee shall report the results of the study provided for by this section to the Senate, together with any recommendations for legislative or other actions it deems appropriate, no later than July 1, 1977, and from time to time thereafter as it deems appropriate.

SEC. 14. (a) As used in this resolution, the term ''intelligence activities'' includes (1) the collection, analysis, production, dissemination, or use of information which relates to any foreign country, or any government, political group, party, military force, movement, or other association in such foreign country, and which relates to the defense, foreign policy, national security, or related policies of the United States, and other activity which is in support of such activities; (2) activities taken to counter similar activities directed against the United States; (3) covert or clandestine activities affecting the relations of the United States with any foreign government, political group, party, military force, movement or other association; (4) the collection, analysis, production, dissemination, or use of information about activities of persons within the United States, its territories and possessions, or nationals of the United States abroad whose political and related activities pose, or may be considered by any department, agency, bureau, office, division, instrumentality, or employee of the United States to pose, a threat to the internal security of the United States, and covert or clandestine activities directed against such persons. Such term does not include tactical foreign military intelligence serving no national policymaking function.

(b) As used in this resolution, the term ''department or agency'' includes any organization, committee, council, establishment, or office within the Federal Government.

(c) For purposes of this resolution, reference to any department, agency, bureau, or subdivision shall include a reference to any successor department, agency, bureau, or subdivision to the extent that such successor engages in intelligence activities now

conducted by the department, agency, bureau, or subdivision referred to in this resolution.

SEC. 15. (a) In addition to other committee staff selected by the select Committee, the select Committee shall hire or appoint one employee for each member of the select Committee to serve as such Member's designated representative on the select Committee. The select Committee shall only hire or appoint an employee chosen by the respective Member of the select Committee for whom the employee will serve as the designated representative on the select Committee.

(b) The select Committee shall be afforded a supplement to its budget, to be determined by the Committee on Rules and Administration, to allow for the hire of each employee who fills the position of designated representative to the select Committee. The designated representative shall have office space and appropriate office equipment in the select Committee spaces. Designated personal representatives shall have the same access to Committee staff, information, records, and databases as select Committee staff, as determined by the Chairman and Vice Chairman.

(c) The designated employee shall meet all the requirements of relevant statutes, Senate rules, and committee security clearance requirements for employment by the select Committee.

(d) Of the funds made available to the select Committee for personnel—

(1) not more than 60 percent shall be under the control of the Chairman; and

(2) not less than 40 percent shall be under the control of the Vice Chairman.

SEC. 16. Nothing in this resolution shall be construed as constituting acquiescence by the Senate in any practice, or in the conduct of any activity, not otherwise authorized by law.

SEC. 17. (a)(1) Except as provided in subsections (b) and (c), the Select Committee shall have jurisdiction to review, hold hearings, and report the nominations of civilian individuals for positions in the intelligence community for which appointments are made by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

''(2) Except as provided in subsections (b) and (c), other committees with jurisdiction over the department or agency of the Executive Branch which contain a position referred to in paragraph (1) may hold hearings and interviews with individuals nominated for such position, but only the Select Committee shall report such nomination.

''(3) In this subsection, the term 'intelligence community' means an element of the intelligence community specified in or designated under section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003(4)).

''(b)(1) With respect to the confirmation of the Assistant Attorney General for National Security, or any successor position, the nomination of any individual by the President to serve in such position shall be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and, if and when reported, to the Select Committee for not to exceed 20 calendar days, except that in cases when the 20-day period expires while the Senate is in recess, the Select Committee shall have 5 additional calendar days after the Senate reconvenes to report the nomination.

''(2) If, upon the expiration of the period described in paragraph (1), the Select Committee has not reported the nomination, such nomination shall be automatically discharged from the Select Committee and placed on the Executive Calendar.

''(c)(1) With respect to the confirmation of appointment to the position of Director of the National Security Agency, Inspector General of the National Security Agency, Director of the National Reconnaissance Office, or Inspector General of the National Reconnaissance Office, or any successor position to such a position, the nomination of any individual by the President to serve in such position, who at the time of the nomination is a member of the Armed Forces on active duty, shall be referred to the Committee on Armed Services and, if and when reported, to the Select Committee for not to exceed 30 calendar days, except that in cases when the 30-day period expires while the Senate is in recess, the Select Committee shall have 5 additional calendar days after the Senate reconvenes to report the nomination.

''(2) With respect to the confirmation of appointment to the position of Director of the National Security Agency, Inspector General of the National Security Agency, Director of the National Reconnaissance Office, or Inspector General or the National Reconnaissance Office, or any successor position to such a position, the nomination of any individual by the President to serve in such position, who at the time of the nomination is not a member of the Armed Forces on active duty, shall be referred to the Select Committee and, if and when reported, to the Committee on Armed Services for not to exceed 30 calendar days, except that in cases when the 30-day period expires while the Senate is in recess, the Committee on Armed Services shall have an additional 5 calendar days after the Senate reconvenes to report the nomination.

''(3) If, upon the expiration of the period of sequential referral described in paragraphs (1) and (2), the committee to which the nomination was sequentially referred has not reported the nomination, the nomination shall be automatically discharged from that committee and placed on the Executive Calendar.''.

APPENDIX B

INTELLIGENCE PROVISIONS IN S. RES. 445, 108TH CONG., 2D SESS. (2004) WHICH WERE NOT INCORPORATED IN S. RES. 400, 94TH CONG., 2D SESS. (1976)

TITLE III—COMMITTEE STATUS

* * * *

SEC. 301(b) INTELLIGENCE.—The Select Committee on Intelligence shall be treated as a committee listed under paragraph 2 of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate for purposes of the Standing Rules of the Senate.

TITLE IV—INTELLIGENCE-RELATED SUBCOMMITTEES

SEC. 401. SUBCOMMITTEE RELATED TO INTELLIGENCE OVERSIGHT.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Select Committee on Intelligence a Subcommittee on Oversight which shall be in addition to any other subcommittee established by the select Committee.

(b) RESPONSIBILITY.—The Subcommittee on Oversight shall be responsible for ongoing oversight of intelligence activities.

SEC. 402. SUBCOMMITTEE RELATED TO INTELLIGENCE APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Committee on Appropriations a Subcommittee on Intelligence. The Committee on Appropriations shall reorganize into 13 subcommittees as soon as possible after the convening of the 109th Congress.

(b) JURISDICTION.—The Subcommittee on Intelligence of the Committee on Appropriations shall have jurisdiction over funding for intelligence matters, as determined by the Senate Committee on Appropriations.

APPENDIX C

RULE 26.5(b) OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE (REFERRED TO IN COMMITTEE RULE 2.1)

Each meeting of a committee, or any subcommittee thereof, including meetings to conduct hearings, shall be open to the public, except that a meeting or series of meetings by a committee or a subcommittee thereof on the same subject for a period of no more than fourteen calendar days may be closed to the public on a motion made and seconded to go into closed session to discuss only whether the matters enumerated in clauses (1) through (6) would require the meeting to be closed, followed immediately by a record vote in open session by a majority of the members of the committee or subcommittee when it is determined that the matters to be discussed or the testimony to be taken at such meeting or meetings—

(1) will disclose matters necessary to be kept secret in the interests of national defense or the confidential conduct of the foreign relations of the United States;

(2) will relate solely to matters of committee staff personnel or internal staff management or procedure;

(3) will tend to charge an individual with crime or misconduct, to disgrace or injure the professional standing of an individual, or otherwise to expose an individual to public contempt or obloquy, or will represent a clearly unwarranted invasion of the privacy of an individual;

(4) will disclose the identity of any informer or law enforcement agent or will disclose any information relating to the investigation or prosecution of a criminal offense that is required to be kept secret in the interests of effective law enforcement;

(5) will disclose information relating to the trade secrets of financial or commercial information pertaining specifically to a given person if—

(A) an Act of Congress requires the information to be kept confidential by Government officers and employees; or

(B) the information has been obtained by the Government on a confidential basis, other than through an application by such person for a specific Government financial or other benefit, and is required to be kept secret in order to prevent undue injury to the competitive position of such person; or

(6) may divulge matters required to be kept confidential under other provisions of law or Government regulations.

