



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 160

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MAY 1, 2014

No. 64

Senate

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

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Gracious God who brought light out of darkness causing the morning to appear, give to our Senators the vigor needed for today's tasks. Lord, protect them from every evil way, empowering them to live with integrity. Keep their bodies fit and healthy, their thinking straight, and their hearts pure. As they strive to serve You, may they accomplish their daily duties with simplicity, uprightness, and faithfulness. Give them the grace of faith by which they may lay hold of things unseen.

We pray in Your sacred Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

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

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

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

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, May 1, 2014.

To the Senate:

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

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

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

ENERGY SAVINGS AND INDUSTRIAL COMPETITIVENESS ACT OF 2014—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 368, S. 2262, the Shaheen-Portman energy efficiency legislation.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 368, S. 2262, a bill to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following my remarks and those of the Republican leader, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 11:15 a.m., with the time equally divided and controlled. At 11:15 a.m. there will be three rollcall votes, cloture on two U.S. district judges from Maryland and cloture on a U.S. circuit judge for the Tenth Circuit.

At 1:45 p.m. there will be up to four rollcall votes on confirmation of the U.S. district judges in Maryland and the circuit judge.

TRIBUTE TO TERRY GAINER

Mr. REID. Mr. President, there are a number of us who have large families. I have five children and lots of grandchildren, but the person about whom I am going to speak has an even larger family than I have. Terry Gainer has a huge family. He and his wife Irene have 6 children and 14 grandchildren, but that is just the beginning because he has 10 siblings himself.

His family extends far beyond the immediate family I just talked about. As

the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, Terry Gainer has taken care of roughly 6,500 people who work in the Senate and all the facilities around here, but that is not the end of it. He is also someone who is concerned and feels responsible for the thousands and thousands of people who come to this building every day. They are also a part of his family. So he has a huge family, and he has nurtured and taken care of his family, from his wife Irene to the thousands of people whom he has never known and never will know who come into this building, and he has done a wonderful job.

Senators and staffers are oftentimes split along ideological lines, but we all agree on one thing: We are utterly dependent on the Sergeant at Arms office, and we are aware of the wonderful job Terry Gainer has done as Sergeant at Arms.

The daily needs of the world's greatest deliberative body are not few in number, and Chief Gainer has been up to this task. As the Sergeant at Arms, he has been responsible for the enforcement of Senate rules as well as the security of the Capitol and Senate office buildings.

I try not to talk about this often, even though I would like to talk about it more than I do. For a number of years of my life I was a police officer. I was a Capitol policeman. I have my badge in my office across the hall from here, and I am very proud of that. I was a Capitol policeman, but today the Capitol policemen who work in this facility and around this great building and all the office buildings have so many more responsibilities than someone who was a police officer during my day.

Every minute of every day we have evil people trying to do harm to these beautiful buildings and the people who work in them. It is the responsibility of the Sergeant at Arms and the Capitol Police—for whom he is responsible—to take care of us, and he has

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S2571

done an admirable job. We are confident in him every day.

Under his leadership, the day-to-day operation of the Senate has never been better, even though we have been through some difficult times with the government shutdown, sequestration, and all of those issues that have been very difficult, but none of this is surprising considering that Terry Gainer has been in public service for almost 50 years.

He was a young homicide detective in Chicago. He comes from Chicago. He did a lot of things as a police officer. He is a lawyer. He has been Chief of the Capitol Police. Over the many years I have seen Chief Gainer—that is what I call him, Chief Gainer. I don't call him Mr. Gainer or Terry. I call him Chief because to me he will always be the Chief of Police of the U.S. Capitol Police Force, for whom he did an admirable job.

I check with the officers often and ask: How are things going? I think that during the time he was the Chief of Police, the positive attitude of the police officers has been significant because of his experience with the bad guys and his ability to do such a good job. They felt very confident in his leadership abilities. He has been a wonderful Sergeant at Arms. Only one of his functions is to take care of the Capitol police.

As his time in the Senate comes to an end, Terry leaves his successor with an organization that has weathered a government shutdown, as I mentioned, a crippling sequestration, and is adequately prepared for the challenges of the future.

I try to be as praiseworthy as I feel is appropriate, but having done that, I know I have not done justice to Terry Gainer. I will truly miss him. I will miss him significantly. He is somebody we can all turn to, and he is very direct; whether it is the latest big problem we had with some issues dealing with the Intelligence Committee and their battles with the CIA, whatever it is, he has the ability to step forward and put out the flames.

I say to Terry Gainer: I am going to miss you. I have great affection for you. I have great confidence in your having a wonderful future. You have experience that very few people in the world have, and I wish you the very best in all of your future endeavors and that of your wife Irene and all the kids.

TRIBUTE TO DARYL CHAPPELLE

Mr. President, not everybody knows the next individual I am about to acknowledge. He has a job in a small part of this great Capitol complex. He is retiring after having been a Senate employee for approximately 40 years. His name is Daryl Chappelle.

When I first came to the Senate, all rides to the office building were in an old train. It was, as they still are, old, old, old. They would crunch and bang as they went along the tracks. The handicapped can't get on those trains. But a Republican Senator from Okla-

homa who is now retired and I worked to change that so the train system would not be the old, dilapidated trains, and now all the people coming from Hart and Dirksen are in these beautiful enclosed trains that you can wheel a wheelchair in without any effort whatsoever, and that is wonderful.

There is a person there to help people who travel from the Old Senate Office Building, as it was called when I was there. It is now called the Russell Building. They still have this old train, and Daryl is always there. He is so nice and greets everybody who comes on those trains. We all recognize him when we are trying to get from here to the Russell Building.

He has operated the underground trains that run between the Capitol office buildings for 41 years. He has a smile that covers his whole face. He has a voice that is infectious. You can hear him when he laughs, and we will all miss that.

I join my colleagues in wishing Daryl all the best as he embarks on his much needed and deserved retirement.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

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

TRIBUTE TO TERRY GAINER

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I too want to comment on the great service of Terry Gainer and Daryl Chappelle.

Our departing Sergeant at Arms, Terry Gainer, whose decade-plus period of Senate service has been the capstone to a very long and distinguished career.

Terry is a familiar presence in the halls of the Capitol and always a reassuring one. Whenever you saw Terry, you always had the sense that things were under control around here, even though you knew how much work and preparation went into it. It is the same feeling you might have being around the father of a large family or a veteran big city cop, and I think it is no accident that Terry is both of those as well.

He has the bearing of a guy with long experience who has seen it all. We have all gotten the benefit of that experience over his years here, and that is something that just can't be bought.

Those of you who have watched the majority leader and I spar down here on the floor in the mornings know we don't agree on much, but picking Terry was one decision he got just right.

Terry's resume is pretty well known by now. He spent nearly half a century enforcing the law at the Federal, State, and city levels in a number of very demanding, high-profile posts. He started his law enforcement career in Chicago during the tumultuous year of 1968, making him one of five boys in his family to serve in the Chicago Police Department. That is to say nothing of his extended family. It is a point of pride in the Gainer family that there has been a Gainer on the Chicago PD for more than a century.

Terry volunteered to serve his country in Vietnam and served with distinc-

tion. He spent several years as a homicide detective in Chicago before moving over to the State police. He later served as an official at the Transportation Department, and for a time he was No. 2 in the DC Police Department. Somehow along the way he also got a law degree and helped negotiate Chicago's first-ever labor contract with the police union there.

He is the only person ever to serve as both the Chief of the Capitol Police and the Senate Sergeant at Arms. During his tenure as the Senate's top law enforcement officer, he has overseen a dedicated team of 850 professionals. He has presided over major improvements to the physical safety of the Capitol Complex and the Senate's IT infrastructure here and in our State offices. He has kept us all informed during emergencies.

For one night every January, he is the public face of the institution. I know Terry says he tries to get out of camera shot during the State of the Union, but we won't blame a guy with 14 grandkids for sneaking in a little face time on the State of the Union night.

Terry recently admitted to having a few secret signals for the grandkids—sort of like a third base coach. One time, he even got President Obama and the First Lady to pose for a photo with Flat Stanley. It is just one of the fond memories he says he will carry with him into his next chapter, and we wish him all the best.

We will miss his intelligence, his professionalism, and his good humor. Terry's colleagues will tell us that among his many other qualities, he is a lot of fun to be around. We will also miss the wisdom and judgment he brought to the job every morning. Terry leaves a legacy of excellence and a stellar example for his successors.

Let me add on that note that one of the most impressive aspects of Terry's legacy is the fact that despite the incredible demands of a high-pressure, high-profile career, he and Irene managed to raise six wonderful kids. I know they both share a deep and lively faith and would attribute much of their success to that. But it is still impressive, and we are glad the family will get to spend even more time with Terry now.

So, Terry, thanks for your service. You are a credit to your profession, your native Chicago, and to the Senate you have served so well. You have every reason to be proud. Now go enjoy your retirement, at least for awhile.

TRIBUTE TO DARYL CHAPPELLE

Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to another beloved member of the Senate family, Mr. Daryl Chappelle. Daryl has been here for more than four decades, and this week he takes his final turn at the helm of one of the two subway cars that run from Russell to the Capitol.

Daryl came here right out of Springarn High School, over in northeast Washington, when he was 19 years

old, and by all accounts he has been an exemplary worker. He began his career in the night labor division of the Senate superintendent's office in 1972. Since 1986, he has worked off and on as a mechanic and driver for the subway service. By one estimate, he has taken 130,000 trips between Russell and the Capitol.

But it is not the length of Daryl's tenure that I wish to honor this morning, as impressive as that is. It is the spirit in which Daryl did his job every day. It is literally legendary.

The motto of the Architect of the Capitol is to serve Congress and the Supreme Court, preserve America's Capitol, and to inspire memorable experiences, and I think Daryl Chappelle embodies that motto.

First of all, he is the happiest guy you ever met, and he has a genius for lifting people's spirits. One of the stories I heard about Daryl this week came from a woman on my staff. She told me she met Daryl on her very first day here, more than a decade ago, and still remembers it vividly. She had just moved here from Kentucky for an internship. She didn't know her way around, and she was pretty nervous, and it must have shown too because after giving her directions to the office, Daryl not only gave her a big warm smile, he also left her with a message that she has never forgotten. As she stepped off the train and headed off to her first day on the job, Daryl looked at her and said, "Everything is going to be OK."

It is a great story, because it not only captures Daryl's spirit, it points to the secret of his success: Daryl is the undisputed champion of making the most of a brief encounter.

He showed us all the power of the small gesture. He reminded us that when all is said and done, what really matters is how we deal with each other. If you didn't happen to find yourself down by the trains this week, you missed something special. People were pretty much tripping over each other to say goodbye to Daryl Chappelle: Senators, visitors, colleagues, locals—everybody saying goodbye. It has been like a rolling party down there all week.

Over the years, through all of these trips, Daryl has had a tremendous impact on this place. Today we want to thank him for warming this place every single day, and for helping our image around here, because Congress may not have a very high approval rating these days, but nobody who ever had the pleasure of riding Daryl's train could ever leave Washington without feeling a little bit better about this place.

Now, Daryl, you may not have had any major pieces of legislation named after you during your years here; reporters may not have snapped photographs of you when you walked down the hall, but at the beginning or the end of the day, you lifted our spirits. You brought us all back to Earth. It is

hard to think of this place without you.

We wish you and Pat all the best in your retirement. I know you have been looking forward to spending more time with your bride. Thank you for your service, my friend, and thank you for your wonderful example.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 11:15 a.m. with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, and with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The assistant majority leader.

HONORING SENATE RETIREES

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, in the history of the United States of America, we estimate some 500 million people have lived in this great Nation—60 percent of them as of today. But in the history of America, with 500 million people, only 1,950 men and women have been given the opportunity to serve in the Senate, including the Presiding Officer, our newest Senator, from the State of Montana. So 1,950 men and women who have occupied this Chamber in the previous Senate, becoming part of the history of this Nation and contributing to this great institution. I have been fortunate enough to have served with some of the greatest, and I have noted their presence, their impact, and I have noticed their absence too.

When we take stock of the Senate and what it has done for America, what it means to America, it goes way beyond the men and women who occupy these desks. It includes a lot of people who make a contribution to this institution who may never be recognized for it, but, nevertheless, make this the great institution it is, serving this great Nation. Today we honor two of those people.

TRIBUTE TO DARYL CHAPPELLE

First I wish to join in honoring Daryl Chappelle. Daryl, thank you so much for 41 years of service in the Senate. His legendary smile has warmed my spirits on days when I was really down in the dumps. He always had that happy smile, wishing me well. He was always making a person's day a little bit better. Daryl, I want to thank you. Time and time again, I am sure even on days when you weren't so up, you made a point of adding to a positive feeling for everyone—not just Senators and staff but visitors as well. You have been a great part of our Senate family. I wish you the very best in your retirement. We are going to miss you on that rickety old train that runs back and

forth between the Russell Building and the Capitol. I wish you the very best.

TRIBUTE TO TERRY GAINER

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I also come to the floor to give special tribute to our Sergeant at Arms, Terry Gainer, who is retiring. If one is not from Chicago and one doesn't know the scene very well, one may not understand what I am about to say. Let me make it clear. When one asks where Terry Gainer is from and someone says Chicago, one would then say: And?

He would add: The South Side.

And?

Beverly.

And?

Saint Barnabas.

When a person reports their parish in that section of Chicago, they have really identified themselves as being part of that great city and part of a great American Catholic tradition—Irish Catholic tradition in many respects—that Terry Gainer represents.

I think about him today and what his life has meant, but first I think of his family name. There aren't many names like the Gainer family name that carry with it so much respect in the city of Chicago. I think of his relatives I have worked with, the families who are related to him that I know, neighbors to staffers—the list goes on and on of the Gainers who have made an impact on the city of Chicago and the State of Illinois. Few can make the claim Terry can make in terms of what he has given to the city, the State of Illinois, and to our Nation.

Terry Gainer, of course, is the Sergeant at Arms today and has announced his retirement soon, after 7½ years serving in that capacity, or at least serving in the Senate with the Capitol Police and with the Sergeant at Arms office. He has served longer than any Sergeant at Arms since World War II. Terry served as Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper since January of 2007. His accomplishments are so many.

Do not underestimate the responsibility that has been given to him and the men and women who work with him. This building is a target for people who would bring destruction to this building and death to those who visit. Sadly, we have seen graphic examples of that in recent years past. It has been Terry's job, both with the Capitol Police and now with the Sergeant at Arms office, to keep us safe and to keep the business of the Senate working every single day.

Terry had the background to achieve it. He volunteered to serve our Nation in Vietnam. After his service, he retired as a captain in the Naval Reserves in the year 2000. He earned his bachelor's degree from St. Benedict's College. He continued his family's proud tradition of law enforcement by serving in the Chicago Police Department for nearly two decades. As Senator MCCONNELL mentioned earlier, over a century of service by the Gainer family to the Chicago Police Department was carried on by Terry. He obtained a master's of science degree and

his law degree from DePaul University. He was appointed superintendent of the Illinois State Police by Governor Jim Edgar and held that position for 7 years. He was then called to Washington, DC, to serve as second in command at the District of Columbia Metropolitan Police Department.

In 2002, Terry became chief of the United States Capitol Police and was instrumental in facilitating the substantial growth of that force in the challenging days following 9/11/2001.

After a brief stint in the private sector, Terry returned to public service when he was appointed by Majority Leader HARRY REID to serve as Sergeant at Arms. HARRY REID, himself a former Capitol Hill policeman, understood the responsibility and understood Terry was the right person for the job.

As I noted earlier, during his tenure as the Sergeant at Arms, Terry has done an exemplary job of balancing security and public access to the Capitol and to the Senate. His steady management hand, his quick smile, his constant presence in the halls of the Capitol and Senate office buildings are going to be greatly missed.

I wish to thank Terry Gainer personally for his friendship, support, the little favors he has done for me and for every Member of the Senate to make our lives and the lives of our family better. You have truly added to this great institution, as much as any person who served because you have made your mark and you have kept us safe and you have kept the millions of visitors during your tenure safe as well.

That is quite an accomplishment, Terry.

Congratulations to you and especially to Irene, who has been patient throughout it all, with her own career and her own effort, raising the family and making her mark professionally. The two of you are quite an example to all of us of public service at its best.

Thanks, Terry, for your service.

And now comes the tough responsibility of following in the steps of Terry Gainer.

Majority Leader REID has announced that Drew Willison, who is in the Chamber here today, will be replacing Terry as the next Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper—officially on Monday.

Drew has spent more than 5 years in two stints as the Deputy Sergeant at Arms, and he has learned from the best—Terry Gainer.

Prior to his work in the Sergeant at Arms office, Drew was a senior member of the Senate Appropriations Committee staff, where we worked together. He had roles in the Energy and Water Subcommittee effort, as well as the Legislative Branch Appropriations. His experience and knowledge of the legislative branch will serve him well in his new capacity.

I congratulate Drew and wish him the very best of luck. Terry's service as Sergeant at Arms has set the bar very high, but I know, Drew, you are up to the challenge.

Mr. President, let me end by thanking again Terry, Irene Gainer, the Gainer family, and all who support them for unselfishly giving to this Senate such an extraordinary contribution—for sharing their husband, father, and grandfather with our home State of Illinois and with this great Nation for so many years.

Terry and Irene have more than earned the right to move to the next chapter in their lives and to celebrate that time with their 6 children and 14 grandchildren.

I congratulate Terry on his distinguished public service career, for his accomplishments as a law enforcement officer, a decorated veteran, and the Senate Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper. Most importantly, I thank Terry for his friendship.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

TRIBUTE TO TERRY GAINER AND DARYL CHAPPELLE

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, before he leaves the floor, let me offer my congratulations to the Sergeant at Arms, Terry Gainer, and also my thanks to him for his service to this great institution. We know we will miss him but also wish him well in the next chapter of his life.

Mr. President, I also want to express, as have the majority leader and the Republican leader, my best wishes to Daryl Chappelle, as he leaves after 40 years of service to the U.S. Senate.

There are some people you run into each day who sort of make you feel better and brighten your day, and Daryl was one of those people.

I know we get involved in some pretty tough debates around here, and people sometimes walk around with a scowl on their face, but it is nice when people like Daryl help break that mood and remind us that we are lucky to be alive each day and come to work in such a wonderful place as the U.S. Senate.

I wish both Chief Gainer and Daryl well in the next chapter of their lives.

VA ACCOUNTABILITY

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I came to the floor primarily to talk about a very serious matter; that is, our U.S. military and our commitment not only to those who wear the uniform of the military—and, of course, I am aware of the Acting President pro tempore's long distinguished service—but also the solemn obligation we have to our veterans once they leave active-duty status.

They have more than upheld their commitment—in the mountains, in the valleys of Afghanistan, in the deserts of Iraq, and in postings around the world, from Japan, to Korea, to Kuwait, to Israel, to Germany, and all across the globe. Of course, they have joined generations of men and women—the “greatest generation,” of which my dad was a member, the World War II generation; and, of course, then those who fought in Korea, in Vietnam, and, of course, the most recent conflicts we have had, which I just mentioned, in Iraq and Afghanistan.

My strong conviction is that we owe a moral obligation, not just a legal obligation, to those veterans, to keep our commitments to them once they separate from military service.

I am sorry to say the Department of Veterans Affairs has repeatedly and outrageously failed to uphold its own commitment to America's Armed Forces and our veterans.

The problem, the way I see it, is we have almost become desensitized because we all know as a result of the drawdown of our military after our exit from Iraq and now Afghanistan we are getting a large number of people retiring from military service, so it is understandable there would be more pressure put on the Department of Veterans Affairs to process these claims, to process these retirements, but what we have learned is there are outrageous examples—for example, in Phoenix, where 40 veterans died because their names were taken off of the appointment system list in order to make the backlog look not as bad as it really was. Many of them had been put on what was called a secret waiting list that was designed to conceal the unconscionably long wait times endured by up to 1,600 sick veterans.

So what I mean when I say I think we have become almost desensitized to this backlog—where more than half of the claims now made with the VA are backlogged, according to the Department of Veterans Affairs' own criteria—it takes something like this, where 40 veterans have died because they were put on a secret waiting list in order to cook the books at the Phoenix VA, to hopefully wake us up and to get us to do something about this outrageous situation.

According to the investigation, high-level officials in the Phoenix VA knew about the secret waiting list, and they did nothing about it. It is even worse than that. Not only did the Phoenix officials tolerate this list, they actually defended it.

A former Phoenix VA doctor told CNN that the list “was deliberately put in place to avoid the VA's own internal rules.” That is why I call this a case of cooking the books. To avoid accountability, to avoid solving the problem, they tried to sweep the problem under the rug, and that is outrageous.

One of the victims of the secret waiting list was a 71-year-old Navy veteran named Thomas Breen. In late September, Mr. Breen was rushed to the

Phoenix VA hospital after he became ill. The doctors diagnosed him, knew he had a history of cancer, and they very clearly designated his condition as "urgent." That would indicate Mr. Breen should get another checkup within a week of his visit to the emergency room. Yet Mr. Breen was forced to wait and wait and wait and wait—even as he and his daughter-in-law made daily phone calls to the VA asking about an appointment and emphasizing the urgency of his medical condition. Each time they were told to wait just a little longer. Finally, a full 2 months after his initial ER visit, Mr. Breen passed away. The cause of death was stage 4 bladder cancer.

A week after that the VA finally called with Mr. Breen's appointment—after he died. By then, obviously, it was too late.

Stories such as Mr. Breen's should be a wake-up call to the U.S. Senate. They should be a wake-up call to the White House. They should pierce our sense of moral indignation and say: When are we going to do something about this backlog? When are we going to hold people accountable for cooking the books so that they avoid accountability for a backlog that we all know exists?

So I am suggesting again that the President needs to designate a point person who will come in and deal with this on an emergency basis; it is that serious. The President needs to treat this seriously—not ignore it, not sweep it under the rug—and the Senate needs to treat this with the urgency it deserves as well, which is why I hope the majority leader, who is the person responsible for such things, would designate or ask the committees with jurisdiction to hold emergency hearings to get to the bottom of this because we do not know whether this just happened in Phoenix. Chances are it did not, and I will mention another outrageous example in a minute. We need to know if this is just a local matter or endemic to the whole VA disability and health care system.

In Pittsburgh, we know there have been other problems. Six patients at the VA hospital died, and more than 20 others became sick, after an outbreak of Legionnaires' disease. As in Phoenix, patients at the Pittsburgh facility were kept in the dark about what was going on. It took "CBS News" doing an investigation to bring this to the light of day.

"CBS News" concluded:

An internal memo shows a top doctor at the hospital knew that Legionella—

Which causes Legionnaires' disease—could potentially be in the hospital's water system, and [he] recommended the use of bottled water. Though staff members were told to test patients for Legionnaires' disease if they exhibited certain symptoms, there is no evidence to suggest patients or their families were informed of management's concerns about a potential outbreak.

In other words, they were kept in the dark.

It is scandals such as this and a rampant lack of accountability that have prompted people such as Senator MARCO RUBIO from Florida to introduce legislation that would give the VA Secretary more authority to fire and discipline senior officials for abuses and failures on the job. I think that is a smart move, and I am proud to cosponsor that bill. Because the lack of accountability leading to the problems I have just described is absolutely appalling. It should shock all of us.

The underlying problem, which we have known about—to which I fear Congress and the Federal Government have become desensitized—is there are literally hundreds of thousands of U.S. military veterans who are waiting to have their disability, compensation, and pension claims processed and waiting more than the 125 days the VA calls a backlog.

According to the VA's own figures, in mid-April there were 602,000 compensation and pension claims pending nationwide, and a majority of them had been pending and in the backlog category.

For that matter, there are still 51,000 entitlement claims pending at just two VA regional offices, in Houston and Waco in my State. A majority of those claims are backlogged too.

I know that Congress has taken steps to address the backlog in claims. In the national defense authorization bill from last year, we included some of the provisions which authorized State-based veterans organizations, like those in Texas, to help the Federal Veterans' Administration expedite processing of these backlogged claims. But it is not enough. The evidence from Pittsburgh and the evidence from Phoenix indicates that it is not enough. So we have to do more.

This is not partisan politics. This should not be treated as business as usual. This should be a call to action on the part of the Senate and the Federal Government to live up to its obligations and its commitment to our Nation's veterans.

Just a few concluding words and thoughts about the challenges that face our current generation of military veterans. According to a recent survey, more than half of those who served in Afghanistan and Iraq struggle with some sort of physical or mental health issues stemming from their service. Some of them are relatively minor. Some of them are very serious, indeed. The serious ones have manifested themselves in horrible ways. For example, one out of every two Afghan and Iraq war veterans says they know a fellow servicemember that has either attempted or committed suicide. As I said a moment ago, those who sign up for the U.S. military and our all-volunteer force receive a promise—a promise that if they serve their country, if they can do their part, their country, our country, will do our part.

All they are asking for is us to make good on that promise. Serving Amer-

ica's veterans is one of the most important responsibilities the Federal Government has. The VA's failure to meet its responsibility is an ongoing scandal—one that I will continue drawing attention to until our veterans get the support they so rightfully deserve.

I hope my other colleagues, who I know share this commitment to our veterans, will come to the floor and urge the majority leader to ask the committees with jurisdiction to convene emergency hearings to get to the bottom of this, to find out if what happened in Phoenix and Pittsburgh are isolated events or if this a cancer that is eating away at our VA health care and disability system.

I call upon the President once again to appoint a point person to make sure that we get to the bottom of this as soon as possible because, of course, this is an executive branch function—the veterans health care system. I remember when healthcare.gov was rolled out and the Web site did not work the way the President expected it to. He appointed a point person to help make sure that all hands were on deck and we got to the bottom of the problem as soon as possible. I would think that this scandal in the Veterans' Administration and the way our veterans are being treated would at least equal the same sense of urgency and call for the same sort of response as the failure of the Web site for healthcare.gov.

So I hope our colleagues in the Senate can pull together to come to the service of our veterans in a way that they deserve. I hope the President views this with the kind of urgency that it really deserves and appoints a point person who can get to the bottom of this, working with Congress as quickly as possible so we can meet our obligations to our Nation's veterans.

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

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

TRIBUTE TO DARYL CHAPPELLE

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, before I give my intended remarks, I want to add my voice to others who have paid tribute to Daryl Chappelle, who retires today after 42 years of working in the Senate. I have only been here for 3 years, but I can tell you, in the time that I have been here, I look forward to running into Daryl as I make my trips back and forth between the Russell Senate Office Building and the Senate floor. There are certain people in life who just brighten your day. Every occasion when I have encountered Daryl during the workday, it has just been that experience.

I pay tribute to an individual about whom I don't know a lot personally or of his background or his family. It is a sad thing about the nature of today's busy world in which we don't know people—as I certainly do at home and in hometowns across our country—but I will tell you that the opportunity to be with and experience the conversation and joy that Daryl adds to this place has been a real treat and a wonderful experience for me.

I wish him and his family best wishes in his retirement and thank him for his service to the Senate and to the people of our country.

NOMINATION OF NANCY MORITZ

I rise to tell my colleagues about a nomination we are considering, and I speak in support of Justice Nancy Moritz.

She is currently a supreme court justice on the Kansas Supreme Court, and she is before us today as a nominee to sit on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

I appreciate working with my colleague Senator ROBERTS and those in the White House as we came together to try to find an acceptable and honorable nominee, and I believe we did. I extend my appreciation to Justice Moritz for having agreed to answer the call to serve her country in a new capacity as a member of the Tenth Circuit Court of Appeals.

She comes today before the Senate and again on Monday as someone who is highly qualified, greatly prepared, and who has the necessary background. Certainly the educational requirements are there, but the experience that she has encountered in her distinguished legal career, both public and private, really adds a dimension to this person and something that I would look for in a member of the tenth circuit.

For the past 4 years she has been a justice on the Kansas Supreme Court. Prior to that she spent 15 years as an attorney in the U.S. attorney's office in our State in both Kansas City and Topeka. Prior to that she had 6 years of experience in private practice as well.

Justice Moritz was raised in a small neighboring town of mine. Her hometown is Tipton. It is in many ways a typical small Kansas town. I know folks in Tipton would tell me how exceptional they are—and I have seen many instances of how true that is—but I know the people of Tipton. I have witnessed their character, their integrity, their work ethic, their kindness, their care and genuine concern for others. That sense of community you attain when you grow up in a town of just a few hundred people is something I think has great benefit in becoming who we are.

I, in some ways, admire the justice for that background and know what that kind of experience means in molding her character as well as her work ethic and how she conducts herself.

She also served for a period of time as a law clerk to Judge Ed Larson. Ed

Larson was a law partner of mine, and he remains a good friend. I called to visit with him about the nomination of Justice Moritz, and I trust his judgment. He not only was a law partner in practice with me—or really I was in practice with him—but he then went to the court of appeals and then was elevated to the Kansas Supreme Court.

Of all the people I have met in life, and certainly many of the attorneys I have met in life and the judges, if you were looking for someone whose opinion and judgment you would trust, Judge Ed Larson is certainly that person. He has made clear to me that Justice Moritz was one of the very best law clerks he ever had, and he believes her to be highly qualified. With his recommendation, my judgment about Justice Moritz was even more increased and enhanced.

Again, I am convinced that her background, growing up the way she did, her experience with Judge Larson and his stamp of approval upon her character and abilities, suggests we have a great person to join the tenth circuit.

I encourage my colleagues to review her qualifications, and I would hope and assume they would reach the same conclusion that I have, that the Tenth Circuit Court of Appeals will be well served with this Kansan on it. I look forward to supporting her confirmation, and I ask my colleagues to do the same.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maryland.

NOMINATIONS OF GEORGE HAZEL AND THEODORE CHUANG

Mr. CARDIN. I rise in support of the nominations of George Hazel and Theodore Chuang to be U.S. district judges for the District of Maryland.

Let me say from the beginning that I am very proud of the manner in which Senator MIKULSKI, the senior Senator from Maryland, and I have established a process to review and make recommendations to the President for the vacancies in the U.S. District of Maryland.

We have used a process that we think works. It gets us the most qualified individuals, and these two today are certainly an example of highly qualified individuals who want to be judges for the right reasons. They have a demonstrated track record of public service.

I particularly appreciate their commitment to pro bono. They understand that the courts need to be open to all and that we have a special responsibility as lawyers and as judges to make sure that there is equal access to justice. They understand the appropriate role of a judge in our system to be objective and to carry out the laws of this land.

George Jarrod Hazel received his B.A. cum laude in 1996 from Morehouse College and his J.D. in 1999 from Georgetown University Law Center. He was

nominated to fill the vacancy created by the taking of senior status in May of 2013 by Judge Alexander Williams, Jr.

I might just say Judge Williams had a very distinguished record on the district court.

Mr. Hazel began his legal career in private practice from 1999 to 2004. He then became a government prosecutor as an assistant U.S. attorney in the District of Columbia from 2005 to 2008.

He then joined the Greenbelt, MD, U.S. attorney's office for the District of Maryland. Finally, Mr. Hazel joined the office of the State's attorney for Baltimore City and now serves as the chief deputy State's attorney.

I can attest that being the chief deputy State's attorney in Baltimore City is a demanding position. In his present job, Mr. Hazel helps to oversee 200 prosecutors and 200 support staffers, and he has fought tirelessly to keep our communities safe and make them safer. In fact, he has played a key role in achieving those objectives.

He has demonstrated in his entire career as a lawyer a commitment to public service in each of the positions that he has held. He wants to serve the public, and these are the types of people I would hope we would like to see in our district court.

Mr. Hazel has extensive Federal and State court litigation experience, including civil and criminal matters, as well as jury trials. He has served as a prosecutor, private attorney, and manager of a large legal office.

Mr. Hazel lives in North Potomac with his wife and two children. He is an active member of his community. He is a leader in the Metropolitan Baptist Church of Largo, MD, and in Washington, DC, and has served as a member, trustee, and now as a deacon.

In terms of his pro bono commitment, Mr. Hazel has been president of his church's legal ministry, where he has assisted members of the church, including many who could not afford lawyers, in obtaining legal representation when they are in need.

He also prepares meals at the church and teaches Sunday school classes.

Mr. Chuang was nominated to fill the vacancy created by Judge Roger Titus when he took senior status in January of this year.

Judge Titus had a very distinguished record and continues to have a very distinguished record in our district court.

Mr. Chuang received his J.D. magna cum laude in 1994 from Harvard Law School and his B.A. summa cum laude in 1991 from Harvard University. He began his legal career as a law clerk for Judge Dorothy W. Nelson in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit from 1994 to 1995. From 1995 to 1998, Mr. Chuang served as a trial attorney in the Civil Rights Division of the U.S. Department of Justice. From 1998 to 2004, Mr. Chuang served as an assistant U.S. attorney in the District of Massachusetts. He spent 3 years in private practice from 2004 to 2007.

He served as a deputy chief investigative counsel for the U.S. House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform from 2007 to 2009. In 2009 he became the chief investigative counsel for the Committee on Energy and Commerce in the House of Representatives. Mr. Chuang currently serves as deputy chief counsel of the U.S. Department of Homeland Security, where he has worked since 2009.

Like Mr. Hazel, Mr. Chuang has devoted his entire professional career to serving the public. He is very much interested in helping this community and, again, he is the type of individual I hope we would all like to see in our district court.

Mr. Chuang has extensive Federal court litigation experience, both civil and criminal cases, including jury trials. He has served in all three branches of government: as clerk, law clerk, congressional investigative counsel, and agency deputy general counsel. The American Bar Association's Standing Committee on the Federal Judiciary gave him a "well qualified" rating. You can see that he has the type of experience and type of sensitivity to understand the appropriate role of a district court judge.

Mr. Chuang lives in Bethesda with his wife and his two children. He is an energetic member of his community. In terms of his pro bono work, he has served on the board of directors of the Asian Pacific American Legal Resource Center, a nonprofit legal services organization that serves low-income, limited-English proficient Asian Americans and immigrants in Maryland, Washington, DC, and Virginia, and which provides legal representation and referral services in cases involving domestic violence, family law, immigration law, employment law, and a variety of other areas.

Mr. Chuang also told us that from approximately 2002 to 2003, as president of the Asian American Lawyers Association of Massachusetts, he oversaw and promoted a project of the organization's Community Service Committee to provide a pro bono legal workshop in Boston's Chinatown, at which attorneys provided general information about immigration law, employment law, and other areas of law that may affect the lives of area residents.

He is committed to helping his community, and he has demonstrated that during his entire professional career.

Mr. Chuang's parents emigrated from Taiwan to the United States seeking freedom and opportunity. I would note that if confirmed, Mr. Chuang would not only be the first Asian-American Federal judge in Maryland but also the first Asian-American Federal judge in the Fourth Circuit, covering five States in the Mid-Atlantic and South.

President Obama nominated these two individuals in September of 2013 and the Judiciary Committee held their confirmation hearings in December of 2013. The Judiciary Committee then favorably reported both nominations in January of this year.

I urge the Senate to confirm these very well-qualified nominees and fill these important vacancies to better serve the people of Maryland.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

JUSTICE FOR ALL REAUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, last year, the Senate came together to pass meaningful legislation that was supported by victims of violence, law enforcement, and those committed to working to end domestic and sexual abuse. That bill, the Leahy-Crapo Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act, had the support of all Senate Democrats and a majority of Senate Republicans. It cleared the Republican House overwhelmingly and it was signed into law 1 year ago. In a divided Congress, this historic reauthorization was made possible because so many victims and service providers stood together to push for a comprehensive bill.

The Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act, which I was proud to co-author with Senator MIKE CRAPO, a Republican from Idaho, strengthens protections on campuses, where far too many students have become victims of devastating violence instead of enjoying the wonderful experience of learning and growth that we all wish for our children. Our bill, which was signed into law last year, ensures that college students are informed of the resources available to them if they are victims of sexual assault or stalking, and of their school's planned response to such crimes.

For women like Laura Dunn, these provisions have real meaning. When many skeptics called for a watered-down VAWA bill to make it easier to pass, champions like Ms. Dunn, a courageous survivor of campus sexual assault, urged us to stand strong for all victims. More than 200 survivors of campus violence at 176 colleges and universities joined her in an open letter to Congress calling for the passage of the Leahy-Crapo VAWA bill. People like her made all the difference in our ability to ultimately pass this important legislation.

One year after its enactment, I am heartened that the Obama administration has begun to implement the Leahy-Crapo VAWA bill and that it announced a series of steps that will help colleges and universities meet new requirements contained in the law. This includes stronger reporting requirements and better training for university officials, more coordination be-

tween campus police and local law enforcement, and the implementation of privacy policies to protect the identity of victims. I can remember the horrific scenes I witnessed when I was a prosecutor in Vermont. I can also remember that I never asked a victim about their nationality, immigration status, religion, sexual orientation, or political affiliation. As I have said countless times, a victim is a victim is a victim. Providing a victim with the services they need in a safe and private environment is common sense and I am glad the Obama administration is making the protections Senator CRAPO and I fought for a reality for students across the country.

We cannot stop there, however, and we should be doing even more to protect all victims of crime. That is why I urge my fellow Senators to support the Justice for All Reauthorization Act. This comprehensive and bipartisan legislation was unanimously approved by the Senate Judiciary Committee in October. The Justice for All Reauthorization Act protects victims of crime by providing them with the resources they need and enhancing protections for crime victims. It also helps to prevent and overturn wrongful convictions, and provides law enforcement with the tools and resources necessary to ensure justice for all.

The Justice for All Act reauthorizes the Debbie Smith DNA Backlog Reduction Act, which has provided significant funding to reduce the backlog of untested rape kits so that victims need not live in fear while rape kits languish in storage. It also strengthens the Kirk Bloodsworth Post Conviction DNA Testing Grant Program, one of the key programs created in the Innocence Protection Act.

Kirk Bloodsworth was a young man just out of the Marines when he was sentenced to death for a heinous crime that he did not commit. He was the first death row inmate in the United States to be exonerated through the use of DNA evidence. There are certainly others out there like Kirk Bloodsworth now, wrongly convicted, waiting for the day when a DNA test will prove their innocence and set them free. We must never stop trying to improve our imperfect criminal justice system, to bring closure to cases swiftly but accurately, and to correct mistakes when they happen.

The Justice for All Act reauthorizes funding for the Paul Coverdell Forensic Science Improvement Grant Program, which assists laboratories in performing the many forensic tests that are essential to solving crimes and prosecuting offenders.

The Justice for All Reauthorization Act is a bipartisan bill that Senator CORNYN and I introduced nearly 1 year ago. All Senate Democrats support passage of this bill, and it is even cosponsored by the minority leader, Senator MCCONNELL, but it has not passed the Senate because some Senate Republicans object. In the face of this obstruction, some would have us pick

apart pieces of the Justice for All Reauthorization Act, with the hope that we can do the other pieces later. To me, to law enforcement, and to countless victims of crime, this is not acceptable. Just last year, we showed the country it was possible to stand with all victims of domestic and sexual violence when we ignored the critics in the House who tried to divide us. When they told us we could only protect some victims, we refused to let them pit survivors of injustice against one another.

By remaining unified in the face of such efforts, this divided Congress was able to pass a historic Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act that for the first time provided key protections for college students, tribal women, and members of the LGBT community. This year, we should again stand by all victims of crime and do what is right by passing a comprehensive Justice for All Reauthorization Act. We should not let the House of Representatives lessen our resolve to reauthorize public safety programs widely supported by crime victims and law enforcement.

I remain steadfast in my resolve to get this done. I know every Senate Democrat shares this resolve, and I know that law enforcement, civil rights leaders, victims groups, and countless others feel the same way. I hope Senate Republicans will join us to pass meaningful legislation that supports all victims of crime and upholds our system of justice. We should stand united for all victims. I urge all senators, and particularly those in the Republican Caucus, to clear the Justice for All Act without further delay.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Iowa.

NOMINATION OF THEODORE CHUANG

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I am going to talk for a few minutes on one of the nominations we have today, the nomination of Theodore Chuang to be district judge for Maryland. This nomination was voted out of committee on a 10-to-8 vote. I opposed the nomination in committee, and I would urge my colleagues to do the same today. I can't support the nomination because of the central role Mr. Chuang played in the administration's persistent and steadfast stonewalling of the congressional investigation into the attack on our diplomatic mission in Benghazi on September 11, 2012. That attack resulted in the first murder of a sitting U.S. Ambassador in over 30 years. Three other brave Americans serving their country were killed in Benghazi as well.

As we all know too well, just hours after the fighting had ended, this administration—in the middle of a Presidential campaign at the time—rushed to blame the attack on an obscure Internet video. The administration denied what was already clear: that what had happened at Benghazi was a pre-

meditated terrorist attack that had nothing to do with any video. The CIA's Libya station chief and other administration officials immediately recognized and reported that the attack was an act of terror, not a spontaneous demonstration. The American people demanded answers. Congress demanded answers as well. But the administration has systematically stonewalled our ability to get those answers. That is where this nominee's role comes into play.

Following the Benghazi attack, Mr. Chuang left his position at the Department of Homeland Security to undertake a special detail at the State Department. His job at the State Department was to provide legal guidance and manage the Department's responses to the congressional investigation into a terrorist attack.

For months the State Department ignored congressional inquiries. That forced the House Oversight & Government Reform Committee to issue subpoenas in August 2013. Mr. Chuang received those duly issued subpoenas but continued the administration's policies of systematic stonewalling.

So let me be very clear. The State Department has never asserted that the emails, the documents or witness interviews conducted by the Benghazi Accountability Review Board are protected by executive privilege. The State Department has never asserted any privilege justifying its refusal to disclose documents responsive to these subpoenas. The State Department has never provided any legal basis whatsoever for its continued stonewalling of this investigation.

So following Mr. Chuang's nomination hearing before our Judiciary Committee, I asked him several questions for the record about why the State Department refused to comply with its legal obligation to respond to the subpoenas. Mr. Chuang, who was in charge of coordinating the State Department's responses, couldn't come up with a legal basis. Instead, he cited only "institutional concerns."

That ought not be a good enough answer for what is a legitimate role of oversight by the Congress, trying to get answers to legitimate questions. In other words, abstract "institutional concerns" does not permit the executive branch to toss a congressional subpoena into the garbage.

Benghazi raises questions of vital national importance that to this very day remain unanswered. They remain unanswered because this administration refuses to honor its legal obligations to comply with the congressional oversight that is being done through the extraordinary measure of subpoena. The American people deserve better and so do we. We are members of co-equal branches of the Federal Government.

But the Benghazi scandal isn't simply going to go away. In fact, just this week additional emails came to light demonstrating that the White House

led a coordinated messaging effort on Benghazi from the very beginning.

This is what one of the emails said: It was the administration's goal "to underscore that these protests are rooted in an Internet video and not a broader failure of policy."

That quotation is from an email sent by the administration's Deputy National Security Advisor on September 14, 2012—2 days after the attack. That email was sent even though officials on the ground in Libya had reported that the attack was an act of terror.

Some have called this email the smoking gun, proving that the administration intentionally misled the American people about the terrorist attack, but no matter how this email is characterized, it was clearly responsive to congressional subpoenas and does not seem to have been produced until a government watchdog group filed a Freedom of Information lawsuit seeking to compel the administration to comply.

So let me be clear. From what we know now, it took a Freedom of Information Act request and an ensuing lawsuit to force the State Department to produce documents that were obviously related to the terror attack at Benghazi, and this is the case even though the House committee made multiple requests for those documents and then issued subpoenas compelling their production.

I am sure Mr. Chuang thought he was doing his duty to zealously represent his client when he was managing the document subpoenas the State Department received from Congress, but his role in coordinating administrative responses was plainly unsatisfactory and unacceptable and something that goes against the grain of an administration that on day two of their administration—in other words, January 21, 2009—said this was going to be the most transparent administration in the history of the country.

We should demand more and expect more respect for congressional oversight. For this reason I have decided to oppose this nomination, a nomination that was reported out of committee on a 10-to-8 vote.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOOKER). The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise to speak on the nominations related to the cloture vote of Theodore Chuang and George Hazel.

Senator CARDIN and I are recommending these two outstanding men to serve on the U.S. district court in Maryland. Senator CARDIN and I are proud to nominate these men because of the outstanding qualities they will bring to the Federal bench in Maryland that has had a long and distinguished career of absolutely fantastic judges.

We have before us two Maryland judges who will be taking a different status—Judge Titus and Judge Williams. Judge Williams served in the Southern District of the Maryland Federal court—and we salute those two for

their outstanding service. On another day I will say what a great job they have done.

Senator CARDIN and I take our responsibilities for recommending to the President the people of the highest caliber to serve as judges. We believe very strongly in the concept of an independent judiciary, people who will bring to the bench absolute integrity, judicial competence and temperament, a commitment to the core constitutional principles that have made our country great, and also though a history of civic engagement in Maryland—because a judge is not how many Law Review articles they write but can they administer equal justice and continue to honor equal protection under the law. Mr. Chuang and Mr. Hazel meet and exceed these standards.

Mr. Hazel comes with an incredible background. He served as an assistant U.S. attorney to the district court of Maryland. He has been the southern division coordinator on tough issues such as Project Exile, a Federal-State partnership addressing gun and violent crimes in Prince George's County and surrounding areas. He spent 5 years in private practice at Weil, Gotshal & Manges. He is also a man of faith, involved deeply in his church, Metropolitan Baptist Church, where he serves as a deacon.

Most recently, he has worked with the Baltimore State's attorneys office. The Baltimore State's attorney's office faced a lot of challenges. It faced dated technology and difficulties in maintaining chain of custody on evidence. He came in to work with our new State's attorney, which is an elected position, and he is a real reformer. So whether you were a prosecutor or you were a defendant, you knew it was going to be one of the best well-organized offices in Maryland.

Hazel brought that kind of know-how to make sure the apparatus of government worked because that was all part of making sure people got equal justice: Did we have the right guy when we were a prosecutor? Did we have the right evidence? Did the prosecutor have the right tools? Did the public defender or their private counsel have the opportunity to provide the defense of them? We have been able to do that. Also, working in his church he has shown he has been available to provide all kinds of pro bono services.

He is a graduate of a distinguished law school and he is a Morehouse man. I think when he takes the Federal bench and takes that oath, we are going to be proud of the service he does.

Then there is Mr. Chuang, the one who has been under dispute today. Gosh, I wish the whole Senate could meet him as well as Mr. Hazel. This is a new generation coming into the Maryland Federal judiciary. Mr. Chuang's parents and his own story is that of the American dream.

Mr. Chuang's parents came with practically nothing from Taiwan seek-

ing the American dream and a better life for their family. He worked very hard and then went on to some of our most distinguished schools. He went to Harvard Law School and Harvard University. He was a summa cum laude undergraduate and named by Time magazine as one of the high achievers. At Harvard, he was with the Law Review. But as I said, it is not how many Law Review articles one writes; it is, do they right wrongs in our society.

Yes, he has served at the U.S. Department of Homeland Security; yes, he has worked in government positions; yes, he has worked in private practice at Wilmer Cutler; yes, he has been at the Department of Justice; and, yes, he did provide legal counsel to the State Department. I am going to talk about that.

First of all, I am kind of tired of this Benghazi witch hunt stuff, but I am not going to go into that. I respect my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. Congress has a right to oversight.

But let me make the record clear: Mr. Chuang's role during his temporary assignment was as legal counsel providing legal advice and representation to his client. His client was the State Department. Although he provided legal advice related to the House Committee on Oversight & Government Reform, he did not have decisionmaking authority over whether to provide subpoenaed documents to the committee. That was at higher levels. If the committee had a beef with the State Department, they should have taken it up with the Secretary of the State, which I know they did.

During his 6-month detail, the State Department produced a vast majority of documents and witnesses requested by the HOCR.

In the case of the subpoena in question—which was for internal files of the independent Accountability Review Board that conducted the Benghazi investigation—the State Department agreed to produce most of the documents but has to date declined to produce memoranda of interviews of State Department personnel because disclosure of those witness statements may chill cooperation in future ARBs. Although State offered to discuss alternative means of serving the committee's request, the House Committee on Oversight & Government Reform has not actively engaged the State Department on this since the fall of 2013.

Opposition to Mr. Chuang's nomination will have no impact on whether the State Department produces the documents, and he is not a State Department employee.

So I respect my colleagues for wanting to have cooperation. I don't dispute whether they have a legitimate grievance. I leave that in that field and domain, but I would say Mr. Chuang's role was that of a civil servant, providing advice to the leadership of the State Department on this matter. Then the State Department's job, at its highest level, was to negotiate with the

House Committee on Oversight & Government Reform, chaired by Mr. Issa and the ranking member, our very good colleague Congressman CUMMINGS of Baltimore.

So if we are going to vote against Chuang because the Secretary of State did or did not do something, I think we have other problems.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I ask for 1 additional minute to summarize.

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

Ms. MIKULSKI. If we continue to attack people because of the job they did for which they had no decision about, we are going to have a chilling effect on who comes into government.

If these two men whom I am recommending and whom the President has nominated were in private practice, they could be making hundreds of thousands of dollars. Because these two men are duty-driven, with outstanding educations, backgrounds, and experience, they have chosen public service. I hope the Senate chooses them to serve on the Federal bench. This body is going to be very proud of them the way Senator CARDIN and I are in bringing them to the floor's attention. I urge that we invoke cloture.

I yield the floor and ask that we follow regular order.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Theodore David Chuang, of Maryland, to be United States District Judge for the District of Maryland.

Harry Reid, Patrick J. Leahy, Elizabeth Warren, Robert Menendez, Barbara Mikulski, Jack Reed, Richard Blumenthal, Carl Levin, Christopher Murphy, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Sheldon Whitehouse, Patty Murray, Thomas R. Carper, John D. Rockefeller IV, Jeff Merkley, Richard J. Durbin, Benjamin L. Cardin.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today, we are again voting to overcome Republican filibusters of three highly qualified judicial nominees. Republicans

continue to refuse to consent to vote on much needed judges to our Federal Judiciary. We currently stand at 80 vacancies and have not had fewer than 60 vacancies since February 2009, at the beginning of President Obama's first term. For most of President Obama's tenure in office, judicial vacancies have continued to hover around 80 and 90 because of Senate Republican obstruction. Nevertheless, Senate Republicans continue to object to votes on these nominations. This includes the three nominations that we are voting on today.

Nancy Moritz has been nominated to serve on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit. Justice Moritz is currently a justice on the Kansas Supreme Court, where she has been serving since 2011. Prior to joining the Kansas Supreme Court, she was an appellate judge on the Kansas Court of Appeals from 2004 to 2011. Before becoming a judge, Justice Moritz spent nearly ten years as an assistant U.S. attorney in the Kansas City and Topeka offices. From 1989 till 1995, she was an associate at Spencer, Fane Britt & Browne, LLP in Kansas City and Overland Park. From 1987 to 1989, she served as a law clerk to the Honorable Patrick F. Kelly, U.S. District Court for the District of Kansas. Justice Moritz has the support of her Republican home state senators, Senator ROBERTS and Senator MORAN. She was also reported from the Judiciary Committee unanimously by voice vote on January 16, 2014.

Theodore Chuang has been nominated to serve on the U.S. District Court for the District of Maryland. Since 2009, Mr. Chuang has served in the Office of General Counsel at the Department of Homeland Security. He currently serves as deputy general counsel and as counsel on detail to the U.S. Department of State. Previously, Mr. Chuang served as the chief investigative counsel for the House Committee on Energy and Commerce and the deputy chief investigative counsel for the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reforms from 2007 to 2009. From 2004 to 2007, Mr. Chuang worked in private practice as a counsel at the law firm Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP. Prior to that, Mr. Chuang served as an assistant U.S. attorney, Criminal Division, for the District of Massachusetts from 1998 to 2004 and as a trial attorney in the Housing and Civil Enforcement Section of the Justice Department from 1995 to 1998. Upon graduating from Harvard Law School, magna cum laude, Mr. Chuang served as a law clerk to Judge Dorothy W. Nelson on the Ninth Circuit U.S. Court of Appeals from 1994 to 1995.

Mr. Chuang has the support of his home State Senators, Senator MIKULSKI and Senator CARDIN. He was voted out of the Judiciary Committee on a 10-8 vote on January 16, 2014. During the committee vote, the ranking member urged others to vote "No" based on

the fact that Mr. Chuang has been serving on temporary detail to the State Department and has been working with the agency to assist in its response to the ongoing congressional investigation into Benghazi. The ranking member argued that because the administration has refused to turn over interview notes and summaries that he would vote "No" on Mr. Chuang's nomination. This appears to be a case where Mr. Chuang is being held responsible for the decisions of the administration not to turn over the documents when it was not his decision to make. Moreover, Mr. Chuang has responded to the ranking member's Question for the RECORD on this issue fully and forthrightly, and nothing in those responses indicates that Mr. Chuang has conducted himself improperly in any way. Mr. Chuang is a superbly qualified attorney with an impeccable background, and should be supported by the entire Senate.

George Hazel has been nominated to the U.S. District Court for the District of Maryland. Since 2010, he has served as the chief deputy State's attorney for the office of the Maryland State's attorney for Baltimore City. Prior to taking this position, he was an assistant U.S. attorney for the district of Maryland from 2008 to 2010 and for the District of Columbia from 2005 to 2008. From 1999 to 2004, Mr. Hazel also served in private practice at the law firm Weil, Gotshal and Manges, LLP. An experienced trial counsel, Mr. Hazel has tried approximately 50 cases to verdict. Mr. Hazel also has the support of his home State senators, Senator MIKULSKI and Senator CARDIN. He was reported from the Judiciary Committee unanimously by voice vote on January 16, 2014.

All three of these nominees have the experience, judgment, and legal acumen to be terrific judges in our Federal courts. Let us end these unnecessary filibusters. I thank the majority leader for filing cloture petitions and I hope my fellow Senators will join me today to end these filibusters so that these nominees can get working on behalf of the American people.

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 nomination of Theodore David Chuang, of Maryland, to be United States District Judge for the District of Maryland, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN).

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 54, nays 43, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 124 Ex.]

YEAS—54

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

NAYS—43

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

NOT VOTING—3

Boozman	Rockefeller	Tester
---------	-------------	--------

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote the yeas are 54, the nays are 43. The motion is agreed to.

NOMINATION OF THEODORE DAVID CHUANG TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Theodore David Chuang, of Maryland, to be United States District Judge for the District of Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, has the clerk reported the nomination?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination has been reported.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I yield back all time.

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

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of George Jarrod Hazel, of Maryland, to be

United States District Judge for the District of Maryland.

Harry Reid, Patrick J. Leahy, Elizabeth Warren, Robert Menendez, Barbara Mikulski, Jack Reed, Richard Blumenthal, Carl Levin, Christopher Murphy, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Sheldon Whitehouse, Patty Murray, Thomas R. Carper, John D. Rockefeller IV, Jeff Merkley, Richard J. Durbin, Benjamin L. Cardin.

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 nomination of George Jarrod Hazel, of Maryland, to be United States District Judge for the District of Maryland, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN).

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 55, nays 42, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 125 Ex.]

YEAS—55

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

NAYS—42

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

NOT VOTING—3

Boozman	Sanders	Tester
---------	---------	--------

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote the yeas are 55, the nays are 42. The motion is agreed to.

NOMINATION OF GEORGE JARROD HAZEL TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of George Jarrod Hazel, of Maryland, to be United States District Judge for the District of Maryland.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to yield back all time before the vote.

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

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Nancy L. Moritz, of Kansas, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Tenth Circuit.

Harry Reid, Patrick J. Leahy, Dianne Feinstein, John D. Rockefeller IV, Debbie Stabenow, Barbara Mikulski, Carl Levin, Benjamin L. Cardin, Tom Harkin, Amy Klobuchar, Barbara Boxer, Patty Murray, Jack Reed, Robert Menendez, Sheldon Whitehouse, Christopher A. Coons, Richard J. Durbin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Nancy L. Moritz, of Kansas, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Tenth Circuit, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) is necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN).

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 60, nays 38, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 126 Ex.]

YEAS—60

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

NAYS—38

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

NOT VOTING—2

Boozman	Tester
---------	--------

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote the yeas are 60, the nays are 38. The motion is agreed to.

NOMINATION OF NANCY L. MORITZ TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE TENTH CIRCUIT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Nancy L. Moritz, of Kansas, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Tenth Circuit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. I ask unanimous consent that the time until 1:45 p.m. be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

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

HIGHWAY TRUST FUND

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, the Highway Trust Fund is a vital resource for States to tackle much-needed transportation projects. But right now that trust fund is running on fumes. States from Vermont to California and many in between are rethinking their plans for construction because of funding uncertainty in the Highway Trust Fund. One example is New Mexico. Their State officials are starting to ramp up construction plans for Interstate 25 in Albuquerque. That project has been a high priority for city officials for a number of years. Once it is completed, it is going to reduce traffic and improve safety. That is vital for that area. But right now State officials in New Mexico have said they are concerned about Federal funding for that project and it now might be in jeopardy.

That is not an isolated case. The trust fund supports transportation projects across our entire country. It eases congestion for our commuters and for businesses that need to move their goods efficiently and quickly. It funds safety initiatives and construction that improves our roads and bridges. It sparks job creation for American workers.

But the Department of Transportation now says that trust fund will not be able to keep up with its payments to States as soon as this summer. This crisis is right around the corner. Many States are now planning for worst-case scenarios. In fact, the State of Missouri has stopped planning for

new projects. In Colorado, a State official has said: Without these funds, major projects probably will not be completed or ever get underway.

Arkansas has begun planning several projects to replace old bridges and widen highways and repair roads, but now, their transportation officials have put 10 projects on hold because of this looming crisis.

Construction is at its height during our summer months. So if the Highway Trust Fund hits a crisis in the next few months, we could potentially see a construction shutdown, meaning workers are going to be left without paychecks.

That could add up to 10,000 jobs in Florida, according to the President of the Florida Transportation Builders Association. Across the country, failing to shore up our Highway Trust Fund could cost more than 180,000 jobs in fiscal year 2015. That is according to an analysis from the Center for American Progress.

In Kentucky, Governor Steve Beshear summed it up by telling reporters: "We can't afford for the Highway Trust Fund to go insolvent." States and workers are counting on us to solve this. I am hopeful that we can replenish the Highway Trust Fund in a bipartisan way. In fact, House Republican DAVE CAMP, who chairs the Ways and Means Committee, has proposed using corporate revenue to replenish the Highway Trust Fund.

President Obama's Grow America Act also calls for corporate revenue to address this crisis and make important investments in our infrastructure. That approach makes a lot of sense. Closing wasteful loopholes so we can create jobs here at home would be good for our workers, good for our economy, and it would make our broken tax system fairer in the process. I am here today to say I am hoping that Republicans will come to the table willing to close just a few corporate loopholes so we can avoid an unnecessary crisis in our Highway Trust Fund, so that we can give our States more certainty to plan and we can help spark job growth in the summer.

But if Republicans are not willing to work with us, they are going to have to explain why egregious corporate tax loopholes are more important than workers in our construction industry and more important than drivers and businesses that rely every day on safe roads and bridges.

I am here to say and to warn that construction projects are at risk across our country. Another example happens to be in New Hampshire, where construction crews have been working on a major project to widen Interstate 93. That project was designed to ease congestion and improve safety. Last month the State transportation commissioner said the project could be stalled and thrown off schedule if Congress does not resolve the Highway Trust Fund crisis. He said, "Any hiccup in federal funding could have a negative impact on the ending."

For many States this looming crisis is already a reality. We have to act now. So let's show our States that together we will continue to invest in projects that help drivers and help businesses move their goods, and let's show the American people that Congress can work together to ensure vital transportation construction projects will move forward this summer. Let's shore up that Highway Trust Fund and avoid this unnecessary and totally preventable crisis.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CAMPAIGN FINANCE

Mr. COONS. Madam President, I come to the floor today to speak about the corrupting power of money in our national politics and the tragic impact of a whole series of decisions by the Supreme Court that has steadily strengthened that power.

Over the last 40 years a bipartisan coalition in this body and bipartisan coalitions in Congress have come together behind commonsense measures that actually succeeded in limiting the power of money in politics. Most recently, back in 2002, a bipartisan coalition in this Chamber led by Senators JOHN MCCAIN and Russ Feingold, Republican and Democrat, took a few steps to effectively limit the use of so-called "soft money" and to ban special interests from pouring money into national elections in the month or two before Election Day.

As actual elected representatives, their perspective as Members of Congress who enacted that legislation was informed by their real experience as public officials who have run and won elections and who have written, fought for, and passed actual legislation.

Since Members of this Chamber, Members of this Congress, have seen and experienced the corrosive effect of money every day, Congress, in my view, should be given great deference when it has been able to transcend partisan division and put in place commonsense protections.

Yet over the past few years a bare majority on the current Supreme Court has, in decision after decision, dismantled many of those critical protections and shows no signs of stopping.

In doing so, this Court's decisions display a significant and stunning naivete about how our political system actually works and how it is continuing to change and as a result have brought us closer to a world where, as a recent New Republic piece argues, "millionaires and billionaires speak loudly and the rest of us do the listening."

Most recently, in a 5-to-4 decision, the Supreme Court struck down a limit

that has stood since 1971, when Congress passed the Federal Elections Campaign Act, on total campaign donations anyone may make in the same election cycle.

Before this recent Supreme Court ruling, individuals couldn't give more than \$117,000 between candidates and party committees. After the ruling, that limitation has been swept away, and there is nothing to stop a wealthy donor, an ultrawealthy donor, from contributing to every Federal race each election cycle.

Some here have cheered the decision as upholding the First Amendment and free speech, but in my view, when you are able to spread around hundreds of thousands of dollars in donations to dozens and dozens of candidates in a coordinated way, you are not speaking, you are coming dangerously close to buying.

For ultradonors, the reality is not just about making their voices heard. Under existing Supreme Court precedent under these recent decisions, there is no limit on anybody's ability to spend whatever amounts he or she wishes to conduct actual speech, to buy newspaper ads, buy television spots, or even to make a politically motivated movie.

The reality is it is about trying to control more and more of the legislative agenda of this Congress and more and more of the direction of our government.

In *McCutcheon*, this recently decided case, the Supreme Court hasn't just enabled speech, it has made it dramatically easier for the wealthiest and the special interests they represent to hedge their bets by diversifying their political portfolio. It has more in common, sadly, with Wall Street investment strategies than with the free speech rights envisioned by our Founders at the Constitutional Convention.

Frankly, I think the Founders would not recognize our political system today and the increasingly harsh influence of big-money donors in our overall national political scene.

Together with the *Citizens United* decision of the Supreme Court of 5 years ago, we see the truly dangerous implications of the decisions rendered. One of the boldest decisions I have ever seen—*Citizens United*, with another 5-4 decision—killed off nearly half of that bipartisan compromise bill of 2002 of McCain-Feingold by allowing corporations and other special interests to anonymously fund campaign ads in the months before an election.

In doing so, as Justice Stevens wrote in a dissent, the Supreme Court "relied largely on individual dissenting opinions. . . . blaz[ing] through our precedents [and] overruling or disavowing a body of case law."

Justice Stevens noted that to do so the Court decided a question the parties did not present directly to it, saying:

Essentially, five justices were unhappy with the limited nature of the case brought

before us, so they changed the case to give themselves an opportunity to change the law.

I understand this is a dissent, but a dissent that I think should draw our attention to the direction these two vital, difficult Court decisions are taking this Nation.

Soon after the Supreme Court extended these rules to State campaign finance laws as well. In combination these two decisions, *McCutcheon* and *Citizens United*, have brushed aside important bipartisan legislation that was designed to prevent corruption of the political branches and to provide Americans some level of confidence that their voices, not just those of the ultrawealthy and powerful, mattered to their elected representatives. We have all seen the impact of this decision, of *Citizens United* in particular, as commercials by groups nobody has ever heard of, funded by donors who can remain in the dark, have flooded the airwaves of our election years ever since.

Earlier I mentioned that these two decisions show a stunning naivete about how politics in our modern world really works. Let me be clear I don't say this because the Supreme Court overturned a law that Congress passed. It is the Court's job to be a check on Congress to defend our fundamental freedoms in the face of congressional overreach or improvident action. But in the *McCutcheon* decision, the Court overturned a core holding of its own previous decision in *Buckley v. Valeo*, the case it purports to apply. As Justice Breyer wrote in dissent in *McCutcheon*, the Court's holding:

understates the importance of protecting the political integrity of our governmental institutions. It creates a loophole that . . . taken together with *Citizens United* . . . eviscerates our Nation's campaign finance laws, leaving a remnant incapable of dealing with the grave problems of democratic legitimacy that those very laws were intended to resolve.

For instance, in the Court's decisions, it consistently refers to traditional political corruption as *quid pro quo* corruption, corruption of the sort where a specific contribution is made for a specific vote or action in arguing that campaign donations and political spending or speech have shown no signs of leading to corruption. The majority argues that campaign giving and the "general gratitude" that a candidate or elected official may feel is not the same thing as *quid pro quo* corruption in the sense of directly buying votes or action in the Congress.

But as Justice Breyer notes in his opinion in *McCutcheon* in the dissent, the majority's:

narrow view of corruption . . . excludes efforts to obtain "influence over access to elected officials or political parties."

Every single Member of this body and every Member of the House of Representatives knows that to be true and knows this influence to be pernicious. Let me give an example. As many of my colleagues would attest, hanging

over everything we do is the shadow of anonymous big-money ads getting dropped into the airwaves out of nowhere in the last weeks before an election, and it influences, in pervasive and corruptive ways, decisions made in this body week in and week out.

Of course, tough opposition ads are nothing new. Robust debates in campaign season go back to the very first campaigns of this Republic. As politicians, we all welcome the opportunity to those who engage to disagree with them. That is an important and healthy part of our democracy, and every citizen should have the right to voice their opposition to me or to any Member.

But what is a huge problem is the fact that nobody knows who is behind these ads, making it easier for any wealthy individual or corporation to pour an unlimited amount of money into a race behind completely false attacks. Because the donor is often in the dark, there is no way for the public to know who the claims are coming from or whether they are credible.

That is why in this Chamber folks in my caucus, Democrats, have repeatedly argued for our taking up and passing the DISCLOSE Act, which would require third-party ads to say who funded them so that citizens can reach their own conclusions.

This is an increasingly difficult problem for our country. In the 2010 election cycle, super PACs spent more than \$62 million nationally. Through the 2012 cycle, outside groups spent an incredible \$457 million on House and Senate races. So far in this cycle they have already raised and spent more than \$200 million.

The result is that every campaign has to do more and more fundraising so they have the resources to rebut the claims made in these negative ads with concealed donors. That means more time on the phone or at fundraisers, traveling around the country, organizing and carrying out fundraising activities rather than engaging with our constituents and diving into details of policy. It is even worse in the House where the daily demands in their 2-year cycle are even more difficult.

Let me offer one brief statistic. In the average winning Senate race in 2012, it cost \$10 million, which means the winning Senator had to raise \$4,600 every single day over a 6-year term.

That is time not spent on solving the real issues facing our country. That is an unbelievable amount of time dedicated to fundraising, and it just doesn't end, whether the term is 2 or 6 years.

I know I have it relatively easy, little to complain about. Compared to my colleagues I come from a small State. The very modest amount we have to raise in a competitive race in Delaware pales in comparison to much larger States with much more expensive media markets, but it is a problem for this entire body and this entire country.

Let me offer one last example of concretely why this matters. As we debate

in the Senate, the other party complains about the absence of opportunities to offer amendments and the lack of a robust and open amendment process. One of the reasons we often do not take to the floor and vote on competitive, compelling amendments is the concern that they will then become the subject of last-minute, aggressive, targeted campaign ads funded by undisclosed donors. Rather than being a Chamber of honest, open, and free debate, the shadow of secret money turns policymaking into a beacon of risk aversion. Policymaking gets paralyzed and this serves no one.

Although it is not an example of corruption in the *quid pro quo* sense that the Supreme Court so narrowly focuses on, money does corrode the public trust and steadily corrupts this system in a thousand different ways. The irony of this all is that we badly need an honest discussion about the impact of big spending and fundraising on our political system. At this point I believe we badly need fundamental changes to redirect the decisions and the attention of the Supreme Court.

Buckley v. Valeo, the 1976 decision by the Court that equated political contributions and money with speech, in my view needs to be revisited. Senator UDALL of New Mexico has introduced a constitutional amendment that, in my view, restores the balance of that original law and decision, and it is one that I strongly support. By bending backward to declare anything that corporations or the ultrawealthy wish to do with their money the equivalent of speech, today's Court, in my view, rather than strengthening speech, has weakened it for the millions of Americans who cannot afford to play in this new system.