ENDNOTES

[1] As amended by S. Res. 4, 95th Cong., 1st Sess. (1977), S. Res. 445, 108th Cong., 2d Sess. (2004), Pub. L. No. 109–177, §506, 120 Stat. 247 (2005), and S. Res. 50, 110th Cong., 1st Sess. (2007), S. Res. 470, 113th Cong., 2d Sess. (2014).

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

90TH ANNIVERSARY OF VFW POST 1322

• Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I wish to honor the oldest Veterans of Foreign War post in Arkansas. VFW Post No. 1322 in Van Buren, AR is celebrating its 90th anniversary.

Founded February 13, 1925, the post was named in honor of Robert W. Jack—the first casualty of World War I from Crawford County. Robert Jack was 23-years-old when he was killed by shrapnel on September 22, 1918, in the fourth day of the famous allied drive of St. Mihiel.

As a member on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I understand the importance of acknowledging the bravery and valor of the young men and women who fought in defense of our country. Men like Robert Jack, and members of VFW Post 1322, set their personal lives aside to fight for our country. This post recognizes their service, sacrifice and courage.

Members are dedicated to improving the community and the lives of its members; offering scholarships to students, teaching flag etiquette to classes, providing local transportation for veterans and hosting community events.

As the Robert Jack VFW Post 1322 proudly celebrates its 90th anniversary, the building is also celebrating the 65th anniversary of its groundbreaking. In recent years, the building was in desperate need of maintenance. Members banded together and worked with local organizations and businesses to provide funds for extensive repairs. This is a true testament to the importance of Post 1322 in the community.

I congratulate VFW Post 1322 on its 90th anniversary. I wish members the best of luck and many more years of camaraderie, service and investment in the community.●

REMEMBERING JAMES KOLLER

● Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I wish to remember Mr. James Koller, a devoted father, husband and Pennsylvania leader. Jim passed away on February 3, 2015, after a 6-year battle with ALS.

Jim's life was defined by his many passions. A successful lawyer and businessman, he was also deeply engaged with his community. A graduate of Marquette University and the Dickinson School of Law, he practiced real estate law in Philadelphia before cofounding Vesterra Corporation, a commercial real estate development company through which Jim built many strong community relationships. Alongside his professional success, Jim maintained an active role in his church and enjoyed an active lifestyle.

Jim's diagnosis with ALS 6 years ago did not slow him down; rather, it pushed him to do even more to combat the disease. Along with his family and friends, he started Team Koller, a fundraising group that participated in local ALS awareness events and raised tens of thousands of dollars for research and treatment. Even at the most difficult times, Jim stayed focused on solutions, seeking answers and help for those afflicted by ALS.

Although we mourn Jim's passing, his selfless and passionate efforts give me hope that we may soon find a cure for this menacing disease. May we continue to live and fight as James Koller did, with courage and fortitude. My thoughts and prayers are with Jim's wife Marianne, his sons, James and Kevin, and the rest of his family in this difficult time.●

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.)

REPORT ON THE CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO CUBA AND OF THE EMERGENCY AUTHORITY RELATING TO THE REGULATION OF THE ANCHORAGE AND MOVEMENT OF VESSELS, AS AMENDED—PM 7

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent the enclosed notice to the *Federal Register* for publication, stating that the national emergency declared on March 1, 1996, with respect to the Government of Cuba's destruction of two unarmed U.S.-registered civilian aircraft in international airspace north of Cuba on February 24, 1996, as amended and expanded on February 26, 2004, is to continue in effect beyond March 1, 2015.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 25, 2015.*

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 12:23 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 212. An act to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to provide for the assessment and management of the risk of algal toxins in drinking water, and for other purposes.

H.R. 734. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to consolidate the reporting obligations of the Federal Communications Commission in order to improve congressional oversight and reduce reporting burdens.

MEASURES REFERRED

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

H.R. 734. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to consolidate the reporting obligations of the Federal Communications Commission in order to improve congressional oversight and reduce reporting burdens; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

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–675. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, an addendum to a certification of the proposed sale or export of defense articles and/or defense services to a Middle East country (OSS–2015–0171); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–676. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, an addendum to a certification of the proposed sale or export of defense articles and/or defense services to a Middle East country (OSS–2015–0173); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–677. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Department's Alternative Fuel Vehicle (AFV) program for fiscal year 2014; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–678. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Case-Zablocki Act, 1 U.S.C. 112b, as amended, the report of the texts and background statements of international agreements, other than treaties (List 2015–0011 - 2015–0017); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–679. A communication from the Director of Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Domestic Source Restrictions on Certain Naval Vessel Components'' ((RIN0750–AI36) (DFARS Case 2014–D022)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 23, 2015; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–680. A communication from the Director of Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Deletion of Obsolete Text Relating to Acquisition of Commercial Items'' ((RIN0750–AI50) (DFARS Case 2014–D002)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 23, 2015; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–681. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Raymond P. Palumbo, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–682. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the continuation of the national emergency with respect to Libya declared in Executive Order

13566; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–683. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Reallocation of Pollock in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands'' (RIN0648–XD728) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 23, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–684. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Section 73.622(i), Post-Transition Table of DTV Allotments, Television Broadcast Stations. (Longview, Texas)'' ((MB Docket No. 14–245) (DA 15–150)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 13, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–685. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary for Transportation Policy, Office of the Secretary, Department of Transportation, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 12, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–686. A communication from the Chairman of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the progress made in licensing and constructing the Alaska Natural Gas Pipeline; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–687. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Insular Affairs, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports entitled ''Report to the Congress: 2014 Compact Analysis'' and ''Impact of the Compacts of Free Association on Guam: Fiscal Year 2004 through Fiscal Year 2013'' ; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–688. A communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the North Slope Science Initiative; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–689. A communication from the Deputy Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the report of proposed legislation entitled ''Bureau of Land Management Foundation Act''; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–690. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Annual Report to Congress on the Use of Mandatory Recall Authority Submitted Pursuant to Section 206 of the FDA Food Safety Modernization Act, Public Law 111–353''; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–691. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Implementation of Section 3507 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act of 2010: Final Report''; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–692. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Performance Report of the Food and Drug Administration's Office of Combination Products for fiscal year 2013; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–693. A communication from the Executive Analyst (Political), Office of the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary for Children and Families (Family Support), Department of Health and Human Services, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 23, 2015; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–694. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Fiscal Year 2013 Report to Congress: Older Americans Act''; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–695. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Generic Issues Program'' (Management Directive 6.4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 11, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–696. A communication from the Chief of the Trade and Commercial Regulations Branch, Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Documentation Related to Goods Imported from U.S. Insular Possessions'' (RIN1515–AD97) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 12, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–697. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Report to Congress on the Administration, Cost and Impact of the Quality Improvement Organization (QIO) Program for Medicare Beneficiaries for Fiscal Year 2011''; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–698. A communication from the Director, Mississippi River Commission, Department of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's Annual Report for calendar year 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–699. A communication from the Chairman, Merit Systems Protection Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''The Impact of Recruitment Strategy on Fair and Open Competition for Federal Jobs''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–700. A communication from the Director of Public Affairs, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Service's fiscal year 2014 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation (No FEAR) Act of 2002; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–701. A communication from the Director, Office of Management, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Department's 2012 list of Government activities determined to be inherently governmental and those to be not inherently governmental in nature; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–702. A communication from the Chairman of the Administrative Conference of the United States, transmitting, a report of three recommendations adopted by the Administrative Conference of the United States at its 61st Plenary Session; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–703. A communication from the Executive Director, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Commission's commercial and inherently governmental activities for 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–704. A communication from the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''The District of Columbia Board of Elections Election Day Preparation and Administration Can Be Improved''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–705. A communication from the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''ANC 8E Did Not Properly Support all Reported Expenditures''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–706. A communication from the Acting Director of Regulation Policy and Management, Veterans Benefits Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Automobile or Other Conveyance and Adaptive Equipment Certificate of Eligibility for Veterans or Members of the Armed Forces with Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis'' (RIN2900–AP26) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 23, 2015; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC–707. A communication from the Acting Director of Regulation Policy and Management, Veterans Health Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Supportive Services for Veterans Families Program'' (RIN2900–AO50) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 23, 2015; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