At a time of growing economic inequality, that concerns me more and more because this new political inequality threatens the very foundations of our democracy.

Noting the presence of two other colleagues, I would ask if I might have the forbearance of two brief speeches recognizing Delawareans.

I appreciate the forbearance of my colleagues and would like to take a few minutes to recognize two great Delawareans.

TRIBUTE TO HARRY GRAVELL

I wish to recognize Harry Gravel.

Right now in Wilmington, DE, friends will be coming to celebrate Harry, who is retiring from his long leadership role of the Delaware Building Trades Council after a lifetime dedicated to workers and our Nation.

I first got to know him in my service on the county council in New Castle County, where he gave me very helpful, very insightful advice, and was a constant source of encouragement and support.

Don't get me wrong. He didn't always agree with me. He didn't always support me. With Harry you got a straight shot. You got exactly what he thought and nothing less. You always knew

where he stood even if he disagreed with you. He is transparent, he is honest, and you know why he believes what he believes.

He is not only a great friend but a great father. We were both honored in 2012 by the Delaware chapter of the American Diabetes Association as fathers of the year. Harry is the proud father of two: Jayme and Dee, and grandfather of three: Makayla, Avery, and Lily.

Harry's life story is one of determination and service. He never gives up, especially when he puts his mind to something. From an early age he knew the value of hard work. For high school he went to the Salesianum School, a great school in our community, and worked his way through school to make sure he could afford a great education.

A Vietnam veteran, he served our country in wartime. Since he came home, he has never stopped fighting for working families and veterans, and I was particularly proud to work with him in his role in the Sprinkler Fitters Union, then on the Building Trades Council on Helmets to Hardhats, on offering training and real job opportunities to returning veterans.

If you know Harry, you have seen his drive up close. You have seen him fight through thick and thin for his workers, his family, and our community.

But perhaps the greatest example of his sheer will was his most recent fight. He suffered a stroke a few months ago. Doctors read him a long list of things he was never going to do. Harry scoffed. Digging in, as he has his entire life, he finished his physical and occupation therapy faster than doctors thought he could. He has just finished building a house in Lewes. Everyone who knows him I believe will agree with me that he deserves the years he will now get to spend on the beautiful beaches of Delaware.

REMEMBERING JAMES WILCOX BROWN

Let me last briefly offer a tribute to a lifelong friend and mentor, James Wilcox Brown of Newark, DE. He set sail on April 24 at the age of 65. The gentle determination and unconditional kindness with which he lived his life inspired all around him, including his family, his friends, and this junior Senator from Delaware.

Jim graduated from Salesianum School, the University of Delaware, and the Washington and Lee University School of Law. He worked as legal counsel for W.L. Gore & Associates for 36 years. He served as a member of the U.S. Army Judge Advocate General Corps for 26 years, retiring as colonel.

His tireless community service was broad and deeply felt. I was proud to be able to appoint him to the Delaware Service Academy Selection Board.

He is survived by his wife Peggy and their four wonderful children: Genevieve, Hilary, William, Mary Ellen, and six grandchildren. I simply wanted to add my voice to so many who will deeply miss this patriot, this great lawyer,

this centered, thoughtful, kind man, and this personal friend who helped teach me the importance of humility and of a commitment to excellence.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

ARKANSAS STORM

Mr. PRYOR. I come to the floor with a psalm and a story. The psalm I want to read is one of the most famous passages in all of Scripture. In times such as this that Arkansas has been through, a lot of people go to Ecclesiastes or one of the gospels, but I want to read Psalms 23—and I will tell you why in a moment.

The Lord is my shepherd; I shall not want. He maketh me to lie down in green pastures: he leadeth me beside the still waters.

He restoreth my soul: he leadeth me in the paths of righteousness for his name's sake.

Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil: for thou art with me; thy rod and thy staff they comfort me.

Thou preparest a table before me in the presence of mine enemies; thou anointest my head with oil; my cup runneth over.

Surely goodness and mercy shall follow me all the days of my life, and I will dwell in the house of the Lord forever.

Madam President, on Sunday, April 27, 2014, at about 7:06 p.m., a tornado touched down right on the Saline and Pulaski County lines, just west of Little Rock. It stayed on the ground for about an hour, crossed the Arkansas River, crossed right near a little town called Mayflower. The weather service now tells us it was an EF-4. That means it had a wind speed of up to 190 miles per hour—190 miles per hour. We lost 15 Arkansans, and we will never forget them. We love them and their families, and we will miss them. It is a great loss to each and every Arkansan and really each and every American: Paula Blakemore of El Paso; Mark Bradley of Mayflower; Jamye Collins of Vilonia; Helen Greer of Mayflower; Jeffrey Hunter of Vilonia; Dennis Laverne of Vilonia; Glenna Laverne of Vilonia; David Mallory of Vilonia; Robert Oliver of Mayflower; Cameron Smith of Vilonia; Tyler Smith of Vilonia; Rob Tittle of Paron; Rebekah Tittle of Paron; Tori Tittle of Paron; and Daniel Wassom of Vilonia. As you can see and hear from those names, a lot of these were family members and obviously members of a few communities in my State.

I wish to thank my colleagues first because many called and reached out in various ways. Some covered meetings for me. In fact, Senator JACK REED of Rhode Island actually covered a military promotion ceremony, which was really special for me—and for him to do—and special for everyone involved. So I thank him for that. Many of my colleagues have offered to help.

We also had people from outside Arkansas who reached out. I know our Governor fielded calls from a number of other Governors from around the country. Our emergency management people have been contacted by other emergency management folks.

Another phenomenon that has happened in our State—we neighbor several States that have gone through this before. One of those is Missouri, and I see my colleague from Missouri here in the Chamber today. People from Missouri came down to help. People from Oklahoma came down and helped. Of course, we helped those States in their time of need, so it was reassuring and so appreciated that those folks, those previous storm victims came to Arkansas and helped us. We really do mean that, and we appreciate it very much.

Federal officials reached out. I was in the car with our Governor Mike Beebe when President Obama called him. That meant a lot. They were able to work through some of those Federal-State issues immediately, right there on the phone. That was great. Of course, Secretary Jay Johnson called the Governor, and I talked to him actually that same day. He is trying to come to Arkansas in the next few days, and I hope he will be able to make it. Craig Fugate, Director of FEMA, came in the very next day, and we appreciate Director Fugate and the resources FEMA brings and the attention to our State.

One of the things we recognize is that the work is just beginning. I see my colleague from Louisiana, and I don't know of anyone in this Chamber who better understands about recovering from a widespread disaster.

I thank and acknowledge the thousands of Arkansans who made a difference.

One of the underappreciated groups I want to mention—they probably don't get enough notoriety, even though this may sound kind of silly—is the TV weather people. As soon as the storms were in the area, they broke from their normal broadcasting and they went with wall-to-wall coverage. I talked to so many folks in Mayflower, Vilonia, and other areas who said: Hey, we watched on TV, and we could see exactly where that storm was, and that is what saved us because we knew it was coming.

The sirens were going. I was at a dinner with some friends of mine in Little Rock, and we heard the sirens, we heard the weather radio go off, and sure enough we turned on the television and we watched it too, just like everyone else.

The Department of Emergency Management has been off-the-charts good. There is a man there named David Maxwell who unfortunately has a lot of experience with this, but ADEM has been phenomenal. We have a system in Arkansas called Code Red, and that got activated and worked very well. The various elected officials—the county judges, et cetera—all came together.

We also, obviously, had first responders who rolled in immediately, and that was great. General Wofford of the Arkansas National Guard activated 54 guardsmen. They showed up and did their duty. And it is so reassuring to the communities when they see those

men and women in uniform. First, they know they have a lot of training and a lot of experience, and it stabilizes things.

The other thing I noticed when I pulled up was that there were police cars and firetrucks and everything from what seemed like every jurisdiction in Arkansas. So it was really great to see that.

Some of the unsung heroes in this are just everyday, ordinary Arkansans, just everyday citizens. They came and brought their chainsaws. They checked their kids out of school to go help, and they rolled out and really streamed in to help.

There are really too many other folks to mention from some of the State agencies that are really underappreciated—the Arkansas Game and Fish Commission; the Forestry Commission, which had people there clearing the way and knocking down things; the highway department; the utilities. As always, the utilities sprung into action. Even though power was down for a pretty good while—I think we had about 35,000 customers or so without power for a little while, but the utilities people got that taken care of. They got their folks from other States to come in, as we do. Entergy is our largest single electric utility in the State, and they brought people in from other States and got their contractors going.

I noticed also the churches. The churches really are prepared for this. It is part of their mission. I did notice the State Baptist Convention has what they call a mobile mass feeding unit. In the first 3 days they fed 4,300 hot meals in Vilonia alone. I don't know what else they were doing in other places, but it was great for the volunteers who were helping and also the families there to be able to go and get a hot meal. Of course, the Salvation Army and Red Cross—all of them really rolled out and helped.

Again, these two Senators who are here in the Chamber with me today have been through these tragedies before. They know the insurance industry rolls out and sets up temporary units. I saw lots of insurance folks with clipboards and cameras and all the things they needed.

The wireless companies came and put up temporary towers because a lot of those were knocked down. There were charging stations for folks.

Walmart is the largest company based in Arkansas, and they came with truckloads of water, diapers, snacks, various kinds of donations, baby wipes, batteries, and flashlights. Whatever people needed, it seemed as though Walmart was there with a truck to offload and really help people do what they needed to do.

Tyson Foods is another of our great Arkansas companies. They have a program they call Meals that Matter, and they do three meals a day. I saw their trucks at the Mayflower school where they were set up. I saw this big Tyson truck just sitting there, and I knew ev-

erybody was scurrying around doing other things at other trucks, and I asked: What is that one for? And I heard that one was just full of ice. They have learned through these tragedies and other places they go that ice is in very short supply, and they know that keeping things cold and giving people something cool to drink is very important.

I could talk about this for a long time, seeing those people and seeing what they have gone through. I was there the next morning with the Governor and the attorney general and a number of others, and it was very emotional. You talk to some folks, and they are grieving for the loss of their loved one or their next-door neighbor in one case. I talked to a man who had lost his mother. At the same time, others are rejoicing to be safe and to have their lives and the lives of their children.

One man I talked to—I never even got his name, but I think he was stationed at Little Rock Air Force Base—said he looked out his front door and saw the storm bearing down on the house and there wasn't any way to avoid it. He grabbed his kids, threw them in the bathtub, got some blankets, covered them all up—including himself—in the bathtub. He said that for about 45 seconds it sounded as if they had an F-16 in their house. When it finally stopped, he took the blankets off, and at that point they weren't in the bathroom anymore, they were in the garage. The roof had collapsed and they couldn't get out. Before long, they heard some neighbors calling for them, and they were able to dig a tunnel and get those three girls out and then he got out. They came out of it with just scratches, but it is an amazing story of perseverance.

There is a little hardware store in Mayflower called H&B True Value Hardware, and that building was really shaken to its foundation. It is a total wreck, but the merchandise was good. This man's entire career, his entire working life is right there in that building, that local hardware store he is going to turn over to his daughter one day. His daughter was there with her children, and they were getting their merchandise out and trying to get it into some sort of storage so it could be safe while they rebuild. That is a real-life matter for them, so we tried to help there.

I remember standing out by the curb in front of what used to be a home. It was just a pile of rubble. At first, when you look at that, all you see is debris. Your eyes can't even focus on it. You don't even know what you are looking at. But when you sit and take a moment and look—I looked down and saw a ceiling fan motor. The blades were all gone, but there was a ceiling fan motor. And, gosh, right there I saw Legos mixed in the yard. There was an upside-down sink right there on the pavement. There was a family portrait—whether it was from this family,

that family, or a family from a mile away, who knows, but nonetheless a family portrait, just a color photo lying there in the middle of the street.

Another of the things I saw as I stood there looking at what used to be a house—there was the front door, the doorframe, the brick, and sort of a stoop with the steps going up to the house, but there was no house there. All that was left was that doorframe. You think about that. Think about those people, and their house is completely gone. They have to rebuild.

I did hear a story—I didn't talk to the people, but a story was going around among some of the volunteers who were working about a family who survived and their dog survived. The way the dog survived is that as the tornado was hitting their home, they actually grabbed the dog by the collar. He was about to fly out the window or what was left of the house, and not only were they holding on for dear life, but they held on to the dog, and they all made it.

A lot of times you would go up to where a house was and it would be just a concrete slab. That is all there was. You just look at that and think, how did anybody survive that? But they did, in most cases.

I went to the farm of a friend of mine, a guy named Preston Scroggins, whom I have known a long time. He is a pillar-of-the-community kind of person there in Vilonia. I went to his home and saw that he had lost everything. He lost his home, lost all of his vehicles. He had a big farm shop—what we call a shop—which is a metal building with steel girders in it. And I have never seen this before with a tornado. When they built that metal building, of course they build these girders to hold it up, and then there is the siding type of stuff on the sides, the roofing, which is all metal. Of course the steel was twisted, and that is pretty bad, and it takes a lot of force to twist steel like that. But what I had never seen before is that the footings of the building, which were these huge concrete balls—they dug a hole, filled it with concrete, and stuck the steel girders in them to create the footings—these balls of concrete were actually picked up out of the Earth by that tornado. They were actually picked up and set down a few feet away from the big hole in the ground. That is an amazing amount of force, and that is what an EF-4 does. This tornado didn't just knock down buildings; it obliterated them.

The beautiful thing about our people is that it did not obliterate their dreams. We talked to one woman who said: This was my dream house. But the amazing thing was—and a new phrase has been created out of this—we heard people saying over and over that they were Ark strong because people in our State are resilient. They are strong people. They are scrappers. And part of being strong is to pull yourself up by your bootstraps and dust yourself off

and go out and do more that day to improve what you have and work for your family.

But another element of being strong is neighbor helping neighbor, and we saw that in abundance in Arkansas. To sit there in your front yard with no worldly possessions left—your truck looks as though it has been beaten by 20 men coming at it with hammers and beating on it, your house is in ruins and there is nothing left—and then to look at me and say, “Well, it is just stuff,” it takes a strong person to do that. That is someone who has the right perspective.

I saw the bravery, the selflessness, and the generosity, and now you know why I am so very proud to be the Senator for these amazing people.

I am also proud of the Senate because it wasn't too long ago we voted for disaster relief in this body. We now have money sufficient to cover this and other disasters. I wish I could say this is going to be the last one for the year, but everyone knows it will not be.

I will close with a psalm.

The Lord is my shepherd; I shall not want. He makes me to lie down in green pastures.

There are green pastures as part of this, and our people have found those and will continue to be finding those as we go through this.

He leads me beside the still waters.

It is a very comforting thing, and they need to be comforted right now.

He restores my soul.

One thing I looked up is the definition of “soul.” According to Webster's, it is a nonphysical aspect of a person. It is a person's emotional and moral nature, where the most private thoughts and feelings are hidden, the complex of human attributes that manifest as consciousness, thought, feeling, and will.

He restores my soul; he leads me in the paths of righteousness for his name's sake.

Even though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death—

I can guarantee those people in Arkansas know they have walked through the valley of the shadow of death—

I will fear no evil; for you are with me. Your rod and your staff, they comfort me.

You prepare a table before me in the presence of my enemies. You anoint my head with oil; my cup overflows.

The attitude of the people in my State is, even though it has been a difficult week, their cup is overflowing and those blessings continue to come.

Surely, your goodness and mercy will follow me all the days of my life, and I shall dwell in the house of the Lord forever.

Having that eternal perspective is going to get people through.

I thank the Presiding Officer and my colleagues for all the best wishes and the willingness to help and offers of assistance and all that makes up the Senate family.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

CURRENT EVENTS

Mr. BLUNT. Madam President, I wish to respond to my good friend from Ar-

kansas. Where he lives and where I live we know way more about tornadoes than we would like to know. Our friend from Louisiana knows about tornadoes and hurricanes both.

We had a massive tornado in Joplin, MO, not too far away from these tornadoes in the last week, in fact, in Baxter Springs and Quapaw, along with tornadoes in Arkansas and Mississippi, but that tornado was 3 years ago, I believe next week, and there was massive destruction. But the first responders were your neighbors. Before anybody else can get there, your neighbors are there, thinking of getting that man out of the garage with his three little girls and your neighbors beginning to help you collect those few things that are left—that may just be stuff, but it is your stuff. It is pictures and things that can't be replaced, but what can't be replaced are the lives which are saved, and what can't be replaced are the lives which are lost—and people will live with that strategy. No matter how resilient, that is a tragedy that lasts forever. For all those families affected this week, the ones Mr. PRYOR has talked to and others have talked to—in the hometown of two of our colleagues from Mississippi, Tupelo hit by a tornado—these are tragic moments when communities and families and neighbors come together. That and faith, as Senator PRYOR said, are what help people get through this.

CARING FOR AMERICA'S HEROES ACT

Madam President, this is National Mental Health Awareness Month. It just started today.

Senator STABENOW and I have introduced some legislation this week, Caring for America's Heroes Act, that would look at what we are doing in the military. We are looking carefully at the military as it relates to what we are doing to help our veterans and to help those who serve.

I was at Fort Leonard Wood, in Waynessville, MO, just a few days ago, talking to the hospital personnel there about mental health issues as they relate to the many new inductees who come there and as to the full-time force and the retirees who come there.

The act Senator STABENOW and I are introducing this week would treat mental health conditions like other health conditions for spouses, dependents, and for retirees who now have a limit on what can be done and how many hospital days they can stay for mental health that is not the same limit for anything else. There is no justifiable reason for it not to be the same limit. I think we are going to have good support from the Defense Department as we work to try to get this done, to just simply ensure that military dependents and retirees who were covered under TRICARE, for instance, are treated in the same manner for inpatient mental health services as they would be for any other injury or any other kind of health issue. Bringing those to par with others is important.

The National Institutes of Health estimates that one out of four adults in

American has a behavioral health problem and if diagnosed can almost always be treated. I asked the Surgeon General of the Army at a hearing just a few days ago if that one out of four would relate to the military as well. Her view was as follows: Yes, we recruit from the general population. We don't have any reason to believe those numbers aren't reflected in our population as well.

So as we move forward, we need to be sure, in Mental Health Awareness Month—and in a month where, as in every month, we should be always mindful of our veterans and retirees—that we are pursuing those solutions for them as we are for the country generally. Hopefully, we will be able to work with the Defense Department and get this one gap closed in the very near future.

HEALTH CARE

I wish to speak about where we are on health care. I know there was an attempt in recent days to take a victory lap, and maybe again today, over the number of people to sign up.

I will say one more time, I don't think that is the way you can measure this. I said when the Web site wouldn't work, we can't measure this by whether the Web site works because surely the Web site will eventually work. Frankly, we shouldn't measure this by how many people sign up because the people who sign up don't have any other option. Their option is to not sign up at all or to sign up. That is not much of a choice for most people. I am going to talk in a minute about a couple people who decided they don't have a reasonable choice, so they are not signing up for anything.

We need to be sure this government does what is necessary to create access to what has been the best health care system in the world. We all want people to have access to that system. The question truly is, Are we doing that the right way?

Polling clearly shows that people don't think we are doing that the right way. The President's numbers reflect that. The Kaiser Family Foundation poll shows that just 38 percent of people think the law is working as intended; 57 percent say it is not working the way the White House had hoped.

I would think 100 percent would think it is not working the way the White House had hoped. Surely, the rollout, the sign-up—we can talk all we want about how many people sign up. There is a debate going on right now over in the House of Representatives this week about they signed up, but did they pay.

According to the House Commerce Committee, insurers tell them that only two-thirds of the people who have signed up have paid. If they don't pay, they are not signed up and they don't have coverage. I don't think any insurance works that way.

That same committee's report said only 25 percent of paid enrollees are within the crucial age range, which is 18 to 34.

For this to work, we have to have people who are young and healthy sign up as well. Why isn't that happening? The original estimate was we need 40 percent. We appear to have 25 percent. What do we need to do?

Why is it the fact that insurance costs more relative to everybody else insured for young people than it ever has before by the law? That would maybe explain why young people aren't signing up. Prior to January 1 of this year, if someone were young and healthy, they might pay 20 percent of what the person at the other end of the spectrum was paying. Now they have to pay at least 33 percent. Maybe that is why those people aren't signing up.

Of course, the workforce impact of people who have part-time jobs because full-time jobs are covered, jobs of more than 30 hours—the House recently passed the Save America Workers Act to help increase these wages by saying: No, it is not a 30-hour standard. It should be a 40-hour standard. I am a co-sponsor of the Senate bill that would do that same thing Senator COLLINS has been advocating for months now.

The unintended consequences in the workplace are not fair to American families. They are not fair to American workers. We could do something about one of those unintended consequences by just saying: Wait a minute. The 40-hour workweek that we have always said was full-time work should still be the 40-hour workweek, not the new 30-hour workweek.

The emergency contractor hired to repair the Web site said it is going to cost \$121 million to repair the Web site, which is a whole lot more than the \$94 million already spent to create the Web site. I wonder what would have happened if we had taken that many millions of dollars and bought insurance for the people we were trying to move from uninsured to insured.

I will give about three more examples. My time is limited on the floor today, and I have this down to a handful of examples of people we have heard from in the last few days about families who are dramatically impacted. Surely, there is a good story out there to tell, but there are lots of stories, and no matter what anybody says, these stories over and over turn out to be tragedies for families.

Randy and his wife from Mexico, MO, had a plan they liked, but they received a cancellation notice in October of last year. He went on to the exchange but found on the exchange he would have to pay over \$600 a month more in premiums and face deductibles that were \$3,500 higher than they had been in the past—so a \$600 increase in premiums and \$3,500 higher deductibles.

The cheapest plan available to Randy and his wife would have them paying \$14,000 in premiums a year and they would have an \$11,000 deductible before the insurance would pay anything—\$25,000.

Randy and his wife decided: That is not insurance at all, so we are not

going to have insurance. They found the best thing he could find, found what was available, and decided it clearly wouldn't work. And that wouldn't work for any of us either. If it was going to cost \$25,000 annually before a single thing was covered, we wouldn't think that was insurance, and that was the best thing Randy from Mexico, MO, could find.

Neal lost his job 2 years ago and decided to go back—Neal is from Raymore, MO. He decided to go back to school full time. He has nerve damage in his back and takes several medications. His doctor prescribed 120 pills a month, but his insurance plan will only pay for 100 pills a month.

Neal said not only does he have pain he didn't have before, but he says: There is nothing I can do about it. He says: Nobody wants to help. The doctor says I need 120 pills a month. The insurance says they are not going to let me have more than 100. I think he wishes this was between him and his doctor instead of between him and his insurance company.

Myron from Hannibal, MO, and his family have annual premiums that went from \$2,200 to \$6,500—a \$4,300 increase. He found his doctor is no longer in the network. He doesn't want to have a new doctor. He liked his old insurance, but it was canceled, and he can't get to the doctors he used to use with his new insurance.

Campus problems: A young healthy son on campus. His insurance was \$550 a semester last semester. This year it is \$770 a semester so he can have the same insurance that in all likelihood he will not use because he is, after all, young and healthy, but the 40-percent increase is an increase the law almost requires. The law went from five different categories of people to be insured to three, and the top one can't pay more than three times what the bottom pays.

One final story. Dennis is from Dexter, MO, near Missouri's bootheel. He is an insurance broker. He says he has lots of stories he could tell, but the one that came to mind that he told us about this week was people who had a nationwide network of doctors in a plan he used to sell now are transitioned to a network that is much smaller and it only works in the State you reside in.

Missouri has many States that touch it. As many as eight States touch our State, so almost everybody in our State lives on or near a border. If you live on or near the border in the exchange, you cannot go to the doctor or hospital, in all likelihood, that may be 10 miles from where you are because it is not in your State. When I was first told that, I simply didn't believe it, and the more we checked into it the more we found out that is what people were finding over and over. The policies they could get did not allow them to go a reasonable distance if they had to cross a border.

So we have work to do. I hope we can do it. I think there are ways we can

work together, but the real thing we have to solve is better health care for families and affordable health care and health insurance for families. It is not happening right now. I hope we move to a better place.

I yield the floor.

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

HEALTH CARE

Mr. VITTER. Thank you, Madam President.

I come to the floor again to urge consideration and a vote, and a positive vote, on my no-Washington exemption from ObamaCare proposal.

I think the first rule of American democracy should be that whatever Congress chooses to impose on America it lives by itself; whatever laws Washington passes, it lives by itself. That should be the rule across the board, and that should certainly include health care and ObamaCare. But that is not the case.

That is not the case at all, because there is a Washington exemption from ObamaCare. There are special-interest Washington subsidies under ObamaCare that the average American doesn't get in any way, shape, or form. As it relates to health care and ObamaCare, I think the rule should be simple: The baseline plan, the fallback position for all Americans is what we live by. Under ObamaCare that was first during the debate called the public option, but then it came to be known as the exchanges. That should be the plan we all live by and our staff live by and the White House and top members of the administration live by—no special exemption, no special deal, no special subsidy, no special treatment.

That was the intent of an amendment, and that is actually the clear language of an amendment that actually passed this body and passed the process and became part of ObamaCare, thanks to the leadership of Senator CHUCK GRASSLEY and others, and I certainly strongly supported the amendment. There was a clear amendment added to ObamaCare in the Senate that said every Member of Congress, all of our staff, have to go to the so-called exchanges for our health care. The problem is on the way to implementing that, after passage of the bill, folks around here understood what that meant and so they watered down and amended that language through the back door by administrative fiat in an illegal way.

They got the President and his administration to issue a special rule that took all of the sting out of that amendment. That rule did two things: First of all, it came up with a mechanism whereby a lot of congressional staff don't even have to go to the exchanges at all; and secondly, this illegal rule gave Members of Congress a special subsidy to go to the exchanges that no other American gets at comparable income levels, no one else gets, completely unique.

In addition, the administration, top members of the administration, such as Cabinet officials and top White House aides, have never been subjected to anything like the same rule.

Again, I think we should come back to what almost all Americans feel should be the first rule of American democracy: What is good for America has to be good for Washington. What is imposed on America needs to be imposed first and foremost on Washington, with no special exemptions, no special subsidies, no special carve-outs, no special deals, and that is what my no-Washington exemption from ObamaCare proposal is about. Every Member of Congress, our staff, and the White House and top administration officials should go to the exchanges for our health care, with no special deal, no special exemption, no special subsidies.

I have been fighting for simply a full debate and vote on this for 6 months now, and unfortunately have been completely shut out of any vote. This started as soon as the administration announced its special illegal rule to get around this provision of ObamaCare late last year, and as soon as that was announced, I said: This is wrong. We need to address this. We need to stop this. I proposed my clarifying language, and I brought up that language as an amendment on the floor as soon as I could. It was in September of last year on the Portman-Shaheen bill which is back on the floor now, and after a lot of back and forth, the majority leader finally agreed: Fine, we will have a vote on the Vitter amendment on this subject. In fact, Senator REID was quoted in *The Hill* on September 17 of last year: "What I said I will do is we'll vote on Vitter," meaning my no-Washington-exemption language, "... as senseless as that is."

I appreciate that endorsement of the proposal.

"I mean, we'll go ahead and do that."

So he agreed to that vote on Portman-Shaheen. That was reported the same day by Bloomberg on September 17:

Reid said on the Senate floor that a vote would be allowed on the Vitter proposal as long as Republicans agreed to consider a yet-to-be unveiled Democratic counterproposal that would be offered as a side-by-side or second-degree amendment.

And also that same day in *CQ*:

Reid said Tuesday he was willing to give Senator David Vitter, R-LA, a vote on his proposal to force more government workers onto health care exchanges and to pay the premiums themselves...

In addition, at the same time the next day, September 18, and the day following, September 19, Senators SHAHEEN and PORTMAN said the same thing. Senator SHAHEEN was on the Senate floor September 18 saying: Great, we will give Senator VITTER his vote. I have no problem with that. Senator PORTMAN, September 19, the same thing.

My understanding is that there has been a general agreement to have a vote on the Vit-

ter amendment. That is something I have heard on the floor from leadership.

Well, as we all know, that agreement never materialized, was never honored. I have never gotten that vote. It is now 6 months later, and I am simply asking for a full debate and a fair up-or-down vote on this important issue.

Look, it is a free country. People don't have to agree with me, but let's have a vote. We voted yesterday on something that we have voted and revoted multiple times at the majority leader's insistence.

I am asking for one vote on this important issue that the American people care about. We voted and revoted on things multiple times. I am asking for one clear vote on this issue. After the majority leader agreed to a vote on this amendment that I never got in September, a couple months later when I was revisiting the issue, he said: Okay. Well, you can have a vote, but it has to be the only vote in this Congress.

Well, I resisted that at the time, but I will take that one vote. Can we have one vote on this important issue this Congress? Can we have a modicum of free expression and open debate and an open amendment process on the Senate floor? Can we have one vote on this issue that the American people certainly care about? That is what I am asking. I am asking for the majority leader to honor his commitment. That is what I am pushing for. That is what I will continue to push for, which is why I am filing the amendment to the Portman-Shaheen bill. And again, I am filing it to this bill for one clear reason: That is the context in our previous consideration of Portman-Shaheen where I was told we agreed to having a vote on this issue. We will have the vote. I am simply asking for that commitment to be honored.

I also care deeply about other important issues, including energy issues, moving forward with a very important jobs project for America, the Keystone XL Pipeline; and because of that, when I saw the majority leader's recent proposal that we move ahead on Portman-Shaheen with five energy-related votes, one of which would clearly be the Keystone XL Pipeline, I certainly took that very seriously. That is also an important issue and it deserves a vote. It has had votes in the past, but that needs to be addressed. So as soon as I saw that—and again, this is an offer by the majority leader—a hotline request that we now consider the Portman-Shaheen bill and limit considerations to five energy-related amendments, that would be chosen by the Republican leaders—as soon as I saw that hotline and that offer, I called the Republican leader to make sure of two points—two points that I care about quite a bit—No. 1, that one of those amendments would be a very substantive amendment on the Keystone Pipeline, not general, vague, sense-of-the-Senate language, but binding language that would approve, without the

President's involvement, this very important jobs project; and No. 2, that at least one of the other amendments was an important matter within the jurisdiction of the EPW Committee on which I serve as ranking member.

The Republican leader absolutely agreed that was the case. Yes, absolutely, once we lock in this unanimous consent request by Leader REID, one of those votes would absolutely be a binding proposal about the Keystone Pipeline. Another would clearly be an important matter from the jurisdiction of the committee on which I serve as ranking member on EPW. So those are important matters and those are significant votes.

So I will set aside temporarily my pursuit of this no-Washington-exemption vote. I promise I will be back to it. I promise I will use every reasonable opportunity to get that vote which was promised to me last September, 6 months ago and counting; but I believe we should move forward with Majority Leader REID's proposal that he made as a hotline request this morning.

I offer that as a unanimous consent agreement, so we can lock it down and move forward, and move forward with this Keystone vote, move forward with these other energy votes, and then move forward beyond that, hopefully to a vote on the no-Washington-exemption language very soon. So I make as a unanimous consent request Majority Leader REID's own proposal, that there be a unanimous consent agreement on S. 2262, the energy efficiency bill; that we move to its immediate consideration; that the only amendments in order be five amendments to be offered by the Republican leader or his designee related to energy policy, with a 60-vote threshold on adoption of each amendment; and that following the disposition of these amendments, the Senate will proceed to a vote on passage of the bill as amended, if amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant majority leader.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 5 minutes in response to the Senator from Louisiana after I have responded to his unanimous consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. VITTER. Madam President, reserving the right to object, I would only ask for the opportunity to respond to the response to the unanimous consent request before the assistant majority leader proceeds, but I have no objection otherwise to his speaking after that for 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant majority leader.

Mr. MCCAIN. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. What is the request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant majority leader.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, first, reserving the right to object, what the Senator from Louisiana has characterized as the majority leader's position on the pending legislation, S. 2262, has not been stated by the majority leader, and I suggest that the Senator from Louisiana speak to his leadership and work with the majority leader to resolve differences on amendments. I object.

Mr. VITTER. Madam President, reclaiming the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. VITTER. Madam President, let me read the exact text of the hotline. A hotline is a message that goes out to all Senators.

The Majority Leader in consultation with the Republican Leader would like to enter into a unanimous consent agreement on S. 2262, the Energy Efficiency bill. The only amendments in order would be 5 amendments to be offered by the Republican Leader or his designee, related to energy policy, with a 60 vote threshold on adoption of each amendment. Following the disposition of these amendments, the Senate will proceed to a vote on passage of the bill, as amended, if amended.

That is clearly an expression of the majority leader's proposal in consultation with the Republican leader. That is what was sent to all Members of the Senate—at least on our side—after a personal discussion between the majority leader and the Republican leader.

Just to be crystal clear, my unanimous consent right now is that hotline request that has been clearly characterized as the request of the majority leader in consultation with the Republican leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant majority leader.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I know the Senator from Arizona is waiting to take the floor. I have waited for the Senator from Louisiana to finish his lengthy statement about several issues.

I ask unanimous consent to speak for only 5 minutes—and maybe less—and then I will leave and turn the floor over to the Senator from Arizona.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. VITTER. Madam President, reserving the right to object, I would like 2 minutes to respond. I don't mean to delay the Senator from Arizona, but I would like 2 minutes to respond.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the Senator from Louisiana's request?

Mr. VITTER. There is an objection, and I propose an alternative unanimous consent that the Senator from Illinois speak for up to 5 minutes followed by me for up to 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, reserving the right to object—and I will not object—but I ask unanimous consent that following the completion of what was just discussed that the Sen-

ator from South Carolina and I be allowed 20 minutes for time to speak.

Mr. DURBIN. Reserving the right to object, I think there is a vote scheduled at 1:45 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is correct; there is a vote scheduled at 1:45 p.m.

Is there objection to the request from the Senator from Louisiana?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The assistant majority leader.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, because my friend from Arizona has waited patiently, I will turn the 5 minutes into 3 minutes.

The question is health insurance for Members of the Senate and their staff. The Senator from Louisiana said that we should not be treated any differently than anyone else, and he is right. It turns out that Members of the Senate and their staff go to get their health insurance through the insurance exchanges, just like 8 million other Americans, and we buy our health insurance not from a special little company but from the same list—in my case—of 100 different policies available to anyone working in the District of Columbia.