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–5. A resolution adopted by the City Council of Clarksville, Tennessee expressing support for the maintenance of current troop levels at Fort Campbell and urging Congress to oppose any reductions; to the Committee on Armed Services.

POM–6. A resolution adopted by the Mayor and City Council of the City of Minneapolis, Minnesota, expressing strong support for the Executive Order issued on November 20, 2014, by the President of the United States, on the issue of immigration and immediate protections for long-term, law-abiding residents who are parents of United States citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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. RUBIO (for himself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. NELSON, Mr. COATS, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. CRUZ, and Ms. AYOTTE):

S. 555. A bill to require the Secretary of State to offer rewards for information on the kidnapping and murder of James Foley, Peter Kassig, Steven Sotloff, Kayla Mueller, or any other United States citizen by a foreign terrorist organization; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI:

S. 556. A bill to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. FRANKEN:

S. 557. A bill to promote Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate programs; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CARPER (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON, and Ms. AYOTTE):

S. 558. A bill to amend title 44, United States Code, to require information on contributors to Presidential library fundraising organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. BURR (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. COTTON, Mr. HATCH, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. ROBERTS, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. ENZI, and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 559. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of Education from engaging in regulatory overreach with regard to institutional eligibility under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 560. A bill to amend title 35, United States Code, to provide for an exception from infringement for certain component parts of motor vehicles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAPO (for himself and Mr. RISCH):

S. 561. A bill to amend the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 to allow the importation of polar bear trophies taken in sport hunts in Canada before the date on which the polar bear was determined to be a threatened species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. HELLER (for himself and Mr. RISCH):

S. 562. A bill to promote exploration for geothermal resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself and Mr. TESTER):

S. 563. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish the Physician Ambassadors Helping Veterans program to seek to employ physicians at the Department of Veterans Affairs on a without compensation basis in practice areas and specialties with staffing shortages and long appointment waiting times; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself and Mr. TESTER):

S. 564. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to include licensed hearing aid specialists as eligible for appointment in the Veterans Health Administration of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself and Mr. LANKFORD):

S. 565. A bill to reduce the operation and maintenance costs associated with the Federal fleet by encouraging the use of remanufactured parts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself, Mr. BURR, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. UDALL):

S. 566. A bill to reauthorize the Tropical Forest Conservation Act of 1998 through fiscal year 2018, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. ENZI (for himself and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 567. A bill to protect the right of law-abiding citizens to transport knives interstate, notwithstanding a patchwork of local and State prohibitions; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. CASEY, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. WARNER, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. REED, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. SANDERS, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 568. A bill to extend the trade adjustment assistance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself and Mr. COCHRAN):

S. 569. A bill to reauthorize the farm to school program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 570. A bill to improve access to oral health care for vulnerable and underserved populations; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. INHOFE (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. DAINES, Mr. CASEY, Mr. WICKER, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. MORAN, Mr. TESTER, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. BARRASSO, and Mr. KING):

S. 571. A bill to amend the Pilot's Bill of Rights to facilitate appeals and to apply to other certificates issued by the Federal Aviation Administration, to require the revision of the third class medical certification regulations issued by the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. KIRK:

S. 572. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide a penalty for knowingly selling advertising that offers certain commercial sex acts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. ROBERTS, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. INHOFE):

S. 573. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to issue or revise regulations with respect to the medical certification of certain small aircraft pilots, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. SCOTT (for himself and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 574. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 allow employers a credit against income tax for employees who participate in qualified apprenticeship programs; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KIRK (for himself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 575. A bill to continue operation of the Human Exploitation Rescue Operative (HERO) Child Rescue Corps, a Cyber Crimes Center, a Child Exploitation Investigations Unit, a Computer Forensics Unit, and a Cyber Crimes Unit to support the mission of the Homeland Security Investigations directorate of United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement to combat the exploitation of children; 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 Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. NELSON):

S. Res. 85. A resolution honoring the life and legacy of Georgia Jones-Ayers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mr. WARNER, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. KIRK, Mr. KING, and Mr. PETERS):

S. Res. 86. A resolution recognizing March 3, 2015, as the centennial of the Navy Reserve; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. KIRK, Mr. REID, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. WICKER, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. ROUNDS, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. COONS, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. COATS, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. KAINE, Mr. BLUNT, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. KING, Mr. HELLER, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. GARDNER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. COTTON, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. MCCAIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. MORAN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. HATCH, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. FRANKEN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. PETERS, Ms. CANTWELL, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. BROWN, Mr. NELSON, Mr. WARNER, Mr. BENNET, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. CASEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PORTMAN, and Mr. SCOTT):

S. Res. 87. A resolution to express the sense of the Senate regarding the rise of anti-Semitism in Europe and to encourage greater co-operation with the European governments, the European Union, and the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe in preventing and responding to anti-Semitism; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 11

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 11, a bill to protect the separation of powers in the Constitution of the United States by ensuring that the President takes care that the laws be faithfully executed, and for other purposes.

S. 117

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 117, a bill to recognize Jerusalem as the capital of Israel, to relocate to Jerusalem the United States Embassy in Israel, and for other purposes.

S. 139

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 139, a bill to permanently allow an exclusion under the Supplemental Security Income program and the Medicaid program for compensation provided to individuals who participate in clinical trials for rare diseases or conditions.

S. 144

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 144, a bill to prohibit the Federal Government from mandating, incentivizing, or making financial support conditioned upon a State, local educational agency, or school's adoption of specific instructional content,

academic standards, or curriculum, or on the administration of assessments or tests, and for other purposes.

S. 148

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 148, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require State licensure and bid surety bonds for entities submitting bids under the Medicare durable medical equipment, prosthetics, orthotics, and supplies (DMEPOS) competitive acquisition program, and for other purposes.

S. 153

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the names of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) were added as cosponsors of S. 153, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to authorize additional visas for well-educated aliens to live and work in the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 166

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) and the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 166, a bill to stop exploitation through trafficking.