My wife and I chose Blue Cross Blue Shield; that was our choice. We are paying a monthly premium. Our employer, the Federal Government, is contributing toward that premium like every other family in America where the employer makes a contribution, in this case the Federal Government, and the employee makes a contribution, in this case the Senator and his wife. We are being treated like everyone else.

Now he wants to take away the employer contribution not just for the Members of the Senate but also for our staffers. All these poor hard-working people want is health insurance like every other family. The Senator from Louisiana is going to make a statement of principle here: They shouldn't get employer contribution for their health insurance. What a noble and courageous position.

The question is whether he is going to turn back any Federal subsidy for his health insurance. I don't know if he does or not. It would be a show of good faith if he did.

I will stand here and fight for the right of Members of Congress to be treated like everybody else—buying health insurance on the exchanges from private insurance companies from policies that are available to everyone else with an employer contribution. I will fight for staffers—Democrats and Republicans—to have that same right.

The Senator from Louisiana has held up a bill on the floor of the Senate all week because he wants to call that amendment. Isn't it about time we get to the business of the Senate and do something? We will leave today and come back next week. I hope he will have some second thoughts about holding up the Senate for another week.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. VITTER. Madam President, I had the feeling I would need to respond to whatever was said, and I was certainly right.

I have a couple of points to make in order to set the facts right. First of all, my proposal does mean Washington is treated like all other Americans with regard to ObamaCare. That is not going on now. Many members of our staff don't have to go to the exchange. All others and Members of Congress get a huge taxpayer-funded subsidy that no other American at the same income level gets—no other American. And the Obama administration—White House officials—doesn't fall under that requirement at all to go to the exchange. That is No. 1.

No. 2, I don't take that subsidy. The assistant majority leader is a little late to the game. I made that decision months ago and announced it, so I do not take a subsidy.

No. 3, the assistant majority leader has just rejected a proposal of the majority leader in consultation with the Republican leader. I don't know why they can't take yes for an answer. They are complaining about my holding up a bill that is not on the floor yet, and I am asking for unanimous consent, which they initiated, with regard to energy amendments.

I will read the exact text of the hotline again.

The Majority Leader in consultation with the Republican Leader would like to enter into a unanimous consent agreement on S. 2262, the Energy Efficiency bill. The only amendments in order would be 5 amendments to be offered by the Republican Leader or his designee, related to energy policy, with a 60 vote threshold on adoption of each amendment. Following the disposition of these amendments, the Senate will proceed to a vote on passage of the bill, as amended, if amended.

I don't know why we can't take yes for an answer here. I'm holding up the bill? The bill is not on the Senate floor yet. I am asking for a unanimous consent that was a discussion and an idea of the majority leader in consultation with the Republican leader and now that is being objected to by the same sources who proposed it. This is silly.

Let's get on with the important votes. Let's get on with this important Keystone vote—a binding Keystone vote—and then in the future let's get on with important ObamaCare votes, which certainly includes my no-Washington-exemption proposal.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, how much time is remaining before the vote?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eight and a half minutes.

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the votes Senator GRAHAM and I be allowed 20 minutes to speak as if in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCAIN. I thank the Presiding Officer.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

NOMINATION OF THEODORE DAVID CHUANG TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND—Continued

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays, and I yield back any remaining time.

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

Is there a sufficient second? There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Theodore David Chuang, of Maryland, to be United States District Judge for the District of Maryland?

The yeas and nays are ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO).

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

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 42, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 127 Ex.]

YEAS—53

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

NAYS—42

Alexander	Collins	Grassley
Ayotte	Corker	Hatch
Barrasso	Cornyn	Heller
Blunt	Crapo	Hoeven
Burr	Cruz	Inhofe
Chambliss	Enzi	Isakson
Coats	Fischer	Johanns
Coburn	Flake	Johnson (WI)
Cochran	Graham	Kirk

Lee	Portman	Shelby
McCain	Risch	Thune
McConnell	Roberts	Toomey
Murkowski	Scott	Vitter
Paul	Sessions	Wicker

NOT VOTING—5

Boozman	Rubio	Tester
Moran	Sanders	

The nomination was confirmed.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, earlier today, I voted against confirmation for Theodore David Chuang to be U.S. district judge for the District of Maryland because of his involvement in the State Department's response to Congressional inquiries into the attack on the U.S. Embassy in Benghazi, Libya. The State Department refused to comply with a subpoena from the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee without citing any valid privilege. I cannot support any nominee who played a part in stonewalling attempts by Congress to uncover the truth surrounding the events in Benghazi on September 11, 2012.

NOMINATION OF GEORGE JARROD HAZEL TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND—Continued

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

Does anyone yield back their time?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of George Jarrod Hazel, of Maryland, to be United States District Judge for the District of Maryland?

The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW), and the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN).

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

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

[Rollcall Vote No. 128 Ex.]

YEAS—95

Alexander	Brown	Collins
Ayotte	Burr	Coons
Baldwin	Cantwell	Corker
Barrasso	Cardin	Cornyn
Begich	Carper	Crapo
Bennet	Casey	Cruz
Blumenthal	Chambliss	Donnelly
Blunt	Coats	Durbin
Booker	Coburn	Enzi
Boxer	Cochran	Feinstein

Fischer	Klobuchar	Roberts
Flake	Landrieu	Rockefeller
Franken	Leahy	Rubio
Gillibrand	Lee	Sanders
Graham	Manchin	Schatz
Grassley	Markey	Schumer
Hagan	McCain	Scott
Harkin	McCaskill	Sessions
Hatch	McConnell	Shaheen
Heinrich	Menendez	Shelby
Heitkamp	Merkley	Thune
Heller	Mikulski	Toomey
Hirono	Murkowski	Udall (CO)
Hoeven	Murphy	Udall (NM)
Inhofe	Murray	Vitter
Isakson	Nelson	Walsh
Johanns	Paul	Warner
Johnson (SD)	Portman	Warren
Johnson (WI)	Pryor	Whitehouse
Kaine	Reed	Wicker
King	Reid	Wyden
Kirk	Risch	

NOT VOTING—5

Boozman	Moran	Tester
Levin	Stabenow	

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we are going to have one more recorded vote. The next vote will be on Monday at 5:30. We will have two votes at that time.

NOMINATION OF JANICE MARION SCHNEIDER TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the clerk will report the Schneider nomination.

The legislative clerk reported the nomination of Janice Marion Schneider, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

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

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

Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

Without objection, all time is yielded back.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Janice Marion Schneider, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN).

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

The result was announced—yeas 64, nays 32, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 129 Ex.]

YEAS—64

Alexander	Bennet	Brown
Ayotte	Blumenthal	Cantwell
Baldwin	Booker	Cardin
Begich	Boxer	Carper

Casey	Hirono	Pryor
Coats	Johnson (SD)	Reed
Collins	Kaine	Reid
Coons	King	Risch
Corker	Klobuchar	Rockefeller
Crapo	Landrieu	Sanders
Donnelly	Leahy	Schatz
Durbin	Levin	Schumer
Feinstein	Manchin	Shaheen
Flake	Markey	Udall (CO)
Franken	McCaskill	Udall (NM)
Gillibrand	Menendez	Walsh
Hagan	Merkley	Warner
Harkin	Mikulski	Warren
Hatch	Murkowski	Whitehouse
Heinrich	Murphy	Wyden
Heitkamp	Murray	
Heller	Nelson	

NAYS—32

Barrasso	Grassley	Portman
Blunt	Hoeben	Roberts
Burr	Inhofe	Rubio
Chambliss	Isakson	Scott
Coburn	Johanns	Sessions
Cochran	Johnson (WI)	Shelby
Cornyn	Kirk	Thune
Cruz	Lee	Toomey
Enzi	McCain	Vitter
Fischer	McConnell	Wicker
Graham	Paul	

NOT VOTING—4

Boozman	Stabenow
Moran	Tester

The nomination was confirmed.

NOMINATION OF SUZAN G. LEVINE TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE SWISS CONFEDERATION AND THE PRINCIPALITY OF LIECHTENSTEIN

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the clerk will report the LeVine nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Suzan G. LeVine, of Washington, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Swiss Confederation, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Principality of Liechtenstein.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 2 minutes of debate prior to the vote on the LeVine nomination.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I ask unanimous consent that all time be yielded back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Suzan G. LeVine, of Washington, to be Ambassador of the United States of America to the Swiss Confederation, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Principality of Liechtenstein?

The nomination was confirmed.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

ENERGY SAVINGS AND INDUSTRIAL COMPETITIVENESS ACT OF 2014—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume legislative session.

The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to engage in a colloquy with the Senator from South Carolina as in morning business.

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

BENGHAZI

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, 19 months ago a terrible thing happened in Benghazi, Libya. Four brave Americans were murdered, and the issue has not only not been resolved but as each of the last 19 months has ensued, the issue of how and under what circumstances this heinous crime was committed continues. The Senator from South Carolina and I, the Senator from New Hampshire, and some others, have vowed we will never give up on this issue until the truth is known and the people who perpetrated it are brought to justice.

We have seen another page turn in this chapter of coverup and obfuscation by this administration by the belated—19 months later—release of the following emails. The first one we will not pay much attention to. This is from Benjamin Rhodes, who is supposed to be the public affairs officer for the National Security Council. In fact, he is obviously the propaganda organ. The goals, as he states them, are to underscore these protests are rooted in an Internet video and not a broader failure of policy.

I tell my colleagues that was not a fact. That was not a fact. There was no evidence these protests were rooted in an Internet video. In fact, the station chief before these talking points were made up sent a message that this is not—not—a spontaneous demonstration.

To show that we will be resolute in bringing people who bring harm to Americans to justice, and standing steadfast through these protests; to reinforce the President's strength and steadiness—that is all about the Presidential campaign. It is not about trying to find out who perpetrated this heinous crime. It is not about trying to respond to the people who committed these acts.

In fact, because of the coverup and the obfuscation and now 19-month delay, not a single person who was responsible for the murder of these four brave Americans has been brought to justice, as the President promised they would be.

Yesterday Mr. Carney said the release of this information had nothing to do with the attack on Benghazi. My friends, I have heard a lot of strange things in my time, but that has to be

the most bizarre statement I have ever heard. This is all about a Presidential campaign. This is all about an effort to convince the American people the President of the United States had everything under control.

The next day, on the Sunday talk shows, Susan Rice said Al Qaeda had been decimated. False; that the embassy was safe and stable and secure. False. And of course the whole issue of blaming an Internet video lasted on and on for a couple of weeks when it was clear the evidence did not indicate that.

I yield to my friend from South Carolina on this issue, and then I will return.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. GRAHAM. I thank my colleague.

To remind the body of what we are talking about, this email was released as a result of a lawsuit, and not voluntarily by the White House. In August of last year, the House of Representatives and the committees of jurisdiction subpoenaed all documents related to Benghazi and basically were stiff-armed.

Senators MCCAIN, AYOTTE, and I have written enough letters to destroy a small forest to the White House with virtually nothing to show for it. A private organization called Judicial Watch sued under the Freedom of Information Act, and an independent judiciary—thank God for that—ordered this White House to disclose this email just days ago. Knowing the email was going to come out, the White House provided it to the Congress a few days ago.

What does that tell us? That tells us they did not want anyone to know about this email. They talk about 25,000 documents they have provided. It doesn't matter the number of documents they provided to the Congress. They could have provided us with the Benghazi phone book. It is the relevance of the documents and the significance of the documents. The reason they did not want anyone—me and anyone else—to know about this email is because it is the smoking gun that shows that people at the White House level—these are people who work at the White House for the administration—were very intent on shaping the story about Benghazi away from what they knew to be the truth.

Here is the problem for the White House. This was 7 weeks before an election. President Obama had said repeatedly: Bin Laden is dead, Al Qaeda is on the run, the war is receding, my foreign policy is working. Many of us were critical of President Obama's foreign policy, particularly in Libya, because after Qadhafi fell, we really did nothing to secure the country.

Senator MCCAIN, myself, and a couple of other Senators—RUBIO—went in 2011 to Libya. We said in an op-ed piece if we don't get rid of these militias, Libya is going to become a safe haven for terrorists.

You have to understand this about the Benghazi consulate. It had been previously attacked in April of 2012.

The British Ambassador had been attacked in June of 2012. The British closed their consulate. The Red Cross closed their office because they had been attacked. And we have email traffic coming from Libya to Washington at the State Department level saying on August 16: We cannot secure the Benghazi consulate from a coordinated terrorist attack, and Al Qaeda flags are flying all over Benghazi.

What they did not want you to know is that the consulate in Benghazi was very unsecure, that everyone else had left the town, and that the numerous requests for security enhancements going back for months had been denied. They didn't want you to know because it would make the American people mad that the facility was so unsecure in such a dangerous area and people in Washington constantly ignored requests for additional security.

Here is what they wanted you to know:

... to convey that the United States is doing everything we can to protect our people and facilities abroad. . . .

That, to me, is the worst of the whole email because they are trying to convey to the American people and the families of the fallen that: These things happened, but we did all we could to protect your family and those who served this Nation.

Nothing could be more untruthful about Benghazi than this statement that they did everything they could to secure the facility.

The question as to whether this email relates to Benghazi was the most offensive thing coming out of the White House in quite a while. No one else died. There was an attack on our Embassy in Cairo with property damage.

What did we think Susan Rice was going to be asked about on Sunday, 16 September? Everybody in the Nation wanted to know how our Ambassador and three other brave Americans died. To suggest they weren't trying to prepare her to talk about the deaths of 4 Americans is insulting to our intelligence, but the document itself tells us it was directed toward explaining Benghazi.

To show that we will be resolute in bringing people who harm Americans to justice . . .

That was part of what they wanted her to convey. No one else was hurt other than in Benghazi. So within the document itself, they are talking about reinforcing the view that we will go after those who harmed Americans. The only people who were harmed—the four people killed—were in Benghazi. So that is just a bald-faced lie. That is insulting our intelligence, and it really is disrespectful to those who died in the line of duty to suggest this email—which they would not give us without a court order—had nothing to do with the death of four Americans.

Mr. MCCAIN. I might add that all of the emails were supposed to be given to the Congress in return for the confirmation of Mr. Brennan as head of the CIA. They didn't do that.

Mr. GRAHAM. The bottom line is the goals set out in this email are to try to convince the American people 7 weeks before an election: We had done everything possible to protect our people and facilities; “to underscore that these protests are rooted in an Internet video, and not a broader failure of policy.”

I am here to tell you—and I dare anybody to show where I am wrong—there is no evidence of a protest outside the compound that led to an eventual attack.

I have talked to the man in charge of security at Benghazi—the only survivor I have been able to talk to. He told me that when the Ambassador went to bed shortly after 9, there was nobody outside the compound. They would not have let him go to bed if there had been protesters, and they would have reported a protest up the chain of command.

Mr. MCCAIN. And the next day the station chief sent a message that there was “not-slash-not spontaneous demonstration.”

Mr. GRAHAM. That was the 15th. So this is in real-time that people are reporting a coordinated terrorist attack. There was no protest. The video had nothing to do with this because there was no protest. And why would they suggest that? They would be far less culpable in the eyes of the American people and myself if, in fact, this was caused by a video we had nothing to do with, a protest we could not see coming. The truth is that this was a coordinated terrorist attack that you could see coming for months, and it was the result of a broader failure of policy. Why didn't they want to admit that? They were 7 weeks out. It undercuts everything they were trying to tell the American people about their foreign policy.

This is the smoking gun that shows they were consciously trying to manipulate the evidence to steer the story away from a coordinated terrorist attack of an unsecured facility and toward the land of an Internet video causing a protest. That, to me, is unacceptable and is clear as the Sun rises in the east, for those who care.

I will end with this and turn it back over to Senator MCCAIN.

After this attack, President Obama said the following:

But everything that—every piece of information we get, as we got it, we laid it out for the American people.

I am here to tell you that statement has not borne scrutiny. The administration did not live up to this statement.

Here is another statement from Jay Carney:

I can tell you that the President believes that Ambassador Rice has done an excellent job as the United States Ambassador to the

United Nations, and I believe that—and I know that he believes that everyone here working for him has been transparent in the way that we've tried to answer questions about what happened in Benghazi . . .

If they were trying to be transparent about what was happening in Benghazi, why would they fail to provide the relevant information?

The information that we provided was based on the available assessment at the time.

I am here to tell you, ladies and gentlemen, they have not provided the relevant information. Why? Because the relevant information crumbles the story Susan Rice told on 16 September, crumbles the story of the President himself when weeks later he talked about a protest caused by a video that never happened. The reason they haven't shared this with us is because it exposes the lie of Benghazi.

I will end with this thought. We would not know today about an email on 14 September setting goals for Susan Rice to meet on 16 September to change the whole narrative if it were not for an independent judiciary and a private organization.

This White House has stiffed the Congress. Mostly, the media has been AWOL. But the reason we haven't stopped is because we met the families.

To any Member of the Congress who thinks Benghazi is a Republican conspiracy designed to help LINDSEY GRAHAM or anyone else get elected, why don't you go to the family members and explain to them what happened. Why don't you tell the family members that the government was up front and honest and see if they believe you.

This email that came from a court requiring the White House to disclose is devastating. It is devastating because it shows that 3 days after the attack, their goal was not to inform the American people of what happened but to shape the story to help the President get reelected. I hope and pray that matters to the American people, and I believe it does. And I hope and pray our friends on the Democratic side will start taking a little bit of interest.

I can tell you this about Senator MCCAIN and myself: When President Bush's policies in Iraq were crumbling, we did not have enough troops, and JOHN MCCAIN, to his credit, said that publicly and asked for the resignation of President Bush's Secretary of Defense because of failed policy.

When we discovered the abuses at Guantanamo Bay and Abu Ghraib when it came to detainee policies, both of us said: The system failed. Don't believe it when they tell you this was a few bad apples.

Why did we do that? I have been a military lawyer for 31 years. It means a lot to me to adhere to the conventions we have signed up to.

Senator MCCAIN—if there were ever an American hero in the Senate, it is he. He has lived through a country that practices torture, and he did not want us to go down that road.

When we did those things, we were “great Americans holding the system accountable and doing the country a service.” Now, all of a sudden, we are “just party hacks.”

I am here to say that what drove us then drives us now. When we ask people to serve in faraway places with strange-sounding names and to go out on the tip of the spear, we owe it to them to help them, to give them the best ability to survive. And if something bad happens, we owe their families the truth.

Just as in Iraq, they tried to shape the story in a fashion that did not bear scrutiny. It wasn't a few dead-enders; it was system failure that led to the collapse of Iraq. And thank God we changed tactics and we overcame our problems.

This Benghazi story is about a foreign policy choice called the light footprint that caught up with this administration. It is about an administration that said no to additional security requests because they didn't want to be like Bush. It is a story about an administration that is too stubborn to react to facts on the ground, that kept a consulate open when everybody else closed theirs, unsecured, believing that ignoring the problem would solve the problem.

We have now found evidence of their willingness and desire to change the narrative from a coordinated terrorist attack of an unsecured facility—something they really couldn't control, and they did the best they could 7 weeks before an election.

All I can say is if the shoe were on the other foot and this had been the Bush administration, it would be front-page news everywhere and our colleagues on the other side would be screaming. It is sad that it hasn't been news everywhere. It is sad that my Democratic colleagues in the House in particular have disdain for trying to find out what happened in Benghazi.

Mr. MCCAIN. And the fact is, I would say to my friend, the time has now come for a select committee. The time has now come because these talking points raise more questions than answers. It is time for a bipartisan, bicameral select committee to investigate the entire Benghazi fiasco and tragedy, and it needs to be done soon. The American people and the families of those brave ones who sacrificed their lives deserve nothing less.

My friend Senator GRAHAM mentioned the media. I would like to say thanks.

I would like to say thanks to FOX News. I would like to say thanks to some at CBS. I would like to say thanks to Charles Krauthammer and the handful of people who kept this alive when the “mainstream media” not only wanted to bury it but subjected, of course, as Senator GRAHAM just mentioned, him and me to ridicule.

I wish to go back for a second to this email. In response to questions yester-

day by Mr. Carney, the White House Press spokesperson, if we look at this email and then look at what Mr. Carney said, it is an absolute falsehood. It is a total departure from reality. How does the President's spokesperson tell the American people something that is patently false?

The President's spokesperson, in regard to this email that says to show “these protests are rooted in an Internet video, and not a broader failure of policy”—what was he talking about? He says Rhodes' email “was explicitly not about Benghazi.” Well, then what was it about?

Then he goes on to say:

The fact of the matter is, there were protests in the region.

The talking points cited protests at that facility.

They didn't. The talking points did not cite protests at that facility—i.e., Benghazi.

The connection between protests and video—and the video turned out not to be the case—

It turned out not to be the case because it was never the case and no one ever believed it—

but it was based on the best information that we had.

He had no information that there was a spontaneous demonstration sparked by a video. That was manufactured somewhere. The American people and we need to know where those talking points came from that Susan Rice gave.

He goes on to say:

If you look at that document, that document that we're talking about today was about the overall environment in the Muslim world.

How could he say that and look at this email here? Talking about events in the Muslim world?

And of course he goes on to say, talking about Susan Rice:

She relied on her—for her answers on Benghazi, on the document prepared by the CIA, as did members of Congress.

Mr. Morell, the deputy head of the CIA at that time, said he was astonished to hear that there was reference made on all five Sunday morning shows that there was a hateful video involved.

So Mr. Carney is saying things that are absolutely false. The American people deserve better than that from the President's spokesperson whom they rely on for accurate information. When the bodies came home, and it was a moving event—I was there—the then-Secretary of State told members of the family and told me: We will get these people who were responsible for the hateful video.

That was a number of days later when it was absolutely proven to anyone's satisfaction there was no hateful video, and of course we still don't know what the final version of the talking points was that Susan Rice used on all the morning talk shows, who was the final arbiter of it. We know now that Mr. Rhodes played a very key role in

that, and we need to know who gave her those talking points because they are patently false. If someone gave her those talking points, then why in the world did that person manufacture out of whole cloth information that was told to the American people?

There are a lot of points here, and we can get into some of the details, but the fact is that this is a coverup of a situation which was politically motivated in order to further the Presidential ambitions of the President of the United States. That is what this is all about. That is why comments and instructions were given in this email, because the narrative was: The tide of war is receding, Osama bin Laden is dead.

Secretary Susan Rice said at the time: Al Qaeda is decimated and the Embassy is safe and secure. None of those facts were true. Most importantly, we have five Americans who were killed. It is very clear that should not have happened, would not have happened if proper actions had been taken.

Most important now or just as important now is the fact that for the last 19 months this White House has been engaged in a coverup. It calls for a select committee to examine all of the facts, and as always happens in these kinds of scandals, the coverup is equally or sometimes worse than the actual action itself. The American people deserve to know the truth.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COONS). The Senator from Rhode Island.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Thank you, Mr. President.

I ask unanimous consent to speak as if in morning business for up to 20 minutes.

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

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I am here, as regular viewers of the C-SPAN network know, for the 65th time, every week that the Senate is in session, to ask my colleagues in the Senate to wake up to the realities of climate change that surround us.

Here is what we know: We know the oceans and atmosphere are warming. By the way, that is measurement, not theory. We know sea level is rising. Again, that is measurement, not theory. We know oceans are becoming more acidic—again, a simple measurement. The potential that these changes have to disrupt economic growth and to disrupt global commerce is the subject of my remarks today, and it is those changes that make investors and corporate executives take climate change seriously.

We may not take climate change seriously, but corporate executives do. A world of shifting seasons and extreme heat hurts their bottom line. The world of drought-stricken farms and flooded cities, of raging wildfires and migrating diseases is not good for business. A

recent article from the World Bank conveys the corporate outlook this way:

In corporate boardrooms and the offices of CEOs, climate change is a real and present danger. It threatens to disrupt the water supplies and supply chains of companies as diverse as Coca-Cola and ExxonMobil. Rising sea levels and more intense storms put their infrastructure at risk and the costs will only get worse.

Earlier this month executives from major American companies came to Washington for a roundtable discussion at the Bicameral Task Force on Climate Change, which I lead with Congressman WAXMAN. Each of the companies present had signed the climate declaration of the Business for Innovative Climate and Energy Policy or BICEP. They see a low-carbon economy as a smart way to create new jobs and stimulate economic growth. More than 750 companies, nameplate American corporations such as eBay, Gap, Levi's, Nike, Starbucks, and many others have signed BICEP's climate declaration.

Kevin Rabinovitch is global sustainability director at Virginia-based candy company Mars, Incorporated, makers of the famous M&Ms, among other things. At the roundtable he told us Mars has a goal of eliminating fossil fuel energy use and greenhouse gas emissions companywide by 2040. In fact, just yesterday Mars announced it will build a 200-megawatt wind farm in Texas that will generate enough energy to power all Mars operations in the United States. I applaud this exciting step for Mars and the bold vision it represents.

But Mr. Rabinovitch told the Bicameral Task Force on Climate Change:

... if other companies and governments don't adopt similar science based targets, our efforts will have limited effect on climate change. We cannot do it alone. This is why the business community needs Congress to get off the sidelines, to quit denying rudimentary science and abundant evidence. Improving energy efficiency reduces climate-altering carbon emissions, but it also—these businesses find—reduces operating costs.

Colin Dyer, the president and CEO of Jones Lang LaSalle, Incorporated, the second largest publicly traded commercial real estate brokerage firm in the world said:

Cost savings alone represent a compelling benefit of sustainable design, construction, and management. Jones Lang LaSalle put smart building management technology to work for the consumer goods giant Procter & Gamble.

According to Dyer:

P&G earned back its initial investment in the technology in three months and saw average energy cost savings of 10 percent annually. The program, which is being expanded, also improved building systems reliability, supported the company's broader sustainability programs, and actually increased employee productivity.

Smart executives also understand how much their customers care about this. Rob Olson, vice president and chief financial officer of IKEA, said this:

From talking to our customers, we know that Americans are increasingly concerned about climate change as they experience events like Hurricane Sandy and the drought in California. They want to reduce the amount of energy they use in their home and they care about reducing waste and using less water.

This is not a new message from America's corporate sector. Last year the Bicameral Task Force on Climate Change wrote to over 300 businesses and organizations about carbon pollution and climate change. The response was encouraging. Coca-Cola, headquartered in Georgia, wrote:

We recognize climate change is a critical challenge facing our planet, with potential impacts on biodiversity, water resources, public health and agriculture. Beyond the effects on the communities we serve, we view climate change as a potential business risk, understanding that it could likely have direct and indirect effects on our business.

Walmart, founded and headquartered in Arkansas, wrote this: "We're committed to reducing our carbon footprint and we're working with our suppliers to do the same."

Here is what Walmart said in its 2009 sustainability report:

Climate change may not cause hurricanes, but warmer ocean water can make them more powerful. Climate change may not cause rainfall, but it can increase the frequency and severity of heavy flooding. Climate change may not cause droughts, but it can make droughts longer. Every company has a responsibility to reduce greenhouse gases as quickly as it can. Currently, we are investing in renewable energy, increasing efficiency in our buildings and trucks, working with suppliers to take carbon out of products and supporting legislation in the U.S. to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

Serious business leaders are looking for serious answers to the looming economic crisis of climate change. An article last month in the Harvard Business Review entitled "How to Survive Climate Change and Still Run a Thriving Business" outlines recommendations for companies looking to strengthen their supply chains and better understand their consumers.

Serious business leaders are also fed up with the denial apparatus that is run by the big carbon polluters. Major utilities PG&E, the Public Service Company of New Mexico, and Exelon all quit the U.S. Chamber of Commerce after a chamber official called for putting climate science on trial similar to the Scopes Monkey Trial of 1925. Large tech companies such as Apple and Yahoo also left the chamber.

One of the companies that came in to the Bicameral Task Force was North Carolina-based VF Corporation. You may not have heard of VF Corporation, but you have sure heard of their major brands. They make Lee, Wrangler, Nautica, North Face, and many other name brands. Letitia Webster is their director of global corporate sustainability, and they have a global perspective on climate change. Their customers around the world are concerned about climate change, particularly their younger customers, and VF wants

to meet those customers' expectations for good citizenship. VF also needs cotton for all their clothing and they are worried about climate disruption to the cotton supply chain. "Research tells us that continued climate change will make it more and more difficult for farmers to manage cotton crops and for companies to manage their supply chains."

VF also provides very high performance clothing and equipment to high-performance outdoor athletes who train and compete in places where climate changes are already evident. Those athletes see the same changes as the 100 winter Olympic competitors from 10 countries who signed a letter of warning about climate change. Letitia Webster mentioned in particular the Khumbu Icefall which has closed Mount Everest to climbers for the first time. She is not the only one.

John All, a climber, scientist, and professor of geography at Western Kentucky University told the Atlantic magazine:

I am at Everest Base Camp right now and things are dire because of climate change. ... The ice is melting at unprecedented rates and [that] greatly increases the risk to climbers. You could say [that] climate change closed Mt. Everest this year.

Tim Rippel is a climbing guide, and he blogged from Everest's base camp:

As a professional member of the Canadian Avalanche Association, I have my educated concerns. The mountain has been deteriorating rapidly the past three years due [to] global warming and the breakdown in the Khumbu Icefall is dramatic.

Ms. Webster warned of the costs of inaction, saying, "It's too expensive not to take action." This is a North Carolina company, and I hope its message gets through to elected officials who represent North Carolina.

Senator HAGAN has already spoken passionately about the need to act on climate change. She gets it, but her colleagues on the other side of the aisle remain silent.

I visited North Carolina over the recess as part of a tour of the effects of climate change along the southeast coast. I flew out to where sea level rise is gnawing away at North Carolina's Outer Banks.

I visited the marine science facility at Pivers Island, where scientists from Duke University, the University of North Carolina, North Carolina State, East Carolina University, and of course NOAA, are studying aspects of sea level rise in North Carolina and the effects of ocean acidification on microbes that form the basis of the food web.

These are some of the world's leading scientists. They all know that these changes are driven by carbon pollution. There is no doubt. Unless North Carolina's elected officials think that their own universities are part of the big hoax some of our colleagues talk about, they had better pay attention to what is happening on the North Carolina coast.

I met with the North Carolina Coastal Federation at their coastal education center in Wilmington, NC. It

was a bipartisan group joined together in concern over the exposure of their coastal communities to the rising seas. The "North Carolina Sea-Level Rise Assessment Report" prepared in 2010 by the North Carolina Coastal Resources Commission's Science Panel on Coastal Hazards says:

The most likely scenario for 2100 AD is a rise of 0.4 meters to 1.4 meters (15 inches to 55 inches) above present.

By the way, that is what they call bathtub measures. That doesn't take into account what 55 inches of extra sea will do when it is heaped against the shore by a storm surge from a big tropical storm or hurricane.

I hope their congressional delegation in Congress is listening.

The biggest power producer in North Carolina is Charlotte-based Duke Energy. Duke worked through the U.S. Climate Action Partnership for climate change legislation. Duke actually pulled out of the National Association of Manufacturers because of that organization's denial of climate change. Duke's then-chief executive officer Jim Rogers said:

We are not renewing our membership in the NAM because in tough times, we want to invest in associations that are pulling in the same direction we are.

He said that NAM, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and Republicans "ought to roll up their sleeves and get to work on a climate bill. . . ." Duke Energy might want to also consider whether North Carolina politicians are pulling in the same direction.

This is not complicated. Load up carbon dioxide concentrations in the atmosphere and you load up heat in the atmosphere. We have known that since Abraham Lincoln was President. This is not a new discovery. Load up the heat, and the oceans warm up. That is not some theory either. You can measure it—with thermometers. When liquid warms, it expands, unless my colleagues want to repeal the law of thermal expansion. As the ocean expands and ice melts, up goes the sea level. It is up 6 inches at the tide gauge in Wilmington, NC, since 1954.

If my colleagues want to deny the 6-inch increase in the tide gauge in Wilmington, NC, let me explain to them what the North Carolina assessment says about how you measure sea level rise:

[Sea-level rise] can be directly measured in a straightforward way. The longest record of direct measurement of sea level comes from tide gauges. A tide gauge is a device built to measure water level variations due to tides and weather, and to eliminate effects due to waves. A tide gauge can be as simple as a long ruler nailed to a post on a dock. More sophisticated instruments, like those used by NOAA, are usually placed in a stilling well, or a pipe, that protects a float connected to a recording device from waves. As tides rise and fall, the float's motion is recorded.

It is not complicated. Good luck denying that. When you fly over the North Carolina coast, you see lots of investment along the seashore. There

are lots of houses, lots of hotels, condominiums, restaurants—an entire seafront economy that the larger North Carolina economy very much depends on.

What are my colleagues from North Carolina going to tell them about climate change: Don't worry. It is not real? Good luck with that. They are already measuring the sea level rise.

Those small businesses in North Carolina want to protect their storefronts from sea level rise just as VF Corporation wants to protect its cotton supply from drought. These North Carolina companies get the economic threat that climate change presents.

The frustrating thing here is that we can strengthen our economies and businesses by tackling the problem of climate change and sea level rise head-on, and we can leave things better, not worse, for the generations that will follow us—perhaps the simplest obligation that we hold, and one, by the way, at which we are presently failing. But if we are going to stop failing at that obligation and tackle this problem head-on, we have to wake up to reality. We have to put aside, once and for all, the toxic polluter-paid politics that infect Washington.

The denial campaign that is run by these polluters is as poisonous to our democracy as carbon pollution is to our atmosphere and oceans. America is suffering as a result of Congress being tangled in a web of lies and surrounded by a barricade of special interests. We have to break through that. It is a matter of truth, it is a matter of honor, and it is a matter of being effective at these real problems.

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

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

MR. 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.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 2265

MR. PAUL. Mr. President, it is often said that foreign aid from America is to project American power and what America believes in. Unfortunately, over decades, the only thing consistent about foreign aid is that the money continues to flow regardless of the behavior of the recipients. This is extraordinary, and we have seen this decade after decade.

Studies will often show that 75 percent of foreign aid throughout many continents is simply stolen, taken in graft. The Mubarak family in Egypt is an example.

The point I would like to make today is if we are going to project what America stands for, if we want our money to go to people who are supporting activities that America is for, we should write that into the law. We have made attempts at this in the past.

Several years ago Senator LEAHY attached an amendment to foreign aid that says that countries need to be evolving towards democracy or showing an ability to go forward towards democracy. The problem is that every time we have restrictions on foreign aid, they are evaded. We always give an out. The President always has an out.

This week in Egypt, 683 people were condemned to death in one trial. Yet your money still flows to Egypt without interruption.

We have another contingency that says: If a country has a military takeover—if you have an election and then you have a military junta or a military takeover of the government—our aid should end. It didn't happen in Egypt when there was a military takeover.

The only consistency about foreign aid is that it flows to all countries regardless of behavior. It is the opposite of what many of the proponents say. Many of the proponents say that we do this so we can modulate behavior and try to improve and make things better around the world. Yet they steadfastly oppose restrictions on foreign aid.

I have a bill that I am going to ask—in a few minutes—for the Senate to unanimously approve. This is a bill that should be an easy lift for most Senators. This is a bill to support our ally Israel and to say to the Palestinian Authority that if you wish to continue to take American money—and many people don't realize this, but the American taxpayer gives hundreds of millions of dollars every year to the Palestinian Authority, and we supposedly have restrictions, but there is always an out. Guess what. They always get their money regardless of behavior.

What have I have been saying is, let's have some restrictions. If we are going to give money to the Palestinian Authority, shouldn't they agree to recognize the State of Israel? Shouldn't that be part of what goes on with this?

We now have a problem—and the reason this has become a more pertinent issue and something that has come to the forefront—because Hamas, a terrorist group in Gaza, is now aligning them with Fatah, the people who run the Palestinian Authority.

My question is: Are we now going to send money to a unity government? Part of the charter of Hamas is not only not to recognize Israel, but they are actually for the destruction of Israel.

This is what I would ask Americans and those who will object to the bill—because there will be an objection to my bill: How can you object to something that calls for the recognition of Israel as a state? How can you object to this and how can you continue to allow the flow of money to a group that calls for the destruction of Israel? They will say: Well, we have contingencies for that or we will stop it if they become part of or control the West Bank.

When I was in Israel a year ago, I asked everybody that question. I met

with the Prime Minister of Israel, the President of Israel, the King of Jordan, and with the leader of the West Bank, Abbas. I met with all of these people and asked them: Can there be a separate peace? Can there be peace with the West Bank and peace with Gaza—a separate peace?

They all said: No, it has to be one peace.

I said to the Israeli side: If they are unified, will you negotiate with Hamas?

They said: No. They lob missiles at us. They are at war with us. They don't recognize our right to exist as a state. Not only that, they openly advocate for the destruction of Israel.

Realize that in the objection you will hear today, you will hear an objection that despite arguments to the contrary we will allow money to go to a unity government that will include Hamas.

I am simply asking that if we are going to send good money after bad—frankly, it is money we don't have. We have \$1 trillion in debt. We have bridges falling down in our own country, and your government is sending hundreds of millions of dollars to the Palestinian Authority—which is now going to be unified with Hamas, without restrictions or with restrictions that have a hole so big you can drive a truck through them. This always happens.

Every contingency and every limitation on foreign aid that you think would be practical and reasonable always has an exception for the President to overcome. The President always does it so the only thing consistent about foreign aid is that money continues to flow.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we pass my bill, S. 2265, Stand With Israel. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be discharged from further consideration of S. 2265 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration. I further ask that the bill be read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Reserving the right to object to Senator PAUL's request to discharge S. 2265 in the committee, this legislation Senator PAUL has been referring to has not been considered by the committee. It was just introduced in the last day or so, I think.

As chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and on behalf of the Republican ranking member, Senator CORKER, who had to depart to return to Tennessee but otherwise would have joined me in making remarks, I come to the floor to express our opposition to an effort to circumvent the normal legislative process and deprive the members of our committee of the opportunity to decide whether to take up this legislation. The authorization to provide or cut U.S. assistance to the

Palestinian Authority is clearly within the purview of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and it should have its members decide if it is appropriate, and it should be fully and openly considered by the committee.

This bill is a blunt-force instrument that would risk the collapse of the Palestinian economy in the West Bank. That is not in Israel's interests and it is not in our interests either. The bill would shift the burden of dealing with a failed state on its borders to Israel. That is certainly not my goal, and I hope it is not the goal of Senator PAUL either. Our goal should be to get back to a process and a negotiation toward a two-state solution that will allow Israel to live in peace and security.

We need to allow the parties—and particularly Mr. Abbas—the time to steer back toward a productive path to peace. To be clear, his time is limited. I am in agreement with Senator PAUL that President Abbas must ultimately choose between a future that envisions two States living side by side in peace and security or a destructive unity pact with a terrorist organization whose stated objective is to make sure there is no two-State solution.

A unity government—not a unity announcement but a unity government—between Fatah and Hamas has consequences that are clear under existing U.S. law. If Mr. Abbas definitely opens the door to Hamas exercising influence in the Palestinian Authority, I will encourage my colleagues to stand with me in exercising the existing legal authority to halt assistance to a government that includes parties that reject Israel's right to exist as a Jewish state and continues to support terrorism.

For those reasons, I must object to the Senator's request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Vermont.

DIFFERENCES OF OPINION

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, there has been a lot of criticism waged at the majority leader of the Senate, HARRY REID, for his discussion about the Koch brothers. That criticism of Senator REID is unfortunate. I think what Senator REID is trying to do is educate the American people about the disastrous Citizens United Supreme Court decision and what it has done by allowing billionaire families, such as the Koch brothers and Sheldon Adelson and others, to pump hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars into the political process in order to elect candidates in the House, in the Senate, and in the White House, who are working overtime against the best interests of the middle class and working families of this country and, at the same time, are working to provide even more tax breaks to millionaires and billionaires and large profitable corporations.

I think it is important, when we talk about the Koch brothers, not to make this discussion personal. It is not a personal discussion. It is a discussion about what the most powerful political

family in this country believes. If they are spending hundreds of millions of dollars—and this is a family worth \$80 billion, and they may end up spending, in fact, billions of dollars on campaigns—what is it they want? What do they believe? What do folks such as Sheldon Adelson believe, when they invite potential Republican candidates for President to come to Las Vegas for what has been called the Adelson primary, where he will listen to them and decide who he might support and spend hundreds of millions of dollars on in a Presidential campaign?

So I think it is important we know what the Koch brothers believe. Here is the best information I have. In 1980, as it turns out, David Koch, one of the two brothers, ran for Vice President of the United States on the Libertarian Party platform. What is interesting to me is to what degree the platform he ran on—which in 1980 got him 1 percent of the vote on the Libertarian ticket—to what degree that extremist set of positions has now become mainstream Republican today.

I want to take a few minutes to quote exactly what was in that 1980 platform so the American people can recognize to what degree ideas that at one point were considered extremist are now mainstream Republican. This is what was in the 1980 Libertarian Party platform upon which David Koch ran for Vice President:

We urge the repeal of federal campaign finance laws, and the immediate abolition of the despotic Federal Election Commission.

What that means is the Koch brothers, and increasingly the Republican Party, now believe there should be no campaign finance laws, that Citizens United did not go far enough, and that the Koch brothers should be able to spend millions of dollars by giving that money directly to individual candidates. That is what the Koch brothers said in 1980. That is what many Republicans believe today.

Let me state an exact quote from the platform:

We favor the repeal of the fraudulent, virtually bankrupt, and increasingly oppressive Social Security system.

There are many Republicans today who not only want to see cuts in Social Security but who ultimately want to privatize Social Security who believe it is unconstitutional for the U.S. Government to be involved in retirement benefits for seniors.

Libertarian Party platform, 1980:

We oppose—

Listen to this one. This is really quite incredible:

We oppose all personal and corporate income taxation, including capital gains taxes. We support the eventual repeal of all taxation.

Repeal of all taxation? That is the government. Basically, what they are saying, very boldly, straightforwardly—we have to respect their honesty—is they don't believe in government.

I have not heard any of my Republican colleagues say they want to abolish all taxation. That is not what they say and that is not what they believe. But on the other hand, it is important to note that the Ryan budget, just passed in mid-April in the House, provides a \$5 trillion tax break over a 10-year period, mainly by cutting the top individual and corporate income tax rates significantly. In other words, at a time when the wealthiest people are doing phenomenally well at the same time as the middle class disappears and more and more people live in poverty, what my Republican colleagues believe is we should give more tax breaks to millionaires and billionaires.

The Koch brothers' position in 1980 was that they support—Libertarian Party platform:

We support repeal of all laws which impede the ability of any person to find employment, such as minimum wage laws.

What does that mean?

Yesterday, we had a vote on the floor of the Senate which said that a \$7.25 an hour minimum wage is a poverty wage; that people who are working 40 hours a week and are making \$7.25 an hour are living in poverty; that they cannot bring up and raise families on those wages; and that if we raise the minimum wage to \$10.10 an hour, we could increase the salaries of approximately 28 million Americans. On that vote to overcome a Republican filibuster, one Republican voted with members of the Democratic caucus, and we lost that vote.

What is interesting, it is not simply that almost every Republican voted against raising the minimum wage; what is more significant is that many Republicans believe we should abolish the concept of the minimum wage.

Many of us know Senator TOM COBURN of Oklahoma to be an honest and straightforward guy. He tells it the way he sees it. This morning on the "Morning Joe" television show, this is what Senator COBURN said, and I quote from the transcript:

I don't believe you ought to interfere in the market. If there's to be a minimum wage—my theory is I don't believe there ought to be a national minimum wage. That's my position.

In other words, what Senator COBURN is saying today and, in fact, what many Republicans agree with him about, is we should abolish the concept of the minimum wage—something the Koch brothers were talking about 34 years ago.

What are the implications of that if we do as Senator COBURN suggested and just let the market work and don't have government interfere by establishing a minimum wage American workers should receive? What it means, quite simply, when we let the free market work, is that if people are in a high unemployment area and there are many workers competing for few jobs, an employer will say to a potential employee: I am prepared to hire you, good news, and I am going to pay \$4.

The worker says: I can't live on \$4 an hour. That is a starvation wage.

The employer says: That is OK, because I have 20 other workers who are prepared to accept that wage.

That is what happens when we abolish the concept of the minimum wage.

Many of us—and I think the vast majority of the American people—have a very different vision of where our country should go. We don't believe we should be abolishing the minimum wage. We don't believe we should be cutting or privatizing Social Security or transforming Medicare into a voucher program or making horrendous cuts to Medicaid.

What, in fact, the American people want is the Federal Government to start standing up for working families rather than millionaires and billionaires. In poll after poll, what the American people have said is they want us to invest in rebuilding our crumbling infrastructure and create millions of decent-paying jobs. That is what the American people want. They do not want tax breaks for billionaires but the creation of millions of jobs for rebuilding our crumbling infrastructure.

The American people, despite what Senator COBURN and others may believe, want us to raise the minimum wage. Poll after poll suggests the American people want us to raise the minimum wage to at least \$10.10 an hour.

The American people do not want us to cut Social Security. In fact, more and more Americans want us to expand Social Security, to make sure when elderly people reach retirement age, they can live and retire with dignity.

I think there has perhaps never been a time in the modern history of this country where the political lines have been drawn as clearly as they are right now. If you listen to the Koch brothers, if you read the Republican Ryan budget in the House, their positions are quite clear: Tax breaks for millionaires and billionaires and significant cuts in the programs that are life and death for the middle-class and working families of this country.

That is not what the American people want, and it is time we began to listen to the American people. It is time we took on those people, those billionaires who are spending huge amounts of money electing candidates who represent their interests. And it is time we listen to the working families of this country, who are struggling to survive.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARKEY). The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. ROBERTS. I thank the Presiding Officer.

Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of my friend from Vermont, who I know is in a hurry to leave the premises, as most Senators have already done. Perhaps he could relax and go out and have a Coke. Bad pun.

(The remarks of Mr. ROBERTS pertaining to the introduction of S. 2282

are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

IMMIGRATION REFORM

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I rise today to point out to my colleagues that more than 300 days have passed since we in the Senate passed bipartisan legislation that would secure our borders, hold employers accountable for hiring illegal workers, grow our economy, and provide a chance for people currently here illegally to get right with the law and earn legal status. But the House has failed to do anything to fix our broken immigration system—more than 300 days after we in the Senate passed bipartisan legislation.

To be clear, the problem is not that there is a difference of opinion between a House bill and a Senate bill on immigration that cannot be reconciled. The problem is that House Republicans have completely abdicated their responsibility to address important issues, such as fixing our broken immigration system.

Again, the problem is not that the House has passed laws that the Senate disagrees with. The problem is that the House will not put any immigration bills up for a vote, no matter what is in those bills. Now, why is that?

It is not because our immigration system is not broken. There is no Member of Congress who will stand and say: Our immigration system is great. Leave it alone. What is all the fuss about?

No one is happy with the present system. Finding a Member of Congress anywhere who will say we do not need to reform our broken immigration system is impossible.

The reason the House has done nothing on immigration is because House Republicans have handed the gavel of leadership on immigration to far-right extremists such as Congressman STEVE KING.

Congressman KING is not a mainstream Republican on this issue. You cannot even call him a conservative on this issue. He is an extreme outlier on the issue of immigration reform.

Every time any Republican has raised the possibility of action on immigration reform in the House, STEVE KING is there, in his own words, "manning the watchtowers 24/7" to make sure nothing can be passed to fix our broken immigration system.

When Republicans such as ERIC CANTOR, hardly a flaming liberal, talked early in 2013 about introducing a bill called the KIDS Act which would allow minors brought here through no fault of their own to earn legal status if they served in the military or obtained a college degree, KING said, "For every child who's a valedictorian, there's another 100 out there who weigh 130 pounds and they've got calves the size of cantaloupes because they're hauling

75 pounds of marijuana across the desert.”

The rhetoric of STEVE KING is beyond the pale. I am certain that the majority of Republicans in the House have their stomachs churn when they see STEVEN KING spew that kind of rhetoric. But rather than stand up to him, they give him the keys to the kingdom of immigration reform. Just look at what happened after KING protested. There was no KIDS Act introduced. Go look for the text of the KIDS Act on line. It does not exist. There is no bill. Not only was the KIDS Act never introduced, but House Republicans actually voted, nearly unanimously, to resume deporting minor children who had committed no crimes.

Another Republican, JEFF DENHAM, a Republican from California, who is also an Air Force reservist, recently proposed to let young people who came here illegally earn status by enlisting in the military. They love America so they would enlist in the military and risk their lives for this country. Here is what DENHAM said—paraphrasing him. He said: I know many of us do not want to vote on immigration. But we can at least tweak the Defense authorization bill to allow young people who were brought here illegally as minors through no fault of their own to serve in the military when they love this country and this is the only country they know.

To be clear, this measure is far short of comprehensive legislation that is needed to fix our broken system. This slight tweak is not even a drop of water in the Grand Canyon. Even for the small microscopic measure known as the ENLIST Act, STEVE KING responded, saying, “Don’t do it.” And the Republicans did not.

Here is what KING said:

As soon as they raise their hand and say I’m unlawfully present in the U.S., we are not going to take your oath into the military, but we’re going to take your deposition and we have a bus for you to Tijuana.

What happened when KING said this? He won. The ENLIST Act was stricken from the Defense authorization bill. So not only are Republicans catering to the views of KING and others on the far, far, extreme right on immigration by refusing to vote on any immigration reform, they actively promote anti-immigrant viewpoints by having passed a bill called the ENFORCE Act. You see, STEVE KING and his little group of far-right Members of Congress on immigration want to sue the Federal Government to require them to deport minor children, parents of U.S. citizens, and agricultural workers, rather than use all of its resources to focus on immigrants who are criminals, terrorists, and recent border crossers.

But Members of Congress, as most everyone knows, do not have standing to sue the Federal Government, because under our Constitution, Congressmen are not allowed to sue every time they disagree with a decision of the executive branch. Instead of think-

ing it was probably a good idea to focus our immigration enforcement resources on criminals, terrorists, and border crossers, once again STEVE KING said: Jump. And the Republican mainstream in the House said: How high? Republicans overwhelmingly voted to give KING and others the ability to sue the Federal Government every single time a decision on immigration enforcement is made with which they disagree.

There are Republican colleagues in the House who do not have the views of STEVE KING. We know that. They can offer other excuses they want for failing to do anything on immigration. For instance, they tried to blame the President. They say the President is to blame because he will not enforce the law. The record shows that he does enforce the law. In fact, many of the more liberal people, many of the immigration groups, are angry with him because they think he is enforcing the law too much.

But let’s say you believe he is not enforcing the law. So we have said to them: Good. Pass a bill now and say it does not take effect, all of the enforcement and any of the rest of it, until 2017. We will have a new President. If Republicans cannot agree to pass a bill that goes into effect after the President’s term, then we know that mistrust of the President is nothing but a straw man.

They say they really want to pass immigration legislation in their heart, but they are only one Member and it is not up to them. They can even have their leadership blame other Republicans for not holding a vote. But Bill Parcells, who used to coach for both the New York Giants and New York Jets, was famous for saying, “You are what your record shows you are.”

What does the record show? The record on Republican immigration reform is clear. STEVE KING, a far-right, way-out-of-the-mainstream outlier, does not just spew hatred, he calls the shots. They listen to him. The Republican Party, the party of Abraham Lincoln and Theodore Roosevelt and Dwight Eisenhower and Ronald Reagan and George Bush, all of whom had much different views on immigration than STEVE KING, is following STEVE KING on immigration.

Let me say, they are following STEVE KING over the cliff. Because not only are they hurting America, but because they are so afraid to buck this extremist—and he is extreme on immigration—they are going to make it certain that they will lose the 2016 Presidential election, that they will make sure that the Senate remains Democratic in 2016 and that the House turns Democratic.

It is amazing. The Republican record on immigration reform is clear. STEVE KING has three wins. The rest of the Republican Party and the rest of America is winless. Good for him. Terrible for us. Since House Republicans will not stand up to STEVE KING, KING is in the driver’s seat on immigration re-

form. As long as he sits there, things will continue to be stuck in a rut.

America is growing weary of Republicans talking a good game on immigration while high-tech businesses cannot get the labor they need to grow and create American jobs. We are growing weary of all the talk while crops go unpicked because farmers cannot find labor. We are growing weary while Republicans talk and immigrants continue to come into our country illegally.

STEVE KING is calling the shots of the entire House Republicans on immigration. That is a shame. That is a disgrace. That is a singular lack of courage that we see in our dear colleagues across the way on the Republican side of the aisle. KING is not satisfied. He is warning that his colleagues have to man the watchtowers 24/7 to make sure nothing happens to fix our broken immigration system.

Where are the people in the Republican Party in the House of Representatives with the courage to stand up to STEVE KING and the far right? They know he is wrong. We know they know he is wrong. Where are the people in the Republican Party to stand up to STEVE KING and say: Enough is enough. We will not let our party or our country be hijacked by extremists whose xenophobia causes them to prefer maintaining our broken immigration system over achieving a tough, fair, and practical long-term solution.

If Republicans continue to kowtow to STEVE KING and the hard right on immigration, they will consign themselves to being the minority party for more than a decade or they can show some courage and say the STEVE KINGS in the world can say whatever they want, but they have no place in the modern Republican Party. They can move their party into the light by passing a bill that secures borders, holds employers accountable, grows our economy, reduces our debt, and heals broken families. The choice is theirs.

Speaker BOEHNER has occasionally said he wants to pass reform. Where are the rank-and-file Republicans who know STEVE KING is wrong to encourage Speaker BOEHNER? Where are they? I hope that for our sakes, the majority of Republicans in the House Republican caucus make the right choice.

But I will tell them this: For the country, no matter what choice they make, the ultimate outcome is undeniable. Immigration reform will pass this year with bipartisan support and a bipartisan imprint or it will pass in future years with only Democratic support and Democratic imprints, because Democrats will control the Congress and the White House. The right thing will ultimately be done. But hopefully Winston Churchill will not be right in saying that it will only be done after everything else is tried.

Republicans in the House, stand up to STEVE KING. You know he is wrong. You know you cringe when he says

what he says. Do not let him dictate policy.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. REED. The Republican-led filibuster of the minimum wage bill—which would raise the Federal minimum wage from \$7.75 per hour to \$10.10 per hour—means that an estimated 27.8 million Americans, including 91,000 Rhode Islanders, will not get a raise. It also means, according to estimates from the Economic Policy Institute, that our economy will miss out on a GDP boost of \$22 billion by 2016, which would have supported over 84,000 additional full-time jobs.

Those 27.8 million workers who would have received a raise would have spent it at local businesses, helping their local communities and spurring economic growth. Typically, minimum wage workers are those who, when they receive an increase in their paychecks, go out and buy things that are necessary. They are the ones who really provide the kind of local stimulus we need to grow the economy.

The Federal minimum wage has not been increased since 2009. Today an individual who works 40 hours per week 52 weeks a year at the Federal minimum wage earns \$15,080 per year, and that is nearly \$5,000 below the Federal poverty level for a family of three and almost \$9,000 below the poverty level for a family of four. That means we have hard-working Americans putting in full-time work every week for the entire year and yet still living in poverty. That is not fair to these families who are just looking for a fair shot.

People who work hard for a living shouldn't have to live in poverty. That was not the case in the sixties when the minimum wage was such that it would lift you out of poverty, and that is what we have to do today.

When Congress last passed legislation to raise the minimum wage in 2007, it was a bipartisan undertaking, and 44 Republican Senators joined Democrats to send President Bush a bill that raised the minimum wage to its current level. That bipartisan effort should be emulated today in this Senate. In fact, one could argue that the needs are more pressing; that American workers have fallen further behind; and that the same logic that compelled President Bush to sign this bill and a bipartisan Congress to send it to him is even more compelling today.

Our constituents sent us here to work together to grow the economy and create jobs. It is disappointing that this bill to provide millions of hard-working Americans a raise—a raise

they deserve through their own efforts—has been filibustered.

I hope my colleagues on the other side would find a way to work with us on this issue and come together to strengthen our economic recovery. I was particularly gratified, working with my colleagues on emergency unemployment insurance, that we did get bipartisan support to pass sensible and fiscally responsible legislation. Unfortunately, now it is in the House and it is not moving there. I hope it does.

But we have to do more of that, focus on what will actually help Americans individually and collectively move and grow our economy. We have worked together on emergency unemployment insurance and other issues, such as immigration reform. We can work together on this issue, and we must.

Again, I am at this point very disappointed that same bipartisan effort has not been translated into action by the House of Representatives when it comes to restoring emergency unemployment insurance. Speaker BOEHNER could call up our bill, which is fully paid for and which will affect, at this point, about 2.6 million Americans—and their families, so it is many more Americans who will benefit—and under the rules of the House could quickly have a vote within probably 24 hours. I am convinced and so is my colleague Senator HELLER of Nevada, who is my chief cosponsor, that bill would pass in the House today on a bipartisan basis. We have had Republican Representatives who have written to the Speaker and said: Bring it up for a vote. That would help. It would help not only 2.6 million Americans—and that grows each day—but it would also help our economy.

So, again, in a similar vein, we need bipartisan action on raising the minimum wage in the Senate, emulating the bipartisan action we took with respect to emergency unemployment insurance, and then we need that same bipartisanship in the House of Representatives to move these measures to the President for his signature.

Raising the minimum wage and restoring jobless benefits are the right things to do for the American people and for the American economy. I hope these policies, which traditionally have enjoyed strong bipartisan support, will eventually prevail in both the Senate and the House and be signed into law by the President of the United States.

Once again, I think it is important to emphasize that the last time we raised the minimum wage, it was a bipartisan effort signed by a Republican President. This is not an issue or should not be an issue of political ideology or political posturing. This should be an issue of what helps the American worker make his or her way through a very difficult economy. Viewed in that logic, it is clear to me that we should pass this legislation, not filibuster it, and that the House should pass quickly the emergency unemployment insurance compensation bill.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

Mr. HOEVEN. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. HOEVEN pertaining to the introduction of S. 2280 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. HOEVEN. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HEITKAMP). The Senator from Connecticut.

HEALTH CARE

Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, I wish to tell the story of a 57-year-old man from Boyertown, PA. His name is Dean Angstadt.

Dean is a self-employed, self-sufficient logger. He is the kind of guy, similar to a lot of Americans out there, who has sort of grown up to believe he could do everything for himself; that he didn't need a lot of help from people around him in order to make a living, in order to provide for his family, in order to keep himself healthy.

He has been uninsured since 2009, and he had some particular thoughts about the Affordable Care Act. He knew he didn't want anything to do with ObamaCare.

In 2011 Dean had a pacemaker and a defibrillator implanted to help his ailing heart pump more efficiently. Not long after he got these two implants, the 6-foot, 285-pound guy was back out in the woods, but last summer his health worsened again. It was taking him about 10 minutes just to catch his breath after he felled a tree, and by the fall he was winded just traveling the 50 feet between his house and his truck. He said:

I knew that I was really sick. I figured the doctors were going to have to operate, so I tried to work as long as I could to save money for the surgery. But it got to the point where I couldn't work.

So he called his friend Bob who is a 55-year-old retired firefighter and nurse, and talked about the fact that he was having trouble. Bob said: Why don't you check out the Affordable Care Act? But every time he made that suggestion, Dean refused. Dean said:

We argued about it for months. I didn't trust this ObamaCare. One of the big reasons is it sounded too good to be true.

January came, and Dean's health continued to get worse. His doctor made it clear he urgently needed valve replacement surgery, and he was facing a choice: He either had to find a way to get health care or he was going to die. That was his choice, find a way to pay for health care or perish.

Luckily, his friend Bob finally convinced Dean to come over and at least

take a look at the Affordable Care plans available to Dean. So he came over to his house, and in less than an hour the two of them had finished the application. One day later Dean signed up for the Highmark Blue Cross Silver PPO plan and paid his first monthly premium of \$26.11.

All of a sudden, I'm getting notification from Highmark, and I got my card, and it was actually all legitimate. I could have done backflips if I were in better shape.

His plan kicked in on March 1, just in time to get the surgery he couldn't have afforded otherwise, that he couldn't have put off any longer. On March 31, after his surgery, he said without that surgery:

I probably would have ended up falling over dead. Not only did it save my life, it's going to give me a better quality of life.

For me, this isn't about politics. I'm trying to help other people who are like me, stubborn and bullheaded, who refused to even look. From my own experience, the ACA is everything it's supposed to be and, in fact, better than it's made out to be.

Dean's story is one of 8 million stories that can be told all across the country. Eight million people have enrolled in private health care plans under the Affordable Care Act. Why? Because there is a simple premise embedded at the foundation of the Affordable Care Act; that is, that you shouldn't get sick—in Dean's case, you shouldn't face death—simply because you don't have the money to afford surgery.

Dean was working. Dean was a logger, a salt-of-the-Earth kind of guy who was playing by the rules, obeying the law, had a job, but he just didn't have the money to afford that expensive surgery. He gets to live and he gets access to health care because of the Affordable Care Act—not because of a government handout but because of our collective decision to give Dean a discount on private health care, 1 of 8 million people all across the country.

That is just the number of people who have been insured on these private exchanges. Three million young people under the age of 26 have been able to stay on their parents' plans because the Affordable Care Act allows for that to occur. New numbers this week suggest more than 4.8 million people have enrolled in Medicaid and CHIP plans between October 2013 and March of 2014. Another approximately 1 million individuals gained coverage through an early expansion of Medicaid that happened in States before January 1, 2014.

Put that all together: Eight million people on exchanges, 3 million young people covered through their parents' plan, 5.8 million people on Medicaid. That is 16 million, 17 million people in this country who have health care who didn't have it before.

In my State the numbers are even more remarkable. We had a goal of signing up about 100,000 people, and we went out there and did everything we could to get the word out about the Affordable Care Act. We didn't sign up 100,000 people; we signed up 200,000 peo-

ple. To be exact, we signed up 208,301 people in Connecticut. On the last day alone, on March 31, 5,900 people signed up in Connecticut. Connecticut is a small State. We only have a handful of 1 million people who live in our entire State, and we increased those who have insurance by 200,000 in a State of only a few million. That is probably why—the fact that in States such as Connecticut 200,000 people now have insurance, 15 million-plus across the country have insurance—the polling is starting to fundamentally change. A Washington Post poll from a few weeks ago showed that for the first time a majority of Americans support the Affordable Care Act. A new poll in battleground congressional districts shows that 52 percent of respondents want to implement and fix the Affordable Care Act, which is about 10 percent more than those people who want to repeal and replace the bill. That 52 percent number has increased beyond what the poll showed last December. The 42 percent number of those who want to repeal and replace is much less than the number from last December. People are starting to figure out that all the Republican spin and rhetoric about the Affordable Care Act is just that, spin and rhetoric, and the reality is that 15 million people have access to health care. The stories such as Dean's can be multiplied all over the country in every corner of this great Nation.

But here is the even better news: We are not only enrolling more people but we are saving money. We are enrolling people and saving money. Medicare spending growth is down. Medicare per capita spending is growing at historically low rates. In April, for the fifth straight year, CBO reduced its projections for Medicare spending over the next 10 years. This time they reduced it by another \$106 billion.

This is what we always said was the problem with the American health care system. We always said we don't insure enough people. We still leave 30 million people without access to health care and we spend twice as much money as our other competitor first-world nations—less people insured, much greater cost. We all came down to the floor, the Senate and the House, and said the Affordable Care Act will tackle both problems, and now a few months into the full implementation of the law that is exactly what is happening.

It is actually costing less than we thought. The projections are that the Affordable Care Act is going to reduce the deficit by \$1.7 trillion over the next two decades. Let me say that again. The Affordable Care Act will reduce the deficit by \$1.7 trillion, meaning if you repeal the Affordable Care Act, as so many still want to do—as the House has tried to do 50 different times—you would increase the deficit by \$1.7 trillion and the overall cost of the program is 15 percent less than what the initial projections were.

Insurers are starting to weigh in as well. The second biggest U.S. health in-

surer, WellPoint, increased its profit forecast after the ACA enrollment numbers boosted their quarterly results. Their chief executive officer said:

The risk pool and the product selection seem to be coming in the manner that we hoped it would. It's very encouraging right now.

UnitedHealthcare, which had a pretty small footprint in these exchanges, has now changed its bias to increase the participation in exchanges in 2015 because it said it saw a positive response from consumers who enrolled in the plans they did offer in limited States in greater than expected numbers. Fifteen million people, including eight million people on private insurance plans, enrolled, saving money for taxpayers and for insurance companies. That is the real story of the Affordable Care Act.

Let me finish by sharing with you a couple more stories from Connecticut, and I am going to share them through the eyes of the enrollers because enrollers and assisters are the heroes of these last several months.

There was an embarrassing rollout of the Affordable Care Act in the fall of last year, a Web site that should have been working on day one that wasn't. But the fact is that thousands of people all across this country working in community health centers and emergency rooms, at nonprofits, decided to make this thing work in red States and in blue States and went out and enrolled in record numbers, shattering expectations for people on affordable health care. I had a few of these assisters together in Connecticut. They started telling me stories and I will finish with two of them.

Michael, who is an assister in Danielson, CT, tells this story, and he said: I recall a husband and wife who came into our health center and didn't have health insurance mainly because they indicated their employer's insurance plan was way too expensive. As I went along asking questions during the application the husband mostly complained about ObamaCare. He kept saying our government is making it so no one can afford insurance and that he and his wife heard that insurance plans were still too high, even after going through the exchange. After completing the application and showing them the plans that were offered, they were totally surprised by the minimal cost of the premiums as well as the deductible rates. I also helped them understand how certain plans were structured and what services the deductible applied to. They left that day choosing a plan that was right for them. Needless to say, they went home from our meeting feeling more confident about their choice, more educated about health insurance and less resentful of the Affordable Care Act.

Sean, who is an assister from Norwich, tells this story: I met one middle-aged man. He hadn't had insurance for over 5 years because all the plans were so high and unaffordable and he was

over the income for the State Medicaid insurance program. He had a few prescriptions and had to pay out-of-pocket around \$150 to \$200 every month. We successfully completed an ACA application and selected an Anthem Blue Cross and Blue Shield plan with tax credits. The plan's monthly premium was only a fraction of what he would have paid every month for prescriptions and medical care, and the prescription drug copay was only about \$10. This man was ecstatic, and he said he would have to go home to figure out a way to spend all of the money that he would save every month with his new plan.

There are stories similar to his and Dean's all over the country, 8 million of them just when it comes to the people who have signed up for private health care, but for the rest of us who have health care, the news is good as well: \$1.7 trillion off of the deficit, a program that is costing 15 percent less than we had expected, an overall Medicare inflation rate for taxpayers that is coming down, and for many of us the ability to sleep a little bit better at night because we know that the most affluent, most powerful country in the world has committed itself to the idea that somebody like Dean—a logger, going out and working the land—doesn't have to die simply because he doesn't have the money to pay for surgery. In so many ways the Affordable Care Act is working.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

CAMPAIGN SPENDING

Mr. KING. Madam President, there is an ominous tide rising in this country. It is not water. It is not oil. It is not any kind of substance. It is dollars. It is cash. It is a tide of dark money that is flowing in and threatens to dominate our political system.

Yesterday we had a very interesting hearing in the Rules Committee on the subject of disclosure and the rise of outside money in campaigns. We have developed a kind of parallel universe of campaign financing, where the candidates, you and I and other Members of this body, work hard to raise money from supporters so we can fund our campaigns. By the way, all of that money that is raised has to be under certain limits. There are limitations. There are disclosure requirements. If you get a contribution, it has to be disclosed who paid it and what do they do for a living and what is their address. All of that is public.

Yet on the other side is this parallel universe, as I mentioned, where a multimillionaire can come into your State or my State or anybody's State and put in an enormous amount of money, essentially unregulated and often totally anonymous. I think this is a danger to our country. I started the hearing off yesterday by saying I fear for my country. I fear for our democracy.

There are several basic points I wish to make. This isn't an evolutionary

change. This isn't, OK, we are spending a few more dollars this year than we did last year and it is a little more of the same and it is no big deal. This is what is happening: This is nonparty outside spending starting back in the early nineties, and we see what happened in 2012. Now we don't have the numbers in 2012. Of course, 2012 was a Presidential year. What we see is it started to go up, the Presidential year in 2004, and then down. It goes up in 2008 in the Presidential year, down—but not so much—and then way up in 2012, and this gives the context of what is happening. This isn't evolutionary change; this is revolutionary change. This is a fundamental change.