S. 170

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 170, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the maximum age for children eligible for medical care under the CHAMPVA program, and for other purposes.

S. 185

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 185, a bill to create a limited population pathway for approval of certain antibacterial drugs.

S. 200

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 200, a bill to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to provide for macroeconomic analysis of the impact of major revenue legislation.

S. 223

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 223, a bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a pilot program on awarding grants for provision of furniture, household items, and other assistance to homeless veterans to facilitate their transition into permanent housing, and for other purposes.

S. 226

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 226, a bill to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that major rules of the executive branch shall have no force or effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted into law.

S. 239

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 239, a bill to amend title 49, United States Code, with respect to apportionments under the Airport Improvement Program, and for other purposes.

S. 246

At the request of Ms. HEITKAMP, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 246, a bill to establish the Alyce Spotted Bear and Walter Soboleff Commission on Native Children, and for other purposes.

S. 253

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 253, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to consolidate the reporting obligations of the Federal Communications Commission in order to improve congressional oversight and reduce reporting burdens.

S. 262

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 262, a bill to reauthorize the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act, and for other purposes.

S. 269

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 269, a bill to expand sanctions imposed with respect to Iran and to impose additional sanctions with respect to Iran, and for other purposes.

S. 275

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 275, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the coverage of home as a site of care for infusion therapy under the Medicare program.

S. 284

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 284, a bill to impose sanctions with respect to foreign persons responsible for gross violations of internationally recognized human rights, and for other purposes.

S. 289

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 289, a bill to prioritize funding for an expanded and sustained national investment in biomedical research.

S. 299

At the request of Mr. FLAKE, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 299, a bill to allow travel between the United States and Cuba.

S. 308

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 308, a bill to reauthorize 21st century community learning centers, and for other purposes.

S. 313

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 313, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to add physical therapists to the list of providers allowed to utilize locum tenens arrangements under Medicare.

S. 318

At the request of Ms. MIKULSKI, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 318, a bill to prioritize funding for the National Institutes of Health to discover treatments and cures, to maintain global leadership in medical innovation, and to restore the purchasing power the NIH had after the historic doubling campaign that ended in fiscal year 2003.

S. 332

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 332, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to make permanent the extension of the Medicare-dependent hospital (MDH) program and the increased payments under the Medicare low-volume hospital program.

S. 335

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 335, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve 529 plans.

S. 356

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 356, a bill to improve the provisions relating to the privacy of electronic communications.

S. 371

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 371, a bill to remove a limitation on a prohibition relating to permits for discharges incidental to normal operation of vessels.

S. 373

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER), the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) were added as cosponsors of S. 373, a bill to provide for the establishment of nationally uniform and environmentally sound standards governing discharges incidental to the normal operation of a vessel.

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr.

SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 373, supra.

S. 394

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 394, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the 15-year recovery period for qualified leasehold improvement property, qualified restaurant property, and qualified retail improvement property.

S. 399

At the request of Mrs. FISCHER, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 399, a bill to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to increase transparency in Federal budgeting, and for other purposes.

S. 403

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 403, a bill to revise the authorized route of the North Country National Scenic Trail in northeastern Minnesota and to extend the trail into Vermont to connect with the Appalachian National Scenic Trail, and for other purposes.

S. 409

At the request of Mr. BURR, the names of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) were added as cosponsors of S. 409, a bill to amend the Sex Offender Registration and Notification Act to require the Secretary of Defense to inform the Attorney General of persons required to register as sex offenders.

S. 421

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 421, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide for greater transparency and efficiency in the procedures followed by the Federal Communications Commission, and for other purposes.

S. 431

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) were added as cosponsors of S. 431, a bill to permanently extend the Internet Tax Freedom Act.

S. 437

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 437, a bill to provide for congressional approval of national monuments and restrictions on the use of national monuments, to establish requirements for the declaration of marine national monuments, and for other purposes.

S. 474

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 474, a bill to require State educational agencies that receive funding under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to have in effect policies and procedures on background checks for school employees.

S. 489

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the names of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) were added as cosponsors of S. 489, a bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to increase the maximum value of articles that may be imported duty-free by one person on one day.

S. 498

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 498, a bill to allow reciprocity for the carrying of certain concealed firearms.

S. 505

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 505, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the Health Coverage Tax Credit.

S. 517

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 517, a bill to extend the secure rural schools and community self-determination program, to restore mandatory funding status to the payment in lieu of taxes program, and for other purposes.

S. 527

At the request of Mr. SESSIONS, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 527, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the Foot Soldiers who participated in Bloody Sunday, Turnaround Tuesday, or in the final Selma to Montgomery Voting Rights March in March of 1965, which served as a catalyst for the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

S. 532

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 532, a bill to improve highway-rail grade crossing safety, and for other purposes.

S. 539

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 539, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to repeal the Medicare outpatient rehabilitation therapy caps.

S. 546

At the request of Ms. HEITKAMP, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 546, 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. 553

At the request of Mr. CORKER, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 553, a bill to marshal resources to undertake a concerted, transformative effort that seeks to bring an end to modern slavery, and for other purposes.

S. CON. RES. 4

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the names of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) were added as cosponsors of S. Con. Res. 4, a concurrent resolution supporting the Local Radio Freedom Act.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself and Mr. COCHRAN):

S. 569. A bill to reauthorize the farm to school program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, 5 years ago, the President signed into law the Healthy and Hunger-Free Kids Act. This law has made improvements to our school lunch program by making healthy food choices a reality for students nationwide. One of the best ways to help students make healthy choices is to teach them about their food and how it is grown. That is why I championed the inclusion of funding for a farm-to-school grant program, which was included in the Healthy and Hunger-Free Kids Act. The program has had tremendous success and interest nationwide, and has awarded grants in 42 States—showing the reach and diversity of farm-to-school. In order to improve upon this successful program and expand its reach, I am glad to be joined today by Senator COCHRAN, and Representatives FUDGE and FORTENBERRY in the House, to introduce the Farm to School Act of 2015.

We all know that hungry children cannot learn. Studies have shown that healthy nutrition in a young person's diet is crucial to cognitive ability and better health in the long run. With food insecurity on the rise, more than 30 percent of all children in the United States struggle with obesity, resulting in poor health, and learning and behavioral difficulties at school. The school meal program has made tremendous strides in recent years to ensure not only that children have access to meals throughout the school day, but that those meals are nutritious. The Farm to School program has given children and schools across the country the tools to craft farm-fresh, healthy, and delicious meals that students enjoy.

The Farm to School grant program offers support to farmers and local economies, while teaching kids about nutritious foods and where they come

from. The program has helped schools across the country meet the new nutrition standards by offering children local, fresh produce that tastes great. Just as importantly, the program has a strong educational component, making our school cafeterias an extension of the classroom, giving students an opportunity to learn about nutrition, well-balanced meals, and even how to grow the food themselves.

In Vermont, I have seen first-hand how farm to school efforts have better connected children with the food in their cafeteria. Students participate in school gardens, sustainability projects, and taste tests for new school menu items. The Burlington School Food Project created a half-acre Healthy City Youth Farm, connecting schools to the farm by engaging individuals in local agricultural production. Organizations in Vermont such as Vermont Food Education Every Day, now the Northeast regional leader of the National Farm to School Network; Shelburne Farms; and the Northeast Organic Farming Association have been able to expand their programs to link more farms to the classroom throughout Vermont.