I asked one of our witnesses yesterday at the hearing: Is this a very significant, great change that is going on? He said: Senator, it is an explosion.

It is an explosion. Here is what it looks like. This is nonparty spending, cycle to date, and the day was the day before yesterday. In other words, it is the outside party spending, the so-called independent expenditures comparing apples to apples as of April 29 of each year.

So here again, 2004 Presidential year, then it drops way down in 2006 midterms, again jumps up in 2008, down in 2010, big jump for 2012. But look where we are as of this date in 2014. Look at the comparison between this and the last midterm year. It is almost 10 times as much. This is a threat that is growing and it is going to overwhelm us.

Some of my colleagues have said we are bound for a scandal. Indeed, that is what has driven campaign finance reform throughout our history. The first major campaign finance reform was in 1907. It resulted from the Presidential campaigns in the late 1890s and the turn of the century, where Mark Hanna, a political operative, called the major corporations of America and said: You will give us this—and that is how the money was raised for those campaigns. We then passed the first campaign finance law under the leadership of Teddy Roosevelt in 1907 because he saw a scandal coming.

So this is nonparty outside spending. This is both disclosed and undisclosed, but look at this. This is spending by nondisclosure groups, cycle to date. Look where we are. This is the money that nobody knows where it comes from. If we start back in here, 2012, this is a Presidential year to date and here we are in 2014. It is an explosion, and nobody knows where that money is coming from. It is secret money.

What we have is the development of organizations and institutions engaged in what I call identity laundering. I am not going to attempt to explain this chart, but this is a chart that traces in 2012 one set of funds. It is about \$400 million from three large organizations that go through all of these different entities and the whole purpose is to keep the names of the donors secret. So the public doesn't know who is trying

to influence their vote. This isn't insignificant money. Fifty million dollars this line represents to something called the American Future Fund. They create these entities—and there is also the wonderful nomenclature here—there are even entities entitled “undesigned” or “disregarded”—and the whole purpose of this is to hide the identity of the people who are supporting it.

I don't think that is consistent with the First Amendment. It is not consistent with our political traditions. It is not consistent with the whole idea of conveying information. If somebody wants to come and buy ads in Pennsylvania or North Dakota or New York or California, that is fine. They have a right to do that, at least under the current Supreme Court rulings, but they also ought to tell us who they are. That is part of the information the voters should have in assessing the validity of the message that is being delivered to them.

In Maine you cannot go to a town meeting with a bag over your head. If you are going to make a speech, if you are going to take your position on an issue, you tell who you are, and people can assess the validity of your views based upon in part who they know you are, what your interest is, what your stake is in this process, and we are denying the people of America the opportunity to know that.

It is important to realize in this whole area of campaign finance, which is unbelievably complicated, that the Supreme Court has significantly narrowed our ability in Congress or in the States to regulate campaign finance. They have essentially said that money is speech and that it can't be limited—at least in the aggregate, that is the *McCutcheon* decision. Under the *Citizens United* decision, the corporations are also people and have a right to free speech and can spend as much money as they want.

When you go back and read those key opinions—*Citizens United* and *McCutcheon*, which was just decided about a month ago—the Supreme Court said: We are going to strike down these limitations because they are limitations on free speech, but the basic reason we feel comfortable doing so is because the public still has disclosure and they will know who is talking, and that is our bulwark against abuse and corrosion of our system.

The problem with that reasoning is the bulwark doesn't exist, and clever campaign operatives have created this elaborate system which is designed to disguise who the contributors are, and that is the problem with our system.

The problem right now is that one party may think they are advantaged by the current system, but 2 years from now that advantage could disappear. Indeed, data we received just before our hearing indicates that 2 years ago 88 percent of the outside money was conservative. Indeed, this year—so far in 2012—it is closer to being balanced. It

is 60-40 conservative over more liberal messages. I submit that once it gets to be 50-50, everybody on both sides of the aisle will say that maybe we need to do something about it. I am suggesting we do something about it sooner rather than later.

The Supreme Court has invited us to do something about disclosure. I think it is the tool we know we have. There is discussion about a constitutional amendment, which is fine, and I am a supporter. That is a long-term solution. That could take 4, 5, 6 years, assuming the support could be achieved in the Congress and in the States. In the meantime, disclosure is something we could do next week, and it is something we should do. We owe it to the American people to allow them to know who it is that is trying to influence their vote.

Occasionally, there is an argument that people who make these kinds of contributions will be subjected to some kind of intimidation—crank phone calls, threats, and those kinds of things. Well, Justice Scalia—the Supreme Court Justice whom I used to know in law school—recently said: “Requiring people to stand up in public for their political acts fosters civic courage, without which democracy is doomed.”

If people are willing to spend millions of dollars attacking someone else's character, integrity, and career, they ought to at least be willing to stand up and say: Here am I. I am making these statements.

They should not be allowed to hide behind something created by an army of accountants and lawyers to disguise their identity. I think this is something—and based upon the hearing we had yesterday and the work we did in preparing for it—we really need to attend to.

When I first got into this subject last year, I thought it was bad. Well, what I have learned over the last several months is that it is a lot worse than I thought. It is happening fast. It is a tidal wave, and it is going to engulf our system. Why do we care? Because it is corrosive and it undermines the confidence citizens have in us as their political leaders.

In the 1970s and 1980s, people had a perception that money was corrupting around here, even if it wasn't. But, boy, when we start to have unidentified, outside dark money and nobody knows where it is coming from, what could be more calculating to undermine public confidence in their leadership than a system like that? It is corrosive. It undermines the trust of our people. It is wrong, and I think it is something we should attend to. It is something we can do. We know we can do it constitutionally. We had an 8-to-1 majority vote. McCutcheon and Citizens United invited us to do this. I think we should be able to find a bipartisan solution to this subject because it will benefit this whole country, and I think it will be a great benefit to the institution of de-

mocracy itself. This is not what the Framers envisioned, and we have it within our power to do something about it so we can improve this situation and the flow of information—including the source of that information—to the people of America.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

UKRAINE

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I take this time on the floor as the Chair of the U.S. Helsinki Commission. The Helsinki Commission is the operating arm of the U.S. participation in the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, the OSCE. It has been in the press recently because of the circumstances in Ukraine, which is what I am going to talk about.

First, I will remind my colleagues that the United States, along with all the countries of Europe and Canada, formed the commission on security and cooperation in Europe in 1975. It was founded on the principle that in order to have a stable country, you need to deal not just with the direct security needs—the military needs—of a country and not just with its economic and environmental agenda, but you also need to deal with its human rights and its good governance, and all three of these are related.

Commitments were made by all the signatories to the OSCE about respecting the jurisdictions of the member states and dealing with the rights of your neighbors and dealing with the rights of your own citizens. The Soviet Union was a member of the OSCE, and now all of the countries of the former Soviet Union are members, including Russia and the countries of central Asia.

I am increasingly alarmed at the deterioration of the situation in Eastern Ukraine, particularly in the Donetsk region, where Moscow-controlled pro-Russian separatists have seized 19 buildings and 14 cities and towns.

Last week seven members of the German-led OSCE Vienna Document inspection team, charged with observing unusual military activities, along with five of their Ukrainian escorts, were kidnapped by pro-Russian militants. One observer has been freed, and the rest continue to be held hostage. Russia, an OSCE member, has not lifted a finger to secure their release. There is no doubt in my mind that if Mr. Putin gave the word, this hostage situation would cease to exist.

This hostage-taking of unarmed international monitors must continue to be condemned in the strongest possible terms, and everything possible must be done to secure their release.

In addition to the OSCE observers, 40 people—journalists, activists, police officers, and politicians—are reportedly being held captive in makeshift jails in Slovyansk.

Meanwhile, the violence in Eastern Ukraine continues. On Monday, several

thousand peaceful protesters marching in favor of Ukraine's unity were attacked by pro-Russian thugs wielding clubs and whips, resulting in 15 seriously injured. That same day, Gennady Kernes, the mayor of Ukraine's second largest city, Kharkiv, was shot, underwent emergency surgery, and remains in serious condition. He is now in Israel for further medical treatment.

Furthermore, I am deeply dismayed at other flagrant violations of human rights by pro-Russian militants in Eastern Ukraine and in Russia's annexed Crimea. These include attacks and threats against minority groups, particularly Jews and Roma as well as Crimean Tatars and ethnic Ukrainians in Crimea. Supporters of a united Ukraine have been targeted as well, including a local politician and university student whose tortured bodies were found dumped in a river near Slovyansk.

The joint statement on Ukraine signed in Geneva on April 17 by the EU, the United States, Russia, and Ukraine calls on all sides to lay down their arms, vacate buildings, and begin the process of dialogue and de-escalation. That was signed just 2 weeks ago. That agreement provided a basis for de-escalation. Yet, over the course of the last days and weeks, we have not seen the Russians follow through on urging separatists to stand down in Eastern Ukraine. What have we seen? Kyiv, on the one hand, is taking concrete steps and making good-faith efforts to live up to the Geneva agreement, including vacating buildings and offering dialogue. Russia has done nothing. Instead of working to de-escalate the conflict, it is doing the opposite—fueling escalation. Russia continues to violate the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Ukraine and flagrantly flaunts its commitments under the Geneva agreement.

The Geneva agreement also calls upon the parties to refrain from any violence, intimidation, or provocative actions and condemns and rejects all expressions of extremism, racism, religious intolerance, including anti-Semitism. Clearly, both the spirit and the letter of this agreement have been breached by Russia.

In recent days we have seen troubling manifestations against ethnic and religious minority communities. The distribution of flyers in Donetsk calling for Jews to register their religion and property is a chilling reminder of an especially dark period in European history. While the perpetrators of this onerous action have not been determined, one thing is clear: Moscow, which controls the pro-Russian separatists in Eastern Ukraine, is using anti-Semitism as an ingredient in its anti-Ukrainian campaign. Perhaps even worse, among the Russian special forces and agitators operating in Ukraine are members of the neo-Nazi and other anti-Semitic groups.

Jewish communities in parts of Eastern Ukraine are not the only ones that have reason to be worried. In

Slovyansk, armed separatists have invaded Romani homes and beaten and robbed men, women, and children. Ukrainian speakers—including Ukrainian-speaking journalists—have reportedly experienced intimidation in the largely Russian-speaking Donetsk area.

At the same time in Crimea, which Russia forcibly annexed, Crimean Tatars continue to be threatened with deportation and attacked for speaking their own language in their ancestral homeland. Moreover, the longtime leader of the Crimean Tatar community and former Soviet political prisoner Mustafa Dzhemilev has been banned from returning to Crimea.

It is important to underscore that Crimea is the ancestral home of the Crimean Tatars, who in 1944 were forcibly and brutally evicted by Stalin to central Asia and only allowed to return to their home in the early 1990s.

Additionally, the separatist Crimean authorities have gone after the Ukrainian community, announcing that Ukrainian literature and history will no longer be offered in Crimean schools.

These attacks and threats underscore the importance of the OSCE Special Monitoring Mission and other OSCE institutions in Ukraine in assessing the situation on the ground and helping to de-escalate tensions. They need to be permitted to operate unhindered—and most certainly not held hostage—in Eastern Ukraine and to be allowed access into Crimea, which Russia continues to block.

The actions against pro-Ukrainian activists and minorities are the direct result of Russia's unfounded and illegal aggression against Ukraine—first in Crimea and then in Eastern Ukraine. There is no doubt as to who pulls the strings. The Kremlin has been relentlessly flaunting their Geneva promises and has done nothing to rein in the militants they control. Mr. Putin needs to get Russian soldiers and other assorted military and intelligence operatives out of Ukraine.

We must not forget Crimea. We must never recognize Russia's forcible, illegal annexation of the Ukrainian territory, which violates every single one of the 10 core OSCE Helsinki principles. We must build on the punitive measures already undertaken against the Russian and Ukrainian individuals who so blatantly violated the international agreements in the Ukrainian and Crimean Constitutions. Violations of another nation's territorial integrity and sovereignty must not be tolerated. Russia's flagrant land grab of Crimea has set a horrible precedent for those countries harboring illegal territorial ambitions around the globe.

I welcome the President's stepping up of economic sanctions on seven Russian officials, including members of President Putin's inner circle and 17 companies linked to Mr. Putin. I also welcome the State Department and Commerce Department tightening pol-

icy to deny export license applications for any high-technology items that could contribute to Russia's military capabilities. I am confident Russia will feel the impact of these sanctions. These, along with the further targeted sanctions announced by the EU earlier this week, will only continue to have a growing impact.

Nevertheless, if the situation in eastern Ukraine continues to deteriorate, or even should the status quo persist, the United States needs to ratchet up these sanctions, and soon, including several sectoral sanctions against Russia's industries such as banking, mining, energy, and defense.

Of equal importance, we need to remain steadfast in helping Ukraine become a stronger democratic state and foster its political and economic stability. The millions of men, women, and children who demonstrated for months for human rights and human dignity spoke loudly and clearly, expressing the wishes of the vast majority of the Ukrainian citizens. The interim government has been working hard under exceedingly difficult circumstances to move Ukraine further on the path of economic and political reforms. We and our international partners need to keep making this progress our focal point. Ukraine needs a lot of help after the devastation wreaked on their economy by the incredibly corrupt and dysfunctional Yanukovich regime.

Ukraine has so many pressing needs. Among the most important are stabilizing the economy and preparing for the most important May 25 Presidential elections. Others include judicial reform, reform of the police and military, seeking justice and rehabilitation for the victims of the violence, including those suffering now at the hands of the pro-Russian militants, helping internally displaced people who are fleeing Crimea, and working to recover the billions in assets stolen by the previous regime.

I am pleased Ukraine's civil society, including Western-educated young people, is firmly committed to the rule of law and democracy and is playing a critical role in helping the Ukrainian Government work toward these ends. NGOs and think tanks have worked with the Parliament to pass a law on the independence of public broadcasting, a bill on public procurement, and one on how judges are appointed—all critical in fighting the scourge of corruption.

The United States is providing concrete assistance through a U.S. crisis support package for Ukraine, which includes support for the integrity of the May elections and constitutional reform, substantial economic assistance, energy security technical expertise, help to recover proceeds of corruptions stolen by the former regime, and other anticorruption assistance, and fostering greater people-to-people contacts. We need to be willing to provide more resources to the Ukrainians as

they actively work to fulfill their aspirations.

Ultimately, these choices will lead to a more secure, democratic, and peaceful world, and that is something that reflects both American interests and American values.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

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

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

(The remarks of Ms. LANDRIEU pertaining to the introduction of S. 2280 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the motion to proceed to S. 2262 is now pending?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The leader is correct.

Mr. REID. I have a cloture motion that I would ask to be reported.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 368, S. 2262, a bill to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes.

Harry Reid, Jeanne Shaheen, Michael F. Bennet, Richard J. Durbin, Christopher A. Coons, Bill Nelson, Tom Harkin, Martin Heinrich, Patrick J. Leahy, Richard Blumenthal, Tim Kaine, Patty Murray, Tom Udall, Joe Manchin III, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Angus S. King, Jr., Mark R. Warner.

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

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

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

TRIBUTE TO GLENN POSHARD

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I want to thank Dr. Glenn Poshard for his years of public service to Illinois.

Today, Dr. Poshard will be stepping down as president of Southern Illinois University, a position he has held with honor and distinction for more than 7 years. Under his leadership, Southern Illinois University has been able to keep tuition costs low and the university's finances sound, despite financial problems that have plagued the State.

Dr. Poshard has dedicated his life to working for the people of southern Illinois. In 1984, he was appointed to the Illinois State Senate until the people of the 22nd Congressional District sent him to the United States House of Representatives in 1989. I was fortunate to serve with Dr. Poshard for 8 years in the House of Representatives, where he was a strong proponent of campaign finance reform. Due to his commitment to reform, he limited individual donations to his gubernatorial campaign in 1998 and refused to accept contributions from political action committees.

Following his tenure in Congress, Dr. Poshard and his wife, Jo, founded the Poshard Foundation for Abused Children. For the last 14 years, the Poshard Foundation has worked to help abused, abandoned, and neglected children in southern Illinois.

After a 40 year affiliation with Southern Illinois University, Dr. Poshard is leaving his alma mater in good shape. He retires as the second longest-serving president in the history of the Southern Illinois University system, an experience he calls "the greatest honor of my life."

I congratulate Glenn on his outstanding career and thank him for his dedicated service to the people of Illinois. I wish him and his family all the best.

AFGHANISTAN AND UKRAINE SECURITY

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I just returned from a trip to Afghanistan and Ukraine where I reviewed the security situation in each country as chairman of the Armed Services Committee.

In each country, I met with military leaders and with civilian leaders and representatives of civilian society. The overwhelming impression I came away with is that American leadership remains critical, that others who are struggling for democracy and freedom see us as an essential friend and ally, and support for those who share those values must remain a cornerstone of our foreign policy and as essential to our own security.

In Afghanistan, I met with senior leaders of both our military and the Afghan military, including General Dunford, the commander of U.S. and coalition forces, and Afghan Minister of Defense Mohammedi. They reported that the transition of security responsibility to the Afghanistan National

Security Forces—ANSF—has gone even better than we had hoped, with no significant loss of security in the country despite the withdrawal of tens of thousands of American and coalition troops. U.S. and Afghan leaders alike expressed satisfaction with the ability of the newly built and much larger ANSF to successfully protect the Afghan people, to defeat Taliban forces in combat, and to secure a series of major public events, culminating in the April 5 Afghan presidential election.

Our military commanders emphasized that while these gains reflect the growing confidence of the Afghan security forces in their ability to provide security to the Afghan people, the challenge ahead is to put in place the final pieces needed to make the progress of the last decade sustainable. This includes logistics, maintenance, airlift, and building the institutions of the Afghan Army and police. Fundamental to any long-term effort on our part in Afghanistan will be the signing of the Bilateral Security Agreement as soon as possible with a new Afghan president. While President Karzai remains unreliable and his rhetoric offensive, all the major Afghan presidential candidates, including the two winners of the first round, support what we have done so far and look forward to signing the BSA promptly if elected.

In addition to meeting with the three leading presidential candidates, I met with Afghan government officials and with several groups of representatives of Afghan civil society. The Afghans I met with came from different backgrounds and spoke with different voices, but they shared a common message of pride in the achievement of their country as it has rebuilt and recovered from the devastation of decades of civil war and Taliban rule. They pointed to the revival of Afghanistan's education and health systems, the dramatic improvement in the role of women in the country, and the new life that the last 10 years have brought to the country's economy.

They also spoke of their frustration with the exceedingly negative picture of events in Afghanistan depicted in the U.S. press. A leading national paper writes about a "deepening resentment" of the American presence and a "growing alienation" between Afghanistan and the United States. But the Afghans I met and large majorities of Afghans, according to public opinion polls, are grateful for the sacrifices we have made on their behalf and are convinced they can continue to transform their country with our continued support. Their polls show that 64 percent of the Afghan people believe there has been significant progress in security. U.S. polls show the opposite, the product of an unbalanced, negative view in our media.

The Afghans I met spoke with pride of the election they held on April 5, in which 7 million Afghans braved threats and violence to get to the polls, voting

at a higher rate than we achieve in our own elections. According to preliminary counts, more than 35 percent of the voters were women. This record vote was the culmination of a campaign in which the leading candidates held huge rallies, attended by tens of thousands of Afghans all over the country—including in areas that much of our press reports are controlled by the Taliban. All of the security for these events, and for the vote itself, was provided by Afghan forces. And every Afghan I spoke with said that he—or she—feels more secure today than a few years ago, in part because Afghan forces are providing security in Afghan cities and towns.

Although the vote was divided among a number of candidates and a run-off between Dr. Abdullah and Dr. Ghani will occur, Afghans say the act of voting itself sent a message that Afghans reject the Taliban and what it stands for. Our intelligence sources indicate that the Taliban leadership is concerned by its inability to disrupt the election and prevent Afghans from getting to the polls.

So, far from what we may read in much of our press, the Afghan people conveyed to me their optimism regarding their country's significant progress, their desire for democracy, and their gratitude for the assistance of the United States over the past decade.

In Ukraine, I met with Acting President Turchinov, Prime Minister Yatsenyuk, Defense Minister Koval, National Security and Defense Council Head Parubiy, and numerous other government officials, activists, and participants in the political process. Ukrainians faced down the heavily armed security forces of a corrupt, repressive regime on the Maidan—their Independence Square—while they themselves armed with little more than rocks, tires, and sandbags. Now they face an even greater challenge in the form of tens of thousands of Russian troops massed on their borders. Already, the Russians have annexed Crimea and Russian Special Operations forces have organized sympathizers to occupy buildings in a number of Eastern Ukrainian cities and towns in an effort to disrupt and destabilize the government, make an election on May 25 difficult to organize, and establish a basis for Russian occupation or a Russian-oriented breakaway State.

In the face of these challenges, the Ukrainians I met expressed gratitude for the solidarity and support our country has shown through the dark days of the Yanukovich regime and into the challenges they face today. They expressed their support for our values and their strong desire to be a part of the democratic West, rather than the authoritarian sphere of Putin's Russia and its allies. And they asked for our support in their effort to stabilize their country, fend off the Russian challenge, and hold free and fair elections as scheduled.

The Ukrainian people earned our support when they put their lives on the line at the Maidan and turned to face the Russian threat with both toughness and restraint. We should stand with the Ukrainian government and the Ukrainian people because they share our democratic values, and because Russia's effort to dismember their country through the threat of force, if allowed to succeed, could undermine decades of stability and a peaceful, democratic, and united Europe.

Ukrainians understand there will not be American "boots on the ground" in their country. But there are a number of important steps we can take to support the Ukrainians in their struggle.

First, we must expedite the aid we have already promised them—including both financial assistance and nonlethal military equipment—to make sure it arrives as quickly as possible.

Second, we should provide additional support, including body armor and fuel, that the Ukrainians need to protect themselves. We should provide the Ukrainians with firearms and ammunition if they need them—but it appears that at this point they do not.

Third, we should make more robust use of the powers established in Executive order 13661, which authorizes sanctions against the Russian financial, energy, metals, mining, engineering, and defense sectors, to ensure that the Putin regime pays a heavy price for its illegal actions. President Obama's action to sanction more wealthy individuals in Putin's circle, as well as businesses they own, is a wise one, but we can do more.

Fourth, we should ensure that Russian banks are subject to the significant tax penalties imposed on non-compliant banks by the Foreign Account Tax Compliance Act, or FATCA, the antitax evasion law set to take effect in July. Russian banks and financial institutions that fail to register with the Internal Revenue Service and obtain the required identification number by July 1 of this year will be non-compliant with FATCA and become subject to a 30-percent withholding tax on any U.S. investment earnings. We should not negotiate with either Russia or certain Russian banks on measures to provide relief from FATCA's sanctions until Russia honors its diplomatic commitments and takes steps to diffuse tensions in Crimea and eastern Ukraine, including by withdrawing Russian troops from the border region.

Finally, we should use the existing authorities to take on Russia's manipulation of energy prices and supplies which it has used to coerce not only Ukraine but also many of its neighbors. To be most effective, these actions should be taken in close coordination with our friends and allies in Europe, many of whom are directly affected by Russia's abuses and threatened by its actions. We must take concrete steps toward substituting energy from other sources for the countries that would be impacted by a reduction

of Russian energy. We must actively become involved in energy development, diversification, and conservation, even if it means paying higher prices for fuel, to break Russia's iron grip on this market, and to prevent future acts of attempted political extortion by Russia from being effective.

The people of Ukraine are proud of their fight for freedom at the Maidan, as are the people of Afghanistan of the courage they showed, when they voted in record numbers to reject the Taliban in their April 5 election. Both countries are struggling for values that we, as a Nation, have always shared. They both deserve our support, and we should continue to give it to them.

THE MINIMUM WAGE

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to voice my disappointment over yesterday's vote to increase the Federal minimum wage. It is vitally important that working families receive a long-overdue pay increase, but once again the Senate failed to move forward on a crucial piece of legislation.

At \$7.25 per hour, today's Federal minimum wage fails to provide a living wage for many Americans. Working a standard 40-hour week, 52 weeks a year, with no time off and no sick days, the minimum wage pays just over \$15,000 a year.

In many parts of the country, including California, that salary is nowhere near enough for an individual to subsist, let alone a family.

It is difficult to fathom how a single mother working a minimum wage job—or jobs—can survive. These are the Americans who would benefit from this bill.

To get a better idea of what the standard 40-hour-a-week worker must earn to meet basic necessities, I had my staff look at the cost-of-living in various California cities.

In San Francisco, a single adult with no children would need to earn over \$12 an hour to meet basic necessities.

In Los Angeles, they would need to make over \$11 dollars an hour. The same goes for San Diego. That amount only increases for families.

By one measure, a single mother with two children living in San Francisco would have to earn almost \$30 an hour just to meet basic necessities.

I would add that we aren't debating an exorbitant increase. Moving from \$7.25 to \$10.10 would still leave many low-income working families well short of a living wage. But it is a start, and it would benefit millions of low-income working Americans.

According to the Congressional Budget Office, the proposed minimum wage increase would increase incomes for 16.5 million low-wage workers; 97 percent of the low-wage working population would benefit from this increase; 900,000 low-wage workers would move above the poverty line; and the increase in the federal minimum wage

could reduce demands on other Federal assistance programs.

A lot of attention has been given to CBO's estimate that increasing the minimum wage would lead to 500,000 job losses for low wage workers. It is important to note that CBO's estimate is the median in a wide range of estimates on the employment effects of increases in the minimum wage.

When you study the report, you find that most estimates of job losses related to increases in the minimum wage are clustered around zero, which means that most studies have found that increasing the minimum wage has a negligible effect on employment.

This isn't to say businesses won't have to make some adjustments. Some will have to raise prices, some might see slightly reduced profits, and some might slow hiring or choose to reduce their workforce.

But the effects will not be devastating, as opponents of the minimum wage increase suggest. In fact, cities and States throughout the country are natural experiments for the effects of a minimum wage increase on jobs.

The minimum wage in San Francisco is currently \$10.79 per hour. Far from an economic catastrophe, San Francisco is enjoying a sustained period of economic growth and employment. San Jose, which has a similar minimum wage, also has a robust labor market.

Bloomberg has also researched the effects of minimum wage increases on employment and found that employment effects are negligible and, in general, States that have recently raised the minimum wage are actually creating more jobs than those that haven't.

Washington State increased its minimum wage in 1998 and tied the wage to increases in inflation. The minimum wage is currently the highest in the country.

Since that time, annual job growth in Washington has outpaced the rest of the country, and the service industry has added thousands of jobs. There are many other examples of localities that exceed the Federal minimum wage and continue to experience sustained job growth.

It is clear to me that businesses are capable of adjusting for an increase in the minimum wage in a way that will allow them to thrive.

And a minimum wage increase would not only alleviate some of the burdens and obstacles facing the low wage work force, it would also put more than \$30 billion in the pockets of workers struggling to get by, those most in need of a pay raise.

According to many economists, that additional income could spur local economies, more than offsetting any negative effects from a minimum wage increase.

In a time of nearly unprecedented income inequality—during which the wealthy have actually made even more money—it is vitally important that Congress enacts laws to allow all

Americans to benefit from economic advancement.

Increasing the minimum wage is certainly not the only option. Congress should be looking elsewhere to do even more to ensure that children born into low income families aren't locked into a life of poverty. But increasing the minimum wage would be a step toward that goal. It would also serve as an indication that Congress appreciates the daunting challenges posed by income inequality and is willing to confront them.

Mr. President, I fully support an increase in the minimum wage and I hope that we can come together to find a way to reconsider the minimum wage bill and move it forward.

FORD ADMINISTRATION'S 40TH ANNIVERSARY

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, this year marks the 40th anniversary of Gerald R. Ford taking the oath of office and becoming the 38th President of the United States. The Gerald R. Ford Museum in Grand Rapids, MI will be commemorating this significant anniversary throughout 2014 by highlighting the impact of his service to our country.

Gerald Ford took the oath of office on August 9, 1974, in the aftermath of the Watergate scandal, the Vietnam war, and President Nixon's resignation, a very tumultuous time in our Nation's history. He reflected this when he stated:

I assume the Presidency under extraordinary circumstances . . . This is an hour of history that troubles our minds and hurts our hearts.

Although he was born in Omaha, NE, his family made Grand Rapids, MI, their home very soon after his birth. After high school, he attended the University of Michigan and played football for the Wolverines, earning the designation of Most Valuable Player. Choosing to attend law school instead of pursuing a professional football career, he completed his law degree at Yale University and then returned to Michigan, where he started a law practice.

After serving with the U.S. Navy during World War II, he returned to his home State where he became a partner in a Grand Rapids law firm and involved in the political scene. His experiences in the war led him to reject his previously isolationist leanings and adopt an outlook of internationalism. As a result, at the age of 35, he challenged the isolationist incumbent for Michigan's Fifth Congressional District in Congress and won.

He served his district, our State, and the Nation honorably. He was reelected 12 times, each with more than 60 percent of the vote. As a new Congressman, he quickly established a reputation for personal integrity, hard work, and the ability to deal effectively with both Republicans and Democrats, qualities that would define his entire

political career. During his time in Congress, he was appointed to the Appropriations Committee and rose to prominence on the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee. He was well respected by his colleagues and was a leader in the Republican Party, serving as the minority leader for 8 years.

After the resignation of Vice President Spiro Agnew, Ford was nominated by President Nixon and confirmed by Congress to fill the vacancy. Less than a year later, Nixon resigned and Ford became President, making him the first President who was not elected to either the Presidency or Vice Presidency.

As President, Gerald Ford was confronted with the challenges of dealing with inflation, reviving a depressed economy, solving chronic energy shortages, and trying to ensure world peace. He described himself as a moderate in domestic affairs, an internationalist in foreign affairs, and a conservative in fiscal policy. Respected for his integrity and openness, he worked to restore our country's trust and confidence in the Presidency.

One of his first acts as President was to pardon Richard Nixon before criminal charges were brought against him. Despite strong negative public reaction and political backlash, Ford maintained that this was the right thing to do for the good of the country, and history has borne this out. When the new President, Jimmy Carter, took the oath of office, President Carter summed up the sentiment expressed by many about Ford's Presidency by saying, "For myself and for our Nation, I want to thank my predecessor for all he has done to heal our land."

Gerald Ford and his wife Betty continued to be active in the political process after leaving office. We are proud that Gerald Ford was from Michigan and an important part of the Ford legacy lives on through the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library in Ann Arbor, MI, and the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Museum in Grand Rapids.

I hope my colleagues will join me in recognizing our 38th President and his outstanding contributions to our country on the 40th anniversary of his Presidency.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

PLYMOUTH COUNTY, IOWA

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

I have always believed in accountability for public officials, and this, my

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

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

Between 2001 and 2013, the creative leadership in your community has worked with me to secure funding in Plymouth County worth over \$11 million and successfully acquired financial assistance from programs I have fought hard to support, which have provided more than \$1 million to the local economy.

Of course my favorite memories of working together have to include working with community leaders on the renovation of the American Legion building in LeMars. The funding allowed for a new glass block window and improvements to the existing front door to meet code on the first floor and the replacement of windows, repainting, and new signage on the second floor.

Among the highlights:

Main Street Iowa: One of the greatest challenges we face—in Iowa and all across America—is preserving the character and vitality of our small towns and rural communities. This isn't just about economics; it is also about maintaining our identity as Iowans.

Main Street Iowa helps preserve Iowa's heart and soul by providing funds to revitalize downtown business districts. This program has allowed towns like LeMars to use that money to leverage other investments to jumpstart change and renewal. I am so pleased that Plymouth County has earned \$30,000 through this program. These grants build much more than buildings; they build up the spirit and morale of people in our small towns and local communities.

Investing in Iowa's economic development through targeted community projects: In Western Iowa, we have worked together to grow the economy by making targeted investments in important economic development projects including improved roads and bridges, modernized sewer and water systems, and better housing options for residents of Plymouth County. In many cases, I have secured Federal funding that has leveraged local investments and served as a catalyst for a whole ripple effect of positive, creative changes. For example, working with mayors, city council members, and local economic development officials in Plymouth County, I have fought for

funding for Head Start, school construction, and dialysis center projects worth more than \$1 million, helping to create jobs and expand economic opportunities.

School grants: Every child in Iowa deserves to be educated in a classroom that is safe, accessible, and modern. That is why, for the past decade and a half, I have secured funding for the innovative Iowa Demonstration Construction Grant Program—better known among educators in Iowa as Harkin grants—for public schools construction and renovation. Across 15 years, Harkin grants worth more than \$132 million have helped school districts to fund a range of renovation and repair efforts—everything from updating fire safety systems to building new schools. In many cases, these Federal dollars have served as the needed incentive to leverage local public and private dollars, so it often has a tremendous multiplier effect within a school district. Over the years, Plymouth County has received \$462,349 in Harkin Grants.

Agricultural and rural development: Because I grew up in a small town in rural Iowa, I have always been a loyal friend and fierce advocate for family farmers and rural communities. I have been a member of the House or Senate Agriculture Committee for 40 years—including more than 10 years as chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee. Across the decades, I have championed farm policies for Iowans that include effective farm income protection and commodity programs; strong, progressive conservation assistance for agricultural producers; renewable energy opportunities; and robust economic development in our rural communities. Since 1991, through various programs authorized through the farm bill, Plymouth County has received more than \$3.4 million from a variety of farm bill programs.

Keeping Iowa communities safe: I also firmly believe that our first responders need to be appropriately trained and equipped, able to respond to both local emergencies and to statewide challenges such as, for instance, the methamphetamine epidemic. Since 2001, Plymouth County's fire departments have received over \$325,229 for firefighter safety and operations equipment.

Disability rights: Growing up, I loved and admired my brother Frank, who was deaf. But I was deeply disturbed by the discrimination and obstacles he faced every day. That is why I have always been a passionate advocate for full equality for people with disabilities. As the primary author of the Americans with Disabilities Act, ADA, and the ADA Amendments Act, I have had four guiding goals for our fellow citizens with disabilities: equal opportunity, full participation, independent living, and economic self-sufficiency. Nearly a quarter century since passage of the ADA, I see remarkable changes in communities everywhere I go in

Iowa—not just in curb cuts or closed captioned television but in the full participation of people with disabilities in our society and economy, folks who at long last have the opportunity to contribute their talents and to be fully included. These changes have increased economic opportunities for all citizens of Plymouth County, both those with and without disabilities, and they make us proud to be a part of a community and country that respects the worth and civil rights of all of our citizens.

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

LYON COUNTY, IOWA

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

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

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

Between 2001 and 2013, the creative leadership in your community has worked with me to secure funding in Lyon County worth over \$1.2 million and successfully acquired financial assistance from programs I have fought hard to support, which have provided more than \$6.2 million to the local economy.

Of course my favorite memory of working together has to be our shared

commitment to school construction and modernization. Iowa students cannot learn in buildings that are falling apart. Working together with State and local communities, this funding has ensured Iowa students are learning in schools that are safe and modern. It was an investment in Iowa communities and its kids, and I look forward to learning about the renovations made possible in Lyon County.

Among the highlights:

School grants: Every child in Iowa deserves to be educated in a classroom that is safe, accessible, and modern. That is why, for the past decade and a half, I have secured funding for the innovative Iowa Demonstration Construction Grant Program—better known among educators in Iowa as Harkin grants for public schools construction and renovation. Across 15 years, Harkin Grants worth more than \$132 million have helped school districts to fund a range of renovation and repair efforts—everything from updating fire safety systems to building new schools. In many cases, these Federal dollars have served as the needed incentive to leverage local public and private dollars, so it often has a tremendous multiplier effect within a school district. Over the years, Lyon County has received \$1,197,251 in Harkin grants. Similarly, schools in Lyon County have received funds that I designated for Iowa Star Schools for technology totaling \$34,181.

Agricultural and rural development: Because I grew up in a small town in rural Iowa, I have always been a loyal friend and fierce advocate for family farmers and rural communities. I have been a member of the House or Senate Agriculture Committee for 40 years—including more than 10 years as Chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee. Across the decades, I have championed farm policies for Iowans that include effective farm income protection and commodity programs; strong, progressive conservation assistance for agricultural producers; renewable energy opportunities; and robust economic development in our rural communities. Since 1991, through various programs authorized through the farm bill, Lyon County has received more than \$299,000 from a variety of farm bill programs.

Keeping Iowa communities safe: I also firmly believe that our first responders need to be appropriately trained and equipped, able to respond to both local emergencies and to statewide challenges such as, for instance, the methamphetamine epidemic. Since 2001, Lyon County's fire departments have received over \$397,392 for firefighter safety and operations equipment.

Wellness and health care: Improving the health and wellness of all Americans has been something I have been passionate about for decades. That is why I fought to dramatically increase funding for disease prevention, innovative medical research, and a whole

range of initiatives to improve the health of individuals and families not only at the doctor's office but also in our communities, schools, and workplaces. I am so proud that Americans have better access to clinical preventive services, nutritious food, smoke-free environments, safe places to engage in physical activity, and information to make healthy decisions for themselves and their families. These efforts not only save lives, they will also save money for generations to come thanks to the prevention of costly chronic diseases, which account for a whopping 75 percent of annual health care costs. I am pleased that Lyon County has recognized this important issue by securing \$63,750 for wellness grants.

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

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

RECOGNIZING BULLET TOOLS

● Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, thousands of American businesses stem from simple ideas that are born in the living rooms, backyards, and garages of ambitious entrepreneurs. From humble beginnings, businesses mature to reach new customers and broader regions. I wish to recognize Bullet Tools, a small family owned business from my home

State of Idaho, whose originality and hard work grew into a global success in a distinctive market.

In 1998, Bullet Tools started as a family operated assembly line in Dalen and Mary Gunn's double-wide mobile home in Hayden, ID. The words, "It can't be done," fueled Mr. Gunn's determination to work through any obstacle. Seeking to advance the construction industry, Mr. Gunn discovered an enhanced method of installing flooring without the challenges associated with electricity, dust and constantly moving in and out of buildings.

Today, Bullet Tools is recognized as a world leading expert in fixed-blade cutting tools for the construction industry. The company has earned a worldwide reputation and serves an international market with unique custom installation needs. Fifty percent of its sales are exported to markets abroad, including Australia, Canada, Germany, Japan, Russia and the United Kingdom with an expectation for further growth in other international markets.

Bullet Tools has grown more than 300 percent over the past 5 years. In 2012, Dalen and Mary Gunn's son-in-law, Ben Toews, became president of the company. Mr. Toews' business expertise has allowed Bullet Tools to streamline its product lines and build upon existing manufacturing relationships, while Mr. Gunn continues to focus his energy on researching and developing new products. Today, Bullet Tools boasts over 70 products that may be found both in store and online at Home Depot and other retail distributors across the globe.

Last week, I had the opportunity to meet with Mr. Gunn and Mr. Toews at their facility in Hayden, ID, with my colleague on the Small Business and Entrepreneurship Committee, chair MARIA CANTWELL. I was impressed by the company's strong commitment to its 25 employees and the greater Idaho community. Because of the team's dedication and the business's achievements, it is not surprising that the company has received various awards and endorsements. For example, Bullet Tools was selected as the recipient of the U.S. Small Business Administration's 2009 Northwest Small Business Administration Exporter of the Year Award, the 2010 Green Products Award by Building Products Magazine, the 2013 Pro Tool Innovation Award, and the Gold Hammer Award from Carpenter Magazine. In 2013, Ben Toews was individually recognized as one of North Idaho Business Journal's 30 Under 40 for his ongoing commitment to excellence as an executive setting the pace for outstanding achievement through his integrity and character.

Today, the Gunn's original mobile home continues to welcome visitors to the Bullet Tools' corporate office and manufacturing location, reminding us that with hard work and dedication, the American dream may be achieved in our own backyard. I congratulate

the Gunn family and everyone at Bullet Tools on their continued prosperity, strong work ethic, and outstanding reputation for excellence. Bullet Tools epitomizes the finest characteristics of American innovation and is a tribute to both Idaho and the Nation.●

TRIBUTE TO STEPHANIE GRUBA

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Stephanie Gruba, a legislative aide in my Washington, DC, office, for the years of hard work she has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota.

Stephanie is a native of Milbank, SD, and is a graduate from the University of South Dakota. Upon graduation from USD, Stephanie moved from Vermillion, SD, to Washington, DC, to become a member of my office staff. In her almost 3 years on my staff, Stephanie has served as a staff assistant, legislative correspondent, and as a legislative aide. Stephanie has worked tirelessly for my South Dakota constituents and as a loyal member of "Team Thune."

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Stephanie for her dedicated service in the Senate and wish her continued success in the years to come.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Williams, 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.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 2:36 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 4486. An act making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

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

H.R. 4486. An act making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and

for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

S. 2280. A bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

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-5463. A communication from the Deputy Director, Directorate of Standards and Guidance, Occupational Safety and Health Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Electric Power Generation, Transmission, and Distribution; Electrical Protective Equipment" (RIN1218-AB67) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 22, 2014; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-5464. A communication from the Chief Financial Officer, Corporation for National and Community Service, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the operations of the National Service Trust through September 30, 2013; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-5465. A communication from the Regulatory Coordinator, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standards to Prevent, Detect, and Respond to Sexual Abuse and Assault in Confinement Facilities" (RIN1653-AA65) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 23, 2014; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-5466. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Special Operations and Low Intensity Conflict), Performing the Duties of the Under Secretary of Defense (Policy), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Report to Congress on the Activities of the National Guard Counterdrug Schools for Fiscal Year 2013"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-5467. A communication from the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, the amendments to the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure that have been adopted by the Supreme Court of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-5468. A communication from the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, the amendments to the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure that have been adopted by the Supreme Court of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-5469. A communication from the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, the amendments to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure that have been adopted by the Supreme Court of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-5470. A communication from the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, the amendments to the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure that have been adopted by the Supreme Court of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-5471. A communication from the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United

States, transmitting, pursuant to law, the amendments to the Federal Rules of Evidence that have been adopted by the Supreme Court of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-5472. A communication from the HR Specialist (Executive Resources), Small Business Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Administrator, Small Business Administration, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 22, 2014; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

EC-5473. A communication from the Deputy General Counsel, Office of Size Standards, Small Business Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Small Business Size Standards: Construction" (RIN3245-AG37) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 23, 2014; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

EC-5474. A communication from the Deputy General Counsel, Office of Government Contracting, Small Business Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Acquisition Process: Task and Delivery Order Contracts, Bundling, Consolidation" (RIN3245-AG20) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 23, 2014; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

EC-5475. A communication from the Deputy General Counsel, Office of Size Standards, Small Business Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Small Business Size Standards: Utilities" (RIN3245-AG25) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 23, 2014; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

EC-5476. A communication from the Deputy General Counsel, Office of Size Standards, Small Business Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Surety Bond Guarantee Program" (RIN3245-AG56) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 23, 2014; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

EC-5477. A communication from the HR Specialist (Executive Resources), Small Business Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Administrator, Small Business Administration, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 22, 2014; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

EC-5478. A communication from the General Counsel of the National Credit Union Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Liquidity and Contingency Funding Plans" (RIN3133-AD96) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 29, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-5479. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Mackerel, Squid, and Butterfish Fisheries; Amendment 14; Correction" (RIN0648-AY26) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 17, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5480. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Modifications to Identification Markings on Fishing Gear Marker Buoys" (RIN0648-BD66) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 23, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5481. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Prohibition Against Certain Flights Within the Tripoli Flight Information Region (FIR); Extension of Expiration Date" (RIN2120-AJ93) (Docket No. FAA-2011-0246) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5482. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment to Class B Airspace Area; Detroit, MI" (RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0079) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5483. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Modification, Revocation, and Establishment of Area Navigation (RNAV) Routes; Charlotte, NC" (RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0915) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5484. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes" (RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0977) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5485. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (88); Amdt. No. 3581" (RIN2120-AA65) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5486. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (150); Amdt. No. 3582" (RIN2120-AA65) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5487. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation,

transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (62); Amdt. No. 3579” (RIN2120-AA65) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5488. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (121); Amdt. No. 3580” (RIN2120-AA65) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5489. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Qualification, Service, and Use of Crewmembers and Aircraft Dispatchers” (RIN2120-AJ00) (Docket No. FAA-2008-0677) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5490. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Endangered and Threatened Wildlife; Final Rule To Revise the Code of Federal Regulations for Species Under the Jurisdiction of the National Marine Fisheries Service” (RIN0648-XC659) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 23, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5491. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Part 95 Instrument Flight Rules; Miscellaneous Amendments (4); Amdt. No. 512” (RIN2120-AA63) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5492. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Amendment of VOR Federal Airway V-625, Arizona” (RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2014-0093) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5493. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Requirements for Chemical Oxygen Generators Installed on Transport Category Airplanes” (RIN2120-AK36) (Docket No. FAA-2012-0812) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5494. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives;

Airbus Airplanes” (RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2011-1253) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5495. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes” (RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2014-0169) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5496. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; M7 Aerospace LLC Airplanes” (RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2013-1057) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5497. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes” (RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0326) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5498. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; British Aerospace Regional Aircraft Airplanes” (RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2013-1012) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5499. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Amendment of VOR Federal Airway V-626, Utah” (RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2014-0094) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5500. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes” (RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2014-0171) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5501. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes” (RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0835) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5502. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of

a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters (Type Certificate Previously Held By Eurocopter France) (Airbus Helicopters)” (RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0822) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5503. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes” (RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0798) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5504. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes” (RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0545) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5505. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters (Type Certificate Previously Held By Eurocopter France) (Airbus Helicopters)” (RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0872) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5506. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter Deutschland GmbH Helicopters” (RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0555) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5507. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter Deutschland GmbH Helicopters” (RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0642) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5508. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter Deutschland GmbH Helicopters” (RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0554) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5509. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes” (RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0789) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5510. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0689)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5511. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters (Type Certificate Previously Held By Eurocopter France)" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2011-1158)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5512. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters (Type Certificate Previously Held by Eurocopter France)" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0826)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5513. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters (Type Certificate Previously Held by Eurocopter France)" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2014-0573)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5514. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters (Type Certificate Previously Held by Eurocopter France)" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0477)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5515. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0796)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5516. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2013-1023)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5517. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0331)) received

during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5518. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0089)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5519. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Agusta S.p.A. Helicopters" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2014-1019)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5520. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2014-0174)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5521. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0976)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5522. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; SOCATA Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2013-1019)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5523. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Rockwell Collins, Inc. Transponders" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0966)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5524. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce plc Turbofan Engines" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2013-1015)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5525. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2012-1318)) received

during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5526. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Continental Motors, Inc. Reciprocating Engines With Superior Air Parts, Inc. (SAP) Cylinder Assemblies Installed" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2007-0051)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5527. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0542)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5528. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0327)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5529. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0369)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5530. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Pratt and Whitney Turbofan Engines" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0740)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5531. A communication from the Assistant Administrator for Procurement, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Removal of Procedures for Closeout of Grants and Cooperative Agreements" ((RIN2700-AE06)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 17, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5532. A communication from the Acting Deputy 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; Pacific Cod by Vessels Using Pot Gear in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska" ((RIN0648-XD099)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5533. A communication from the Chief of the Policy and Rules Division, Office of Engineering and Technology, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled

“Revision of Part 15 of the Commission’s Rules to Permit Unlicensed National Information Infrastructure (U-NII) Devices in the 5 GHz Band” ((ET Docket No. 13-49) (FCC 14-30)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 23, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5534. A communication from the Trial Attorney, Federal Railroad Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Track Safety Standards; Improving Rail Integrity” (RIN2130-AC28) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5535. A communication from the Trial Attorney, Federal Railroad Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Railroad Workplace Safety; Adjacent-Track On-Track Safety for Roadway Workers” (RIN2130-AC37) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5536. A communication from the Trial Attorney, Federal Railroad Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Revisions to Passenger Train Emergency Preparedness Regulations” (RIN2130-AC33) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5537. A communication from the Director of the Office of Financial Reporting and Policy, Office of the Chief Financial Officer and Assistant Secretary for Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled “FY 2013 Agency Financial Report”; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5538. A communication from the Deputy Bureau Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Connect America Fund” ((RIN3060-AF85) (FCC 14-5)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 15, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5539. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Seaway Regulations and Rules: Periodic Update, Various Categories” (RIN2135-AA33) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 29, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5540. A communication from the Administrator, Rural Housing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Single Family Housing Loans and Grants” (RIN0575-AC97) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 29, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-5541. A communication from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Chronic Wasting Disease Herd Certification Program and Interstate Movement of Farmed or Captive Deer, Elk, and Moose” (RIN0579-AB35) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 29, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-5542. A communication from the Director of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit

Insurance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Restrictions on Sales of Assets of a Covered Financial Company by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation” (RIN3064-AE05) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 28, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-5543. A communication from the Associate Director for Regulatory Affairs, Office of Foreign Assets Control, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Syrian Sanctions Regulations” (31 CFR Part 542) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 29, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-5544. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Labeling of Pesticide Products and Devices for Export” ((RIN2070-AJ53) (FRL No. 9908-82)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 29, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-5545. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the situation in or in relation to the Democratic Republic of the Congo that was declared in Executive Order 13413 of October 27, 2006; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-5546. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Wisconsin; Nitrogen Oxide Combustion Turbine Alternative Control Requirements for the Milwaukee-Racine Former Nonattainment Area” (FRL No. 9908-93-Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 29, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5547. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Virginia; Control of Volatile Organic Compound Emissions from Mondelez Global LLC, Inc.—Richmond Bakery located in Henrico County, Virginia” (FRL No. 9910-04-Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 29, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5548. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; Regional Haze State Implementation Plan” (FRL No. 9910-06-Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 29, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5549. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plan Revisions; Revisions to the Air Pollution Control Rules; North Dakota” (FRL No. 9909-86-Region 8) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 23, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5550. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmit-

ting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Technical Amendments to Inadvertent Errors in Air Quality Designations for Fine Particles, Ozone, Lead, Nitrogen Dioxide and Sulfur Dioxide” (FRL No. 9909-24-OAR) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 23, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5551. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Idaho Amalgamated Sugar Company Nampa BART Alternative” (FRL No. 9909-37-Region 10) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 23, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5552. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Colorado; Prevention of Significant Deterioration; Greenhouse Gas Tailoring Rule Revisions” (FRL No. 9907-58-Region 8) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 23, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5553. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands; Prevention of Significant Deterioration; Special Exemptions from Requirements of the Clean Air Act” (FRL No. 9909-18-Region 9) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 17, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5554. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Wisconsin; Redesignation of the Milwaukee-Racine 2006 24-Hour Fine Particle Nonattainment Area to Attainment” (FRL No. 9909-50-Region 5) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 17, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5555. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Massachusetts; Revisions to Fossil Fuel Utilization Facilities and Source Registration Regulations and Industrial Performance Standards for Boilers” (FRL No. 9800-2) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 17, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5556. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Amendments to Delegation of Authority Provisions in the Prevention of Significant Deterioration Program” (FRL No. 9909-19-OAR) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 17, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5557. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division,

Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Virginia; Revision for GP Big Island, LLC” (FRL No. 9909-60-Region 3) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 17, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5558. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; New York State; Redesignation of Areas for 1997 Annual and 2006 24-Hour Fine Particulate Matter and Approval of the Associated Maintenance Plan” (FRL No. 9909-65-Region 2) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 17, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5559. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan El Dorado County Air Quality Management District” (FRL No. 9909-66-Region 9) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 17, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5560. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), transmitting, pursuant to law, the Secretary of the Army’s report relative to the Walton County, Florida hurricane and storm damage reduction project; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5561. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Revision of Department of Energy’s Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) Regulations” (RIN1904-AA32) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 28, 2014; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-5562. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Extension of Notice 2012-45 Treatment of Income from Certain Government Bonds for Purposes of the Passive Foreign Investment Company Rules” (Notice 2014-31) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 29, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-5563. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Annual Price Inflation Adjustments for Contribution Limitations Made to a Health Savings Account Pursuant to Section 223 of the Internal Revenue Code” (Rev. Proc. 2014-30) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 29, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-5564. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Applicable Federal Rates—May 2014” (Rev. Rul. 2014-13) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 29, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-5565. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the

report of a rule entitled “Revenue Procedure: Purchase Price Safe Harbors for sections 143 and 25” (Rev. Proc. 2014-31) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 29, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-5566. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled “2013 Actuarial Report on the Financial Outlook for Medicaid”; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-5567. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled “Interim Report to Congress on the Medicaid Health Home State Plan Option”; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-5568. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting proposed legislation entitled the “Generating Renewal, Opportunity, and Work with Accelerated Mobility, Efficiency, and Rebuilding of Infrastructure and Communities throughout America Act”; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-5569. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; South Dakota; Prevention of Significant Deterioration; Greenhouse Gas Tailoring Rule Revisions” (FRL No. 9909-08-Region 8) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 17, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5570. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; States of Arkansas and Louisiana; Clean Air Interstate Rule State Implementation Plan Revisions” (FRL No. 9909-56-Region 6) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 17, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5571. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled “Iran-Related Multilateral Sanctions Regime Efforts” covering the period August 7, 2013 to February 6, 2014; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-5572. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report prepared by the Department of State on progress toward a negotiated solution of the Cyprus question covering the period December 31, 2013 through January 31, 2014; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-5573. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, an annual report relative to the implementation of the Age Discrimination Act of 1975 for fiscal year 2013; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-5574. A communication from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled “Report of the Attorney General to the Congress of the United States on the Administration of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended, for the six months ending June 30, 2013”; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-5575. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule en-

titled “Linuron; Pesticide Tolerances; Technical Corrections” (FRL No. 9908-83) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 17, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-5576. A communication from the Counsel to the Inspector General, Office of Inspector General, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Inspector General, General Services Administration, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 29, 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5577. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled “Financial Report of the United States Government for Fiscal Year 2013”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5578. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-307, “Small and Certified Business Enterprise Development and Assistance Amendment Act of 2014”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5579. A communication from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to compliance by the United States courts of appeals and district courts with the time limitations established for deciding habeas corpus death penalty petitions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. LEAHY for the Committee on the Judiciary.

Elisebeth Collins Cook, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board for a term expiring January 29, 2020.

Deirdre M. Daly, of Connecticut, to be United States Attorney for the District of Connecticut for the term of four years.

James Walter Frazer Green, of Louisiana, to be United States Attorney for the Middle District of Louisiana for the term of four years.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. SCHATZ (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 2275. A bill to expand project eligibility to certain public infrastructure projects under chapter 6 of title 23, United States Code; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. BLUNT (for himself, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. FRANKEN):

S. 2276. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to improve access to mental health services under the TRICARE program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CORKER (for himself, Mr. MCCONNELL, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr.

HOEVEN, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. KIRK, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. COATS, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. THUNE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. HATCH, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, and Mr. BURR):

S. 2277. A bill to prevent further Russian aggression toward Ukraine and other sovereign states in Europe and Eurasia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. COBURN (for himself, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. BARRASSO):

S. 2278. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act so as to eliminate the authority of the Secretary of Health and Human Services to limit the ability of medical providers to conduct lawful business, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. LEE:

S. 2279. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to terminate certain energy tax subsidies and lower the corporate income tax rate; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HOEVEN (for himself, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. MCCONNELL, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. WICKER, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. THUNE, Mr. JOHANNES, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. ENZI, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. LEE, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. COATS, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. KIRK, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. RUBIO, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. COBURN, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. CORKER, Mr. HATCH, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. VITTER, Mr. RISCH, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BURR, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HELLER, Mr. PAUL, Mr. MORAN, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. SHELBY, Ms. AYOTTE, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. PRYOR, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. WARNER, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. WALSH, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. TESTER, and Mrs. HAGAN):

S. 2280. A bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; read the first time.

By Mr. FRANKEN (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY):

S. 2281. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to make technical improvements to the Net Price Calculator system so that prospective students may have a more accurate understanding of the true cost of college; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. ROBERTS (for himself, Mr. ENZI, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. JOHANNES, Mr. THUNE, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. MCCONNELL, and Mr. ISAKSON):

S. 2282. A bill to prohibit the provision of performance awards to employees of the Internal Revenue Service who owe back taxes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin (for himself and Mr. MURPHY):

S. 2283. A bill to encourage enhanced security cooperation with European allies and continued enlargement of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. 2284. A bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to establish new standards for automobile hoods and bumpers to reduce pedestrian injuries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. BEGICH, and Ms. LANDRIEU):

S. 2285. A bill to help small businesses access capital and create jobs by reauthorizing the successful State Small Business Credit Initiative; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 2286. A bill to provide for greater oversight of Department of Defense service contracts; to the Committee on Armed Services.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE:

S. Res. 432. A resolution recognizing the efforts of the National Park Service and others in restoring and repairing the Washington Monument; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. LANDRIEU (for herself, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. COONS, and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. Res. 433. A resolution condemning the abduction of female students by armed militants from the Government Girls Secondary School in the northeastern province of Borno in the Federal Republic of Nigeria; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 279

At the request of Mr. WALSH, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 279, a bill to promote the development of renewable energy on public land, and for other purposes.

S. 323

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 323, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for extended months of Medicare coverage of immunosuppressive drugs for kidney transplant patients and other renal dialysis provisions.

S. 375

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 375, a bill to require Senate candidates to file designations, statements, and reports in electronic form.

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 375, *supra*.

S. 526

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 526, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the special rule for contributions of qualified conservation contributions, and for other purposes.

S. 557

At the request of Mrs. HAGAN, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 557, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve access to medication therapy management under part D of the Medicare program.

S. 865

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from Michigan

(Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 865, a bill to provide for the establishment of a Commission to Accelerate the End of Breast Cancer.

S. 896

At the request of Mr. BEGICH, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 896, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to repeal the Government pension offset and windfall elimination provisions.

S. 1012

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1012, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve operations of recovery auditors under the Medicare integrity program, to increase transparency and accuracy in audits conducted by contractors, and for other purposes.

S. 1174

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1174, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the 65th Infantry Regiment, known as the Borinqueneers.

S. 1349

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

S. 1431

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1431, a bill to permanently extend the Internet Tax Freedom Act.

S. 1622

At the request of Ms. HEITKAMP, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1622, a bill to establish the Alyce Spotted Bear and Walter Soboleff Commission on Native Children, and for other purposes.

S. 1695

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) were added as cosponsors of S. 1695, a bill to designate a portion of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge as wilderness.

S. 1697

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1697, a bill to support early learning.

S. 1992

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1992, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide a standard definition of therapeutic foster care services in Medicaid.

S. 2091

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2091, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the processing by the Department of Veterans Affairs of claims for benefits under laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 2094

At the request of Mr. BEGICH, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2094, a bill to provide for the establishment of nationally uniform and environmentally sound standards governing discharges incidental to the normal operation of a vessel.

S. 2132

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2132, a bill to amend the Indian Tribal Energy Development and Self-Determination Act of 2005, and for other purposes.

S. 2178

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the names of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) were added as cosponsors of S. 2178, a bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act with respect to the timing of elections and pre-election hearings and the identification of pre-election issues, and to require that lists of employees eligible to vote in organizing elections be provided to the National Labor Relations Board.

S. 2182

At the request of Mr. WALSH, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2182, a bill to expand and improve care provided to veterans and members of the Armed Forces with mental health disorders or at risk of suicide, to review the terms or characterization of the discharge or separation of certain individuals from the Armed Forces, to require a pilot program on loan repayment for psychiatrists who agree to serve in the Veterans Health Administration of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 2192

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2192, a bill to amend the National Alzheimer's Project Act to require the Director of the National Institutes of Health to prepare and submit, directly to the President for review and transmittal to Congress, an annual budget estimate (including an estimate of the number and type of personnel needs for the Institutes) for the initiatives of the National Institutes of Health pursuant to such an Act.

S. 2223

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cospon-

sor of S. 2223, a bill to provide for an increase in the Federal minimum wage and to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend increased expensing limitations and the treatment of certain real property as section 179 property.

S. 2244

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) were added as cosponsors of S. 2244, a bill to extend the termination date of the Terrorism Insurance Program established under the Terrorism Insurance Act of 2002, and for other purposes.

S. 2252

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the names of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. COATS) and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) were added as cosponsors of S. 2252, a bill to reaffirm the importance of community banking and community banking regulatory experience on the Federal Reserve Board of Governors, to ensure that the Federal Reserve Board of Governors has a member who has previous experience in community banking or community banking supervision, and for other purposes.

S. 2255

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) and the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. CORKER) were added as cosponsors of S. 2255, a bill to remove the Kurdistan Democratic Party and the Patriotic Union of Kurdistan from treatment as terrorist organizations and for other purposes.

S. 2263

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. JOHANNES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2263, a bill to appropriately limit the authority to award bonuses to employees.

S. 2265

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2265, a bill to prohibit certain assistance to the Palestinian Authority.

S.J. RES. 19

At the request of Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 19, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to contributions and expenditures intended to affect elections.

S. RES. 364

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the names of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER), the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) and the Senator from

Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 364, a resolution expressing support for the internal rebuilding, resettlement, and reconciliation within Sri Lanka that are necessary to ensure a lasting peace.

S. RES. 421

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 421, a resolution expressing the gratitude and appreciation of the Senate for the acts of heroism and military achievement by the members of the United States Armed Forces who participated in the June 6, 1944, amphibious landing at Normandy, France, and commending them for leadership and valor in an operation that helped bring an end to World War II.

AMENDMENT NO. 2752

At the request of Mr. BURR, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2752 intended to be proposed to S. 1982, a bill to improve the provision of medical services and benefits to veterans, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. HOEVEN (for himself, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. MCCONNELL, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. WICKER, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. THUNE, Mr. JOHANNES, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. ENZI, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. LEE, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. COATS, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. KIRK, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. RUBIO, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. COBURN, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. CORKER, Mr. HATCH, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. VITTER, Mr. RISCH, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BURR, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HELLER, Mr. PAUL, Mr. MORAN, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. SHELBY, Ms. AYOTTE, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. PRYOR, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. WARNER, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. WALSH, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. TESTER, and Mrs. HAGAN):

S. 2280. A bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; read the first time.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, today I filed an updated bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline project. That bill is at the desk. What this legislation does is it approves the project congressionally, which is authorized under the Constitution of the United States. Section 8 of article 1 of our Constitution expressly gives Congress the authority to regulate commerce with foreign nations. That is the determination we are looking for here from the President on this pipeline project. The decision is simply: Is the project in the national interest or is it not?

The President and his administration have been considering this project, and

this decision—is it in the national interest or not—for more than 5 years. We are now in the sixth year. It was our expectation the process would be completed on or about the first week in May. The final environmental impact statement came out at the end of January and, as the prior environmental impact statements had determined, this environmental impact statement said there is no significant environmental impact caused by the project. This is a study done over years by this administration's Department of State. For the fourth time the report came out with no significant environmental impact created by this project. So as I say, it was the expectation of this Senate and really of Americans across the country that sometime in May the President would make a decision because all along he said he was following the process, and once the process was completed he would make a decision. A little over a week ago, on the afternoon of Good Friday—a time that I believe was selected in order to minimize the news coverage—the President or the administration made the announcement they would now delay this project indefinitely—indefinitely. Not a statement of: We are just going to follow the process, which is what had been said before. Even though the President, in a meeting with me and our conference, came out and said we would have a decision before the end of 2013. That is what he told us. That didn't happen because then he changed it to: We are going to follow the process. Now it is not even going to follow the process. He is just going to delay a decision indefinitely.

The rationale for that is that there is litigation in Nebraska as to whether the public service commission in the State of Nebraska has the right to determine the route of the pipeline through Nebraska or whether in fact the legislature does.

Some time ago, right at the beginning of 2012, we had passed legislation in this body, which I sponsored, that required the President to make a decision on the project within 90 days. We passed that bill and, in fact, he then made a decision to decline the project based on the route in Nebraska. So Nebraska went through the work of re-routing the pipeline in the State, and that new route was approved by the legislature and it was approved by the Governor. But opponents of the project decided to sue on the basis that, no, the PSC should make a decision as to the route in Nebraska.

So be it. That can be adjudicated in Nebraska, as can any other issue that somebody may choose to file a lawsuit over. But that really has nothing to do with the decision the President needs to make. The decision the President needs to make is a very simple decision: Is this pipeline project in the interest of the United States or is it not? This is after his State Department has said there is no significant environmental impact created by the project

not once, not twice, but four times. So it is a simple decision.

It is a decision of whether we should have more energy that we produce in our country and that is produced in Canada, our closest friend and ally, or whether we should keep getting energy from the Middle East. It is a decision about whether we should have more jobs. The State Department says 42,000 jobs are created in constructing the pipeline. It is a decision about economic activity. This creates economic activity, with hundreds of millions in tax revenue to help reduce the deficit and debt without spending one penny of Federal money.

That is the decision before the President. But he refuses to make it. So it is long past time—long past time, as we are now in year 6—for this body to step forward and make the decision. As I said just a minute ago, we have the authority to make the decision. Section 8 of article 1 of the Constitution of the United States gives Congress the authority to regulate commerce with foreign nations. So we need to make the decision. The time is long past when we can continue to wait.

How can we continue to wait when the President says it will be an indefinite time period before he will even consider making a decision?

So the bill we have put forward is a very simple, straightforward bill. As a matter of fact, I am going to take a couple minutes and read it because it is three pages. It is an updated bill to a bill I provided on a bipartisan basis earlier. We had 27 cosponsors of the earlier legislation. We now have 56 Republicans and Democrats on this bill, and we are working very hard to get 60 so there is no procedural way to stop this legislation, but I will take just a minute and read it because it is self-explanatory, it is simple, it is straightforward, and it is common sense.

A bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

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

SECTION 1. KEYSTONE XL APPROVAL.

IN GENERAL. TransCanada Keystone Pipeline, L.P. may construct, connect, operate, and maintain the pipeline and cross-border facilities described in the application filed on May 4, 2012, by TransCanada Corporation to the Department of State (including any subsequent revision to the pipeline route within the State of Nebraska required or authorized by the State of Nebraska).

So we have expressly put language in there to address the litigation. The litigation the President is concerned about we expressly address in the bill.

(b) ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT.—The Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement issued by Secretary of State in January 2014, regarding the pipeline referred to in subsection (a), and the environmental analysis, consultation, and review described in that document (including appendices) shall be considered to fully satisfy—

(1) all requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 . . . and

(2) any other provision of law that requires Federal agency consultation or review (including the consultation or review required under section 7(a) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 . . . with respect to the pipeline and facilities referred to in subsection (a).

(c) PERMITS.—Any Federal permit or authorization issued before the date of enactment of this Act for the pipeline and cross-border facilities referred to in subsection (a) shall remain in effect.

(d) FEDERAL JUDICIAL REVIEW.—Any legal challenge to a Federal agency action regarding the pipeline and cross-border facilities described in subsection (a), and the related facilities in the United States, that are approved by this Act, and any permit, right-of-way, or other action taken to construct or complete the project pursuant to Federal law, shall only be subject to judicial review on direct appeal to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit.

(e) PRIVATE PROPERTY SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Nothing in this Act alters any Federal, State, or local process or condition in effect on the date of enactment of this Act that is necessary to secure access from an owner of private property to construct the pipeline and cross-border facilities described in subsection (a).

That is it. It is that simple. It is that simple.

So our President has been deliberating on this now for 6 years, and that is the decision. Are we going to produce energy in this country, are we going to work with Canada to get our energy, are we going to create jobs, are we going to generate economic activity or are we going to continue to rely on oil from the Middle East?

It is not as though there is no precedent to do it. Look at this chart. The red line is the Keystone Pipeline. I don't know how many people realize it, but we have already built the Keystone Pipeline—not the Keystone XL Pipeline for which we are seeking approval but the Keystone Pipeline. The project under consideration is a sister project to one that has already been built. It brings oil from Canada into the United States. That is the Keystone project. It has been permitted and built. It is in operation now.

The Keystone XL Pipeline, the sister project, brings oil from Canada into the United States; then North Dakota and Montana put light sweet Bakken and crude oil in it as well, and that oil goes to our refineries. Does it seem like a complicated decision, a difficult decision? Does it seem like something that requires 6 years of study?

The point is this body can approve it. That is what this is all about. We have 56 Senators—56 Senators, Republicans and Democrats—saying: Give us a vote. Give us a vote. Let this Senate do its job. Let's approve this project. It is a very straightforward decision.