Farm to school is equally crucial to farmers and ranchers, who currently receive only 16 cents out of every dollar spent on food. The program opens another market to them to sell their locally grown and locally harvested goods. By incorporating farm fresh products in school meals, children learn the importance of where their food comes from. The program links the classroom with the farm to engage students in the importance of farming and contributing to the local economy.

The Farm to School Act of 2015 would build upon these successes and expand the program's scope by increasing the funding for the program to $15 million per year. The bill also recognizes the importance of growing the program to include preschools, summer food service program sites, and after school programs.

Improving childhood nutrition is a goal we all share. Small changes in eating habits by children will result in lifelong health benefits for generations to come. The Farm to School program empowers children and their families to make healthy choices now and in the future. As the Senate begins considering reauthorizing the child nutrition bill this year, I look forward to including these improvements in the Farm to School program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 569

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Farm to School Act of 2015''.

SEC. 2. ACCESS TO LOCAL FOODS: FARM TO SCHOOL PROGRAM.

Section 18(g) of the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1769(g)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking the paragraph designation and heading and all that follows through ''In this subsection, the'' and inserting the following:

''(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

''(A) AGRICULTURAL PRODUCER.—The term 'agricultural producer' means a farmer, rancher, or fisher (including of farm-raised fish).

''(B) ELIGIBLE SCHOOL.—The''; and

(B) in subparagraph (B) (as so redesignated), by inserting '', including the summer food service program for children under section 13 and the early care and afterschool portions of the child and adult care food program under section 17,'' after ''under this Act'';

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking ''and nonprofit entities through grants and technical assistance'' and inserting ''land-grant colleges and universities, and nonprofit entities through grants, technical assistance, and research'';

(3) in paragraph (3)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) in clause (i), by inserting ''and technical assistance'' after ''training'';

(ii) by redesignating clauses (vi) and (vii) as clauses (vii) and (viii), respectively; and

(iii) by inserting after clause (v) the following:

''(vi) implementing agricultural literacy and nutrition education;''; and

(B) by striking subparagraph (C) and inserting the following:

''(C) IMPROVED PROCUREMENT AND DISTRIBUTION.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—In awarding grants under this subsection, the Secretary shall seek to improve local food procurement and distribution options for agricultural producers and eligible schools.

''(ii) AGGREGATION, PROCESSING, TRANSPORTATION, AND DISTRIBUTION.—In advancing local food procurement options and other farm to school objectives, the Secretary may provide funding for projects that include innovative approaches to aggregation, processing, transportation, and distribution.

''(D) AWARDS.—

''(i) MAXIMUM AMOUNT.—The total amount provided to a grant recipient under this subsection shall not exceed $200,000.

''(ii) TERM.—The term of an award shall not exceed 3 years.

''(iii) PURPOSE AND SCOPE.—In making awards under this subsection, the Secretary shall seek to make awards of diverse amounts and duration in order to best match the award to the purpose and scope of the project to be funded.

''(E) LIMITATION.—The Secretary may not award a grant under this subsection if the grant funds would be used solely for the purpose of carrying out a conference.'';

(4) in paragraph (5)—

(A) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) through (G) as clauses (i) through (vii), respectively, and indenting the clauses appropriately;

(B) in clause (ii) (as so redesignated), by striking ''lunches'' and inserting ''meals'';

(C) in the matter preceding clause (i) (as so redesignated), by striking ''To the maximum extent practicable'' and inserting the following:

''(A) IN GENERAL.—To the maximum extent practicable'';

(D) in clause (vi) (as so redesignated), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(E) by redesignating clause (vii) (as so redesignated) as clause (viii);

(F) by inserting after clause (vi) (as so redesignated) the following:

''(vii) expand the selection of local commodities for eligible schools; and''; and

(G) by adding at the end the following:

''(B) TRIBAL COMMUNITY PROJECTS.—In the case of projects serving tribal communities, the Secretary shall, to the maximum extent practicable, give highest priority to projects that best use products from tribal agricultural producers, as determined by the Secretary.'';

(5) in paragraph (7)—

(A) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) through (C) as clauses (i) through (iii), respectively, and indenting appropriately;

(B) by striking the paragraph designation and heading and all that follows through ''nonprofit entities—'' and inserting the following:

''(7) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND RESEARCH.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall provide technical assistance, research, and information to assist eligible schools, State and local agencies, Indian tribal organizations, agricultural producers or agricultural producer groups, and nonprofit entities—'';

(C) in subparagraph (A) (as so designated)—

(i) in clause (ii) (as so redesignated), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(ii) in clause (iii) (as so redesignated), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

''(iv) to increase awareness of, and participation in, farm to school programs among agricultural and aquaculture producers or agricultural producer groups, including beginning, veteran, and socially disadvantaged farmers and ranchers.''; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

''(B) REVIEW.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Farm to School Act of 2015 and every 3 years thereafter, the Secretary shall review and submit to the Committee on Agriculture and the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report that describes the progress that has been made in identifying and eliminating regulatory and other barriers related to developing farm to school programs.

''(ii) REQUIREMENTS.—In preparing the report, the Secretary shall examine—

''(I) the direct and indirect regulatory compliance costs affecting the production and marketing of locally or regionally produced agricultural food products to school food programs; and

''(II) barriers to local and regional market access for small-scale production.'';

(6) in paragraph (8)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''$5,000,000'' and inserting ''$15,000,000''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(C) ADMINISTRATION.—Of the funds provided to the Secretary under subparagraph (A), not more than 5 percent may be used to pay administrative costs incurred by the Secretary in carrying out this subsection.''; and

(7) in paragraph (9), by striking ''2011 through 2015'' and inserting ''2016 through 2021''.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 85—HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF GEORGIA JONES-AYERS

Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. NELSON) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 85

Whereas Georgia Jones-Ayers was a lifelong resident and prominent community leader in South Florida;

Whereas effective relationships between communities and the police departments that serve those communities promote more effective policing and further the interests of justice;

Whereas Georgia Jones-Ayers worked tirelessly to promote dialogue and foster trust between the police and the community;

Whereas career criminals prey on their communities, destroy lives, and waste their God-given potential;

Whereas the prevention of recidivism, especially by first-time offenders, is an important goal of the criminal justice system, civil society, and faith communities;

Whereas Georgia Jones-Ayers founded and served as Executive Director of Alternative Programs, Inc., a nonprofit agency committed to preventing first-time offenders from reoffending;

Whereas Alternative Programs, Inc. has helped hundreds of first-time offenders become productive members of society;

Whereas Georgia Jones-Ayers retired in October 2013, after nearly 4 decades leading Alternative Programs;

Whereas Georgia Jones-Ayers engaged in many other efforts for the betterment of the community, including cofounding the Daily Bread Food Bank;

Whereas Georgia Jones-Ayers was honored by numerous organizations in Florida, including the Miami Police Department and the Florida Commission on Human Relations;

Whereas Georgia Jones-Ayers was the loving mother of 6 children, grandmother of 9 grandchildren, and great-grandmother of 20 great-grandchildren; and

Whereas Georgia Jones-Ayers passed away on February 17, 2015, at the age of 86: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes and honors the life of Georgia Jones-Ayers;

(2) recognizes—

(A) the lifelong commitment of Georgia Jones-Ayers to bettering the lives of the people of South Florida; and

(B) the landmark work of Georgia Jones-Ayers in steering troubled young people away from a life of crime;

(3) offers heartfelt condolences to the family, friends, and loved ones of Georgia Jones-Ayers; and

(4) in memory of Georgia Jones-Ayers, calls on the people of the United States to redouble their commitment to their neighbors and their communities.

SENATE RESOLUTION 86—RECOGNIZING MARCH 3, 2015, AS THE CENTENNIAL OF THE NAVY RESERVE

Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mr. WARNER, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. KIRK, Mr. KING, and Mr. PETERS) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 86

Whereas the roots of patriotic Americans serving in maritime service trace back to even before the existence of the Continental Navy, when residents from seaside towns engaged in combat with British warships in defense of their homes;

Whereas the tradition of maritime service to the country continued through the robust United States merchant marine, and later the formation of State naval militias in the late 19th century to meet the need for additional naval support;

Whereas during the Spanish-American War, the Navy augmented its force with 4,000 sailors from the State naval militias;

Whereas the emergence of the United States as a world power in the early 20th century required a more robust and multilayered naval force;

Whereas the Act of March 3, 1915 (38 Stat. 928, chapter 83), established the Naval Reserve, which became the ''Navy Reserve'' in 2006;

Whereas by the end of World War I, there were 290,0000 members of the Naval Reserve, more than half of the total manpower of the Navy, who fought valiantly during the war;

Whereas 84 percent of the sailors serving in World War II were members of the Naval Reserve, a group that included 100,000 women;

Whereas the more than 2,600,000 enlisted personnel and 269,000 officers in the Naval Reserve in 1945 served in every theater of World War II and on every type of vessel and aircraft;

Whereas 5 Presidents, John F. Kennedy, Lyndon B. Johnson, Richard M. Nixon, Gerald R. Ford, and George H. W. Bush, served honorably in the Naval Reserve;

Whereas in United States conflicts and national emergencies, including the Berlin Crisis, the Korean War, the Cuban Missile Crisis, the Vietnam War, Operation Desert Storm, and hurricanes and other natural disasters, the Navy Reserve has responded to calls promptly and effectively;

Whereas following the attack on the Navy destroyer, USS Cole, on October 12, 2000, the Naval Reserve immediately responded with coastal warfare security;

Whereas since the attacks on our homeland of September 11, 2001, the Navy Reserve has mobilized more than 72,000 members of the Navy Reserve worldwide to counter threats to national security;

Whereas the Navy benefits from the military experience, civilian skills, and diverse backgrounds of the members of the Navy Reserve;

Whereas as the Senate recognizes the distinguished service of the members of the Navy Reserve, who are proud individuals of the United States, there are more than 2,000 members of the Navy Reserve deployed around the world; and

Whereas March 3, 2015, marks 100 years since the Act of March 3, 1915 (38 Stat. 928, chapter 83), establishing the Naval Reserve: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes March 3, 2015, as the centennial of the Navy Reserve;

(2) recognizes the indispensable and valuable contributions and sacrifices that individual members of the Navy Reserve have made throughout the history of the United States and continue to make in 2015;

(3) celebrates the commitment and service of members of the Navy Reserve, their families, and their employers; and

(4) encourages communities to seize the opportunity to honor and support these patriots in 2015, the centennial of the Navy Reserve.

SENATE RESOLUTION 87—TO EXPRESS THE SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE RISE OF ANTI-SEMITISM IN EUROPE AND TO ENCOURAGE GREATER CO-OPERATION WITH THE EUROPEAN GOVERNMENTS, THE EUROPEAN UNION, AND THE ORGANIZATION FOR SECURITY AND CO-OPERATION IN EUROPE IN PREVENTING AND RESPONDING TO ANTI-SEMITISM;

Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. KIRK, Mr. REID, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. WICKER, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. ROUNDS, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. COONS, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. COATS, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. KAINE, Mr. BLUNT, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. KING, Mr. HELLER, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. GARDNER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. COTTON, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. MCCAIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. MORAN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. HATCH, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. FRANKEN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. PETERS, Ms. CANTWELL, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. BROWN, Mr. NELSON, Mr. WARNER, Mr. BENNET, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. CASEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PORTMAN, and Mr. SCOTT) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 87

Whereas an alarming increase in anti-Semitic attacks and incidents targeting Jewish institutions, places of worship, and individuals continue to take place in Europe and remain a challenge to stability and security;

Whereas on January 9, 2015, 4 members of France's Jewish community were murdered in an attack on a kosher supermarket following the deadly terrorist attack on the Paris offices of newspaper Charlie Hebdo;

Whereas, in a 2014 Anti-Defamation League survey of attitudes towards Jews in more than 100 countries around the world—

(1) 24 percent of those surveyed in Western Europe expressed anti-Semitic views;

(2) 34 percent of those surveyed in Eastern Europe expressed anti-Semitic views; and

(3) a majority of those surveyed worldwide either—

(A) had not heard of the Holocaust; or

(B) do not believe that the factual accounts and recorded history of the Holocaust are accurate;

Whereas the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights issued a report in 2013 on anti-Semitism in the 8 countries in which 90 percent of Europe's Jews reside, namely France, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Latvia, Belgium, Sweden, and the United Kingdom, in which 76 percent of respondents believed that anti-Semitism had worsened where they lived during the previous 5-year period;

Whereas France, which is home to Europe's largest Jewish population, reported that—

(1) twice as many French Jews immigrated to Israel during 2014 than had immigrated during 2013; and

(2) for the first time ever, more Jews moved to Israel from France than from any other country in the world;

Whereas anti-Semitic acts committed and recorded in European countries in 2014 included—

(1) murders and death threats against Jews; and

(2) arson, graffiti, and property desecration at Jewish sites, including Jewish cemeteries,

places of worship, schools, and community centers;

Whereas such acts led many Jewish individuals to conceal their religious affiliation;

Whereas on May 24, 2014, a gunman killed 4 people when he opened fire at the Jewish Museum of Belgium in Brussels, Belgium;

Whereas on July 29, 2014, Molotov cocktails were thrown at the synagogue in Wuppertal, Germany, which had been burned to the ground by the Nazis during the 1938 Kristallnacht, and was rebuilt as recently as 2002;

Whereas the foreign ministers of France, Germany, and Italy issued a joint statement in July 2014, proclaiming: ''Anti-Semitic rhetoric and hostility against Jews, attacks on people of Jewish belief and synagogues have no place in our societies'';

Whereas in September 2014, British Prime Minister David Cameron declared: ''There can never be any excuse for anti-Semitism, and no disagreements on politics or policy should ever be allowed to justify racism, prejudice or extremism in any form'';

Whereas on January 13, 2015, French Prime Minister Manuel Valls spoke before the French National Assembly and declared that anti-Semitism must be dealt with ''powerfully'' and that ''there has been an intolerable rise in acts of anti-Semitism in France [that] have not aroused the outrage expected by our Jewish compatriots'';

Whereas at the Tenth Anniversary of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe's (OSCE) Berlin Conference on Anti-Semitism in November 2014, Samantha Power, the United States Ambassador to the United Nations, noted, ''Rising anti-Semitism is rarely the lone or the last manifestation of intolerance in society. . . . When the human rights and fundamental freedoms of Jews are repressed, the rights and freedoms of other minorities and other sectors are often not far behind'';

Whereas the OSCE's December 2014 Basel Declaration on Enhancing Efforts to Combat Anti-Semitism condemned ''manifestations of anti-Semitism, intolerance and discrimination against Jews'', and protected the commitment to ''declare unambiguously that international developments or political issues, including those with regard to the situation in the Middle East, never justify anti-Semitism'';

Whereas the Government of the United States has consistently supported efforts to address the rise of anti-Semitism through diplomatic efforts including engagement in international organizations such as the OSCE;

Whereas the Office to Monitor and Combat Anti-Semitism in the Department of State, which is headed by the Special Envoy to Monitor and Combat Anti-Semitism, has consistently supported European efforts to combat Anti-Semitism; and

Whereas, at the urging of the United States and 36 other countries, including all European Union States, the United Nations General Assembly convened the first ever meeting on anti-Semitism on January 22, 2015, to consider ways to confront the long-standing and growing problem of anti-Semitism worldwide.

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate urges the Secretary of State, the Attorney General, and other relevant United States Government agencies and officials to work closely with the European Union and European governments to encourage further efforts to address anti-Semitism by—

(1) undertaking prompt, impartial, and effective investigations of any acts of violence motivated by anti-Semitism and fully prosecuting those responsible for such violence within the extent of the law;

(2) encouraging European countries and the European Union to designate senior-level special envoys to monitor, prevent, and combat anti-Semitism regionally and domestically;

(3) cooperating with European counterparts on developing programs to counter violent extremists engaged in anti-Semitic activity;

(4) encouraging the European Union and its Member States to integrate measures to combat anti-Semitism into relevant national strategies and action plans by including measures to protect human rights, religious tolerance, and equality, and to ensure hate crime and violence prevention;

(5) increasing cooperation on training initiatives related to hate crimes, particularly crimes motivated by anti-Semitism, for law enforcement personnel, and improving monitoring and reporting efforts;

(6) empowering civil society, including diverse religious and ethnic groups, civil and human rights organizations, and the business community, to fight anti-Semitism and discrimination;

(7) convening regular consultations with Jewish community organizations and non-Jewish civil and human rights organizations to demonstrate visible support, listen to concerns, and solicit recommendations on improving security and supporting victims; and

(8) reaffirming and implementing the recommendations in the OSCE's December 2014 Basel Declaration on Enhancing Efforts to Combat Anti-Semitism.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on February 25, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SR-253 of the Russell Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled ''Preserving the Multistakeholder Model of Internet Governance.''

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

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Evironment and Public Works be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on February 25, 2015, at 9:30 a.m., in room SD-406 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''The Importance of MAP–21 Reauthorization: Perspectives from Owners, Operators, and Users of the System.''

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

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on February 25, 2015, at 1:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''The Fight Against ISIS: Building the Coalition and Ensuring Military Effectiveness.''

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

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on February 25, 2015, at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing entitled ''Toward a 21st Century Regulatory System.''

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

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Indian Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on February 25, 2015 at 2:30 p.m., in room SD–628 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''The President's FY2016 Budget Request for Indian programs.''

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

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on February 25, 2015 at 10 a.m., to conduct a joint hearing with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PERSONNEL

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Personnel of the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on February 25, 2015 at 2:30 p.m.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON STRATEGIC FORCES

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces of the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on February 25, 2015 at 2:30 p.m.

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

CENTENNIAL OF THE NAVY RESERVE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 86, submitted earlier today.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 86) recognizing March 3, 2015, as the centennial of the Navy Reserve.

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

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

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

The resolution (S. Res. 86) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

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

APPOINTMENTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the President of the Senate, pursuant to Public Law 106–286, appoints the following Member to serve on the Congressional Executive Commission on the People's Republic of China: the Honorable MARCO RUBIO of Florida.

The Chair, on behalf of the President of the Senate, pursuant to Public Law 85–874, as amended, appoints the following individual to the Board of Trustees of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts: the Honorable ROY BLUNT of Missouri.

The Chair, on behalf of the Democratic leader, pursuant to Public Law 96–114, as amended, appoints the following individual to the Congressional Award Board: the Honorable JOE MANCHIN of West Virginia.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 2015

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 11 a.m., Thursday, February 26; 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 leader remarks, the Senate then resume consideration of the motion to proceed to H.R. 240 postcloture, and all time during the adjournment or recess of the Senate count against postcloture time.

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

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MCCONNELL. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order, following the remarks of Senator WHITEHOUSE for up to 15 minutes.

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

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

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

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I am here for the 90th time to urge my colleagues in the Senate to take action on climate change. The science is clearly worthy of our trust, and it is indeed time to wake up.

The human contribution to climate change is no longer up for legitimate debate. We know that carbon pollution accumulates in the atmosphere. We know that carbon dioxide traps the sun's heat. We have actually known that since Abraham Lincoln was President. We know that the atmosphere and the oceans are heating up. We can measure that.

Ocean acidification and sea level rise are also measurable, and they are caused by carbon pollution. These risks to our environment, to our health, to our economy, and to our national security are every week more apparent.

News this week from New York City was that an advisory panel of scientists, engineers, and risk management experts just reported that the sea level rise along that city's shoreline—approximately 12 inches since 1900—may have expanded Superstorm Sandy's flood area by as much as 25 square miles, flooding the homes of some 80,000 people. That is pretty real.

The report's prognosis for the future puts the city in pretty deep water. New York City expects its local sea levels to rise by 11 to 21 inches more by 2050 and as much as 6 feet by 2100.

When he was mayor, Michael Bloomberg began in the wake of Hurricane Sandy an ambitious plan to shore up New York with levees, with storm barriers, and with other coastal defenses to make that great city more resilient in the face of rising seas. That plan is estimated to cost nearly $20 billion to fortify just one city, albeit a great one—New York City—against rising seas.

Let's look south to another major American metropolitan area, Miami-Fort Lauderdale, which also faces daunting projections of rising sea levels.

This map I have in the Chamber shows 3 feet of sea level rise in Miami-Dade County. This is before. This is after. As we can see, they have lost acres. All of this back to the coast is gone, acre upon acre of that city. This nuclear power station right here, Turkey Point, and this sewage treatment plant which serves that municipal area have both become islands.

I visited Florida last year to hear firsthand about the threats that climate change poses to the Sunshine State. I met Glenn Landers, a senior engineer at the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Everglades Division. He has worked on water resources and restoration projects in Florida for nearly 20 years. This is the map he used to show me what just 2 feet of sea level rise would mean for South Florida. There is a lot less of it.

Like New York, they have measured almost 1 foot of sea level rise in South Florida in the last 100 years. And like New York, the Southeast Florida Regional Climate Compact—which is a bipartisan coalition of four South Florida counties—once we get away from this building, it turns out this can actually be a bipartisan issue; that cloud of special interest money that wraps the Congress isn't as apparent when you get to Florida counties. That bipartisan coalition predicts, like New York, again, continued sea level rise. Indeed, the waters around southeast Florida could surge up to another 2 feet in less than 50 years. As we can see, most of the iconic Everglades—which is the largest tract of wilderness east of the Rocky Mountains and home to some of the most rare and endangered species in America—will be under seawater.

Now, there is some resemblance between New York and Florida in the threat of sea level rise. But the resemblance to New York diverges when we look at some of the unique features of the Florida peninsula.

First is its low elevation. Miami is just 6 feet above sea level. Six feet of sea level rise goes a long way.

Second, southern Florida, as the Army Corps of Engineers constantly attests, rests on porous limestone. In New York, levees and dams can be built that will hold the ocean back. They can fortify New York City and wall it in like Holland. In Miami, they would be building those structures on a geological sponge. The rising water will just seep right under. And even in the higher areas that might still stay dry, saltwater will infiltrate the underground drinking water.

Of all the people and all the homes in the Nation at risk from rising seas, an estimated 40 percent are in the State of Florida. The Risky Business Project estimates that between $127 billion and $150 billion worth of property in Florida will be under the mean high tide by 2050. You might want to be careful where you buy in Florida these days if you plan to be around a while.

If we take into account damage from coastal storms, Florida could face an additional $4 billion in damage per year.

Luckily, Florida is home to a number of the country's leading research institutions. Scientific experts at Florida universities are actively researching and trying to plan for the State's changing climate.

Professor Harold Wanless of the University of Miami puts it pretty bluntly:

> Everyone wants a nice happy ending. But that's not reality. We're in for it. We have really done a job warming our ocean, and it's going to pay us back.

The Florida Climate Institute is a network of universities and public organizations that provides Florida policymakers and businesses with reliable, region-specific, factual information. The group includes the University of Florida, Florida State, the University of Miami, Florida A&M, the University of Central Florida, Florida Atlantic University, the University of South Florida, and Florida International University.

Let me focus on Florida International University in Miami. FIU leads the Florida Coastal Everglades Long Term Ecological Research Program to study the effect of climate change and human activity on freshwater availability in the Everglades. FIU hosts the International Hurricane Research Center on its campus and recently established the Extreme Events Institute, devoted to making communities more resilient to extreme weather.

Institute director Richard Olsen, who is an international expert on disaster response and resiliency, has called sea level rise ''a slow onset disaster'' for South Florida.

Four professors of FIU's School of Journalism and Mass Communication set up a media outreach initiative called Eyes on the Rise. Students in this program have produced documentaries to air on local television about the effect of sea level rise on local communities, on real estate prices, and on economic growth in southern Florida.

FIU is a member of the American College and University Presidents' Climate Commitment, a network of schools taking action to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and promote climate research. FIU has adopted a plan to bring emissions 25 percent below 2007 levels before 2030.

On my Florida visit, Dr. Mike Heithaus, a marine scientist and dean of the College of Arts and Sciences at FIU, said:

> We're really standing here at ground zero. There's just about nowhere else on the planet where there is more at risk from sea level rise so fast.

He gets it. They get it. That is why Florida International University is at the fore of climate research and education, particularly as it affects the State of Florida.

But there is another member of that faculty who doesn't seem to get it, one of our Senate colleagues, the junior Senator from Florida. He teaches political science part time at FIU. Last month, however, that junior Senator from Florida voted against amendments to the Keystone XL bill stating that climate change is real and that humans contribute to it. Apparently the message from experts across Florida and frankly from experts across campus that manmade climate change, especially sea level rise, is a big problem for southern Florida—well, apparently that message hasn't gotten through.

What are Florida's other elected officials doing? Fort Lauderdale mayor Jack Seiler is working with NOAA, State and Broward County officials, and the South Florida Regional Planning Council to protect his city from flooding and climate change. Miami Beach mayor Philip Levine showed me the huge pumps his city has installed to pump out the flooding that comes in on high tides and from storms. Republican mayor Sylvia Murphy of Monroe County, which covers all of the Florida Keys and some of the Everglades, is a remarkable lady, and she has put climate and energy policy at the heart of her 20-year growth plan for the county. She is going to lose a lot of her county if we don't get ahead of this. And the senior Senator from Florida, my friend BILL NELSON, is an outspoken advocate for preserving the Florida coast and the Florida economy in the face of climate change.

The Miami Herald recently wrote:

> South Florida owes Senator NELSON its thanks for shining a bright light on this issue. Everyone from local residents to elected officials should follow his lead, turning awareness of this major environmental issue into action. It is critical to saving our region.

So said the Miami Herald.

Unfortunately, the junior Senator does not seem to have followed his senior colleague's lead either in shining a bright light on this issue or in turning awareness into action.

It is a little bit surprising that, according to a recent New York Times poll, an overwhelming majority of Americans support us taking action on climate change, including half of Republicans. Again, this is not that partisan of an issue once you get away from the polluter money that surrounds this building. Two-thirds of respondents said they would be more likely to vote for a candidate for President or for the Senate who explicitly campaigned on a platform of climate action.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to continue for an additional 2 minutes.

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

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. That includes 48 percent of Republicans as opposed to only 24 percent of Republicans who said they would be less likely to vote for such a candidate. So even among Republican voters, the balance tips in favor of climate action. If you look at young Republican voters—as I have said over and over on this floor—under the age of 35, they think climate denial is ignorant, out of touch, or crazy. Those are the words they selected in the poll, not my words.

Let's move west to Arizona. The folks at NASA—a pretty reputable organization—have a rover driving around on Mars right now that they control. These are people who know something about what they are doing, and the folks at NASA have made understanding our planet and its systems their life's work. This month their researchers released a study showing an 80-percent chance of a decades-long what they call ''megadrought'' in the American Southwest, a multi-decade drought between 2050 and 2099 unless we act aggressively to mitigate the effects of climate change. Arizona could see half as much precipitation in the second half of the century as it did in the second half of the last century. It is a call to arms to protect the State of Arizona.

Finally, here is this morning's newspaper headline: ''As ice melts, the future fades. Climate change may force Alaska natives to abandon their village.'' LISA MURKOWSKI, the Senator from Alaska, is quoted here. Senator MURKOWSKI acknowledges the impacts of climate change on Alaska's coastal community.

So maybe we are beginning to make some progress, but all around the country these effects are ones we have to begin to take more seriously. It is indeed time to wake up.

I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate stands adjourned until 11 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 6:23 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, February 26, 2015, at 11 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

MONICA C. REGALBUTO, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF ENERGY (ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT), VICE INES R. TRIAY, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

AMIAS MOORE GERETY, OF CONNECTICUT, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, VICE CYRUS AMIR-MOKRI, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

WILLIE E. MAY, OF MARYLAND, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF COMMERCE FOR STANDARDS AND TECHNOLOGY, VICE PATRICK GALLAGHER, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

ANNE ELIZABETH WALL, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE A DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, VICE ALASTAIR M. FITZPAYNE, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

KATHERINE SIMONDS DHANANI, OF FLORIDA, 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 FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF SOMALIA.

SHEILA GWALTNEY, OF CALIFORNIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE KYRGYZ REPUBLIC.

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)

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

CONO R. NAMORATO, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL, VICE KATHRYN KENEALLY, RESIGNED.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be general

GEN. ROBIN RAND

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. JEFFREY B. CLARK

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY NURSE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. BARBARA R. HOLCOMB

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be brigadier general

COL. RONALD J. PLACE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S. C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be brigadier general

COL. RAYMOND S. DINGLE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

JACINTO ZAMBRANO, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be colonel

CHERYL D. ANDERSON
CHARLES G. KEMPER IV
JAMES D. MOORE
CARLTON G. SMITH

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be colonel

EUGENE S. ALKIRE
DAVID A. GAGNON
SHAUGHNESSY D. HODGE
ANTHONY T. LIEGGI
CHRISTOPHER R. REESE
DENNIS J. SORENSEN
PATRICK R. STARESINA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

RONALD D. SCHOW

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUALS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant commander

SEAN M. MILLER
JOSEPH B. POWELL

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be major

ANDREW J. COPELAND
DANIEL R. GABLE
YONG J. LEE
BRIAN A. LIONBARGER