Is this decision going to be made for special interest groups? Is this decision going to be blocked? Are we not going to get a vote because special interest groups are opposed to something the American people want? In the most recent poll, 70 percent of Americans want it built. What does it take?

One of the arguments I heard is: It is a pipeline. It has to be studied for 6

years because it is so complicated and difficult.

There are the pipelines we have in this country. We have millions of miles of pipeline, but it is so difficult to figure out whether we should build one more that produces energy and jobs for our country? A lot of these pipelines are old and we have millions of miles of pipelines all over this country. We can't decide whether we should build one more that is state-of-the-art?

What are we saying to our friends and neighbors in Canada? They very much want this project. They feel they have dealt with our country in good faith. What are we saying to Canada?

Some might say, if the pipeline isn't built, then that energy will not be produced from the oil sands area in Canada.

Really? Is that right? Then what is this pipeline moving? Oil from the oil sands in Canada. What is moving on our railroads all over this country?

If we don't build this pipeline, that oil is either going to China—and then we end up continuing to get our oil from the Middle East—or it is going to move by rail. If it moves by rail, that is 1,400 tanker cars a day on our railroads, 14-unit trains of 100 cars a day on our railroads. Does that seem like a better way to move it than a state-of-the-art pipeline? That is the decision.

I could put the decision in front of anybody in this country and I don't think it would take them 6 years to decide and I don't think it should take our President not only 6 years to decide, but now he said indefinitely—an indefinite delay.

It is time to vote on this important issue. I wish to thank the Senators who have stepped up and supported this legislation—certainly Senator LANDRIEU, who will be down here to talk about it in a minute, and Senator HEITKAMP, my fellow Senator in North Dakota, and many others on both sides of the aisle, Republicans and Democrats.

It is not a partisan issue. It is an issue of whether we are going to make this decision for the people of this country and build an energy future for this country—energy security for this country—where we produce more energy in North America between the United States and Canada than we consume so we don't have to rely on energy from the Middle East or from Venezuela or other countries that may not share our beliefs, our views, and our interests. That is the decision or is this going to be a decision for special interest groups?

If the President refuses to make that decision, we in this body have a responsibility to do it, and we put forward a bill to approve it.

Again, I thank my colleagues for their hard work on this bill, and I ask others to join us. Let's make this decision, and let's make it for the American people.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Madam President, I am going to speak very briefly this afternoon about a very timely and im-

portant subject. My colleague and partner, Senator HOEVEN, came to the floor earlier—I was unable to come at that time—to speak about a bill for which he has actually provided extraordinary leadership.

I wish to thank the Presiding Officer, and Senator HOEVEN for his leadership as well, to try to help bring to the floor of the Senate a vote to help construct the Keystone Pipeline. It is an issue a group of us have been working on now for quite some time. I wish to thank the Presiding Officer again. I wish to also thank the other Democratic leaders who have been so supportive and helpful to us in this effort: Senator PRYOR from Arkansas, Senator MCCASKILL from Missouri, Senator TESTER from Montana, who agreed to cosponsor the bill, Senator WARNER from Virginia, Senator HAGAN, Senator BEGICH, Senator MANCHIN, Senator DONNELLY, and Senator WALSH. I really want to thank them and other colleagues who have decided they may not want to cosponsor the bill that will be introduced later tonight, but they very well may vote for it, and I appreciate it.

I know this has been a very contentious issue for many, because people have very strong feelings about this particular pipeline called the Keystone XL Pipeline. Some of us who support it have a little trouble understanding why it is such a big deal, but I appreciate there are strong feelings on the other side of this issue. For those of us from States such as Louisiana and Texas and Oklahoma and North Dakota, particularly, that are affected by this pipeline, it is clear that the technology—and we should be proud of it—is extraordinary, it is exploding and, in some ways, unprecedented and unexpected. The technology is creating a real opportunity for America and for North America. That opportunity is for us to produce more oil and gas. The opportunity is to continue to maintain coal supplies that are clean and appropriate for the environment—or advanced coal technologies, I should say—and provide the kind of energy, including as well alternative energies that are emerging, such as wind and solar, and maintaining our nuclear and strategic advantage as part of our electric grid. It provides a real opportunity for us to go from a major country that was scrambling to plan where our energy was going to come from and really concerned about it—paying very high prices sometimes at the pump and through our electric grid—to now a country that gets to actually say, My gosh, look at the resources we have right here in America and the resources we potentially have with our partners and our allies. One of the strongest allies we have in the world is Canada, and an emerging ally—emerging in its relationship with us—is Mexico: The North American continent. I think there is so much potential for Canada, the United States, and Mexico—and others share my view—to become completely not only energy inde-

pendent but an energy powerhouse for the world—a world in which the North American continent, at least, wants to promote freedom, democracy, and human rights. Senator CARDIN was just on the floor talking about how important that issue is for our Nation and world. He has given literally his life as an expert on human rights around the world and is leading the Helsinki Commission. He was just talking with us about the importance of this and what is happening in Ukraine and in Russia and in Europe recently.

So the issue of freedom and private enterprise and opportunity and education and energy self-sufficiency are goals we treasure and it is possible for the rest of the world and our allies around the world.

But what signal does it send if America is not willing to do its part when it comes to production right here in America and transporting oil and natural gas and other emerging fuels—alternative fuels, alternative sources of electricity—when we are not doing our very best?

I know it is contentious, but I come to the floor to talk about this issue. Senator HOEVEN gave an excellent defense of why the Keystone Pipeline is important. But I want to underscore that in terms of jobs and the economy. I want to underscore the process. Because there are a lot of Democrats and others in my caucus—friends and colleagues—who have said: Well, has the process been complete? Has the process been thorough?

I want to review for the record a couple of very interesting aspects. Before I start, I want to point out, again, this, shown on this map I have in the Chamber, is the Keystone XL Pipeline.

There is already a “Keystone Pipeline” that has been constructed and has been operating for quite some time. This is an existing pipeline that is operating from Canada down to the refineries in Texas technically, but very close to the Louisiana border. We are very proud of our industry in Texas and Louisiana—the refining capacity we have, the ability to generate resources this country and the world need. Hopefully, if we can open exports appropriately—which is happening, as we speak. Permits are being issued. The jobs that are created here, the opportunity for creating jobs in every one of our 50 States, including Hawaii and Alaska, and in our territories and in our first nations, as they are called, in our tribal territories, is almost without peer in the last several decades.

But this XL Pipeline is an alternative route, and it has been debated for quite some time. There have been these permits I am going to talk about in a minute that have been reviewed and will put that into the RECORD because there is some concern: Have we really reviewed what we need to do? Have the environmental studies been met?

So into the RECORD I want to put: On April 16, 2010, the Department of State

issued its Draft Environmental Impact Statement. It opened a 45-day comment period, which extended for additional days.

Then, a year later, on April 15, 2011, the Department of State issued a Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement and opened another 45-day comment period. At that time, there were 280,000 comments that were received. Those comments were read, responded to, and absorbed into the process.

On August 26 of that year—2011—the Department of State issued its Final Environmental Impact Statement and opened an additional 90-day review period. The agency continued to accept public comments.

Then, on March 1, 2013, the U.S. State Department issued its Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for the Keystone XL Presidential Permit application, which includes the proposed new route through Nebraska because there were some questions earlier in the process whether it should go through Nebraska.

Let me say, as strongly as I support the Keystone Pipeline, I also support States—whether it is Louisiana, Texas, Virginia, Nebraska, or North Dakota—to make determinations according to their own laws and their own constitutions about the takings of private property, which is sometimes required for projects such as this. Those processes cannot be shortchanged and they cannot be ignored.

One of the court cases right now in Nebraska is because—the courts have ruled this—the Governor there overstepped his bounds and he, according to the court in Nebraska, took actions that were contrary to the law in Nebraska and the constitution.

So these laws I am not dismissive of—the rules and regulations. Nebraska still has some issues that have to be resolved. But the rest of the pipeline to the south here has already been constructed. This part is being worked on. There are other parts of the pipeline that can be started while Nebraska finishes its very legitimate decisions between its courts, its public service commission, and its legislature about the issues in Nebraska—which, let me say, the landowners have valid concerns, and the courts have ruled so.

But, nevertheless, on January 31, 2014—this year—the State Department issued its Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for the permit application, confirming that the project is safe and will have limited environmental impacts. The report reflects that TransCanada has agreed to incorporate 59 special safety conditions recommended by the pipeline safety commission.

So to my colleagues who say: Have we given ample time to review, I would say the answer is clearly yes. Is it time to build the pipeline? Yes. And should we get about a vote on the Senate floor to express strong support for a piece of America's infrastructure—North Amer-

ican infrastructure that is critical to the future growth of our economy and to the promise of opportunity, economic opportunity for our citizens? I think the answer to that is yes.

This group of Democrats—of which the Presiding Officer, Senator WARNER from Virginia, is a part—has been working on this now for several years.

One other point I would like to make: the comparison here of other pretty well-known and very large public works projects or private developments—some of them are public and some of them are private—that have been constructed.

The Hoover Dam—very well known—took 5 years to complete, from 1931 to 1936. From planning, design, to completion—5 years.

The Pentagon took 2 years to complete, from 1941 to 1943.

The Space Shuttle Discovery took 4 years to complete, from 1979 to 1983.

The Ambassador Bridge between the United States and Canada—3 years to complete. Design, build, and complete—from 1927 to 1929.

The Theodore Roosevelt—4 years to complete, from 1968 to 1972.

America and Canada: Together we have been building major projects for many years—complicated, tough projects that require tremendous co-operation between agencies, and dealing with environmental protection rules and regulations, and meeting citizens' concerns.

This is not anything new. We have been doing this in America for a long time. It is time to stop studying and stop waiting and start building this Keystone XL Pipeline.

Now, again, the legislation we have introduced today—Senator HOEVEN, Senator LANDRIEU, and 10 other Democrats, and several other Republicans—to build this pipeline would simply say it is time to stop studying; start building. With all due respect, the process is complete. We just acknowledged the process is done.

We also acknowledge there is still an outstanding issue in Nebraska. Nothing in this bill will affect the court decisions, the timeframe in Nebraska. But what it will send is a signal that this other section can start to be built and constructed. And then, of course, Nebraska will take—we do not know. It could be 6 months, it could be a year. We do not know when that process will finally be resolved.

But we can start now. It is going to take several years for this to be completed. If we wait another year, it is pushing this even further back for no good reason.

Let me mention a third argument.

I think some people are under the mistaken impression that this is maybe the first time we have built infrastructure with Canada. Nothing could be farther from the truth. There are 100 cross-border permits that have already been approved for oil and natural gas and electric transmission facilities crossing the U.S.-Mexico or the

U.S.-Canadian border. Of these 100 are 21 oil pipelines crossing the border.

So this is such a basic, important point of building infrastructure between Canada, America, and Mexico that some of us who support these kinds of things fairly routinely are having difficulty understanding why 5 years and five permits and five reviews is not satisfactory to build something that has been basically built multiple times before.

Some people may say: Oh, but the difference is, this is connecting the oil sands. The oil sands in Canada are a very important resource, not just for Canada but for the United States. I am glad these oil sands are here as opposed to in Venezuela or I am glad the oil sands are here as opposed to in Cuba. I am glad the oil sands are here as opposed to in the middle of Russia with everything else they have.

I am happy Canada has resources. I am happy. They are a friend and a neighbor and close to us. I am also really impressed with Canada's environmental standards, which are, by my calculations—not in depth, but just a broad review, after speaking to so many industry and government leaders there—very rigorous. I do not think there is anyone in this Chamber who would counter that.

It is well known and understood that Canada has very high standards. They understand, accept climate change. They believe carbon is affecting the climate in a negative way. They believe they can reduce the amount of carbon coming out. They are sensitive to that. But they know what we know—that the world is going to need oil and gas for decades to come. It is not going to stop in 5 years or 10 years. We need oil and gas for decades. Why not use our own? Why not use the oil and gas from Canada, America, and Mexico—creating jobs right here at home, instead of importing it from places around the world that we do not even get along with or places around the world that do not share our values or places around the world that can use the price of oil or gas to hurt our economy. Why don't we take charge of our own economy?

So when some people complain about the oil sands in Canada, I am, frankly, glad they are there. I am glad we can tap into them with extraordinary new, cleaner technologies to have oil and gas and energy for this country that has a very bright future.

So with the reviews—five over 5 years—hundreds of thousands of comments from business, industry, citizens, environmental groups that have been taken into consideration, the Department of State has issued its final review, and that final review said it is safer and more environmentally in tune with our environmental rules and regulations to transport this oil through a pipeline than through rail or highway.

For those of us who live in places that do a lot of production, we always

say we are proud of the industry, and we are—the industry makes mistakes, and when they mess up, they have to clean up—but I also have to say, I am very conscious, as most Americans are, of the traffic on our highways, of the backups on our rail system. I hear complaints from businesses, manufacturers: We cannot get our products fast enough.

So here we have a chance to move a commodity under the ground, safely through a pipe, but know if we do not build this pipeline, it is going to move by rail or truck, which congests our highways, congests our rail lines, and causes even more impact on our environment.

I think the record is clear. I think the arguments are in. I think there is no question that this is right for the environment, right for the country, and clearly in the interests of the United States. This will benefit not just the gulf coast where the refineries are, but it is going to create jobs throughout our entire country. Suppliers to this project exist everywhere.

There is a terrific map that I have shown before where suppliers from all over the country are providing either labor or support for the construction of this pipeline and much other similar infrastructure in the Nation.

We already have 2.9 million miles of pipeline in America. This piece we are speaking about today is 1,000 miles. We already have 2.9 million miles of pipe. Yes, some of it needs to be upgraded. Yes, not every inch of it is safe. We are working on that. But this is probably going to be the safest pipeline ever built in the history of America. It has been reviewed so many times. I cannot wait to look at the details of what has been required. I am positive that it is going to be the safest pipeline ever built. It has taken 5 years to get it.

So that is what our bill does. I am going to end with again thanking the Democrats who have joined with me to support the Keystone XL Pipeline. I thank the caucus for at least the opportunity. Hopefully, we will introduce this bill tonight. Hopefully, we can get a vote on this bill. Let me say that the vote will be in connection with the energy efficiency bill that will also be brought to the floor. The reason, as chair of the energy committee, I think that is so important is that while neither one represents a comprehensive energy plan for the country, which I hope to develop with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle—I just stepped into this position in the last month—these are two important energy-related pieces that need resolution.

The energy efficiency bill has now been worked on by Senator SHAHEEN and Senator PORTMAN—bipartisan—for 5 years, almost as long as the Keystone Pipeline has been under consideration by the administration. We have had an energy efficiency bill worked on by Republicans and Democrats that will create thousands of private sector jobs.

It is supported by the Business Roundtable, the Real Estate Round-

table, the Chamber of Commerce, labor leaders all over our country, building owners, and retail establishments. The energy efficiency bill is a terrific piece of legislation. Again, it came out of our committee 18 to 3. There are very few things that have come out of the energy committee that are that impactful. There are little bills that come out that really do not mean much to anybody. They may come out unanimously. It means a lot to the person who is sponsoring it, but it does not have national impact. This has national and international impact—all positive.

Senator SHAHEEN has been a champion of trying to bring this bill to the floor. We have been rebuffed and rebuffed and rebuffed by the Republican side for no reason because some of them are wanting to debate health care and some of them want to debate Iran sanctions. I said: Let's just talk about energy. It is important for the country to focus at least a few hours of the Senate's attention on energy.

America is focused on it. They want it to be affordable. They want it to be as clean as possible. They do not want to have to buy it from countries they do not share values with and do not appreciate. They want less imports to America, more domestic production of alternatives and oil and gas. So let's get about that business.

So efficiency is basically doing a lot more—a lot more with a lot less—saving taxpayers and saving huge sums of money. The example that everyone is becoming more familiar with is the Empire State Building in New York, an extraordinary private sector effort to take one of our most iconic buildings that we all know and which many millions of Americans have actually visited, and to take an old building that was constructed in the 1930s, retooling it with private money—not public grants, private money—and saving the building owners and the tenants of that building millions and millions of dollars as an example of what can be done in commercial buildings throughout this country.

That needs to be unleashed with the legislation of JEANNE SHAHEEN—that power, that promise, to do more of that is going to be unleashed by this bill that Senator PORTMAN and Senator SHAHEEN have carefully put together and Senator WYDEN also when he was chair, with Senator MURKOWSKI's help, and they got it out of the committee.

I committed when I stepped into the leadership of the committee to build on their good work and to do my very best to get that bill to the floor. We have an energy bill with Keystone. I thought the two of them, working together, Republicans and Democrats, we could get a good compromise by working on both of them at the same time. We are capable of doing it. They are clearly broadly supported. It will help create jobs in America.

We will begin with two important steps—not the only ones. There is more

that can be done. People come to me and say: Senator, we should do this, we should do that. Yes, we can work on coal. We can work on propane. We had a hearing on propane today. We can work on additional rail for the country. We can work on pipeline safety. We can work on alternative fuels. We can work on strengthening our relationship with Israel and China. We can work on new kinds of automobiles.

But that is for another day. We cannot do all of it at one time. But what we can do is what is before us. We can do what is before us. We can do what is clearly timely. The energy efficiency bill, for 5 years, has been waiting for action by this Senate. The House has already passed an energy efficiency bill.

The pipeline has been waiting 5 years and has been reviewed five times. It is time to move forward on both and create the kinds of jobs for America that we need—high-paying, middle-class jobs—and to begin to help build America and North America as the energy powerhouse that it can be, doing it together. We can recognize the transport of oil and gas, and the production is important, but also alternative and focusing on efficiency and conservation, and many of our Democrats are very proud of the work in that area.

I am sorry to keep the Senate. I think I might be the last speaker of the evening. But I thank the leadership for providing the time, and again, I want to thank Senator HOEVEN for his leadership.

By Mr. ROBERTS (for himself, Mr. ENZI, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. JOHANNES, Mr. THUNE, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. MCCONNELL, and Mr. ISAKSON):

S. 2282. A bill to prohibit the provision of performance awards to employees of the Internal Revenue Service who owe back taxes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, this is a speech—these are some remarks—that I really should not have to make, but late this afternoon, I rise to discuss more amazing actions from our Nation's tax collector. This is, unfortunately, an agency that is fast becoming the gang that cannot shoot straight—the folks who brought us the partisan suppression of free speech, who piled onto that with proposed rules to shut down political action by groups with which they disagree or do not favor, and the same team that shares confidential taxpayer information with their allies outside of government. Obviously, I am talking about the Internal Revenue Service.

Here is a great deal: Break the law you are required to enforce and get a cash bonus and free time off.

What on Earth is this all about?

Well, last week, the Treasury Department's Inspector General for Tax Administration issued a report, which I have here, on the Internal Revenue Service bonuses that were awarded to

personnel who have violated the tax laws or who have been subject to serious infractions of employee policy.

This is a lot like hiring someone to work for you, and then they steel money from you or acted in ways that are very inappropriate. Would you give them a bonus? I do not think most businesspeople would do that. According to the inspector general, close to \$3 million was awarded to staff with violations on their records, with about half of that amount going to people who had violated the Tax Code.

Other personnel at the IRS received cash bonuses or other awards despite being cited for—listen to this—drug use, making violent threats, fraudulently claiming unemployment benefits and misusing government credit cards. Still they got bonuses—up to \$3 million.

In fact, the report indicates that close to 70 percent of IRS personnel receive some sort of performance award—70 percent of the IRS. That is rather remarkable when you think about the sorts of problems your average taxpayer has in getting help from that particular agency.

This is flatly outrageous—if not appalling or atrocious—and cannot be tolerated. It also makes me wonder what you have to do to be disqualified from an award.

More disturbing, these awards, even for people breaking the law, are perfectly acceptable under current IRS and government-wide guidelines. Let me repeat that. These awards, even for people breaking the law, are perfectly acceptable under current IRS and government-wide guidelines.

Indeed, the IG report makes it clear that under the terms of the collective bargaining agreement with the main union for IRS employees, these awards are appropriate and cannot be taken away because of such violations.

The distribution of these awards at a time when the IRS is under scrutiny for its actions concerning the political activity of conservative groups, when its performance of basic taxpayer service functions has drastically worsened, and when it is calling for additional funding, calls into question the agency's commitment to fair enforcement of our tax laws.

The IG report recognized that these awards—while not technically prohibited—appear to be in conflict with the IRS's charge of "ensuring integrity of the system of tax administration." Well, no kidding. Thank goodness for the inspector general.

That is what we call an understatement—maybe the understatement of the year.

This is another fox in the henhouse story. Not only is the fox in the henhouse, but he is now being rewarded for eating the chickens.

These performance awards are just plain wrong and should not go to anyone who breaks the law, particularly the laws which the agency enforces.

These bonus awards weaken public confidence in the Nation's tax enforce-

ment agency and are a sign that the agency has indeed run off the rails.

The inspector general report recommended that the IRS create a new policy to take disciplinary actions into account when awarding bonuses.

It seems to me we need to do more than set up a new policy or guideline. We need something more concrete and more immediate. That is why today I am joining with my friends—Senators ENZI, CORNYN, RUBIO, TOOMEY, THUNE, JOHANNES, ISAKSON, and Leader MCCONNELL—to introduce the No Bonuses for Delinquent IRS Employees Act—a bill that really should be unnecessary. I thank my colleagues for joining me and, more especially, Senator ENZI, who has done a great deal of work on this and helped expose this from the first.

Our bill is pretty simple. It will prohibit the IRS from providing any performance award to any IRS employee who owes an outstanding Federal tax debt for failing to pay their taxes.

Nobody likes to be audited. Nobody likes to get that phone call from the IRS. Nobody likes to see the taxman at the door. And then if the taxman says: I am sorry, you owe X for a violation of Y, and you find out this individual got a performance bonus even though he or she fails to meet the tax obligations they face, that is rather incredible.

Given what we know about recent IRS actions—and the growing discontent with the agency I hear from Kansans every day—continuing to award personnel bonuses to employees who have outstanding tax liabilities or have violated the tax laws is beyond comprehension and outrageous and should be stopped.

This is not a partisan issue. It is just plain common sense. The IRS should not be in the business of awarding bonuses to its agents who are unable or unwilling to abide by the tax laws they are directed to uphold—simple as that.

So I call upon all my colleagues to support the No Bonuses for Delinquent IRS Employees Act and will ask for its immediate consideration.

In closing, I would like to point out this issue has been well-documented in a 26-page report by the inspector general. I thank the inspector general for the work he has done. Right on the first page it says: "The Awards Program Complied With Federal Regulations, but Some Employees With Tax and Conduct Issues Received Awards." Most IRS employees complied with Federal regulations, but some employees with tax and conduct issues still received awards. That is an oxymoron.

Then, if you skip to the back, there are some recommendations. The recommendation is for corrective action. This is what it says:

The IRS Human Capital Officer—Daniel Riordan is the IRS Human Capital Officer—will conduct a feasibility study. But they do not have to take action right away. They just want to discuss the feasibility of a study—by June 30 of this year—just a couple months away—for the implementation of a policy requiring management to consider a policy change.

It does not say just to do it; it says just consider whether conduct issues resulting in disciplinary actions should be made part of the performance evaluation, especially the nonpayment of taxes owed to the Federal government, prior to awarding performance and discretionary awards.

Daniel Riordan has received marching orders from the Inspector General to conduct a feasibility study by June 30, to determine whether the IRS should even consider whether disciplinary actions, including the nonpayment of taxes owed to the Federal Government, should be part of the evaluation as to whether an employee should be eligible for a performance award.

We really do not need this legislation. We have introduced it to force action. The inspector general says: Let's have action. On 26 pages, he says: Let's have action.

So to Daniel Riordan, I have the following advice—before we get 60 people on this and pass a bill, why don't you just go ahead and do it. Do not conduct a feasibility study. We have all the evidence right here. If you would just change the current policy, it would remove yet another problem, another unfortunate asterisk when we think of the IRS.

I want to thank my colleagues for co-sponsoring this legislation and again ask for its immediate consideration.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 432—RECOGNIZING THE EFFORTS OF THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE AND OTHERS IN RESTORING AND REPAIRING THE WASHINGTON MONUMENT

Mr. WHITEHOUSE submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources:

S. RES. 432

Whereas the employees of the National Park Service work tirelessly to maintain the beauty of the 401 national parks of the United States, revitalize communities, preserve local history, celebrate local heritage, and create outdoor recreation for children and families;

Whereas the Washington Monument was built between 1848 and 1884 to commemorate George Washington, the commander-in-chief of the Continental Army during the American Revolutionary War and the first president of the United States;

Whereas the Washington Monument is a symbol of unity and freedom in the United States and is the distinguishing feature of the skyline in Washington, DC;

Whereas the Washington Monument is admired by more than 25,000,000 individuals who visit the National Mall each year;

Whereas the Washington Monument was closed for over 2½ years for necessary repairs after being damaged by an earthquake in 2011;

Whereas engineers examined each of the 9,040 marble stones on the exterior of the Washington Monument and many of the

more than 10,000 granite stones on the interior of the monument to ensure that the repair of the monument was sound and complete;

Whereas during the rehabilitation, the Washington Monument was covered with scaffolding, markedly altering its appearance;

Whereas although the Washington Monument was closed during rehabilitation, the 488 lights on the scaffolding of the monument illuminated the night sky of the United States capital and provided visitors and residents with a sight of unexpected beauty; and

Whereas the repair of the Washington Monument would not have been possible without the vision and dedication of the National Park Service, contractors of the National Park Service, and generous philanthropic support: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) pays tribute to the National Park Service, contractors of the National Park Service, and all individuals who contributed to the restoration of the Washington Monument; and

(2) calls on the people of the United States to recognize the hard work of the National Park Service in preserving the monuments of the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 433—CON-DEMNING THE ABDUCTION OF FEMALE STUDENTS BY ARMED MILITANTS FROM THE GOVERNMENT GIRLS SECONDARY SCHOOL IN THE NORTHEASTERN PROVINCE OF BORNO IN THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF NIGERIA

Ms. LANDRIEU (for herself, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. COONS, and Mr. MENENDEZ) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 433

Whereas, on the night of April 14, 2014, as many as 234 female students, most of them between 16 and 18 years old, were abducted by armed militants from the Government Girls Secondary School, a boarding school located in the northeastern province of Borno in the Federal Republic of Nigeria;

Whereas the militants burned down several buildings before opening fire on soldiers and police who were guarding the school and forcing the students into trucks;

Whereas, according to local officials in Borno state, about 43 students were able to flee their captors, and the rest remain missing;

Whereas all public secondary schools in Borno state were closed in March 2014 because of increasing attacks in the past year that have killed hundreds of students, but the young women at the Government Girls Secondary School were recalled to take their final exams;

Whereas the group popularly known as “Boko Haram”, which loosely translates from the Hausa language to “Western education is sin”, is known to oppose the education of girls, has kidnapped girls in the past to use as cooks and sex slaves, and is thought to be responsible for the April 14th kidnapping in Borno state;

Whereas there are reports that the abducted girls have been sold as brides to Islamist militants for the equivalent of \$12 each;

Whereas Boko Haram has targeted schools, mosques, churches, villages, and agricultural centers, as well as government facilities, in

an armed campaign to create an Islamic state in northern Nigeria, prompting the president of Nigeria to declare a state of emergency in three of the country’s north-eastern states in May 2013;

Whereas, according to the Brookings Institution, Boko Haram burned down or destroyed 50 schools and killed approximately 30 teachers in Nigeria in 2013, leaving tens of thousands of children unable to attend school;

Whereas, on April 14, 2014, hours before the kidnapping in Borno state, Boko Haram bombed a bus station in Abuja, Nigeria, killing at least 75 people and wounding over 100, making it the deadliest attack ever in Nigeria’s capital;

Whereas Amnesty International estimates that more than 1,500 people have been killed in attacks by Boko Haram or reprisals by Nigerian security forces this year alone, and the Council on Foreign Relations estimates that almost 4,000 people have been killed in Boko Haram attacks since 2011;

Whereas the Department of State designated Boko Haram as a Foreign Terrorist Organization in November 2013, recognizing the threat posed by the group’s large-scale and indiscriminate attacks against women and children;

Whereas, according to the United Nations, girls’ education is a major challenge in Nigeria;

Whereas, according to the United Nations Children’s Emergency Fund (UNICEF), some 4,700,000 children of primary school age are still not in school in Nigeria, with attendance rates lowest in the north;

Whereas a study conducted by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) found that school children in Nigeria, particularly those in the northern provinces, are at a disadvantage in their education, with 37 percent of primary-age girls in the rural northeast not attending school, and 30 percent of boys not attending school;

Whereas, according to the World Economic Forum’s Global Gender Gap Index, Nigeria is ranked 106 out of 136 countries based on women’s economic participation, educational attainment, and political empowerment;

Whereas, according to the United Nations, women held only 6.7 percent of the seats in Nigeria’s parliament in 2013;

Whereas the advancement of women around the world is a foreign policy priority for the United States;

Whereas, according to the United States Agency for International Development, “Broader, more equitable access to education encourages political participation, enhances governance, strengthens civil society, and promotes transparency and accountability.”;

Whereas a 100-country study by the World Bank shows that increasing the share of women with a secondary education by 1 percent boosts annual per capita income growth by 0.3 percentage points;

Whereas, according to UNICEF, adolescent girls that attend school are less likely to be married as children, “are less vulnerable to disease including HIV and AIDS, and acquire information and skills that lead to increased earning power. Evidence shows that the return to a year of secondary education for girls correlates to a 25 percent increase in wages later in life.”;

Whereas, according to the World Bank, “The benefits of women’s education go beyond higher productivity for 50 percent of the population. More educated women also tend to be healthier, participate more in the formal labor market, earn more income, . . . and provide better health care and education to their children, all of which eventually im-

prove the well-being of all individuals and lift households out of poverty. These benefits also transmit across generations, as well as to their communities at large.”; and

Whereas women and girls must be allowed to go to school without fear of violence and unjust treatment so that they can take their rightful place as equal citizens of and contributors to the world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) expresses its strong support for the people of Nigeria, especially the parents and families of the girls abducted by Boko Haram in Borno state, and calls for the immediate, safe return of the girls;

(2) condemns Boko Haram for its violent attacks on civilian targets, including schools, mosques, churches, villages, and agricultural centers in Nigeria;

(3) encourages the Government of Nigeria to strengthen efforts to protect the ability of children to obtain an education and to hold those who conduct such violent attacks accountable;

(4) encourages efforts by the United States Government to support the capacity of the Government of Nigeria to provide security for schools and to hold terrorist organizations, such as Boko Haram, accountable;

(5) urges timely civilian assistance from the United States and allied African nations in rescuing and reintegrating the abducted girls;

(6) recognizes that every individual, regardless of gender, should have the opportunity to pursue an education without fear of discrimination;

(7) reaffirms its commitment to ending discrimination and violence against women and girls, to ensuring the safety and welfare of women and girls, and to pursuing policies that guarantee the basic human rights of women and girls worldwide;

(8) recognizes that the empowerment of women is inextricably linked to the potential of countries to generate economic growth, sustainable democracy, and inclusive security; and

(9) encourages the Department of State, the United States Agency for International Development, and the Department of Defense to continue their support for initiatives that positively impact the ability of women and girls to fully access their human rights.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 1, 2014, at 10 a.m., in room SR-328A of the Russell Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled “The Importance of Regional Strategies in Rural Economic Development.”

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

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 1, 2014, at 2 p.m.

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

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL
RESOURCES

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 1, 2014, at 2:30 p.m., in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

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

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 1, 2014, at 11 a.m., in room SD-215 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "President Obama's 2014 Trade Policy Agenda."

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

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 1, 2014, at 10 a.m., in SD-226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct an executive business meeting.

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

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 1, 2014, at 2:30 p.m.

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

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that floor privileges be granted to Margot Hecht, a member of my legislative staff, during today's session of the Senate.

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

MEASURE READ THE FIRST
TIME—S. 2280

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I understand that S. 2280 introduced earlier today by Senators LANDRIEU and HOEVEN is at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the title of the bill for the first time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2280) to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

Mr. REID. I ask for a second reading but object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, MAY 5, 2014

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

completes its business today, it adjourn until 2 p.m. on Monday, May 5, 2014; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks, the Senate be in a period of morning business until 5:30 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each; and that at 5:30 p.m., the Senate proceed to executive session under the previous order.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. REID. Mr. President, there will be two rollcall votes at 5:30 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY,
MAY 5, 2014, AT 2 P.M.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:41 p.m., adjourned until Monday, May 5, 2014, at 2 p.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

THE JUDICIARY

PAMELA PEPPER, OF WISCONSIN, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN, VICE CHARLES N. CLEVERT, JR., RETIRED.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS THE JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL OF THE AIR FORCE AND FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE SERVING AS THE JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 8037:

To be lieutenant general

BRIG. GEN. CHRISTOPHER F. BURNE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. MARSHALL B. WEBB

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. RAYMOND A. THOMAS III

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. STEPHEN G. FOGARTY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. MARGARET C. WILMOTH

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. JOHN L. GRONSKI

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. THOMAS S. ROWDEN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) JOHN F. KIRBY

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. JON M. DAVIS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. KENNETH F. MCKENZIE, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. ROBERT B. NELLER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. JOHN A. TOOLAN, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. PATRICK J. HERMESMANN
COL. HELEN G. PRATT

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be major

ROBERT J. TRAINER

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 1211:

To be major

PHILANDER PINCKNEY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY NURSE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be major

ELIZABETH JOYCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUAL FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be colonel

JASMINE T. DANIELS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUALS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be lieutenant colonel

JAN S. SUNDE

To be major

SHRUTI P. MUTALIK
HIMANSHU PATHAK

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

JOSEPH L. CRAVER

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

CHARLES E. VARSOGEA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUAL FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant commander

LOUIS J. LAZZARA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

TARA M. MCARTHUR-MILTON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

TODD W. BOEHM

GEORGE JARROD HAZEL, OF MARYLAND, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

SUZAN G. LEVINE, OF WASHINGTON, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE SWISS CONFEDERATION, AND TO SERVE CONCURRENTLY AND WITHOUT ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION AS AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE PRINCIPALITY OF LIECHTENSTEIN.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

JANICE MARION SCHNEIDER, OF NEW YORK, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 1, 2014:

THE JUDICIARY

THEODORE DAVID CHUANG, OF MARYLAND, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND.