



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 160

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MARCH 4, 2014

No. 36

Senate

The Senate met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

PRAYER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Today's opening prayer will be offered by Pastor Dave Weigley, President of the Seventh-Day Adventist Church in the Mid-Atlantic States.

The guest Chaplain offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Almighty God, creator and maker of all, who sits enthroned above the earth, and in whom we live, move and have our being, we praise You from whom all blessings flow. We thank You for Your sustaining power, for peace, for the freedoms we enjoy. We ask Your blessings on our great Nation, insightful leaders and dedicated lawmakers.

Establish their steps and give them discernment and courage to act justly, love mercy and walk humbly. Strengthen those who need to be uplifted, who are downcast, who need the compassionate touch of a brother's or sister's hand. Above all, may Your kingdom come, may Your will be done, and may we readily incline our ears to Your call today. This we pray in Your holy and righteous Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

CHILD CARE AND DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT ACT OF 2014—MOTION TO PROCEED—Resumed

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 309, S. 1086.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN.) The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows: A bill (S. 1086) to reauthorize and improve the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990, 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 with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

There will be no rollcall votes today because of the inclement weather we have had the last 3 or 4 days. The next rollcall vote will be tomorrow at 11:45 a.m.

BENEFITTING THE WEALTHY

Charles and David Koch are shrewd businessmen. Their wealth is nearly unparalleled, not only in America but in the world. The brothers inherited a small oil company. They inherited this company from their dad. They built it into a multinational corporation. It refines oil, makes carpets, manufactures fertilizers and chemicals, makes paper products, extracts minerals, produces glass, owns a cattle ranch, and lots of stuff.

Like most shrewd businessmen, the oil baron Koch brothers are very good at protecting and growing their prodigious future and their prodigious fortune. There is nothing un-American about that. But what is un-American is when shadowy billionaires pour unlimited money into our democracy to rig the system, to benefit themselves and the wealthiest 1 percent.

I believe in an America where economic opportunity is open to all. Based on their actions and policies they promote, the Koch brothers seem to believe in an America where the system is rigged to benefit the very wealthy.

Based on Senate Republicans' ardent defense of the Koch brothers and the fact that they advocate for many of the same policies as the Koch brothers, it seems my Republican colleagues also believe in a system that benefits billionaires at the expense of the middle class.

The Koch brothers are willing to invest billions to buy that America. They are investing billions to buy that America. In 2010 the Supreme Court opened the flood gates of corporate money into electoral politics. That was with the Citizens United decision. Since mega donors such as Charles and David Koch can launder their huge contributions using shadowy shell groups and so-called nonprofits, it is difficult to tell exactly how much they have invested so far.

Investigative reporting done by some of the most respected news outlets in the country has revealed that the Koch brothers funnel money through a web of investor groups and advocacy organizations that are immune from disclosure rules, such as the Club for Growth, Heritage Action, the NRA, and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. We may never know how much money the Koch brothers are spending to rig the system, to rig the system for themselves.

But we do know their investments have paid off already. In November 2010, the petroleum industry walked right through the door the Supreme Court had opened and spent hundreds of millions of dollars to elect a Republican majority to the House of Representatives. That Republican majority has effectively shut down any hope of passing legislation to limit the pollution that has caused climate change.

That Republican majority is, in fact, working to gut the most important safeguards to keep cancer-causing toxins and pollution that cause sickness and death out of the air we breathe and the water we drink. Without those safeguards, the Koch brothers would pass on the higher health care costs to

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S1257

middle-class Americans while padding their own pocketbooks.

So the Koch brothers are already seeing a return on their 2010 investment in a Republican House of Representatives that does what they want done. But they certainly have not stopped there. The Koch-backed Americans for Prosperity alone spent \$400 million in misleading attack ads last election cycle.

If you have seen an ad recently maligning the Affordable Care Act or ObamaCare, chances are, significantly, that these ads are from the Koch brothers or one of the shadow groups paid for by the Koch brothers. Koch-backed groups have spent a vast sum trying to elect Republican Senate candidates this year, a sum that dwarfs even the National Republican Senatorial Committee's own spending.

The Koch brothers and other moneyed interests are influencing the political process for their own benefit in a way not seen for generations. Republican Senators have come to the floor to defend the Koch brothers' attempts to buy our democracy. Once again, Republicans are all in to protect their billionaire friends.

Not only have Senate Republicans come to the floor to defend the Koch brothers personally, they have again and again defended the Koch brothers' radical agenda—and it is radical, at least from a middle-class perspective.

Senate Republicans have opened so many different avenues to oppose closing a single tax loophole. Senate Republicans have opposed closing even a loophole for these oil companies or corporations that ship jobs overseas. This benefits the Koch brothers. Senate Republicans have opposed asking billionaires to pay the same higher tax rate as middle-class tax families, as illustrated by Warren Buffett.

Senate Republicans have opposed environmental and workplace safety standards that might cause the Koch brothers or their corporate donors a few extra dimes—a few extra dollars maybe. The Koch brothers are returning the favor with huge donations to Republican Senate candidates, either directly or indirectly.

Senate Republicans are addicted to Koch. In fact, Senate Republicans hardly need the NRSC any more, which for decade after decade was the main funding tool for the Republican Senate. Not any longer; the Koch brothers take care of that.

Aside from that, the NRSC cannot hide its donors' identities like the Koch brothers-funded groups can hide their donors' identities. Senate Republicans call this freewheeling spending by anonymous donors nothing more than "free speech." Senate Republicans say that whoever has the most money gets the most free speech. But that is not what America's Founding Fathers said. They did not mean that by free speech. The Founders believed in a democracy where every American had a voice and a vote.

This discussion, this fight, is not just about health care or even about a few

hundred million dollars in disingenuous ads. This is about two very wealthy brothers who intend to buy their own Congress, a Congress beholden to the money and bound to enact their radical philosophy. Witness this: Senators beholden to wealthy special interests; Republican senators rush to the floor to defend the Kochs whenever I say something negative about the brothers or their radical agenda.

By the way, the words "radical agenda" are not my words. Charles Koch proudly told Brian Doherty, an editor of the magazine "Reason," about his self-described—his quote—"radical philosophy" in 2007. These are the same brothers who have lobbied against the recognition of formaldehyde as a cancer-causing carcinogen, because it might be bad for their business.

These are the same brothers whose Koch Industries ranks near the top of the list of America's worst toxic air polluters. Those are the same brothers whose company, according to a Bloomberg investigation, paid bribes and kickbacks to win contracts in Africa, India, and the Middle East.

These are the same brothers who, according to the same report, used foreign subsidiaries to sell millions of dollars of equipment to Iran, a state sponsor of terrorism. Let's make sure we understand that. I may not have said it quite right. These are the same brothers who, according to the same report, used foreign subsidiaries to sell millions of dollars of equipment to Iran, a state sponsor of terrorism. We all know that.

The Koch brothers already believe they can play by a different set of rules. Think about how an America rigged by the Koch brothers would look. The Koch brothers do not care about creating a strong public education system in America. The Koch brothers do not care about maintaining the strong safety net of Medicare and Social Security. The Koch brothers do not care about the guarantee of affordable, quality health insurance for every American.

That is obvious from the misleading ads they have paid for all over the country. Why? Because the Koch brothers can afford to buy all of those benefits and more for themselves and their families. Their extreme vision for America means abolishing Social Security and Medicare. Their extreme vision for America means eliminating minimum wage laws. Their extreme vision for America means putting insurance companies back in charge of your health care and denying coverage for preexisting conditions. That is the way it used to be.

I guess that is what they want, running all of these ads. Their extreme vision for America means stripping tens of millions of people of the benefits in the Affordable Care Act today. Their extreme vision for America means allowing the gap between the wages women and men earn for the same

work to keep growing. Their extreme vision for America means giving giant corporations the unfettered right to dump toxins in our rivers and streams, on our mountains and our valleys, and to give them even more tax breaks while they destroy our environment.

We Democrats have a different vision. Democrats believe the economy is strongest when the middle class is vibrant and growing. Democrats believe world class education leads to world class work. This work is one where people are ready to take on any challenge. Right now there are at least three people for every job available. Democrats believe in an even playing field with higher wages, affordable health care, and a secure retirement for every American so that every American can have a shot at success.

I welcome a debate over these competing visions. Average Americans share our vision for a country whose success is built on a strong middle class. The Koch brothers know Americans share our vision for a country where success is built on a strong middle class. That is why, rather than having an honest and fair debate, they are pouring hundreds of millions of dollars into a massive campaign of deception. They manufacture stories. They make up facts. They are angry that I am calling attention to their campaign of distortion and deceit.

I am not oblivious that my comments about the Koch brothers have caused some controversy. Anyone who has turned on FOX News knows that I have gotten under their skin. But I will continue to shine a light on their subversion of democracy.

When I hear my Republican colleagues defending the Koch brothers as they have, I recall the words of Adlai Stevenson:

I have been thinking that I would make a proposition to my Republican friends . . . that if they will stop telling lies about the Democrats, we will stop telling the truth about them.

As long as the Koch brothers continue to spend hundreds of millions of dollars buying elections, I will continue to do all I can to expose their intentions.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader is recognized.

POLITICAL PARTICIPATION

Mr. McCONNELL. I noted with interest that the majority leader was hammering the Koch brothers again today, and I wondered why he left out billionaire Tom Steyer, who plans to spend as much as \$100 million pushing the issue of climate change in the 2014 election and "appears primed to rival the deep-pocketed and conservative Koch brothers," according to the New York Times. The truth is that these American citizens have a constitutional right to participate in the political process.

It strikes me as curious that if we are going to demonize people for exercising their constitutional rights to go

out, speak, and participate in the political process, we would just pick out the people who are opposed to us and leave out the people who are in favor of us. The truth is that there are many wealthy Americans who feel deeply about the country, who are committed to one side or the other, and who are trying to have an impact on the country—as many on the left as on the right.

So we ought not to leave out Tom Steyer. I believe he also has a brother, who is also a billionaire, who has similar views and will probably try to impact the fall's election in one way or another beneficial to the things he advocates.

THE BUDGET

The release of a President's budget is usually a pretty big deal, but President Obama's latest budget, released only this morning, hasn't even ginned up much excitement. Folks just aren't taking it very seriously because it is not a very serious document.

First, it could probably never even pass the Democratic-led Senate, and in some sense that is the point. Rather than put together a constructive blueprint that the two parties could use as a jumping-off point to get our economy moving and our fiscal house in order, the President has once again opted for the political stunt—for a budget that is more about firing up the base in an election year than about solving the Nation's biggest and most persistent long-term challenges.

It would increase taxes by well over \$1 trillion in the worst economic slowdown nearly anyone can remember. It would explode spending by \$790 billion, forcing us to borrow more money from places such as China. As I indicated, it would do almost nothing to address the most serious threats facing our children's future, and it doesn't even come close to balancing this year. No wonder the President thought the left would love it.

But this is my question for the President: What about the middle class? What is in it for them? It seems as though the President has just about given up on helping folks who are in the middle, folks who feel as if Washington doesn't take their concerns and anxieties into consideration anymore. What hope is he giving them that their medical bills won't be as high, that their wages will start going up instead of down? What is in this budget for them except for this nagging feeling that they will just keep getting squeezed?

The President is well into his sixth year of trying to fix this economy, his sixth year of trying to tax, spend, and regulate our way to prosperity—just as his ideology demands. But this much has to be clear by now: This doesn't work. Since 2009 the government has spent almost \$18 trillion. Yet millions of middle-class Americans continue to suffer, whether in the unemployment line or in jobs that barely allow them to get by.

It is time the President realized that doubling down on the same failed policies is simply not going to work. Yet that is just what this budget proposes to do. We do not need any more election-year gimmicks. What is needed is a new approach, a positive strategy that focuses on helping the middle class instead of appeasing the far left.

President Obama still has 2 years in his Presidency. It is not too late for him to try to make a positive difference for folks struggling to pay their bills, but he has to let go of the left and reach to the middle. He has to decide that bipartisan solutions are worth fighting for. If he does he is going to find significant support on this side of the aisle. We want to work with him to get important legislation done for our country. We always have. We are eager to expand opportunity for the middle class and to build more ladders of opportunity for those who aspire to it. We are eager to enact policies that can create American jobs—improving things such as the Keystone Pipeline, medical device tax repeal, and important new trade legislation, just to name a few we could do together. We are eager to find ways to control spending and put the debt on a path to elimination. We are eager to reform the regulatory state so that the rules coming out of Washington actually work for people other than the bureaucratic class who writes them.

There are bipartisan solutions to be had on these types of issues if only the President could put the politics aside for a few minutes and actually work with us, really work with us, because the kind of unserious budget he put out today is just the type of silly politicking we need to get past. After all, why would we want a budget that grows the Federal Government while the middle class continues to shrink? Washington is doing just fine in the ObamaCare economy, but real Americans deserve a lot better. We can give it to them if we work together.

What I am saying is this: Mr. President, you have 2 years remaining in office. Work with us to make them count.

I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business for debate only, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The Senator from Connecticut.

POLITICAL SPENDING

Mr. MURPHY. First, I associate myself with the remarks of the majority leader. I certainly understand the con-

cerns of those on the Republican side about the individual who has proposed to spend a certain amount of money supporting the global warming cause, but it pales in comparison to the money that has already been spent by the Koch brothers, who have poured hundreds of millions of dollars and will continue to pour hundreds of millions of dollars into these races, completely dwarfing any amount of money that is spent on the other side.

UKRAINE

Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, I am on the floor to talk about the ongoing crisis in Ukraine. I am pleased to have Senator MCCAIN on the floor because it is very hard to describe the sensation both he and I felt at the end of the last year when we got the chance to travel to the Maidan—Independence Square—in Kiev and speak to about 1 million people. It is even harder to describe the sensation of hearing that group of people yelling back to us in unison:

Thank you, U.S.A. Thank you, U.S.A.

But that was the reality we were able to experience.

It is important to note that Senator MCCAIN and I didn't go to the Maidan that day to advocate for President Yanukovich's removal even though the end of that process resulted in that fact. In actuality we spent 2 hours that night meeting with Yanukovich, pleading with him to reverse course on his decision to abandon plans to join the EU so that he could win back the support of the hundreds of thousands of people who had gathered on that square to support our European integration and domestic political reforms. But President Yanukovich didn't listen, and instead he lost his legitimacy as a ruler when he turned his security service on his own people, resulting in the murder of over 100 Ukrainians who simply wanted to compel their leader to follow the wishes of the Ukrainian people.

I was proud to author a resolution that passed unanimously in this body that declared our support for the ability of Ukrainians to peacefully air their grievances against their government and to oppose the use of force against them. Then, I was equally proud to join Senator MCCAIN and some others in a bipartisan call for sanctions against Yanukovich when he began his murderous crusade against the protesters. I was even prouder of President Obama, who through the State Department sent a clear, unwavering message to the Ukrainian people that the United States stood with them in their desire to see a better future for Ukraine, aligned with Europe and the West.

This strong bipartisan approach here in America to the Maidan movement helped the people of Ukraine as they charted their own path toward a new government. We didn't dictate the

terms of Ukraine's future; we simply supported the right of the people to determine it for themselves.

But now, despite the success of the Maidan, the crisis in Ukraine has changed its face. It hasn't dissipated. And today Secretary Kerry was greeted in Kiev by Ukrainians pleading for the continued support of the United States.

Having been so clear-voiced in our support of the Ukrainian people thus far since the protests began last November, now is the moment when Democrats and Republicans should stand united in this Congress so that years from now, when a group assembles in Kiev marking the anniversary of this grave crisis, they will celebrate Ukraine's political sovereignty and economic rebirth with more chants of thanks to the United States.

In what shape should this support come?

First, we need to stand together in the next week to deliver serious financial assistance to a Ukrainian economy that is weak and is growing weaker as this crisis persists. A \$1 billion aid package is a good start, but our real work must happen within the structures of the IMF, which can provide potentially tens of billions of dollars necessary to fully right the Ukrainian economic ship. While Ukraine does need to undergo economic and budget reforms from within, I would caution the IMF to be gentle in the timing of the conditions applied to this aid. Difficult steps need to be undertaken to right-size gas prices and trim budget deficits, but Ukraine should be given a long enough lease so that these necessary reforms don't strangle a nation today dealing with threats to its very existence.

Second, Crimea. Russia has invaded Ukraine, make no mistake. They have done so in violation of the United Nations charter and the very accord they signed in 1994 guaranteeing Crimea's territorial security. No doubt Vladimir Putin was sore at losing his erstwhile ally in the Ukrainian President's office. No doubt he didn't like the fact that the United States voiced its strong support for the right of a sovereign Ukraine to make independent decisions about its future partnerships. No doubt he is infuriated that the Ukrainian people are now on their way to getting their way. But this is not a schoolyard. You don't get to push weaker kids around just because you don't like them. This is the 21st century.

The reason we belong to organizations such as the United Nations or the reason we negotiate treaties such as the Budapest memorandum is because now we understand, after centuries of European war, how destabilizing this kind of behavior is.

The irony for Russia, of course, is that this invasion demonstrably weakens, not strengthens, their nation's position in the world. Let's say for argument's sake that the end result of this crisis is a Crimea that is more closely aligned with Russia than with Ukraine.

What does that accomplish for Russia? Well, it will have won the occupation of 2 million Ukrainians while the majority of the other 43 million continue to orient themselves permanently toward the European Union.

If the United States and Europe make good on sanctions threats, which I hope we will, it will devastate the Russian economy, leaving millions of Russians out of work and adding political instability to Putin's own land at a time when he really can't afford much more instability, and it will make Russia an international pariah, shunned by the industrialized nations that help form the future path of global, political, and economic values.

Given this reality, why did Putin do it? He didn't do it to protect Russians in Ukraine because the only threat to their safety is due to the military crisis of Russia's own making. He did it because, like the schoolyard bully, he doesn't see past his own nose. He believes that he wins by temporarily flexing his muscles and by capturing the world's attention. He doesn't look to the long-term, potentially dire consequences to his own political standing and to his own people. He pulls punches because it feels good today no matter how bad it will hurt tomorrow.

But that being said, no matter the irrationality of Moscow's behavior, we need to make sure in the case that Russia does not correct its mistake, and correct it soon, the consequences do hurt. I believe Congress should authorize broad authority for President Obama to enact strong sanctions on Russia through penalties to its banks, its oil companies, and its political and economic elite. I believe the President should only be allowed to use this authority in the case that this illegal incursion into Ukraine continues and that we should give Moscow the opportunity to reverse course or join with the international community to address their concerns about the safety of Russian citizens in Ukraine.

Let's give Russia a chance to make this better and deliver a clear message of the consequences if they don't. This, of course, can't happen without the support of our European allies. As chairman of the Foreign Relations Subcommittee on European Affairs, I will be on the phone this week with European Parliamentarians urging them to join us in proposing new sanctions on the Russian economy.

I know there is hesitance in Europe due to the integration of Russia into the European economies, but this crisis should, frankly, matter more to Europe than it matters to us. Five years ago it was a laughable proposition that Russia would invade Ukraine, but it is happening now. It may be unthinkable today that Russia, in 5 years, is going to move on a NATO ally, but if this aggression goes unchecked, then the future can be very perilous, even for our friends in Europe.

Finally, a word on the politics of this crisis. I have listened to some of my

good friends on the Republican side try to score political points in connection with the Russian move on Crimea, trying to paint this somehow as Obama's fault. This is a ridiculous contention. Putin marched into Georgia in 2008 under a Republican President, who many of my Republican colleagues considered to be strong on foreign policy, and now he is doing it with a Democrat in office. President Obama is considering steps in response that seemingly weren't even considered in 2008.

What has me feeling even more suspect of the criticisms of President Obama is there doesn't seem to be any real difference between what the Republicans want the President to do and what he is actually doing. It is easy to say it is Obama's fault, but history tells us otherwise, and these political attacks mask the fortunate fact that there is pretty solid bipartisan agreement on what to do next.

Ukraine can remain whole and free and it can stay on a path to join Europe. When that day emerges from the smoke and the fire of the crisis, if we play our cards right, then they will have America and our European allies to thank, in part, for that new day.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

UKRAINE

Mr. McCAIN. I thank my colleague from Connecticut for his thoughtful remarks on events taking place and the tragedies taking place in Ukraine as we speak. I appreciate his commitment to trying to find a way through this very difficult situation.

The Senator is dead wrong when he says this is similar to Georgia. In fact, this Senator wanted to do a lot more than we did. In fact, we did a lot more. The fundamental problem, I say to my friend from Connecticut, is that this President does not understand Vladimir Putin. He does not understand his ambitions. He does not understand that Vladimir Putin is an old KGB colonel bent on restoration of the Russian empire. It was Vladimir Putin who said: The greatest catastrophe of the 20th century was the downfall of the Soviet Union.

The Senator from Connecticut should understand that. This President has never understood this. This President is the one who ridiculed Mitt Romney when Mitt Romney said our great enemy was Russia and its geopolitical threats. This President said the Cold War has been over for 20 years. This President believes the Cold War is over, but Vladimir Putin doesn't believe the Cold War is over.

When the President of the United States is overheard to say to Mr. Putin's puppet, Mr. Medvedev: Tell Vladimir that after I am reelected I will be more flexible.

Did you get that? The President said: Tell Vladimir after I am reelected I will be more flexible. This is the same

President who believed that somehow Vladimir Putin had anything but the ambitions which he is now realizing in Ukraine. In fact, I think it might be interesting for my colleagues to note that Vladimir Putin spoke to the press today and Vladimir Putin, among other things, during his answering questions from the press, said:

First of all, my assessment of what happened in Kiev and in Ukraine in general. There can only be one assessment: this was an anti-constitutional takeover, an armed seizure of power.

That was Vladimir Putin's view of what happened in Kiev as Yanukovych slaughtered, I believe, 82 innocent civilians as well as wounding hundreds.

Then he goes on to say:

I would like to stress that under that agreement Mr. Yanukovych actually handed over power.

Obviously, Yanukovych did not hand over power. He was driven from power by the good people who were tired of his corruption and were sick of his nepotism and his crony capitalism. Anybody who believes anything good about Mr. Yanukovych should see the pictures of the home he had and the dacha he was building that cost hundreds of millions of dollars—truly a man of the people.

President Putin went on to say:

The current acting president [of Ukraine] is definitely not legitimate. There is only one legitimate president, from a legal standpoint. . . . Yanukovych is the only undoubtedly legitimate President.

Then comes more interesting things. Vladimir Putin now says:

Now about financial aid to Crimea. As you know, we have decided to organize work in the Russian regions to aid Crimea, which has turned to us for humanitarian support. We will provide it, of course. I cannot say how much, when or how. The government is working on this by bringing together the regions bordering on Crimea by providing additional support to our regions so they can help the people in Crimea. We will do it, of course.

Regarding the deployment of troops, the use of armed forces, so far there is no need for it, but the possibility remains.

Let me repeat that. This is from today. Vladimir Putin said:

Regarding the deployment of troops, the use of armed forces, so far there is no need for it, but the possibility remains.

This is a return to the old Russian Soviet doublespeak which was absolute nonsense, but they said it anyway.

He goes on to say:

What is our biggest concern? We see the rampage of reactionary forces, nationalist and anti-Semitic forces going on in certain parts of Ukraine, including Kiev. . . . When we see this, we understand what worries the citizens of Ukraine, both Russian and Ukrainian, and the Russian-speaking population in the eastern and southern regions of Ukraine. It is this uncontrolled crime that worries them. Therefore, if we see such uncontrolled crime spreading to the eastern regions of the country—

We should pay careful attention to these words of Mr. Putin—

if we see such uncontrolled crime spreading to the eastern regions of the country, and if the people ask us for help, while we already have the official request from the legitimate President, we retain the right to use all

available means to protect those people. We believe this would be absolutely legitimate.

Then he goes on to say, in answer to a question:

Thus the tension in Crimea that was linked to the possibility of using our Armed Forces simply died down and there was no need to use them.

I repeat:

Thus the tension in Crimea that was linked to the possibility of using our Armed Forces simply died down and there was no need to use them. The only something we had to do, and we did it, was to enhance the defense of our military facilities because they were constantly receiving threats and we were aware of the armed nationalists moving in.

Russia has well trained, well equipped now an additional 16,000 or more, and Vladimir Putin was worried about enhancing the defense of his military facilities because they were constantly receiving threats.

He goes on to say:

There is something I would like to stress, however. Obviously, what I am going to say now is not within my authority and we do not intend to interfere. However, we firmly believe all citizens of Ukraine, I repeat, wherever they live, should be given the same equal right to participate in the life of their country and determining its future.

My friends, we are seeing justification for intervention and serious intervention in eastern Ukraine. So the article goes on with further questions, and he goes on to take a shot at the United States saying:

Our partners, especially in the United States, always clearly formulate their own geopolitical and state interests and follow them with persistence. Then, using the principle "You're either with us or against us" they draw the whole world in. And those who do not join in get "beaten" until they do.

Then he goes on to say:

Our approach is different. We proceed from the conviction that we always act legitimately. I have personally—

I say to my colleagues, I am not making this up. This is what Vladimir Putin said—

I have always been an advocate of acting in compliance with international law. I would like to stress yet again that if we do make the decision, if I do decide to use the Armed Forces, this will be a legitimate decision in full compliance with both general norms of international law, since we have the appeal of the legitimate President, and with our commitments, which in this case coincide with our interest to protect the people with whom we have close historical cultural and economic ties. Protecting these people is in our national interests. This is a humanitarian mission. We do not intend to subjugate anyone or to dictate to anyone. However, we cannot remain indifferent if we see they are being persecuted, destroyed and humiliated.

Here is probably the most interesting part:

Question: Mr. President, a clarification, if I may. The people who were blocking the Ukrainian Army units in Crimea were wearing uniforms that strongly resembled the Russian Army uniform. Were those Russian soldiers, Russian military?

Vladimir Putin: Why don't you take a look at the post-Soviet states. There are many military uniforms there that are similar. You can go to a store and buy any kind of uniform.

Question: But were they Russian soldiers or not?

Vladimir Putin: Those were local self-defence units.

Question: How well trained are they? If we compare them to the self-defence units in Kiev. . . .

Vladimir Putin: My dear colleague, look how well trained the people who operated in Kiev were. As we all know they were trained at special bases in neighboring states: in Lithuania, Poland and in Ukraine itself too. They were trained by instructors for extended periods. They were divided into dozens and hundreds, their actions were coordinated, they had good communication systems. It was all like clockwork. Did you see them in action? They looked very professional, like special forces. Why do you think those in Crimea should be any worse?

Question: In that case, can I specify: did we take part in training Crimea self-defence forces?

Vladimir Putin: No, we did not.

This is the same guy the President of the United States pushed the reset button for time and again. This is the same guy whom the President says we can work with—Vladimir Putin.

Then my colleague and former Member of this body on Friday—on Friday, as Putin's forces moved into Crimea, and it was very clear to anyone the Russians were moving in—Secretary of State John F. Kerry spoke Friday with Russian Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov. This is a quote from Secretary Kerry.

We raised the issue of the airports, raised the issue of armored vehicles, raised the issue of personnel in various places. While we were told they are not engaging in any violation of the sovereignty, and do not intend to, I nevertheless made it clear that could be misinterpreted at this moment and that there are enough tensions that it is important for everybody to be extremely careful not to inflame the situation and not to send the wrong messages.

I am not making that up. So after 5 years of believing that somehow Vladimir Putin was anything but what he is, we are now paying the piper. The chickens are coming home to roost.

Do we have a military option? No. But we do have a number of other options.

I wish to read one other article that was in USA Today by Jonah Goldberg entitled "Obama In Denial on Russia."

I will not go through a lot of it, about student Obama, but here is some of the quote from the article:

In 1983, then-Columbia University student Obama penned a lengthy article for the school magazine placing the blame for U.S.-Soviet tensions largely on America's "war mentality" and the "twisted logic" of the Cold War. President Reagan's defense buildup, according to Obama, contributed to the "silent spread of militarism" and reflected our "distorted national priorities" rather than what should be our goal: a "nuclear free world."

That is what student Obama said. But the remarkable thing is 2 weeks ago in response to tensions in Ukraine, the President explained that:

Our approach . . . is not to see (events in Ukraine) as some Cold War chessboard in which we're in competition with Russia.

This is a horrible way to talk about the Cold War because it starts from the premise that it all was just a game conducted between two morally equivalent competitors.

Similar comments about Cold War rivalries and the like are commonplace of late, especially during the Sochi Olympics, when NBC commentators were desperate to portray the entire Soviet chapter as nothing more than a pivotal experience.

America surely made mistakes during the near half-century twilight struggle. The fact is there was a right side and a wrong side to that conflict and we were on the right side of it. The Soviet Union, of which Vladimir Putin was a part, murdered millions of its own people, stifled freedom in nearly every forum, enslaved whole nations, and actively tried to undermine democracy all around the world, including in the United States.

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

Mr. MCCAIN. I ask unanimous consent for 5 more minutes.

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

Mr. MCCAIN. President Putin, a former KGB agent, has said the collapse of the "evil empire" was "the greatest geopolitical catastrophe of the 20th century." This alone should have been a clue to this White House that misspelled reset buttons weren't going to cut it. But they were too stuck in the past to see it.

I could go on and on, including the ridicule some of us were subjected to when we pointed this out from time to time, including in 2008 when I said in a debate with then-candidate Obama: Watch Ukraine. Watch Ukraine. Putin will not give up Ukraine.

We need to have an economic aid package immediately, and I am glad our Secretary of State is over there with initial U.S. loan guarantees, joining the EU, and a longer substitute package through the International Monetary Fund. We have to stabilize the economy of Ukraine which is near collapse. Financial sanctions, freezing assets, visa bans, trade embargoes—all of those can be accomplished, particularly expansion of the Magnitsky act, so people who are responsible will not have bank accounts, they will not travel, they will not ever get a visa. They need to pay a penalty for orchestrating what is happening in Ukraine right now.

Obviously we should not go to the G-8 summit. He should be thrown out of the G-8. It should now be the G-7. They obviously have to suspend military-to-military engagements. We need to have a path—and a quick one—for both Moldova and Georgia to move into NATO. Both countries are occupied by Russian troops, Moldova in Transnistria and in Georgia at Kajan South Abkhazia, and quite often Russians keep moving the fence farther and farther into the sovereign territory of these countries. In an attempt to ap-

pease Mr. Putin, we abandoned missile defense systems in Poland and the Czech Republic. We need to reinstate those and move forward as quickly as possible.

There are a number of things the most powerful Nation in the world needs to do. I am not counting on our European friends. Already there have been statements by Angela Merkel and the leaking of a memorandum from the British Government. We may have to do a lot of these things by ourselves, because they are dependent on Russia for a lot of their energy supplies, and we have seen a significant recession in European leadership over the last 10 to 20 years. But we need to act, and we need to speak in favor of the people who are now being overtaken in Crimea by Vladimir Putin's army and military. I worry.

In conclusion, I say it is time we wake up about Vladimir Putin. It is time this administration gets real. It is also time for us to worry about what Vladimir Putin will do in eastern Ukraine on the pretext that somehow disorder and demonstrations might require Russian presence.

My friends, if we allow Mr. Putin to assert his authority over these areas because of Russian-speaking people, that message is not lost on Poland where there is a Russian population, on Romania, Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania, and Moldova. We are on the verge possibly of seeing a move to reassert the old Russian empire, which is Mr. Putin's lifelong ambition.

I have overstayed my time. I thank my colleague from Alabama.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, I appreciate the opportunity to listen to Senator MCCAIN. I think facts have proven him right for many over many years of warning this country about how we have to conduct international relations in a realistic way.

I had the opportunity to be in Georgia and Ukraine about 3 years ago. In Georgia, we went to South Ossetia where the Russians had moved in, against European international law, and had set in. Last week or so, we were informed by the Prime Minister of Georgia they were building barbed wire fences along that border, digging in even deeper than they had before.

In Ukraine, we met with some of the democratic dissidents who were trying to hang on to democracy there. They had beaten Shevchenko, the fabulous lady who helped lead the Orange Revolution. She was worried about going to jail. I didn't think she would go to jail, but they put her in jail and kept her in jail for years on what EU and NATO officials have all said were bogus charges. They told us some of the democratic activists were somewhat depressed because Putin, with his intel background, was using the Russian intelligence services in Ukraine to buy up media and buy up television to prop-

agandize the country. They were hurting, and they didn't know if they would be able to successfully resist. It was such a delight for me to see this basically nonviolent revolution in which the people stood up for their country. Now we see Mr. Putin did not accept the sovereignty, and he is going to try to utilize military force in a way which is stunning. I have to say, Crimea is far larger and more strategically significant than South Ossetia and Abkhazia, but it is the same actions.

I thank Senator MCCAIN for his leadership.

ADEGBILE NOMINATION

I will share a few thoughts on the nomination of Debo Adegbile to be the Assistant Attorney General of the U.S. Department of Justice, Civil Rights Division, a very important position.

There is no question he is a bright young lawyer, has a good resume. He spent 13 years with the NAACP Legal Defense and Education Fund, one of the advocacy groups of the historic organization. They have been champions for advocacy and defense of civil rights and have done tremendous work over the years, and I have seen a lot of it. But they have also used the courts to advance political agendas which haven't always been accepted and have been seen to be improper.

While serving as the acting president and director-counsel of the Legal Defense Fund, Mr. Adegbile positioned himself at the center of many high-profile cases—cases in the news media, and issues he dealt with. Perhaps most notably as litigation director, he chose, without being asked or without being even needed, to participate in the case of Mumia Abu-Jamal, the country's most notorious killer of a police officer. Abu-Jamal was tried at trial and convicted of the murder of a young 25-year-old Philadelphia police officer, Daniel Faulkner. The evidence at trial proved that Abu-Jamal shot Officer Faulkner in the back, and then stood over him and shot him three more times before firing a final shot into Officer Faulkner's face. Immediately following the murder, he stated that he hoped the officer died.

As noted by Philadelphia District Attorney Seth Williams, in his letter to the Senate Judiciary Committee in opposition to this nomination, he said:

Evidence at the trial established that while this was not some case of random street crime, Abu-Jamal was a supporter of the MOVE organization, an anarchist group that explicitly advocated violence against police.

This is the district attorney's summary of this case.

Some members of this body have argued that Mr. Adegbile's choice to involve himself and his organization in this case is irrelevant because it is simply a case of a lawyer representing an unpopular client.

And lawyers do that. They are called upon to do that. I live in Monroe County, AL, the home of Atticus Finch,

Harper Lee, who wrote "To Kill A Mockingbird." He was asked to defend an unpopular defendant in the setting of Macon, which is Monroeville, AL. He undertook and did his duty because he knew it was his duty.

But I will take a few moments to read from District Attorney Williams' letter to Chairman LEAHY and Ranking Member GRASSLEY which powerfully illustrates why this is not the same thing. We are talking about a lawyer's duty to take on unpopular clients and make sure every American who is charged with a crime is entitled to an adequate defense. The district attorney of this very large office goes on:

Abu-Jamal made every effort to turn the trial into political theater. He repeatedly interrupted the proceedings, insulted the judge, and chanted the name of MOVE leader John "Africa." During the appeals, his supporters attempted to intimidate the judge by massing in front of his home in a residential neighborhood. Worst of all, they have maintained a three-decade-long campaign of verbal abuse against Officer Faulkner's widow, Maureen, who simply wanted justice for her dead husband.

This is indisputable. I think no one denies it. The D.A. goes on to say:

His lawyers . . . echoed these tactics in their legal maneuvers.

In other words, the lawyers defending him used the same tactics that the defendant did.

In other words, the lawyers defending him used the same tactics that the defendant did. They were not required to do that. Lawyers are officers of the court. They should never misrepresent anything in court or take a position contrary to plain law or misstate facts. Lawyers are not entitled to do that. So District Attorney Williams' letter goes on to say:

Despite the overwhelming evidence of guilt, they have—

The defendant and the lawyers, he is saying here—

—they have consistently attempted to turn reality on its head, arguing that Abu-Jamal was framed and that it was he, rather than Officer Faulkner, who was the victim of racism. The LDF perpetuated these allegations when they took over Abu-Jamal's case. Although Abu-Jamal's death sentence was eventually overturned on the basis of new procedural rules invented after his trial, his murder conviction has been upheld, and his lawyers' bogus racial claims have been consistently rejected in both state and federal court.

That is the D.A.'s continuing summation of it. He goes on to say:

Aside from being patently false, moreover, these claims are personally insulting to me. As an African-American, I know all too well the grievous consequences of racial discrimination and prejudice. I also know that Abu-Jamal was convicted and sentenced because of the evidence, not because of his race; and I have continued to fight for the jury's verdict because it was the just result.

So I respect that opinion. I don't think he would be saying that if he didn't believe it. He goes on to say:

Given all the laudable objectives of the NAACP, it is telling that Mr. Adegbile chose to devote his resources to this particular

cause rather than the many legitimate battles that called for his formidable abilities.

I was a federal prosecutor for 15 years and attorney general of Alabama for 2 years. I am a firm believer in the essential integrity of the American criminal justice system. I have seen it too long. I have tried too many cases before a jury. I believe they do justice every time. But there are—in a place as large as Philadelphia, and in places as large as America and in any state in America, you have poor people, people who are uneducated, people who can be deprived of rights they didn't know they had. Errors by chance could occur in a trial. There are needs for groups like the NAACP, the Legal Defense Fund, and other groups to defend people who have been caught up in the system and unfairly treated. That is a legitimate thing. So what I hear the district attorney saying is: Why choose this one to be so active about? He has good lawyers. The case was on appeal. So he goes on to say:

Of course, in our system even a radical cop-killer like Mumia Abu-Jamal is entitled to legal representation. That does not mean, however, that those lawyers who elect to arm him in his efforts are suitable to lead this nation's highest law enforcement offices. To select such a lawyer, among all those qualified for the position, speaks volumes to police officers and their families.

So he is saying: OK, you can do this. You can defend these cases. That is perfectly all right. You can pick that case out of all of them in the country and defend it, but you should not necessarily be promoted to this high position.

So this is not simply a case of a lawyer representing an unpopular client. It was a political cause. There was really no question about it.

What troubles me more than some of the other issues in the case is Mr. Adegbile's co-counsel, Christina Swarns, who actually worked for him. He was a supervising attorney. She explained the Legal Defense Fund motivation for getting involved in this case. Why? She explained it at a "Free Mumia" rally in 2011. This is what she said at that rally:

It is absolutely my honor to represent Mumia Abu-Jamal. It is my pleasure, it is my honor to have that opportunity, and there is no question in my mind, there is no question in the mind of anyone at the Legal Defense Fund—

I suppose, surely, that includes the nominee—

that the justice system has utterly and completely failed Mumia Abu-Jamal and in our view, that has everything to do with race and that is why the Legal Defense Fund is in this case . . . We are acutely aware that the injustices of the criminal justice system are inextricably bound up in race.

She says the Legal Defense Fund agreed with that. But the district attorney, Mr. Seth Williams, an African American himself, said the conviction had nothing to do with race but everything to do with the plain fact that he murdered a police officer, was observed, confessed and admitted it, and

said he hoped he died, and the jury found that. A biracial jury convicted him.

So while that is just her opinion, that is her statement, and she said she was speaking for the Fund. I serve on the Judiciary Committee, and we asked Mr. Adegbile: What about this statement by Ms. Swarns, and do you agree with it? How do you explain it, and what do you have to say about it?

Did he say he didn't agree with it? Did he say she misspoke? Did he say, I wouldn't have used those words? Did he say it was inappropriate, I didn't know about it?

This is what he said:

I do not know what Ms. Swarns had in mind when she made the comment.

That is not satisfactory to me. The question was a very serious one. I believe the comments by Ms. Swarns were inappropriate. They were false. They demeaned the integrity of the legal system of America improperly. As an officer of the court she had no right to do that. She really should have been disciplined, in my opinion. What did he say to the Judiciary Committee's written questions submitted to him? What does he say? All he said was: "I do not know what Ms. Swarns had in mind when she made the comment."

I think it is pretty clear what she had in mind. This is a radical view of criminal justice in America. It is very wrong. It is not correct. It is false. I am amazed that he would not at least take this opportunity now several years later to correct it.

In 2011 a Legal Defense Fund press release at the time that the nominee was leading the department declared:

LDF seeks to sweep the grave injustices embodied in this case into the dust bin of history and, in so doing, give communities of color reason to believe that they can and will receive equal justice in Pennsylvania courtrooms.

So it is a direct attack on the integrity of the courtroom and the jury and the judge and the appellate courts and federal appellate courts in Pennsylvania. That is the official press release of the Legal Defense Fund.

I don't think there is any evidence that there was any grave injustice done. In fact, justice was plainly done in this case. So that same press release, former LDF director, John Payton, is quoted as saying:

Abu-Jamal's conviction and death sentence are relics of a time and place that was notorious for police abuse and racial discrimination . . . unless and until courts acknowledge and correct these historic injustices, death sentences like Mr. Abu-Jamal's will invite continued skepticism of the criminal justice system by the African American community.

Mr. Adegbile has not rejected these statements. In fact, he is proud of his role in the case, testifying it demonstrates America's commitment to follow our procedural rules even in those hardest cases.

I just would say that a chief of the Civil Rights Division of the U.S. Department of Justice in Washington,

DC, holds an extremely important position. He is not a blind advocate for one vision of what some might call civil rights. I do not think it is a civil rights position these lawyers are taking. He is supposed to be a neutral observer. If a police officer violates the civil rights of someone under his custody, then he ought to be prosecuted, dismissed, and punished for it. But the Civil Rights Division leader is supposed to be somebody that everybody can trust, who people believe does not have an agenda, and who they believe is fair to all. So therein lies the rub.

Even someone who murders a police officer deserves legal representation. There is no doubt about that. But the Philadelphia District Attorney, Mr. Seth Williams, an African American said:

That does not mean, however, that those lawyers who elect to arm him in his efforts are suitable to lead this nation's highest law enforcement offices. To select such a lawyer, among all those qualified for the position, speaks volumes to police officers and their families.

It speaks volumes to them that this individual, this nominee for the Department of Justice, would be perceived as someone who is just voluntarily, aggressively, and improperly, in my opinion, taking the side of someone who is tried for murdering a policeman.

So the Civil Rights Division must protect the civil rights of all Americans. It must not be used to further a political agenda of any special interest groups as too often has occurred in this administration, in my opinion. It must be a place where the rights of all Americans are protected, regardless of their race and political party.

We have seen racial prejudice in the past, and it does need to be stamped out, but I do not believe the President's nominee is qualified because I do not see the required degree of objectivity and balance that will be necessary, and I will oppose the nomination.

I don't like to oppose nominees. It is no fun. I am sure this nominee has done many good things in his life. But there are points in time when we just have to say that as a Senator, I cannot vote for a nominee I don't believe is going to be objective and fair in the conduct of that important office.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDENTIAL OFFICER (Mr. MANCHIN). The Senator from Missouri.

HEALTH CARE

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I want to talk for a few minutes today about health care and more inquiries I have from the people I work for in our State about health care. Like we always do, I followed up with them to verify that I understand their account, and they don't mind if I at least mention their first name and where they are from as we talk about these problems.

This morning I had a chance to speak to the American Federation of Hos-

pitals about the challenges we face, and I mentioned the comment I made on the floor a few days ago, which was: If we were dealing with this health care debate today, in my view it would be a much different debate. Every Member of the House, every Member of the Senate, and almost every American who has been impacted in any way by the changes in health care understands this a whole lot better than we may have understood it 4 years ago.

I was in the House in 2009 and was leading our effort to come up with the alternatives that were clearly out there that I think we could have, and, frankly, should have pursued. But at that time it was clear a lot of Members had not really thought about this, and in many cases people who worked thought about it even less. We had a situation that, in many ways, was an accidental development at the end of World War II where most people in America who had insurance got their insurance at work. If the people at work liked the insurance they had, of course, among other things, they hoped they would be able to keep it. Hopefully many of them will, but clearly many of them won't.

The letters I have today are reflective of all kinds of challenges people are seeing. One of the things that was working very well in the almost 40 States that had it was the high-risk pool. The high-risk pool allowed people who had preexisting conditions a way to get insurance. They were in a pool that was pretty well defined. Not everybody with a preexisting condition had an ongoing cost. You might have a condition that was under control, you might have had a heart problem or cancer problem or another problem that stood in the way of your getting other insurance, but it didn't mean you had a lot of ongoing costs. It did mean the high-risk pool was a place you could go.

In our State, the premium for the people in the high-risk pool was 135 percent of what everybody else was paying. So you would take the average rate of what people were paying for insurance and add 35 percent to that.

Remember, these were people who everybody understood—including them—had a preexisting condition. They had a place to go. If the new plan would have reduced that 35 percent back to what everybody else was paying, that might have been a worthy goal, but that doesn't appear to be what has happened at all to the 4,000 people who left the Missouri high-risk pool when it ended because of the new law on December 31 of last year. There was a transition for some of them.

I have a letter from Bjorn of Kansas City. He said his wife was previously insured under the Missouri Health Insurance Pool for preexisting conditions. In her case she had a back condition. That was canceled in the middle of 2012, and she was put in another high-risk pool that the law allowed to happen as a transition.

The problem that created for them was it reset their \$1,000 deductible. They met the \$1,000 in the high-risk pool, and they met the \$1,000 deductible again in the second half of that year.

The insurance they have been able to find costs them four times what they were paying before. It is not 135 percent of the old premium. I guess four times that would be 550 percent of the old premium. So somebody who was paying 135 percent of what used to be the normal premium for an individual is now paying 550 percent of what used to be the premium for the old individual. If that was the way to help people who had a preexisting condition, they better hope the Federal Government doesn't try to help them any more.

Mark, from Parkville, says his two sons—young and healthy as they were, according to him—just had a 20-percent increase in the policies they had. The only reason they were given for the increase was that the new requirements of the Affordable Care Act meant their premium would go up. Mark said he lived out of the country for 2 years and was amazed to find upon his return that the cost for the same type of health coverage he had before he left went up from \$250 a month to \$1,000 a month.

Bill, from St. James, MO, said his deductible went from \$1,000 to \$2,500.

In Missouri, West Virginia, and lots of places, you and I know that if the individual deductible is \$2,500, a family looks at that—that is just like not having insurance at all. If a couple of you happen to get sick that year, it is suddenly \$5,000.

I met with some Missouri hospital folks last week in St. Louis. They said their fastest growing uncollected debt was now among people with insurance. Why would that be? Because people with insurance suddenly have a deductible that is much higher than the average person with insurance used to have.

The point they were making was that people can't pay \$2,500 or \$3,000 or \$5,000 or an even higher deductible, so that part of the bill doesn't get paid. That is the new growing debt that hospitals have.

These people who have the high deductibles are insured for maybe lots of things they didn't used to be insured for, but they don't use any of the things they are now insured for that they didn't used to be insured for. Bill from St. James says:

ObamaCare sure has not helped us.

I work for a small business that has renewed my healthcare and my deductible has risen from \$1,000 to \$2,500. My visits went from a \$20 copay to a \$30 copay and specialists from \$50 copay to \$75 copay.

He says he doesn't understand how he is helped by the new health care law.

Carl, in Lee's Summit, MO, said he has type 1 diabetes and his deductible went up to \$7,500. Again, for most families, a \$7,500 deductible is like not having insurance at all. If we could go

back to where we had the health savings account where you had a high deductible and you had your health savings account and that high deductible would kick in only if you had to pay the high deductible—I never saw a health savings account plan that would not be cheaper than these plans that cover a lot of things, but they cover a lot of things a lot of people don't need.

Carl says:

To keep our premium rates down my employer had to raise our deductible to \$7,500 with no prescription benefit until it is met, so now instead of putting away \$400 per month for my retirement I have to spend it on insulin and diabetic supply's.

How is this ACA helping any honest working American who is trying to take care of themselves and not rely on the government?

Carl's point is that the money he used to spend to prepare for his own retirement he now spends to pay for his insulin and diabetes medicine that used to be covered—until this year—by his policy.

Christine, from Kansas City, said her husband's employer was forced to make changes in their insurance resulting in a deductible that went from \$1,300 to \$6,100.

If this had been the way we would explain this, that somehow—let's assume we are insuring more people. There is no reason to believe that yet, but let's assume we are, but we are insuring more people with what I have here today—a \$7,500 deductible, a \$6,100 and a \$2,500 deductible.

She says:

Our deductible went from a manageable \$1,300 to a devastating \$6,100.

I recently sent in scripts for my Dr and I can't imagine how much they will be. We were told they would be between \$25 & \$200 depending on the cost of the drug.

Remember, they are all before you get the deductible.

I have a letter from Fred from Columbia. He says that a drug company that makes one of his prescriptions no longer offers him a discount. The pharmacy told him it was because of the Affordable Care Act.

I am perfectly willing to believe the Affordable Care Act has become an excuse for some things, and this may be one of them. I have not talked to the pharmacy in this case, but I do know these are problems other individuals are having because their insurance doesn't cover what it used to cover.

Fred is a retired State employee and he said his plan doesn't offer as much coverage as it used to.

Houston and Shirley from Peculiar, MO, have a supplemental health insurance. Their supplemental health insurance increased by \$330 since the Affordable Care Act was passed. They said their policy increased \$149—this is their supplemental policy.

They say:

Senator Blunt, we are on Medicare and have a supplemental health insurance. Our monthly premiums were a little less than \$165 [prior to the ACA's passage in 2010], and now as of January 1, 2014, is \$498.40. Our premium has increased by \$149.55 a month.

That is for their supplemental insurance.

Just last week Medicare Advantage, which serves people in underserved areas—whether they live in the inner cities or rural communities—has had that competition reduced as well.

I will say that if there were ever a time when we should take a second look at something—and the facts that every one of us have in our office suggest we take a look at it, and even demand we take a look at it—it is this policy that is hurting Americans and hurting families.

If we had this debate again, the country, the health care providers, and the Congress of the United States would be a whole lot better prepared to talk about what needs to be talked about than apparently the Congress was prepared to talk about in 2009 and 2010.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

EXECUTIVE NOMINATIONS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Several weeks ago, February 12, to be exact, as Washington, DC, was braced for a snowstorm and the Senate rushed to finish its business before the Presidents' Day recess, the senior Senator from Arkansas came to the floor to offer unanimous consent to confirm a district court judge for his State. Before he made the request, I spoke with that Senator who, to his credit, was one of only three Democrats to vote against the so-called nuclear option in November.

Although I was sympathetic to his desire to see his home State judge confirmed, I objected to his request to bypass the procedure the majority adopted in November, including recorded cloture and confirmation votes.

I did so based on principle. I did so because after 52 Democrats voted to strip us Republicans in the minority of our rights, the very least we could do is to ask the majority to utilize the procedure they voted to adopt. After all, the simple fact is that the minority can no longer stop nominees. That is the result of the nuclear option, and that was, of course, the whole point of what the majority did in November.

So the Senator from Arkansas offered his unanimous consent request, and I withheld my consent. We had our exchange on the floor, but we did so courteously, and that is what Senators should do. Later that evening the majority leader came to the floor and made another unanimous consent. Senator CORNYN objected for the same reason I had objected. Thereafter, the majority leader exercised the power that he has—he alone possesses it—to move these judges and filed cloture on four district court nominees. That set up several votes for last Monday evening.

That evening, during our side's hour of debate time—and that is all we have anymore for Circuit judges; we have 1 hour of debate time on each side. That evening I spoke on the current state of

the Senate with respect to the legislative process. I spoke about how our Founding Fathers intended the Senate to operate. I spoke on how the Senate used to operate, how it should operate and, sadly, how it does the opposite. I spoke about how the majority leader routinely files cloture on bills before debate has even begun. I spoke about how in today's Senate, in what is supposed to be the world's greatest deliberative body, the Senators from great States all over this Nation are shut out of the process of legislating and sometimes even debating.

As our side's hour of debate time neared its end, the distinguished chairman of our committee asked if I would yield him a few minutes of our time. I, of course, agreed to extend him that courtesy. I extended him the courtesy even though I knew he would use that time to argue against everything I just said. I extended him the courtesy because I know he would do the same for me, and, as a matter of fact, he has done exactly that same thing for me. That is the Senate. We are courteous to each other, even when we disagree.

As I said, that was Monday night—eight days ago. On Tuesday morning, we had a series of stacked votes related to those district court nominees. We had several cloture votes as well as confirmation votes. I voted against cloture, along with many of my colleagues. I don't presume to speak for my colleagues, but I voted against cloture to register my objection to a process arrived at via brute force—in other words, by the action of the nuclear option.

But the majority leader wasn't content to simply use the procedures he led his caucus to adopt last November when the nuclear option was adopted—when the minority rights on judges were taken away. He wanted voice votes rather than recorded votes on those lifetime appointments—and I emphasize lifetime appointments—so they deserve serious consideration. At that point, I objected, and I exercised the right of a Senator to ask for a rollcall vote of the yeas and nays.

I supported each of the nominees on final confirmation. Some of my colleagues opposed them. But even if the votes had been unanimous, the right to demand a recorded vote is one of the most basic and fundamental rights of any Senator. There is absolutely nothing wrong with exercising that right, especially when it comes to approving lifetime appointments to the courts.

Before we had that recorded vote, I took the opportunity to remind my colleagues of how well this President is doing with respect to getting the judges he nominates confirmed by the Senate. Specifically, thus far in this Congress, we have confirmed 50 of President Obama's judicial nominees. By way of comparison, at this point in President Bush's second term, we had only confirmed 21 judicial nominees. That is 50 for President Obama and 21 for President Bush. Those numbers

compare both district and circuit nominations. That is a benchmark both sides typically use.

So why are Republicans blamed by Democrats for not approving judges, especially when over the course of 5 years and 2 months now we have approved 223 judges and only disapproved two. Those are basic, unassailable facts.

In response, the majority leader described our request for recorded votes, as I was speaking about eight days ago, as “a waste of taxpayer time.” Then he concluded his brief remarks by saying this: “I would suggest to my friend the senior Senator from Iowa that he not believe his own words because they are simply not true.”

That was on Tuesday, a week ago. Two days later, on Thursday evening, the majority leader came to the floor and proffered a unanimous consent request for several district court judges. Senator MORAN was on the floor at the time and objected for our side. Thereafter, the majority leader filed cloture on four district court judges and the nominee to lead the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice. That is a right the majority leader has under our rules.

A few minutes later the majority leader returned to the floor so he could, as he described, “say a few words about the man who does all the objecting around here—or a lot of the objecting.”

He then proceeded to quote extensively from a speech I delivered in 2005. He then accused me of violating senatorial courtesy during floor consideration of the immigration bill because I objected to consideration of amendments approved by Democrats, without assurances that we would vote on amendments Members on my side thought we had a right to offer, as any Senator should have a right to offer amendments.

Even if some of the amendments the Democrats wanted had bipartisan support, I was the Senator standing up and defending the right of our Members to offer amendments—even controversial amendments. To be clear, I was prepared to vote on any Democratic amendment provided the Republican amendments were not restricted.

The majority leader then concluded his highly discourteous remarks by saying this:

The senior Senator from Iowa is talking out of both sides of his mouth, and the people of Iowa should check this out. They should see what he says and what he does.

Given how inappropriate these remarks were and that they roughly coincided with several other inappropriate comments the majority leader made last week, I feel compelled to respond, and, of course, that is what I am doing.

Let me start by reviewing briefly how we arrived where we are today. As I said, the majority leader quoted from a speech I delivered in 2005. For the benefit of my colleagues who weren't

here at the time, that was back when the Democrats were indiscriminately filibustering a host of President Bush's highly qualified nominees for the circuit courts. Make no mistake. The Democrats were utilizing the filibuster on judges at that time to an extent never witnessed before in our Nation's history.

During this time, they were filibustering 10 different circuit court nominees. So, as I said, the majority leader quoted from a speech I delivered during the debate of May 23, 2005. What he failed to mention is that six days earlier, on May 17, 2005, he said this on the Senate floor regarding the nuclear option:

It appears that the Majority Leader—

Referring to then majority leader Senator Frist—

cannot accept any solution which does not guarantee all current and future judicial nominees an up-or-down vote. That result is unacceptable to me because it is inconsistent with the constitutional checks and balances. It would essentially eliminate the role of the Senate minority in confirming judicial nominations and turn the Senate into a rubberstamp for the President's choices.

I am not going to relitigate that fight today, except to say this. At the time, Republicans, myself among them, were arguing that those nominees should be afforded an up-or-down vote. But as the quotation I just read demonstrates, Democrats refused. At the end of the day, our side lost that debate. We didn't believe judicial nominees should be subjected to a 60-vote threshold nor did we believe we should play by two sets of rules. So when the roles were reversed and there was a Democrat in the White House, Republicans utilized the tool as the Democrats did. The only difference was that we used it much more sparingly. As I said, we have approved 223 Obama nominees to the courts and only disapproved two.

The Democrats, of course, didn't like being treated to the tactics they pioneered, so they began to threaten to utilize the so-called nuclear option.

A lot of negotiations ensued between our side and the majority leader. That is the way the Senate most often gets things done—negotiating to a consensus. Again, I am not going to review every detail, but as any Member of this body can tell us, the result of those negotiations was this. The minority—this time the Republicans—relinquished certain rights regarding nominations. We did it by negotiation.

For instance, district court nominations used to be subject to 30 hours of debate. They are now subject to only 2 hours. In exchange for relinquishing those rights, the majority leader of the Senate gave his word that he would oppose any effort to use the nuclear option.

On January 27, 2011, the majority leader said this on the Senate floor: “I will oppose any effort in this Congress or the next to change the Senate rules other than through regular order.”

Notwithstanding that promise, at the beginning of the next Congress, we were, once again, on the receiving end of threats regarding the nuclear option. Once again, on January 24, 2013, after lots of negotiations, the majority leader again gave his commitment. Here is what he said on the floor of this Chamber: “Any other resolutions related to Senate procedure would be subject to a regular order process, including consideration by the Rules Committee.”

That commitment mattered. It mattered to me, and it mattered to my colleagues. We as the minority relinquished certain rights. In exchange for extinguishing those rights, we received a commitment from the majority leader of the Senate.

Remember, I say to my colleagues, please: This is the Senate. Not only are we courteous to one another, but we keep our word.

Ten months after making that commitment, on November 21, 2013, the majority leader and 51 other Democrats voted to invoke the nuclear option. They chose to adopt a new set of procedures for confirming judges.

So that is how we got to where we are today. Yet three months later, when the minority has the audacity to insist that the majority utilize the procedures they voted to adopt, the majority leader comes to the floor to level an *ad hominem* attack.

Amazingly, given the commitments he made at the beginning of the last Congress, he accuses me of speaking out of both sides of my mouth. The fact of the matter is there is absolutely nothing wrong with demanding debate time and rollcall votes, especially on lifetime appointments to the judiciary, and especially after the majority chose to adopt these very procedures just last November. That is not a “waste of taxpayer time,” as the majority leader called it. It is representative government. While I am on the floor of the Senate and while I am on the subject of floor procedure, let me say this about the legislative process we have been following on the floor. I spoke at length on this subject a week ago yesterday, just as I have on several other occasions. I have been highly critical of the process we follow these days on the floor. But I have always tried to avoid making my criticisms personal. I have always tried to be courteous. But there is no getting around this fact. It is nothing short of a travesty that great Senators from all over the Nation must go to the majority leader to ask permission to offer amendments. Proud Senators from proud States, Republican Senators and Democratic Senators, conservative Senators, liberal Senators, northerners and southerners, appropriators and authorizers, hawks and doves, all of these Senators have been reduced to this. They are forced to come before one individual on bended knee to ask permission—permission—to offer an amendment. That is not as it should be in the world's greatest deliberative body—the Senate.

So am I highly critical of the legislative process we undergo on the floor? Absolutely, I am. But I didn't criticize the majority leader in a personal or discourteous way. I didn't accuse him of "talking out of both sides of his mouth," as he did of this Senator. I wasn't attacking him personally; I was defending the rights of 99 other Senators as well as my own rights as a Senator.

What exactly is the majority leader afraid of, anyway? Taking a few hard votes? We are paid to take hard votes. We are sent here to exercise our best judgment on behalf of our constituents. That is how our Republic is designed.

It does not have to be that way. Consider how amendments are handled in the Judiciary committee, as an example—something that ought to be followed here in the U.S. Senate.

Our chairman—I should say the senior Senator of this body, the President pro tempore, Senator LEAHY—our chairman does not tell us in the minority—Republicans—or even the Democrats what we are allowed to offer; nor does he tell us how many amendments we are allowed to offer.

He controls the agenda, as you would expect a chairman to do. But we get to offer amendments. As a result, every single Senator of our committee—whether they like it or not—contributes to the process.

The chairman controls the agenda. The minority offers amendments. And the majority has to vote on those amendments. That happens to be the process.

That is what happens when you have a chairman who respects the rights of U.S. Senators. There is absolutely no reason we could not do exactly that same thing right here on the floor of the U.S. Senate.

Let me mention one other thing about what the majority leader said the other night because I found it particularly offensive.

Immediately after accusing me of "talking out of both sides of my mouth," the majority leader suggested that the people of Iowa, my constituents, should pay attention to what I say and what I do. Well, they do.

But let me relate something to my colleagues about how I keep track, keep in touch with Iowans. The people of Iowa know who they elected to the Senate. They know that ever since I was first sworn in in this body in January 1981, I have fought all day, every day, to represent them.

I know my constituents. They know me. I go to constituent meetings in every county—every one of 99 counties—every year. Multiply that 99 by 32 years, and you get a fairly large number. I have been in 25 counties so far this year. So I talk to my constituents. I read their mail. I know, for instance, how hard ObamaCare has been on families in my State.

So I find it personally offensive for the majority leader to come to the floor, as he did last Wednesday, and ac-

cuse Americans, including my constituents, of telling lies when they share their stories about how ObamaCare is impacting them.

Last Thursday evening the majority leader came to the floor so he could, as he described it, "say a few words about the man who does all the objecting around here."

Well, Mr. President, do I object? You bet I do. So do the rest of my committee members on the Judiciary Committee when it comes to things of the Judiciary Committee; so does the rest of our caucus.

We object to the authoritarian way this Senate is being run. We object to being shut out of the legislative process. We object to dismissing constituent stories of ObamaCare as lies. We object to taking to the floor of the U.S. Senate to attack fellow citizens as "un-American" because they have the audacity to exercise First Amendment rights. And, yes, we object to the discourteous ad hominem attacks on Senate colleagues because they choose to exercise their right to demand recall votes on lifetime appointments.

It should stop. The Senate should return to being the greatest deliberative body in the world.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

ADEGBILE NOMINATION

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I rise to speak on the nomination of Debo Adebile to serve as Assistant Attorney General for the Justice Department's Civil Rights Division.

Some Americans may vaguely recall Mumia Abu-Jamal from the "Free Mumia" T-shirts and posters that once cluttered college campuses.

Maureen Faulkner will forever remember him as a cold-blooded cop killer who left her as a widow at age 24.

Maureen Faulkner has endured three decades of endless appeals and a dishonest international campaign to turn her husband's killer into a celebrated icon for some on the radical left.

Now one of the lawyers who helped promote that campaign, Debo Adebile, has been nominated to lead the Justice Department's Civil Rights Division. This cannot stand and I hope the Senate will not confirm him.

Let's review the facts.

At 3:51 a.m. on December 9, 1981, 25-year-old police officer Daniel Faulkner pulled over a car in the city of Philadelphia. The car's headlights were off, driving the wrong way down a one-way street.

The driver exited the car and began assaulting Officer Faulkner. The driv-

er's brother, Mumia Abu-Jamal, was watching from across the street. Four eyewitnesses saw Abu-Jamal race across the street, shoot Daniel Faulkner in the back, and while Officer Faulkner was lying helplessly on the ground, Mumia Abu-Jamal shot several more bullets into Faulkner's chest and face.

Three other witnesses heard Abu-Jamal brag that he had shot Daniel Faulkner and hoped that Faulkner would die.

During the trial, when Daniel Faulkner's bloodstained shirt was displayed, the jury saw Abu-Jamal turn in his chair and smirk at Officer Faulkner's young widow Maureen.

So it was no surprise when a Pennsylvania jury took just 3 hours to convict Abu-Jamal of murder, and the next day 2 hours to sentence him to death.

Instead of allowing Daniel Faulkner's young widow to grieve in peace, a group of political opportunists decided to use this case to further their own political agendas. They fabricated claims of racism. They spread lies about the trial and the evidence. They organized rallies that, amazingly, portrayed Mumia Abu-Jamal as the victim.

Before long, Abu-Jamal was a cause celebre, complete with adoring Hollywood celebrities, "Free Mumia" T-shirts and posters. He had his own HBO special, and they even named a street after him in Paris.

In 2009, 27 years after Daniel Faulkner's murder, the NAACP Legal Defense Fund, or LDF, decided they would join the fray.

For decades before Mr. Adebile assumed his leadership role in the LDF, the LDF served as a force for truth and justice for all Americans—a very important and well-deserved reputation for having done that. But, unfortunately, LDF's representation of Abu-Jamal promoted neither truth nor justice.

It is important to point out this is not a case about every accused person deserving a legal defense. That is a principle upon which I hope there is no disagreement, certainly not from me. The fact is, though, Abu-Jamal had multiple high-cost lawyers already volunteering their time.

Mr. Adebile was director of litigation for the LDF. He told the Senate Judiciary Committee that he "supervised the entire legal staff" at LDF—18 lawyers. Also, he was, in the words of the LDF's own Web site, responsible for LDF's advocacy "both in the courts of law and in the court of public opinion."

This is important to understand because this duty to supervise has very specific implications for lawyers. A lawyer must confirm that the lawyers he oversees are honest while presenting facts in a case. The law backs this up. Supervising lawyers can be sued for malpractice or sanctioned by a court for the actions of the lawyers he or she supervises.

And how did the LDF's lawyers comport themselves under Mr. Adebile's

direction and leadership and supervision? Well, under Mr. Adegbile's oversight, LDF lawyers promoted the pernicious myth that Abu-Jamal was an innocent man and that he was framed because of his race.

There was never any merit to the claims of racism. That was a conclusion that was investigated and reached by both State and Federal courts.

In fact, the jury that convicted and sentenced Abu-Jamal to death included two African Americans and would have included one more except that Abu-Jamal himself ordered his lawyer not to seat that third juror.

Yet, in February of 2011, Mr. Adegbile's group issued a press release stating that "Mumia Abu-Jamal's conviction and death sentence are relics of a time and place that was notorious for police abuse and racial discrimination."

In May of 2011, two of the lawyers supervised by Mr. Adegbile traveled to France. They went there for a rally on behalf of Mumia Abu-Jamal.

One LDF lawyer said she was "overjoyed" that Abu-Jamal's death sentence was suspended, but she bemoaned the fact that Abu-Jamal would not have a new trial and so could not be set free.

The other LDF lawyer described Abu-Jamal as one of the "people who are innocent" but "will continue to be put to death in America."

At another event in New York City that same year, a lawyer working for Mr. Adegbile gushed, "It is absolutely my honor to represent Mumia Abu-Jamal." She continued: "there is no question in my mind, there is no question in the mind of anyone at the Legal Defense Fund, that the justice system has completely and utterly failed Mumia Abu-Jamal" and that failure "has everything to do with race."

I agree that the justice system has failed. But it has failed Officer Danny Faulkner and his family.

No one understands this story of injustice better than Officer Danny Faulkner's widow Maureen. Maureen Faulkner pleaded with the Senate Judiciary Committee for a chance to tell her story, for a chance to testify before the committee as they were deliberating the candidacy of Mr. Adegbile. But the Senate Democrats on the committee would not allow her to testify. They did not let her tell her story and, instead, they voted to send his name on to the Senate floor for confirmation.

I think Maureen Faulkner has a right to be heard. So I hope my colleagues will listen as I read a letter she wrote addressing all of us:

Dear Senators,

While I would have preferred to do so personally, I'm writing this letter appealing to your sense of right and wrong, good and evil as you consider the nomination of Debo Adegbile to be the next head of the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice.

33 years ago my husband, Philadelphia Officer Daniel Faulkner, was violently murdered by a self-professed "revolutionary"

named Mumia Abu-Jamal. I was 24 years old. While most of my friends spent their summer at the Jersey Shore, I sat in a hot steamy courtroom and watched in horror and disbelief as the man who murdered my husband tried to turn the courtroom into a political stage where he could spew his hatred and contempt for this country and our judicial system.

At the moment my husband's blood stained shirt was displayed by the evidence handler, Mumia Abu-Jamal turned in his chair and smirked at me; demonstrating his contempt for law enforcement. Thankfully, a racially mixed jury that was selected by Abu-Jamal while representing himself, found him guilty. The following day they sentenced him to death for the brutal act he committed.

That's when my second nightmare began. For three decades, my family and I endured appeal after appeal—each rooted in lies, distortions and allegations of civil rights violations. And year after year, judge after judge, the conviction and sentence were unanimously upheld. Then, thirty years after the fact, my family, society and I were denied justice when three Federal District Court judges who have found error in every capital case that has come before them overturned the death sentence.

Today, as my husband lies thirty three years in the grave, his killer has become a wealthy celebrity. He pens books and social commentaries critical of our country. He regularly uses his nearly unlimited access to the prison telephone to do radio programs, has cable TV in his cell and is permitted to hold his wife, children and grandchildren in his arms when they visit.

Old wounds have once again been ripped open and additional insult is brought upon our law enforcement community in this country by President Obama's nomination of Debo Adegbile. While publicly demonstrating that he doesn't even know my husband's name, Mr. Adegbile fawns sympathy and caring for my family and me.

In reality, Mr. Adegbile was a willing and enthusiastic accomplice in Mumia Abu-Jamal's bid to cheat us of the justice we had waited so many years for. Mr. Adegbile freely chose to throw the weight of his organization behind Mumia Abu-Jamal and he has publicly stated that he would get Mumia Abu-Jamal off death row.

Mr. Adegbile holds Mumia Abu-Jamal, a remorseless unrepentant cop killer, in high esteem. We know this because attorneys working under Mr. Adegbile's supervision have stood before public rallies held in support of my husband's killer and openly professed that it was "an extreme honor" to represent the man who put a hollow based bullet into my husband's brain as he lay on the ground, wounded, unarmed and defenseless. And while Mr. Adegbile and those who support his nomination will undoubtedly argue that he did not personally make such statements, he did nothing to counter or stop them.

In the end, like so many attorneys before him, Mr. Adegbile's allegations of civil rights abuse rang hollow. Mumia Abu-Jamal's death sentence was overturned not because of civil right abuse as alleged by Mr. Adegbile, but because three judges with a personal dislike for capital punishment conveniently determined that the wording in a standard form given to the jury might have confused them.

While Debo Adegbile may be a well qualified and competent litigator, through his words, his decisions and his actions, he has clearly and repeatedly demonstrated that he is not the best person to fill this important position. Certainly there are others with similar qualifications that would be better

choices. I would argue that Mr. Adegbile's decision to defend a cop killer should preclude him from holding any public position.

Your decision means a lot to me personally. The thought that Mr. Adegbile would be rewarded, in part, for the work he did for my husband's killer is revolting.

Throughout my long ordeal I have frequently been labeled a racist by many who support my husband's killer simply because he is black and I white. I have also been asked to throw my name, my voice and my support behind political candidates from both parties. In each case I have declined. I have always believed that my husband's death and my quest for justice transcends politics and race.

From my heart, I'm asking you to do the same thing. Set aside any partisan feelings you have and do the right thing today when you vote on Mr. Adegbile's confirmation. Please spare my family and me from further pain.

Sincerely, Maureen Faulkner.

As the Justice Department's Web site explains, the Civil Rights Division of the Justice Department "fulfills a critical mission in upholding the civil and constitutional rights of all individuals." Clearly, this requires that the head of the Civil Rights Division have an absolute commitment to truth and justice. There are many highly qualified Americans who can carry out this critical mission. Mr. Adegbile's record creates serious doubts that he is among them. For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to oppose the nomination of Mr. Debo Adegbile to serve as Assistant Attorney General for the Justice Department's Civil Rights Division.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I am here now for the 60th time to ask my colleagues to wake up to the threats of climate change. To see the damage that is being caused by our shifting climate, we need look no further than the Winter Olympics. The most recent Winter Olympics concluded last month. Over 200 countries broadcast the event to an estimated 3.8 billion people worldwide. In Rhode Island, we rooted for our very own Marissa Castelli, who brought home a bronze medal in pairs figure skating.

But what does the future hold for the Winter Olympics? As global temperatures rise and weather patterns shift, the world's glaciers are receding and snowpack in traditionally snowy regions is declining.

A report from the University of Waterloo found that February daytime high temperatures during the Winter Games have been steadily increasing from the 1920s and the 1950s to the 21st century. This forced the International

Olympic Committee to take drastic measures to ensure adequate conditions: ramping up the use of snow-making machines and physically transferring large amounts of snow to the site of the games.

This is just the beginning of things to come. If our emissions are left unchecked, as the Republicans and the polluters prefer, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change reports we will likely see warming between 4.7 and 8.6 degrees Fahrenheit by the end of the century. The Waterloo report found that only 10 of the 19 cities to previously host the Winter Olympics would be cold enough to host the games by the 2080s. There could be no Sochi Olympics, no Vancouver or Squaw Valley or Sarajevo Olympics, and that is if we are able to stabilize and ultimately reduce our global carbon emissions before the year 2100. If carbon pollution continues on the current pace, only six of these cities could host the games. Forget about Torino and Nagano, Lake Placid and Lillehammer.

Over 100 Olympic athletes from 10 different countries signed a letter asking world leaders to take action to curb climate change. They said:

As winter Olympic athletes, our lives revolve around the winter and if climate change continues at this pace, the economies of the small towns where we live and train will be ruined. Our sports will be forever changed and the winter Olympics as we know it will be a thing of the past.

Much as we all love the Winter Olympics, we could do without them. We cannot very well do without freshwater. Glaciers represent the largest reserves of freshwater on Earth. Their freshwater feeds our rivers and streams, waters our farms and ranches, and provides some of our drinking water. Glacier loss is happening all over the world, including right here in the United States.

Just like atmospheric warming, ocean acidification, and sea-level rise, this evidence of climate change is not a theoretical projection. It is not a complex scientific model. It is simply observation and measurement.

This is Grinnell Glacier in Montana's Glacier National Park. On top we see the glacier in 1940. On the bottom is the same spot in 2004. Grinnell Glacier has lost 90 percent of its ice in the last century. The glacier has almost disappeared or, as the U.S. Geological Survey puts it, "effects of global climate change are strikingly clear." The U.S. Geological Survey further explains:

Glacier recession is underway, and many glaciers have already disappeared. The retreat of these small alpine glaciers reflects changes in recent climate as glaciers respond to altered temperature and precipitation. It has been estimated that there were approximately 150 glaciers present in 1850 and most glaciers were still present in 1910 when the park was established. In 2010 we considered there to be only twenty-five glaciers larger than twenty-five acres remaining in Glacier National Park.

So there were 150 glaciers 100 years ago, 25 now.

Here we see a similar change at Lillian Glacier in Washington's Olympic National Park. On the top we see a large healthy glacier in 1905, and this almost unrecognizable view of the same landscape in 2010.

Of course, this is not just happening in the United States. Countries across the world are seeing rapid glacier loss.

A 2013 article published in *Nature* found clear evidence that the Tibetan glaciers—the world's third largest ice reservoir behind Antarctica and Greenland—are shrinking, even at altitudes above 20,000 feet.

South America's Andean glaciers are retreating at an amazing rate. Climatologists from Ohio State University and NASA loaned my office a piece of a plant that had been preserved under the Quelccaya icecap in Peru for at least 5,200 years, a little bitty piece of plant. But under the pressure of the ice and the cold, it had been preserved for 52 centuries. Today, due to glacial retreat, it was exposed and I now have that piece of plant in my office.

Glaciers are some of the largest reservoirs of fresh matter on Earth. According to the U.S. Geological Survey, glaciers store 69 percent of the world's fresh water. Annual spring glacial melt provides a dependable source of water for streams, plants, spawning fish, farming, and now often hydroelectricity. In Central Asia hundreds of millions of people rely on the Tibetan glaciers to supply drinking water. The same goes for the people of Peru and Bolivia in the Andes.

This is a crisis we must take seriously. Unfortunately, Congress remains barricaded behind a blockade of polluter influence. Only last week a Republican witness at an Environment and Public Works hearing on adapting to climate change argued that we would all be better off if the glaciers just went away—if they just melted away. After all, he told the committee:

We evolved at the equator in a climate where freezing weather did not exist. . . . It could be said that frost and ice are the enemies of life.

He continued:

Obviously if the glaciers stop melting, there will be no more meltwater from them. So my questions . . . are, Are you saying you want the glaciers to stop melting? Then where would the irrigation water come from? . . . I say let the glaciers melt.

That is the witness the Republicans put up. Let the glaciers melt.

I guess he missed the difference between seasonal melting, whose annual rhythms fill our streams and rivers for drinking water, fishing and farming, and glaciers outright melting away.

There is another little trick the deniers like to play when it is winter-time. Every time there is a cold snap or a little snow falls in Washington, DC, or back in their home States, they say: How can there be global warming when it is cold out? And, yes, we have had a cold winter. But what scientists

and other level-headed observers understand is the changes occurring in the climate are happening over longer periods than just one winter and across broader regions than only one State or even the United States. Moreover, short-term temperature anomalies such as a cold snap might be worse because of climate change, because of changes in the jetstream, for instance. This chart shows how worldwide winter temperatures every year since 1880 compare with the 20th century average.

Do you think there is a trend visible there? Over 100 years, yes, winter is still cold, but it is not as cold as it used to be. This change is ravaging winter sports and tourism across the United States. The National Resources Defense Council found that between 1999 and 2010, a lack of snowfall cost our ski industry \$1 billion and up to 27,000 jobs. Before the end of the century, the number of economically viable ski locations in New Hampshire and Maine will be cut in half. Skiing in New York will be cut by three-quarters and, the report says, there will be no ski area in Connecticut or Massachusetts. If we know our geography, we know if that is true of Connecticut and Massachusetts, there goes Rhode Island's Yawgoo Valley ski area and slope.

The Bicameral Task Force on Climate Change, which I started with Representative HENRY WAXMAN, asked the National Basketball Association, Major League Baseball, National Hockey League, National Football League, and the United States Olympic Committee, to tell us what climate change means for their sports.

National Hockey League Deputy Commissioner William Daly wrote:

Hockey's relationship with the environment is unique. Our sport was born on frozen ponds, where—to this day—players of all ages and skill levels learn to skate. For this magnificent tradition to continue, it is imperative that we recognize the importance of maintaining the environment.

The Park City Foundation in Utah predicts an annual local temperature increase of 6.8 degrees Fahrenheit by 2075, which could cause a complete loss of snowpack in the lower Park City resort area of the Rocky Mountains. The foundation estimates that this will result in thousands of lost jobs, tens of millions in lost earnings, and hundreds of millions in lost economic growth.

While we in Congress equivocate and stall, the evidence of climate change relentlessly mounts. The damage is being done in our atmosphere and our oceans. The longer it takes us to wake up, the harder and more expensive it will be to fix it.

The sickening part is that everyone else is waking up. Sixty-five percent of voters support the President taking significant steps to address climate change now. Another poll found that 82 percent of Americans believe we should start preparing now for rising sea levels and severe storms from climate change.

Even in the party that won't speak the words "climate change" any longer—not since Citizens United cleared the way for big spending by polluters in Republican primaries—even in the Republican Party, among young Republican voters 35 and under, the majority of them feel that climate denial is either ignorant, out of touch, or crazy. If that is what young Republicans feel, that is a very poor foundation for the Republican Party to maintain this denier policy.

The campaign of money and denial that imprisons Congress is as poisonous to our American democracy as carbon pollution is to our atmosphere, oceans and, yes, glaciers. It is time to fight back. It is time to wake up.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

ADEGBILE NOMINATION

Mr. CRUZ. I rise today to pay tribute to the men and women across the country serving as police officers who protect law-abiding Americans. It is out of this respect for our Nation's police officers that I also rise to oppose the nomination of Debo Adebile to be the head of the Department of Justice's Civil Rights Division.

We must always remember our Nation's fallen police officers who have bravely given their lives to serve our Nation and to protect us.

Police officers help form the backbone of our country that supports the rule of law. They risk their lives every day to help keep law-abiding citizens safe. According to the FBI, in 2012, 95 law enforcement officers were killed in line-of-duty incidents and 52,901 officers were victims of line-of-duty assaults—52,901.

The New York Times in 2012 observed: "As violent crime has decreased across the country, a disturbing trend has emerged: rising numbers of police officers are being killed."

In 2008, 41 officers were killed; in 2009, 48 officers were killed; in 2010, 56 officers were killed; in 2011, 72 officers were killed; and in 2012, 95 officers were killed.

Unfortunately, as Byron York noted today, the New York Times has not reported on the controversial nomination of Debo Adebile to head the DOJ Civil Rights Division.

It is out of respect for all of our Nation's police officers that I rise to oppose Mr. Adebile's nomination. Under Adebile's leadership and supervision, the NAACP Legal Defense Fund brazenly politicized the murder of a Philadelphia police officer, Officer Daniel Faulkner. On December 9, 1981, 25-year-old Officer Faulkner was murdered by Wesley Cook, who is widely known as Mumia Abu-Jamal. Officer Faulkner was shot several times. The fatal shot was when Abu-Jamal pointed the gun inches from Officer Faulkner's face and pulled the trigger.

During the trial it was made known that Abu-Jamal was a supporter of the

MOVE Organization, an anarchist group that explicitly advocates for violence against police officers.

In a letter to the Senate Judiciary Committee, Mrs. Faulkner described that during the trial, when her husband's bloodstained shirt was displayed by the evidence handler, Abu-Jamal turned in his chair and smirked directly at her, the grieving widow. The jury convened for a matter of hours before they came back with a guilty verdict and a death sentence. That was 1982.

Fast forward 27 years to the year 2009, Adebile was at the time the NAACP's Legal Defense Fund Director of Litigation. In 2009, the Legal Defense Fund began advocating for Abu-Jamal—first as an amicus and then as cocounsel. To be clear, every criminal defendant is entitled to an attorney, but Adebile's representation of Abu-Jamal was pure advocacy.

Abu-Jamal's guilt was not in doubt. Four eyewitnesses saw the shooting. Abu-Jamal confessed and stated in front of three witnesses that he hoped Officer Faulkner died.

There was significant ballistic and forensic evidence. For example, the murder weapon was registered to Abu-Jamal and found at the scene with spent shell casings.

Abu-Jamal already had a team of high-priced lawyers working pro bono, who had filed decades of post-trial petitions and appeals, delaying the carrying out of his sentence.

Under Adebile's supervision, LDF lawyers fanned the flames of racial tension. Through rallies, protests, and a media campaign, all portrayed Mumia Abu-Jamal, an unrepentant cop killer, as a political prisoner.

For example, a 2011 LDF press release said: "Abu-Jamal . . . is widely viewed as a symbol of the racial injustices of the death penalty."

That press release also said: "Mumia Abu-Jamal's conviction and death sentence are relics of a time and place that was notorious for police abuse and racial discrimination."

LDF lawyers under Adebile's supervision went farther than that. They held rallies and protests.

This is advocacy. This is political advocacy. This is extreme and radical advocacy. This is not legal representation. They even went so far as to travel to France to hold multiple rallies for Abu-Jamal. The French had already named a street after Abu-Jamal in a suburb of Paris.

This prompted the House of Representatives in 2006 to vote 368-31 to condemn the murder of Officer Daniel Faulkner and to urge the French town to change that street name.

After fanning those flames of racial tension in the court of public opinion, Adebile pressed aggressive arguments on race in our courts of law. Thankfully, the State and Federal courts rejected those arguments.

Under Adebile, the LDF initially argued in court that Abu-Jamal's death

sentence should be overturned because he believed there should have been more African Americans on Abu-Jamal's jury.

During his Senate confirmation on January 8, Adebile said the LDF filed a legal brief regarding merely jury instructions about the death penalty. LDF did make those arguments eventually, but Adebile's initial arguments had nothing to do with jury instructions. They were arguments that Abu-Jamal's jury was unconstitutional because it didn't have, he argued, a sufficient number of African Americans serving in the jury.

The courts rejected those arguments. The jury that convicted Abu-Jamal had two African Americans serving on it. It would have had a third African American serving on it but Abu-Jamal instructed his lawyers to strike that person.

The Fraternal Order of Police vehemently opposes this nomination. According to a letter written by the president of the FOP, Adebile's nomination only exacerbates the "growing division and distrust" toward local law enforcement agencies—a trend that has continued from the time now-Labor Secretary Thomas Perez was leading the Department of Justice's Civil Rights Division.

Peter Kirsanow, a member on the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, wrote:

Responsible people should agree that going out of your way to defend a convicted cop-killer long after it has become unequivocally clear that he was guilty and had suffered no violation of his civil rights disqualifies one from serving as the head of a division of the U.S. Department of Justice.

The Obama administration's message with the nomination is clear: It wants even more politicization of the Department of Justice. This is insulting to law enforcement officers everywhere. I stand with the Fraternal Order of Police and oppose Adebile's nomination, and I urge my Democratic colleagues to join the Democratic senior Senator from Pennsylvania, Mr. BOB CASEY, and vote no on this nomination.

This is not a matter of leftwing or rightwing. We all should agree that violent criminals should be punished, and we all should agree that those who go out of their way to advocate for, to celebrate, to lionize convicted cop killers are not suitable for major leadership roles at the U.S. Department of Justice.

I urge every Member of this body to oppose that nomination.

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

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

Mr. FLAKE. I rise to discuss the nomination of Mr. Debo Adebile to

head the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice.

I attended Mr. Adebile's hearing in the Judiciary Committee and submitted additional written questions after the hearing. Unfortunately, after hearing testimony and reviewing his responses to questions, I remain concerned with Mr. Adebile's ability to set aside more than a decade of advocacy on behalf of this and other liberal causes to serve as a neutral enforcer of our Nation's civil rights laws. And it appears I am not the only person who has reached this conclusion.

His nomination is opposed by numerous law enforcement officers, including those represented by the Fraternal Order of Police, National Sheriff's Association, the Major County Sheriffs' Association, the National Association of Police Organizations, the New Jersey State Policeman's Benevolent Association, and the National Narcotics Officers' Association.

This widespread opposition is clearly not driven by partisanship but by a heartfelt concern that this nominee is not suited for the position.

I have no doubt Mr. Adebile is an intelligent and hardworking lawyer with a commendable record of advocacy, but that does not mean he should head the Civil Rights Division.

One of the responsibilities of the Department of Justice's Civil Rights Division is to handle civil rights violations by law enforcement officers from across the country. However, serious questions have been raised about Mr. Adebile's ability to apply the law fairly in these cases, given his advocacy on behalf of a convicted cop killer.

As the Fraternal Order of Police stated in its letter of opposition, in the decades Mr. Adebile pushed this effort, he "falsely disparaged and savaged the good name and reputation of a lifeless police officer" in order to further his case.

The National Narcotics Association shares this analysis of Mr. Adebile's advocacy, noting that he:

... fabricated a baseless and unproven defense while also defaming the victim, Police Officer Daniel Faulkner, which raises serious questions about the nominee's judgment, especially considering the important position to which he has been nominated.

There is no doubt as to Mumia Abu-Jamal's guilt. Afterward, he bragged about shooting Daniel Faulkner, and four witnesses saw the shooting. After being convicted and sentenced, Mumia's lawyers filed dozens of appeals on his behalf, which would suggest he had more than adequate legal representation. However, almost 28 years after his conviction, Mr. Adebile decided to volunteer his time to assist Mumia. In a series of appeals and press events, Mr. Adebile's organization called into question the motivations of the law enforcement officers responsible for Mumia's conviction and distorted the record, calling his conviction and sentence a "relic of a time and place that was notorious for police abuse and racial discrimination."

As the Philadelphia district attorney's opposition letter states, Mr. Adebile's work on this case "sends a message of contempt to police officers who risk their lives every day to maintain the peace."

The district attorney concluded that Mr. Adebile "is ill-suited for a pivotal role in the Justice Department."

The appalling facts of this case are well known. In fact, in 2006, the House of Representatives passed a resolution condemning the history of this case and recognizing the culpability of Mumia by a vote of 368 to 31. There are others, such as myself, now serving in this Chamber who voted in favor of that resolution.

It is deeply troubling that we are faced with voting on this nominee now, after Senate rules have been broken and the minority has no say in executive or judicial nominations. Requiring the support of at least some minority Senators discourages both the nomination and appointment of fringe or problematic nominees, something which benefits the country as a whole. Those rules ensure the Senate was the cooling saucer that George Washington and the other Founders intended. They also ensured heads of executive agencies were responsive to both the majority and minority parties. That is no longer the case.

I do not think we would be moving forward on such a divisive nominee—one who elicits widespread opposition from across the political spectrum—if the majority had not employed the nuclear option last November. I hope we don't move forward with this nomination. I hope my colleagues will join me and others in voicing opposition to this nomination moving ahead.

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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. I ask unanimous consent that the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to urge my colleagues to join me in opposing the nomination of Debo Adebile to head the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice.

The Constitution grants to the President the power to nominate individuals to head the various Federal agencies and departments, but it falls to us in the Senate to ensure those nominees are worthy of the honor and are ready for such responsibility. I don't make it a practice of opposing nominees. In fact, I generally give the President discretion there. I have voted to give him wide latitude in filling the executive branch with individuals of his choice when I believe they are qualified. I have voted along with the minority Republicans who endorsed and confirmed

a number of the President's nominees. But when it comes to a nominee who lacks the essential qualifications to fill one of these high offices, those of us charged with providing advice and consent cannot remain silent. Unfortunately, this is one of those cases.

It takes more than a law degree from a prestigious school and an impressive résumé to head an agency to support the Civil Rights Division at the Department of Justice. Most importantly, I think it takes judgment which cannot be measured by test scores or diplomas. It can only be measured over time through someone's actions.

If we look at Mr. Adebile's record, it is obvious to me and so many of us in the Senate and around the country, including the Fraternal Order of Police, who have not opposed an executive branch nomination, by the way, in 17 years, who are taking a strong stand against this confirmation.

First, as some of his colleagues and my colleagues on the Senate floor have noted, Mr. Adebile has a history of taking positions on some of our fundamental constitutional rights that I think are out of step with the views of the American people, the judgments of our judiciary, and our Nation's history.

In the case of *Hosanna-Tabor v. EEOC*, Mr. Adebile argued that religious institutions do not have the right to hire or fire individuals responsible for conveying a church's teachings, a view that, were it to become law, would severely undermine religious liberty. Mr. Adebile was so out of step with the Constitution on that issue that his view was rejected by the Supreme Court 9-0, which in today's typical 5-4 split in the Supreme Court is quite an accomplishment.

Mr. Adebile's view on the First Amendment is troubling. So too are his views of the Second Amendment. He has repeatedly asserted that the Second Amendment does not "protect an individual's right to keep and bear arms." If Mr. Adebile had his way, millions of Americans would lose one of their most cherished rights, just like that. Whenever a piece of gun control legislation comes to the floor of this Chamber, my colleagues on both sides of the aisle—and, in fact, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle—assure us they will always respect a fundamental right to bear arms. It is unfortunate that despite the words of the Constitution and its interpretation by the Supreme Court, Mr. Adebile cannot give us those same assurances.

There is the case of Mumia Abu-Jamal. Abu-Jamal is a murderer. In 1981 he gunned down a police officer named Daniel Faulkner on a Philadelphia street. In an act of unmatched brutality, Mumia Abu-Jamal stood over Officer Faulkner as he lay dying and shot him in the face. A mountain of evidence from eyewitness accounts, forensics, to his own words makes it clear beyond any doubt that Abu-Jamal killed Officer Faulkner on that day in December 1981.

Still, Abu-Jamal deserved his day in court as would any other American accused of a crime. He got his day in court. He deserved competent counsel, and he got that too. He deserved an opportunity to appeal, and he got it. In fact, after the matter turned from a criminal matter to an issue of justice and to a political cause, he received some of the best counsel in the country and they filed appeal after appeal, all of which were rejected.

But that didn't stop Mr. Adegbile from claiming that Abu-Jamal was a victim of racism and a corrupt judicial system. For Mr. Adegbile, Abu-Jamal's case was apparently an opportunity to focus more on a political agenda than the case at hand. Abu-Jamal's guilt or innocence was not really the concern.

Debo Adegbile is free to make any arguments he sees fit about the First and Second Amendments. He is free to turn the murder of a police officer into a cause to advance a political agenda. When he does so, I think it says something about his judgment and it says something about his fitness to lead the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice.

The Department of Justice and police forces around our country should be working together to ensure that minority rights are respected and that civil rights abuses are punished. In my view, this nominee would only make that work more difficult. As the Fraternal Order of Police wrote in a letter to President Obama, if Mr. Adegbile is confirmed it will serve to "exacerbate growing division and distrust" between the Civil Rights Division—which is charged with securing our most basic freedoms—and the men and women of law enforcement who defend those freedoms by putting their lives on the line every day.

I think we can and should do better with a nominee who can work with the Fraternal Order of Police and other law enforcement around the country in ensuring that our most basic freedoms are secured through the Department of Justice's Civil Rights Division.

For these reasons I oppose the nomination of Mr. Adegbile to this position, and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to do the same.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

UKRAINE CRISIS

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I have been discussing the Ukraine crisis with my constituents and a number of Indiana media outlets for the last few days. Virtually every interview or conversation on the subject includes this question: What difference does this make to us here in Indiana? What American interests are at stake? These are legitimate questions, and they deserve an answer because before we commit America to address potential conflicts, we need to describe and define just what our interest is and why we should be engaged.

In this conflict we are not talking about the use of military force, but we are thinking about and talking about and should be examining other measures that can influence the outcome of a crisis situation that could have significant consequences for the American people.

If we can't answer that question and we can't address that with a compelling answer, then we should not get engaged. But if we can determine a compelling answer and reason why we should engage in some form, then we need to make sure the American people know why it is we are renewing this and why this is important.

Ukraine is 5,000 miles away. The trade between our two countries is minuscule and shrinking. Only 30 percent of the Ukrainian population shares our Christian faith or identifies with any faith. Ukraine is the source of no energy or crucial materials. Indeed, the country is a source of instability and corruption. So why should Americans and Hoosiers care about what is happening to a country 5,000 miles away? Well, let me suggest some reasons and then perhaps some suggestions as to what would be the best way for us to help influence this crisis situation in a way that is positive for our country and, frankly, for Western democracy and for the world.

The first and most obvious reason we should take this seriously is the central lesson of history: Conflicts—even catastrophes—sometimes grow from small beginnings. Most know that the assassination of an imperial relative in a Balkan town in 1914 led to the death by violence of 37 million people—World War I. We also know that the cataclysm of World War II began with the stealth invasion of Austria and Czechoslovakia in 1938. Despite warnings as to what this might lead to, we saw a tragic loss of tens of millions of people in World War II. This is eerily reminiscent of Russia's moves on Crimea last week.

A history lesson closer in time is taught by the Balkan wars of the 1990s. When Serb gunboats shelled Dubrovnik, a Croatian city, in 1992, the world—and most especially Croatia's European neighbors—did exactly nothing. Our own Secretary of State said repeatedly that there were no American interests at stake. Before that view was changed and NATO eventually intervened 3 years later, more than 100,000 people had been slaughtered.

If the international community had had the collective wisdom and leadership—and, frankly, courage and guts—to simply tell Belgrade that civilian European population centers are no longer shelled in modern Europe, all of that suffering could have been prevented and our own Armed Forces could have stayed in their barracks and in their homes.

We should draw from such lessons so that we need not confront later the question of whether we should inter-

vene militarily in a Ukrainian civil war or a war between Ukraine and Russia. Instead, we must confront now the choice we have of doing nothing and letting Putin have his way or leading an American and an international response to impose penalties on Putin's Russia so that he comes to his senses.

A second and related American interest is in the stability of the European continent itself. Ukraine is not an obscure sideshow. It is comprised of remnants of two European empires and deeply embedded in the integrated structure, identity, economy, and culture of Europe as a whole. Disaster there threatens a very great deal in Europe, a continent we have spent 100 years, trillions of dollars, and hundreds of thousands of lives to stabilize. European security and stability have been at the very heart of our foreign and defense policy for an entire century. If American foreign policy and American strategic interests in the world have any permanent core, it is that interest in Europe's well-being.

Ukraine's conflict with the remnants of Soviet-style aggression portends serious threats to the rest of Russia's border lands, nearly all of which were long dominated by Red Army presence and force. The Baltic states must be alarmed right now. If we do nothing, they could panic.

Poland has already summoned NATO councils to consider consequences for its own security and therefore for the security of the alliance. Georgia painfully reflects that the paltry international response to its own war with Russia five years ago surely emboldened Putin in this latest adventure.

In other words, we could be looking at a Sudetenland moment. We hope that is not the case.

It is no secret that Putin has imperial ambitions motivated by his pathological insecurities and a quest to restore lost glories. These are dangerous delusions that, if not confronted firmly, could come to threaten us all.

Beyond history and beyond the threats to continental security instability, I am even more concerned about America's place in the world and how inaction will further harm it. Abroad, we are increasingly seen as a spent force, exhausted by interminable wars, politically divided and inert, financially strained, and floundering without firm, articulate, determined leadership. This is a bleak, incomplete picture of my country that more than anything else makes me determined to be part of an effort to correct this perception of America.

In many ways, we can potentially look at the Ukrainian crisis as an opportunity. We have a chance now to summon our collective will and impose costs for Putin's irresponsible behavior. We have many robust capabilities to reward those who join us in responsible, mutually productive cooperation in managing world affairs and in punishing those who do not.

This is the moment to demonstrate our return to the leadership role that the realities of this harsh world have long imposed upon us. This situation, this crisis which we now face in Ukraine, can be a moment to demonstrate our return to a leadership role desperately needed by this tortured world where the realities of this harsh world have long imposed upon us.

It is in our national interest, in my opinion, to lead the world toward solutions that we know are best for us all. No other country can manage it. We have seen that. Without that management, we risk things that could harm us in many ways and continue to undermine our role in this world in providing for peace and stability.

For these reasons, tomorrow I will introduce a sense-of-the-Senate resolution articulating some of the steps I think we and the President should consider together. None of these steps involve military force or the preparation for using such force. Now is not the time to add to the violence but, rather, to remove the use of force by all parties as an option.

I hope the resolution will contribute to the search for both a bipartisan, unified government approach to problem-solving and an international consensus on firm actions that will change Russia's behavior. I am saying that we should stand united as Americans with a single message and a single voice led by our leader which shows we are resolute in standing together—hopefully with our European allies and others who want to join us—in condemning the actions taken by Putin and Russia and in offering and proposing meaningful sanctions and measures that will bring the reality of Russia's actions straight to Putin's desk and hopefully cause him to rethink his strategy.

The resolution will commit the Senate to work urgently with the President to identify a package of economic sanctions and other measures to compel Putin to remove armed forces from Ukrainian territory and return that territory to full Ukrainian sovereign control.

Further, I will suggest that we construct a complete comprehensive plan to isolate Putin's Russia from the community of nations. We seek a consensus on such a plan with our friends and allies—everyone who wants to see a sovereign Ukraine, secure within its own border, able to seek its own destiny on its own terms. That is the right of every sovereign nation.

My resolution will also call upon the President to consider a number of measures to isolate and sanction Russia.

We could reschedule a meeting of the G-8 nations to take place as soon as possible, at which meeting the participating nations should seriously consider a U.S. proposal to formally expel Russia.

The United States should propose to NATO that the alliance immediately suspend operation of the Russian-

NATO council. The Russian military and diplomatic representation at NATO should be expelled. A close relationship with Russian's defense officials during a time when that country has invaded and occupied a neighbor contravenes the founding purpose of NATO. How could we possibly meet on a Russian-NATO council basis when Russia has invaded and occupied a neighbor?

The President should ask the leadership of FIFA to reconsider its decision to place World Cup 2018 matches in Russia and instead award these games to a more worthy alternative country. Russia has just celebrated the Sochi Olympics. I think we got the real measure of President Putin, a former KGB lieutenant colonel, as to what his real intentions are—it is not to bring more good will and more confidence in that country.

The United States could work with other members of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe—the OSCE—to deploy monitors in Ukraine to help confirm that the security of the Russian-speaking population is not threatened. This pretext for Russian aggression must be removed to international satisfaction.

Senate leadership could dispatch a congressional delegation led by OSCE Commissioners to visit Ukraine and bolster OSCE's involvement in addressing this crisis. Another option would be the United States working with OSCE and German Chancellor Angela Merkel to support her proposal to create an OSCE contact group to pursue dispute resolution and mediate direct negotiations between the Ukrainian and Russian Governments.

The United States should not maintain the current status of diplomatic relations with Russia at current levels. We could downgrade our diplomatic representation while retaining its efficacy by announcing that we will not send our new Ambassador to Moscow. Instead, we could dispatch an experienced professional diplomat to Ukraine to serve as charge d'affaires to handle the crisis. We could also reduce the diplomatic presence to focus exclusively on crisis management, not business as usual. We could close consulates general and require Russia to make reciprocal steps to close their consulates in the United States.

I believe we in Congress should expand the Magnitsky Rule of Law Accountability Act to sanction the Ministry of Defense officials in the chain of command responsible for this invasion, the Duma leadership responsible for rubberstamping it, and Crimean officials complicit in its execution.

The United States should also consider sanctions that might serve to convince more segments of the Russian population that their government is taking irresponsible steps contrary to the people's interests. To this end, we should suspend and could suspend Russia's eligibility for H-2B temporary or seasonal work visas.

This is just a menu of suggestions of actions we can take, actions that I think would impose upon Russia a cost for their brazen attempt to intercede in the affairs of a sovereign nation to, under the most flimsiest of pretenses, invade a country under the pretext that its citizens there, or those who favor support for Russia, are under some type of lethal threat. That is not the case. It has not been demonstrated, and it has not been proven.

Now is the time to act—to act quickly and act together. Our leverage is our leadership. We need to take up that powerful tool and show Putin that he has misjudged us. Now is the time for the United States to reassert its leadership in the world by taking direct action—not through military action but through a menu of measures designed to bring Russia to its senses and designed to protect the sovereign interests of those nations that are seeking to align with the West in a Democratic way. We need that leadership from the President. We need that support from this Congress in a bipartisan measure. And we need to speak with a united voice, hopefully with our European partners and others throughout the Western world and the free world, to send a message that Russia cannot ignore and to impose a measure of costs that will impact that country's economy and impact the decision that has to be made by their President.

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

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

TRIBUTE TO TEQUIA DELGADO

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the Senate is a place where we make friends. We have our differences on policy, but we truly are a Senate family. It is just not that way with Democrats who work in the Senate, it is also the Republicans. When we work together, which we do outside the view of most of the public, we work well together.

One of the troubling things for me—I am sure it is for all of us—is when someone who is a part of the family leaves—especially it applies when you feel so close to the family member. Today, the Democratic cloakroom, the nerve center of the Senate and the entire Senate community, says goodbye to a dedicated staffer Tequia Delgado.

I and we congratulate her on her new role as a member relations advisor for the White House. After graduating from Southern Illinois University in Carbondale, IL, Tequia started her Senate career as a staff assistant in my office.

But even before that she spent the summer interning for this brandnew Senator Barack Obama. In 2007 Tequia joined Senator DURBIN's staff. I have never truly forgiven him for that, for taking her from me. But he has done a lot of nice things, so I guess I will have to try to sweep that under the rug sometime, but it has been very hard. I do not think I have ever gotten over that. I have told him often that he stole her from me. But those things happen.

On a serious note, it was the right move for her. It was an advancement for her. She is from Illinois. It has worked out well for her. She became director of constituent services and then a legislative correspondent for Senator DURBIN, my dear friend.

Despite her hard work in my office and that of the assistant Democratic leader, Senator DURBIN, she found time to perform as a cheerleader for the Washington Redskins for 3 years. These are difficult jobs. They practice like the football team. It is hard. They have tryouts. It is quite an honor. So we have always recognized her for this accomplishment. That is certainly what it is.

When she joined the cloakroom staff in 2010, she brought her warm personality and always a positive spirit to her new role. So for 4 years Tequia has worked in the cloakroom, I repeat, the nerve center of the Senate. She has been an invaluable resource to all Senators. She has been an important mentor for Senate interns and pages. She has been a valued teammate and friend to our colleagues.

Tequia's talent, dedication, and friendly demeanor will be missed by me and Members and colleagues alike. I wish her well in this next endeavor. I know she will perform admirably. We are fortunate that she will continue to work closely with the Senate community. That is her job in her new role as a member of the White House team.

Congratulations Tequia and best of luck in everything you do in the future.

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 for up to 10 minutes each.

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

FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION IN ECUADOR

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I want to speak briefly, as I have several times over the past year, about the government of Ecuador's President Rafael Correa, which continues its aggressive clamp down on press freedom. Most recently, political cartoonist Xavier Bonilla was reprimanded for a cartoon he drew, and the newspaper he works for, *El Universo*, was fined for pub-

lishing it. *El Universal*, one of Ecuador's most respected dailies, has been the target of one of the dozens of harassing lawsuits filed by President Correa.

The cartoon by Mr. Bonilla, who goes by the pen name Bonil, depicts a police raid at the home of an investigative journalist, Fernando Villavicencio, who claimed to have documented evidence of corruption in the government. It shows the police knocking down the door to Mr. Villavicencio's house and parading out with computers and filing cabinets.

A government-established media oversight agency, Superintendency of Information and Communication, SUPERCOM, used Ecuador's vague communications law to sanction both Mr. Bonilla and *El Universo* for publishing an "institutional position" over the guilt or innocence of people involved in investigations. It subsequently ordered a major investigation, required a "correction" to the cartoon, and fined the newspaper. In doing so, the Correa administration sent a clear message to journalists that criticism of government misconduct will not be tolerated.

I have spoken several times about President Correa's attacks on press freedom and I will continue doing so as long as these restrictive laws are enforced and as long as journalists are threatened for their work. Most recently I recognized the efforts of Janet Hinostroza, an Ecuadoran investigative journalist who was honored by the Committee to Protect Journalists, CPJ, for her commitment to fighting for a free press. Ms. Hinostroza is continually threatened for her work exposing government corruption. Unfortunately, the harassment she and Mr. Bonilla face illustrates a norm, not an anomaly, when it comes to President Correa's attempts to intimidate and silence his critics.

The absurdity of censoring a cartoonist aside, this latest attack further erodes what remains of an independent press in Ecuador. It explains why Human Rights Watch and CPJ continually rank Ecuador among the world's worst for press freedom. It is shameful, it is an embarrassment for the hemisphere, and the people of Ecuador deserve better.

MARIJUANA LEGALIZATION

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, the legalization of marijuana is an issue that has generated significant media attention in recent months. Last year Colorado and Washington State became the first jurisdictions in the world to legalize the production, trafficking, possession and use of marijuana for recreational purposes. The consequences of legalization are only beginning to be understood. But one thing is clear. Legalizing marijuana does not make it any safer. Marijuana remains a Schedule I drug under the Controlled Substances Act. According

to that designation, it is a substance that presents "a high potential for abuse."

Colorado's previous experience legalizing medical marijuana suggests that the consequences of full-on legalization could be dire for public health and safety. From 2006 to 2010, the number of Colorado drivers involved in fatal car crashes who tested positive for marijuana doubled. The number of Colorado students who have been suspended or expelled for marijuana use has increased considerably. Nearly three-quarters of Denver teenagers in drug treatment reported obtaining marijuana from a "medical marijuana" user. Colorado has become a source State for the distribution of marijuana throughout the United States. Law enforcement in my home State of Iowa reports that the percentage of marijuana interdicted there that originated from Colorado has increased from 10 percent in 2010 to 36 percent in 2012.

Against this backdrop, the Obama administration has recently sent mixed signals, especially to young people, about the dangers of marijuana use. President Obama recently stated that in his view, marijuana use was no worse than drinking alcohol. The Department of Justice declined to challenge State laws that have legalized marijuana, despite the obvious conflict with Federal law. Additionally, the Department issued guidance to prosecutors concerning the enforcement of the Controlled Substances Act and Federal money laundering laws that is plainly intended to permit marijuana businesses in these States to grow and flourish. These actions have caused confusion and uncertainty about whether using marijuana is really something that should be discouraged because it is harmful.

However, many community anti-drug coalitions, healthcare professionals, public health officials, and law enforcement groups are speaking out about the dangers of marijuana use. One such group, Smart Approaches to Marijuana—or Project SAM for short—has recently begun to confront the marijuana legalization movement head-on.

One of Project SAM's cofounders, former Congressman Patrick Kennedy, has been outspoken in his efforts to fight the marijuana legalization movement. He has appeared on numerous television and radio shows, including ones where audiences may disagree with his views against legalization. He has bared his own struggles with addiction, offering himself up as a cautionary tale about the dangers of becoming addicted to marijuana and other substances. And he has broken with many in his party by speaking out against the President's permissive attitude toward marijuana use and the Obama administration's failure to enforce the Controlled Substances Act. Indeed, all former DEA Administrators, appointed by Republican and Democratic presidents alike, have joined with Project SAM and others to

oppose the Obama administration's policies in this area.

According to a recent article from NBCnews.com, an article I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, Project SAM recently launched a serious counter-offensive to the marijuana legalization movement. The organization began by placing a billboard near the Super Bowl stating that "Marijuana kills your drive." Project SAM launched a website dedicated to tracking public health incidents linked to marijuana use in Colorado and Washington to highlight the consequences of legalization in those States. It is also launching websites that will allow current or former marijuana users to share their stories about how marijuana has damaged their lives.

Project SAM has also been active in my home State of Iowa. The organization recently co-hosted town hall meetings with local community anti-drug coalitions, highlighting the risks of legalizing marijuana. Project SAM has also briefed State officials about the dangers of legalizing marijuana.

It is not every day that I have the occasion to praise a Democrat. However, Congressman Kennedy is to be commended for his courage in coming forward and participating in this debate by publicizing the dangers of marijuana use and opposing the Obama administration's failure to enforce Federal law in this area. His voice is a welcome one for those of us who believe that the legalization of marijuana is an unwise policy that will have a profoundly negative effect on public health and the lives of many young people.

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

[From NBCnews.com, Feb. 14, 2014]

TREATMENT OR JAIL: PATRICK KENNEDY
WAGES FIERCE ANTI-POT CRUSADE

(By Tony Dokoupil)

As a hard-partying teenager, Patrick Kennedy met President Reagan at a fundraiser for the JFK Library, a meeting captured in a photograph that the former Rhode Island congressman now hangs in his home office. He used to think of it as a funny episode, a collision of Camelot's cocaine kid and America's foremost opponent of illegal drug use. But Kennedy took his last hit of anything in 2009, and he's since honed an anti-drug message that sounds a bit like Reagan with a Boston brogue.

Kennedy believes there is "an epidemic in this country of epic dimensions when it comes to alcohol and drugs. He'd like to treat it all, but he's convinced that the single biggest threat to America's mental health is free-market marijuana. So even as Democrats favor the legalization of pot—by a 34-point margin, according to the latest WSJ/NBC News poll—the scion of America's most famous Democratic family has broken ranks, criticized the White House, and aligned with the likes of Newt Gingrich to warn voters against trying to tax and regulate today's psychoactive chlorophyll.

"I don't think the American public has any clue about this stuff," says Kennedy, after welcoming guests with a choice of Gatorade or bottled water.

The "stuff" in question is modern marijuana, of course, which gets pumped into snack foods and candies, and carries more THC (tetrahydrocannabinol, the chemical that gets you high) than the ditch weed used by the hippie generation. Kennedy calls legalization "a public health nightmare because he believes it will warm more people to a dangerous drug, and lead inevitably to 'Big Marijuana,' a blood-sucking vice industry dependent on converting kids and selling to heavy users—same as the tobacco and alcohol industries.

"The science tells the story," he says, breaking into an attack on the idea that marijuana is safer than alcohol. He ticks through studies showing that smoked marijuana is "associated with" or "linked to" IQ loss, psychosis, and self-reported dissatisfaction with life. "It takes you to the same place as cocaine or heroin," he often adds. "It just takes longer."

"Incarceration is a powerful motivator," says Kennedy, who after a prescription drug-addled crash in 2006 spent a year urinating in front of a probation officer three times a week.

Last January Kennedy went public with his beliefs, launching Smart Approaches to Marijuana, or Project SAM, a campaign to keep marijuana illegal and address the failings of the drug war through other means. But what other means? Kennedy has sometimes been vague, promising "a fresh approach that neither legalizes, nor demonizes marijuana," but never quite clarifying what makes him different from Reagan-era prohibitionists.

Not anymore. In a series of interviews, Kennedy and his cofounder Kevin Sabet—a former senior advisor to the Obama administration on drug policy—previewed SAM's aggressive new posture for 2014. It's not a new War on Pot, but it might be the most potent campaign since Nancy Reagan made marijuana the centerpiece of her "Just say no" tour three decades ago.

As Kennedy and Sabet cut a path between the poles of legalization and prohibition, they seem to list toward the status quo. They would make the simple possession of marijuana a civil infraction, like jaywalking, which could take 750,000 annual marijuana arrests down to zero, and alleviate the disproportionate burden that prohibition puts on people who are nonwhite and poor.

But instead of handcuffs, Kennedy and Sabet propose a mandatory screening for marijuana addiction, according to the "Legal Reform" section of their website. That could lead to "marijuana education," and ultimately a year in a "probation program to prevent further drug use." And if the pot smoker still insists on getting high? It's handcuffs time.

"Incarceration is a powerful motivator," says Kennedy, who after a prescription drug-related car crash in 2006 spent a year urinating in front of a probation officer three times a week. He faced a jail term if he relapsed. "That does it for a lot of people," he added. "That's the turning point: hearing that judge say treatment or jail."

"I think Madison Avenue has proven that it can get around more rules and be more ruthless than any Mexican drug cartel," adds Sabet.

Kennedy and Sabet can also sound old-school on medical marijuana. As a member of Congress, Kennedy voted in favor of allowing patients access to pot but now says he was wrong. He'd like to repeal every law that treats smoked marijuana as medicine. Instead he hopes to see pharmaceutical-grade cannabis satisfy an FDA approval process and sell as a patch or pill. "We don't smoke opium for morphine," as Sabet explains, "we don't need to smoke pot for medicine."

SAM's opponents argue that legalizing weed would raise tax revenue, allow law enforcement to chase more serious crime, and undercut Mexico's violent drug cartels. Kennedy and Sabet sharply dispute all this—and so much more—but they're particularly unapologetic about championing the continued existence of a black market. They say it's mostly nonviolent on the American side, and will create fewer public health problems than allowing advertisers to flog for Big Marijuana.

"There is no way to minimize the greed and profit motive in promoting a dangerous substance," says Kennedy. When it comes to pushing a product, adds Sabet, "I think Madison Avenue has proven that it can get around more rules and be more ruthless than any Mexican drug cartel." He calls the black market, "better than having Joe Pot, heir to Joe Camel, on a bus-stop where I'm going to be hanging out with my kids before school."

When Project SAM launched, opponents mocked the effort as foolhardy, and they had a point. Voters had just legalized marijuana by a landslide in Colorado and Washington. Polls showed that a majority of Americans supported doing the same nationwide, and Kennedy could do little at first but appear on TV as the token voice of dissent.

Now, however, SAM is poised to launch a serious counter-offensive. It began this month with a billboard outside the Super Bowl. "Marijuana kills your drive," read the carefully-calibrated text, which picked up national coverage, spreading on a tide of the opposition's howls and guffaws.

It was crafted by Sabet, a 34-year-old prodigy of drug politics, who launched his first anti-drug campaign (Citizens for a Drug-Free Berkeley) while in college and is now, in the opinion of Rolling Stone, the number one national "enemy of legalization."

"Yep," he emailed after the ad launched. "Game on."

"My name is John and marijuana ruined my life," begins one entry from a young man who says that marijuana took "the gifts and potential I was born with."

The game continues this spring, with SAM planning a response to "We Are the Marijuana Majority," a web compendium of legalization's best and most famous friends, launched with a grant from the Drug Policy Alliance, a leading advocate for reform. The SAM answer will be a directory of—you guessed it—the anti-marijuana majority.

The precise URL and title is still under discussion, but the webpage will feature opponents of legalization, an infinite scroll of head shots and quotes from the likes of Tina Brown, David Brooks, and Barack Obama (whose tangled statements on the subject appear to have landed him on both sites at once).

SAM's second website will take aim at Colorado and Washington, the world's first state-approved markets for marijuana, and to Kennedy and Sabet a slowly unfolding disaster that will prove them right in the end. The Justice Department has said it will shut down the state experiments if the regulations fail or public health falters, which is why SAM will use this site to track every known example of pot gone wrong.

The third website is tentatively titled "The Other Side of Marijuana" and it will collect stories from people who believe marijuana damaged their lives. It's a counterpoint to the notion that marijuana is a safe, non-addictive substance. Based on a sample of entries, it's also likely to draw more fire than anything SAM has done yet.

"My name is John and marijuana ruined my life," begins one note from a young man who says that marijuana took "the gifts and potential I was born with." "Most of my daughter's former friends are in jail or

dead," adds the mother of an 18-year-old in residential treatment for marijuana addiction. She is "sickened" by the idea that marijuana will be the next big business in America.

In another note a therapist quits her practice in despair after a rise in marijuana-related patients. "I witnessed first-hand too many of the problems," she writes, ticking off "anxiety, depression, irritability and psychosis."

"This is the stuff of life," Kennedy says, trying to explain his passion for drug policy, "so you bet I'm emotional about it."

Not every pot smoker goes crazy or brainless, as Kennedy admits, but SAM is about minimizing the risk to those who—like him—start drugs young and are predisposed to break bad for life. After he got married in 2011, in his early 40s, he moved to his wife's hometown of Atlantic City, N.J. Now he is the father of three kids under 5 (one is a step-child), and he worries they will inherit his addictions. He can also see the casinos from his backyard.

"The appetite for Americans to lose themselves is just . . ." Kennedy shakes his head and seems too pained to finish the thought. His six-week-old daughter was fussy the night before, and it was his turn to shush and pace. In the hallway, near a stairway to where his 20-month-old son is napping, there's a toy fire engine and Kennedy's eyes return to it again and again. Suddenly, he seems to be on the brink of tears.

"This is the stuff of life," he says, trying to explain his passion for drug policy, "so you bet I'm emotional about it."

The rollout of the new SAM continued this month at a conference in Washington, D.C., where Kennedy and Sabet held a standing-room-only rally for supporters. They celebrated 25,000 media mentions, and 22 states with SAM affiliates. They aired footage of Kennedy telling CNN's Sanjay Gupta that his ballyhooed endorsement of marijuana was "shameful," a ratings ploy that "history will not remember well."

So far, however, the legalization side seems to have an edge in the war of ridicule. They charge Kennedy and Sabet with 21st century reefer madness, which the duo bats away as a sign that the opposition is afraid to engage with the facts. But while they can sometimes be unpopular at parties, they keep going, fueled by those letters from the public, and enthusiastic notes from past drug advisors.

"SAM is doing what no one else has done and doing a darn good job of it," wrote Robert DuPont, Richard Nixon's head of drug control, in a recent email to Sabet. "Absolutely brilliant presentation," Clinton-era drug czar Barry McCaffrey added in a different note.

In a sense, nothing has changed since a teenage Kennedy gave President Reagan a sly smile. To make the world a healthier place, the anti-drug crowd wants to protect people from their most dangerous appetites. The reform side supports the same vision of health but wants to make drug use itself safer, believing that insobriety is normal and indulgence inevitable.

Neither side appears to be winning, because there's no such thing as an "objective" position on marijuana policy. Would legalization really be so bad? Or is it the panacea its proponents claim? The honest answer is: nobody knows for sure, because no modern nation has ever tried legalization before—until now.

"Life isn't really in our control," says Kennedy, as another sober day fades to night. "There's a mover in the universe, a higher power, so to speak, and we can't imagine what we're going to find in our universe if we let go and just let God lead us."

WORLD WILDLIFE DAY

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, in commemoration of World Wildlife Day on March 3, I rise to bring attention to the catastrophic effects of wildlife trafficking on global and economic security and the urgent need to crush this demand for these illegal products.

Conserving natural resources is a priority for me, particularly as chair of the Water and Wildlife Subcommittee; it is a priority for my State of Maryland, and it is a priority for this administration. But the responsibility of protecting natural resources, such as wildlife, doesn't just sit with one State or one country. It requires a coordinated, global effort. Wildlife trafficking is a multibillion-dollar-per-year, transnational, sophisticated network of organized criminals. As the demand for elephant ivory, rhino horns, and other wildlife products resurges, the trade has become an illicit business similar to drug and arms smuggling. And as such, we must approach the problem with an equally hard-hitting strategy.

The Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species, CITES, reports that in 2012, an estimated 22,000 elephants were slaughtered across Africa. According to the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, approximately 2,800 rhinos have been poached in South Africa since 2008, a more than 7,000-percent increase compared to the previous 17 years, mostly destined for Asian countries. Hundreds of park rangers are being gunned down by poachers, leaving behind devastated families with no income. Illegal wildlife trafficking threatens our species and is pushing some to the edge of extinction. The illicit trade hurts developing communities, damages tourism, risks people's livelihood or worse, ends lives.

In February, President Obama released the first-ever National Strategy for Combating Wildlife Trafficking. I joined colleagues on both sides of the aisle to urge the administration to produce a bold, goal-oriented, and whole-of-government approach to combat this growing problem of illicit wildlife trafficking. I commend the administration for its aggressive plan, and I hope we see swift implementation in the three areas of enforcement, demand reduction, and partner-building.

The image of wildlife trafficking is often tied to the African Continent. But the other side—the consumer-demand side, primarily driven in Asia—must be viewed closely as well. With growing wealth in the Asia region, wildlife is being used for traditional and nontraditional medicines, trophies, clothing or pets. As the demand grows, the price of these products continues to skyrocket. We must leverage our bilateral and regional relationships to educate communities about the real effects of this trade.

As chair of the Subcommittee on East Asia and the Pacific, I am particularly pleased to see the tremendous cooperation between the United States

and China on this issue. At the 2013 Strategic and Economic Dialogue, the two countries committed to cooperate on enforcement issues and efforts to end the supply and demand for such products. On January 6, China destroyed more than 5 tons of ivory, publicly demonstrating their commitment to protecting elephant populations. The United States, Kenya, Gabon, and the Philippines have held similar events. In a joint 1-month global operation earlier this year, the United States and China joined with 26 countries, plus international organizations such as ASEAN, to target wildlife trafficking criminals resulting in over 400 arrests and more than 350 major wildlife seizures. This type of collaboration is critical and more needs to be done.

At the London Conference on Illegal Wildlife Trade February 12-13, 2014, representatives from over 40 countries joined together and issued a declaration urging action. There is no doubt that governments recognize the urgency in solving this problem. But we need to build on this momentum, match our words with action, ensure developing countries have the capacity to address enforcement issues, hold criminals accountable, and educate communities to look beyond short-term benefits toward the dangerous long-term effects of illegal trafficking.

I urge all my colleagues to work together to strengthen existing laws, adopt new laws, and pressure consumers to put an end to this damaging trade before the illegal trade puts an end to our world's most precious wildlife.

SOUTH BERWICK, MAINE

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President. I wish to commemorate the 200th anniversary of the town of South Berwick, ME. South Berwick holds a very special place in our State's history, and one that exemplifies the determination and resiliency of Maine people.

While this landmark anniversary marks South Berwick's incorporation, the year 1814 was but one milestone in a long journey of progress. It is a journey that began thousands of years earlier with Native American villages on the banks of the Piscataqua and Salmon Falls rivers. In 1631, barely a decade after the Pilgrims landed at Plymouth Rock, Ambrose Gibbens established a settlement at the falls and built the first sawmill in North America. A manufacturing heritage of textile mills and iron works that developed in the 18th century continues today. The skills and work ethic of the people of South Berwick contribute greatly to the cutting-edge industries in the region, from biotechnology to aerospace and defense.

Industry is only part of South Berwick's story. In 1791, the citizens of the region recognized the importance of education and established Berwick Academy with a charter signed by Massachusetts Governor John Hancock.

Located in South Berwick, the academy is the oldest educational institution in Maine and now, as a private school, remains true to its founding purpose of promoting "virtue and useful knowledge among the rising generation." In addition, the people of South Berwick remain true to the vision of their forebears by supporting an outstanding public school system.

During the Revolutionary War, the growing community provided two full companies to fight for America's independence, more than many towns of greater size. The courage and character demonstrated by the townspeople in standing for liberty echo throughout South Berwick's history. In the years before the Civil War, the many churches in the community were powerful voices for the abolition of slavery. During that terrible conflict, more than 294 of South Berwick's young men, including 46 Berwick Academy students fought, and many died, so that all might live in freedom. The town's honor roll of current military personnel demonstrates an ongoing commitment to our Nation's founding principles.

This anniversary is not just about something that is measured in calendar years. It is about human accomplishment. We celebrate the people who, through the centuries, have pulled together, cared for one another, and built a great community that is a wonderful place to live, work, and raise families. Thanks to those who came before, South Berwick has a wonderful history. Thanks to those who are there today, it has a bright future.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

AMERICAN RED CROSS MONTH

• Mr. BEGICH. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize and pay tribute to the American Red Cross. March is American Red Cross Month—this is a special time to recognize and thank our everyday heroes. The Red Cross is on the frontlines every day. They volunteer their time, take lifesaving courses, and provide financial donations to help those in need.

We would like to remember our heroes in Alaska who help those in need. The Red Cross works tirelessly to help in times of disaster with the comfort of a helping hand. They provide round-the-clock support to members of the military, veterans and their families, and teach lifesaving classes in CPR and first aid.

Across the country and around the world, the American Red Cross responds to fires, hurricanes, tornadoes, floods and wildfires—the tragedy at the Boston Marathon, and Typhoon Haiyan in the Philippines. When an injured servicemember enters a hospital far from home, the American Red Cross offers comfort. When a hospital's patients need blood, the American Red Cross blood donors make that happen.

We dedicate the month of March to all those who support the American Red Cross mission to prevent and alleviate human suffering in the face of emergencies. Our community depends on the American Red Cross, which relies on donations of time and money to fulfill its humanitarian mission. The American Red Cross reflects all that is right with mankind. They make America stronger by their selfless service.●

TRIBUTE TO SISTER LILLIAN MURPHY

• Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, today I wish to honor Sister Lillian Murphy, who is retiring this June after an astounding 27 years as the CEO of Denver-based Mercy Housing, one of the largest and most effective affordable housing organizations in the country.

Since 1982, Mercy Housing has worked tirelessly to develop affordable housing options in more than 40 States. Sister Lillian took over as CEO in 1987 and has overseen enormous growth in Mercy's operations, which now houses more than 135,000 residents in nearly 40,000 homes.

Sister Lillian has won a number of awards for her work, including the prestigious Non-Profit Housing Association of Northern California's Affordable Housing Leadership Award for Lifetime Achievement, and the Annual Housing Leadership Award from the National Low Income Housing Coalition. In 2009, she was inducted into the Affordable Housing Hall of Fame by Affordable Housing Finance Magazine. Sister Lillian has been a remarkable leader at Mercy Housing and she will be sorely missed.

Sister Lillian is leaving the important work of Mercy Housing in very capable hands with the incoming CEO Jane Graf. We all look forward to working with Ms. Graf to ensure that middle- and low-income families continue to have access to quality, affordable housing.●

REMEMBERING TOM GOLA

• Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to the exceptional life of Tom Gola, a Philadelphia basketball legend, who passed away on January 26, 2014.

Mr. Gola was born on January 13, 1933, to Ike and Helen Gola in Philadelphia, PA. His passion for basketball developed early in life and he became a star while playing for La Salle College High School. While there, he led his team to the Philadelphia Catholic League Championship and won the Markward Award as the league's top player.

As one of the most celebrated high school athletes at the time, many expected Mr. Gola to attend one of the big basketball schools in the country. Instead, he decided to stay close to home in Pennsylvania to attend La

Salle University, where he once again quickly distinguished himself as a star player. In 1952, he led La Salle to a NIT championship, earning the championship's Most Valuable Player Award in the process. Two years later, he led the team to its first and only NCAA championship, again earning the honor of tournament MVP. Mr. Gola continued his exceptional collegiate basketball career with: a second place finish in the 1955 NCAA tournament; Player of the Year Awards in 1954 and 1955; a place on three consecutive first-team all-American squads, and; achieving the NCAA record of 2,201 career rebounds, a record which stands today.

The familiar cheer of "Go, Gola! Go!" still echoes in the memories of Philadelphia sports fans of a certain age. Another Philadelphia sports legend, the great Wilt Chamberlain once said:

Growing up, you whispered the name of Tom Gola. He was like a saint.

Following his extraordinary college career, Mr. Gola entered the NBA in 1955 to join his hometown team, the Philadelphia Warriors. He helped the Warriors win an NBA Championship the following year. He is one of only two players who played on NIT, NCAA and NBA championship teams. A five-time NBA All-Star, Mr. Gola was enshrined into the Naismith Memorial Basketball Hall of Fame in 1976.

Following his retirement from the NBA, Mr. Gola focused his considerable talents on his community. He was elected to the Pennsylvania House of Representatives and later served as the city of Philadelphia's Controller.

Mr. Gola also returned to his alma mater as the head coach of the La Salle Explorers for two seasons. Today, the university's multipurpose arena bears his name as a testament to the indelible mark he left on the school.

I ask my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to Tom Gola for his remarkable achievements in basketball and his service to Pennsylvania. My thoughts and pray are with his wife Caroline and his son Thomas as they mourn his loss. May he rest in peace.●

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting a nomination which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

(The message received today is printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY ORIGINALLY DECLARED IN EXECUTIVE ORDER 13288 ON MARCH 6, 2003, WITH RESPECT TO THE ACTIONS AND POLICIES OF CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF ZIMBABWE AND OTHER PERSONS TO UNDERMINE ZIMBABWE'S DEMOCRATIC PROCESSES OR INSTITUTIONS, AS RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT OF THE SENATE ON FEBRUARY 28, 2014—PM 31

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

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13288 of March 6, 2003, with respect to the actions and policies of certain members of the Government of Zimbabwe and other persons to undermine Zimbabwe's democratic processes or institutions is to continue in effect beyond March 6, 2014.

The threat constituted by the actions and policies of certain members of the Government of Zimbabwe and other persons to undermine Zimbabwe's democratic processes or institutions has not been resolved. These actions and policies continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the foreign policy of the United States. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to continue this national emergency and to maintain in force the sanctions to respond to this threat.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 28, 2014.

BUDGET OF THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015—PM 32

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred jointly, pursuant to the order of January 30, 1975 as modified by the order of April 11, 1986; to the Committees on Appropriations; and the Budget:

THE BUDGET MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT

To the Congress of the United States:

After 5 years of grit and determined effort, the United States is better posi-

tioned for the 21st Century than any other nation on Earth. We have created more than 8 million new jobs in the last 4 years and now have the lowest unemployment rate in over 5 years. Our housing market is rebounding. Our manufacturing sector is adding jobs for the first time since the 1990s. We now produce more oil at home than we buy from the rest of the world. We have cut our deficits by more than half since I took office. And for the first time in over a decade, business leaders around the world have declared that China is no longer the world's number one place to invest; America is.

We have made great progress, but we must do more to rebuild our economy on a new foundation for growth and prosperity. I believe that what unites the people of this Nation, regardless of race or region or party, young or old, rich or poor, is the simple, profound belief in opportunity for all—the notion that if you work hard and take responsibility, you can get ahead. That belief has suffered some serious blows. Over more than three decades, even before the Great Recession hit, massive shifts in technology and global competition had eliminated good, middle class jobs and weakened the economic foundations that families depend on.

Today, after 4 years of economic growth, corporate profits and stock prices have rarely been higher, and those at the top have never done better. But average wages have barely budged. Inequality has deepened. Upward mobility remains stalled. Even in the midst of recovery, too many Americans are working more than ever just to get by—let alone get ahead. And too many still are not working at all.

Our job is to reverse these trends. We need to return to an America where our success depends not on accident of birth, but on the strength of our work ethic and the scope of our dreams. That is what drew our forebears here. Opportunity is who we are. And the defining project of our generation is to restore that promise. It will not happen right away. But we must continue to strive toward that goal.

What I offer in this Budget is a set of concrete, practical proposals to speed up growth, strengthen the middle class, and build new ladders of opportunity into the middle class—all while continuing to improve the Nation's long-run fiscal position.

Earlier this year, thanks to the work of Democrats and Republicans, the Congress produced an agreement that undid some of last year's severe cuts to priorities like education and research, infrastructure, and national security. Recognizing the importance of that bipartisan compromise, the Budget adheres to the spending levels agreed to by the Congress for fiscal year 2015. But there is clearly much more we can and should do to invest in areas like infrastructure, innovation, and education that will create jobs, economic growth, and opportunity. So I am including in my Budget a fully paid for Oppor-

tunity, Growth, and Security Initiative that provides the Congress a roadmap for how and where additional investments should be made in both domestic priorities and national security this year.

We know where to start: the best measure of opportunity is access to a good job. With the economy picking up speed, companies say they intend to hire more people this year. And over half of big manufacturers say they are thinking of insourcing jobs from abroad.

We need to make that decision easier for more companies. Both Democrats and Republicans have argued that our tax code is riddled with wasteful, complicated loopholes that make it harder to invest here and encourage companies to keep profits abroad. Last summer, I offered a proposal to couple business tax reform with critical investments in infrastructure. This Budget includes that proposal, using the transition revenue that will result from a shift to a simpler, more efficient tax code to create jobs rebuilding our roads and bridges and unclogging our commutes and transporting goods made in America—because in today's global economy, first-class jobs gravitate to first-class infrastructure. At the same time, this Budget lays out how my Administration will continue to act on our own to cut red tape and streamline the permitting process for key infrastructure projects, so we can get more construction workers on the job as fast as possible.

We also have the chance, right now, to beat other countries in the race for the next wave of high-tech manufacturing jobs. My Administration has already launched four hubs for high-tech manufacturing, where we have connected businesses to research universities that can help America lead the world in advanced technologies. The Budget expands on these efforts by providing funding for five additional institutes, and, through the Opportunity, Growth, and Security Initiative, supports the goal I announced last summer of creating a national network of 45 of these manufacturing innovation institutes over the next 10 years.

We know that the nation that goes all-in on innovation today will own the global economy tomorrow. This is an edge America cannot surrender. That is why the Budget includes investments in cutting-edge research and development, driving scientific and technological breakthroughs that will create jobs, improve lives, and open new opportunities for the American people. The Budget's Opportunity, Growth, and Security Initiative will allow us to push our limits even further, supporting additional biomedical research at the National Institutes of Health that will help us fight Alzheimer's, cancer, and other diseases, climate research to develop climate change-resilient infrastructure, and agricultural research that will help increase agricultural productivity and improve health.

We also know that one of the biggest factors in bringing more jobs back is our commitment to American energy. The all-of-the-above energy strategy I announced a few years ago is working, and today, America is closer to energy independence than we have been in decades.

The Budget advances this strategy by ensuring the safe and responsible production of natural gas and cleaner electricity generation from fossil fuels. It creates new incentives to cut the amount of energy we waste in our cars, trucks, homes, and factories. It promotes clean energy with investments in technologies like solar and by expanding and making permanent the tax credit for the production of renewable energy. And it continues to strengthen protection of our air, water, land, and communities, and addresses the threat of climate change. Climate change is a fact, and we have to act with more urgency to address it because a changing climate is already harming western communities struggling with drought and coastal cities dealing with floods. That is why I directed my Administration to work with States, utilities, and others to set new standards on the amount of carbon pollution our power plants are allowed to dump into the air, and why this Budget advances new approaches to address the growing cost and damage from wildfires.

All of these efforts can speed up growth and create more jobs. But in this rapidly changing economy, we have to make sure that every American has the skills to fill those jobs. The Budget therefore invests in new efforts to drive greater performance and innovation in workforce training, including on-the-job training, apprenticeships, and other steps to equip workers with skills that match the needs of employers.

Of course, it is not enough to train today's workforce. We also have to prepare tomorrow's workforce by guaranteeing every child access to a world-class education. That is why the Budget builds on the progress we have made with new investments and initiatives to improve all levels of education, from early childhood through college.

Research shows that one of the best investments we can make in a child's life is high-quality early education. This year, we will invest in new partnerships with States and communities across the country to expand access to high-quality early education, and I am again calling on the Congress to make high-quality preschool available to every four-year-old child. The Budget also includes funding to provide access to high-quality infant and toddler care for more than 100,000 children, and supports the extension and expansion of voluntary home visiting programs.

Last year, I called on the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) to connect 99 percent of our students to high-speed broadband over the next 4 years. This year, the FCC is making a down payment on this goal by con-

necting more than 15,000 schools and 20 million students over the next 2 years, without adding a dime to the deficit. To ensure students receive the full benefit of this connectivity, the Budget invests in training for teachers in hundreds of school districts across the country.

The Budget also supports redesigning our high schools, helping them partner with colleges and employers that offer the college-level coursework and real-world skills to prepare students for college and careers. And it launches a new Race to the Top competition aimed at closing the achievement gap, so that all children get the high-quality education they need to succeed.

And we are shaking up our system of higher education to encourage innovation, give parents more information, and reward colleges for improving quality and reducing costs, so that no middle class student is priced out of a college education. Last summer, I directed the Department of Education to develop and publish a new college rating system that will identify colleges that provide the best value to students and encourage all colleges to improve. The Budget supports the development of that rating system and provides bonuses to reward colleges that improve educational outcomes for Pell Grant recipients. And to help more Americans who feel trapped by student loan debt, the Budget expands income-driven repayment options, allowing millions the opportunity to cap their monthly student loan payments at 10 percent of their income.

We also must do more to ensure our economy honors the dignity of work, and that hard work pays off for all of our citizens. Americans overwhelmingly agree that no one who works full time should ever have to raise a family in poverty. I have already acted by Executive Order to require Federal contractors to pay their federally funded employees a fair wage of at least \$10.10 an hour. The Congress needs to go further and raise the minimum wage for all workers to that same amount. This raise will help families, and it will help the economy by giving businesses customers with more money to spend and by boosting productivity and reducing turnover. The Budget also invests in enforcement efforts to make sure workers receive the wages and overtime they have earned.

There are other steps we can take to help families make ends meet. Few policies are more effective at reducing inequality and helping families pull themselves up through hard work than the Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC). The EITC for families with children lifts millions out of poverty each year and helps about half of all parents at some point in their lives. But as a number of prominent policymakers, both progressive and conservative, have noted, the EITC does not do enough for single workers who do not have kids. The Budget doubles the value of the EITC for workers without

children and non-custodial parents, and also makes it available to younger adult workers, so that it can encourage work in the crucial years at the beginning of a young person's career.

We also need to do more to help Americans save for retirement. Today, most workers do not have a pension. A Social Security check often is not enough on its own. And while the stock market has doubled over the last 5 years, that does not improve retirement security for people who do not have retirement savings. That is why the Budget builds on my proposal to create a new way for working Americans to start saving for retirement: the MyRA savings bond. To encourage new savers, MyRA requires a low initial contribution and guarantees a decent return with no risk of losing what you put in. Separately, the Budget also proposes to establish automatic enrollment Individual Retirement Accounts, offering every American access to an automatic savings vehicle on the job.

For decades, few things exposed hard-working families to economic hardship more than a broken health care system. With the enactment of the Affordable Care Act, we are in the process of fixing that. Already, because of the health reform law, more than 3 million Americans under the age of 26 have gained coverage under their parents' plans. More than 9 million Americans have signed up for private health insurance or Medicaid coverage. Because of this law, no American can ever again be dropped or denied coverage for a preexisting condition like asthma, back pain, or cancer. No woman can ever be charged more just because she is a woman. And we did all this while adding years to Medicare's finances, keeping Medicare premiums flat, and lowering prescription costs for millions of seniors. To continue this progress, the Budget fully funds the ongoing implementation of the Affordable Care Act.

We must always remember that economic growth and opportunity can only be achieved if America is safe and secure. At home, the Budget supports efforts to make our communities safer by reducing gun violence and reforming our criminal justice system.

Looking beyond our borders, the Budget responsibly transitions from the completion of our military mission in Afghanistan in 2014 to political and security support for a unified Afghan government as it takes full responsibility for its own future. When I took office, nearly 180,000 Americans were serving in Iraq and Afghanistan. Today, all our troops are out of Iraq and more than 60,000 of our troops have already come home from Afghanistan. With Afghan forces now in the lead for their own security, our troops have moved to a support role. Together with our allies, we will complete our mission there by the end of this year, and America's longest war will finally be over.

In addition to responsibly winding down our operations in Afghanistan,

the Budget ensures we maintain ready, modern, and capable defense forces to address any threats we might face, including threats from terrorism and cyber attacks. It funds humanitarian and diplomatic efforts in Syria, supports transition and reform throughout the Middle East and North Africa, and advances our strategic rebalancing toward the Asia-Pacific region. It enhances stability and creates new markets for U.S. businesses with investments in Power Africa and promotes peace and security by supporting global health care and addressing climate change. And it strengthens oversight of intelligence activities and enhances the protection of U.S. diplomatic facilities and personnel overseas.

The Budget also ensures that we continue to meet our obligations to our troops and veterans who have given so much to our country. To deliver on this commitment, it provides significant resources to support veterans' medical care, help military families, assist soldiers transitioning to civilian life, reduce veterans' homelessness, and reduce the disability claims backlog so our veterans receive the benefits they have earned. It also introduces necessary reforms to our military compensation system, which our uniform military leadership called for, to ensure servicemembers and their families receive the benefits that they have earned while making sure that our military can invest in the training, equipment, and support that it needs.

In addition to making these critical investments, the Budget outlines the steps my Administration is taking to create a 21st Century Government that is more efficient, effective, and supportive of economic growth. Our citizens and businesses expect their Government to provide the same level of service experienced in the private sector and we intend to deliver. The Budget includes initiatives that will lead to better, faster, and smarter services, both online and in-person. It calls on Federal agencies to share services and leverage the buying power of the Government to bring greater value and efficiency for taxpayer dollars. It continues to open Government data and research for public and private sector use to spur innovation and job creation. And it invests in the Government's most important resource, its workers, ensuring that we can attract and retain the best talent in the Federal workforce and foster a culture of excellence.

The Budget does all of these things while further strengthening the Nation's long-term fiscal outlook. Over the last 5 years, we have cut the deficit in half as a share of the economy, experiencing the fastest period of deficit reduction since the demobilization following World War II. The Budget continues this progress, bringing deficits down as a share of the economy to below 2 percent by 2023 and putting debt as a share of the economy on a declining path.

Although we have seen a notable and significant decline in health care spending growth over the last few years, in part due to the Affordable Care Act, we know that over the long run, the growth of health care costs continues to be our Nation's most pressing fiscal challenge. That is why the Budget builds on the savings and reforms in the health reform law with additional measures to strengthen Medicare and Medicaid and encourage high-quality and efficient health care.

We also know that revenue has to be part of the solution to our Nation's long-term fiscal challenges. Given the aging of our population and the declining ratio of workers to retirees, we will need additional revenue to maintain our commitments to seniors while also making the investments that are needed to grow our economy and expand opportunity. The Budget secures that revenue through tax reform that reduces inefficient and unfair tax breaks and ensures that everyone, from Main Street to Wall Street, is paying their fair share.

Finally, if we are serious about long-term, sustainable economic growth and deficit reduction, it is also time to heed the calls of business leaders, labor leaders, faith leaders, and law enforcement—and fix our broken immigration system. Independent economists say immigration reform will grow our economy and shrink our deficits by almost \$1 trillion in the next two decades. And for good reason: when people come here to fulfill their dreams—to study, invent, and contribute to our culture—they make our country a more attractive place for businesses to locate and help create jobs for everyone. The Senate has acted to pass a bipartisan immigration reform bill that is worthy of support. It is time for the House of Representatives to finish the job.

We have made progress over the last 5 years. But our work is not done. This Budget provides a roadmap to ensuring middle class families and those working to be a part of the middle class can feel secure in their jobs, homes, and budgets. To build real, lasting economic security, we also need to expand opportunity for all so every American can get ahead and have a shot at creating a better life for their kids.

None of it is easy. America has never come easy. But if we work together, if we summon what is best in us, I know it is within our reach.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 4, 2014.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 2:03 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 899. An act to provide for additional safeguards with respect to imposing Federal mandates, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2804. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to require the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs to publish information about rules on the Internet, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3193. An act to amend the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 to strengthen the review authority of the Financial Stability Oversight Council of regulations issued by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

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

H.R. 899. An act to provide for additional safeguards with respect to imposing Federal mandates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 2804. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to require the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs to publish information about rules on the Internet, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

S. 2077. A bill to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes.

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-4779. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fluxaproxad; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL No. 9906-70) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 25, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-4780. A communication from the Director of Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Enhancement of Contractor Employee Whistleblower Protections" ((RIN0750-AH97) (DFARS Case 2013-D010)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 25, 2014; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-4781. A communication from the Director of Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Disclosure to Litigation Support Contractors" ((RIN0750-AH54) (DFARS Case 2012-D029)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 25, 2014; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-4782. A communication from the Director of Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Acquisitions in Support of Operations in Afghanistan" ((RIN0750-AH98) (DFARS Case 2013-D009)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 25, 2014; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-4783. A communication from the Acting General Counsel, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Deputy Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 26, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4784. A communication from the Acting General Counsel, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, (2) two reports relative to vacancies in the Department of Housing and Urban Development, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 26, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4785. A communication from the Assistant to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Prohibition Against Federal Assistance to Swaps Entities (Regulation KK)" (RIN7100-AD96) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 21, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4786. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Suspension of Community Eligibility" ((44 CFR Part 64) (Docket No. FEMA-2013-0002)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 26, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4787. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Energy (Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy), transmitting, pursuant to law, the semi-annual Implementation Report on Energy Conservation Standards Activities of the Department of Energy; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-4788. A communication from the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, Office of Fossil Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, an annual report relative to the Strategic Petroleum Reserve for calendar year 2012; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-4789. 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; Idaho" (FRL No. 9907-30-Region 10) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 25, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4790. 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 State Implementation Plans; Alaska; Anchorage Carbon Monoxide Limited Maintenance Plan and State Implementation Plan Revisions" (FRL No. 9902-22-Region 10) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 25, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4791. 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; Utah; Revisions to Utah Administrative Code and an Associated Plan Revision" (FRL No. 9905-25-Region 8) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 25, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4792. 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; Transportation Conformity Procedures" (FRL No. 9907-08-Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 25, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4793. 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; State of Colorado; Revised Transportation Conformity Consultation Process" (FRL No. 9905-67-Region 8) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 25, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4794. 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; New York State Ozone Implementation Plan Revision" (FRL No. 9907-02-Region 2) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 25, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4795. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "National Primary Drinking Water Regulations: Minor Corrections to the Revisions to the Total Coliform Rule" (FRL No. 9906-89-OW) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 25, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4796. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutant Emissions: Group IV Polymers and Resins; Pesticide Active Ingredient Production; and Polyether Polyols Production" (FRL No. 9906-34-OAR) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 25, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4797. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulations and Reports Clearance, Social Security Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Medicare Determinations and Income-Related Monthly Adjustment Amounts to Medicare Part B Premiums; Conforming Changes to Regulations" (RIN0960-AH47) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 26, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-4798. A joint communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, an annual report relative to the Health Care Fraud and Abuse Control Program for fiscal year 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-4799. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, an addendum to a certification, of the proposed sale or export of defense articles and/or defense services to a Middle East country regarding any possible affects such a sale might have relating to Israel's Qualitative Military Edge over military threats to Israel (OSS-2014-0228); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-4800. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, an addendum to a certification, of the proposed sale or ex-

port of defense articles and/or defense services to a Middle East country regarding any possible affects such a sale might have relating to Israel's Qualitative Military Edge over military threats to Israel (OSS-2014-0228); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-4801. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Poplar Island, Maryland project; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4802. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Boston Harbor Navigation Improvement Project; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

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. WARNER (for himself and Mr. CHAMBLISS):

S. 2075. A bill to prohibit a reduction in funding for the defense commissary system in fiscal year 2015 pending the report of the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. WICKER):

S. 2076. A bill to amend the provisions of title 46, United States Code, related to the Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. REED:

S. 2077. A bill to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes; read the first time.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mr. COCHRAN, and Mr. REED):

S.J. Res. 32. A joint resolution providing for the reappointment of John W. McCarter as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. MENENDEZ:

S. Res. 369. A resolution to designate May 22, 2014 as "United States Foreign Service Day" in recognition of the men and women who have served, or are presently serving, in the Foreign Service of the United States, and to honor those in the Foreign Service who have given their lives in the line of duty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 149

At the request of Mr. NELSON, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 149, a bill to provide effective criminal prosecutions for certain identity thefts, and for other purposes.

S. 255

At the request of Mr. WALSH, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 255, a bill to withdraw certain Federal

land and interests in that land from location, entry, and patent under the mining laws and disposition under the mineral and geothermal leasing laws.

S. 452

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 452, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to reduce the incidence of diabetes among Medicare beneficiaries.

S. 462

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 462, a bill to enhance the strategic partnership between the United States and Israel.

S. 942

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 942, a bill to eliminate discrimination and promote women's health and economic security by ensuring reasonable workplace accommodations for workers whose ability to perform the functions of a job are limited by pregnancy, childbirth, or a related medical condition.

S. 1014

At the request of Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1014, a bill to reduce sports-related concussions in youth, and for other purposes.

S. 1067

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1067, a bill to establish within the Department of Education the Innovation Inspiration school grant program, and for other purposes.

S. 1174

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1174, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the 65th Infantry Regiment, known as the Borinqueneers.

S. 1181

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1181, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt certain stock of real estate investment trusts from the tax on foreign investments in United States real property interests, and for other purposes.

S. 1204

At the request of Mr. COBURN, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1204, a bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to protect rights of conscience with regard to requirements for coverage of specific items and services, to amend the Public Health Service Act

to prohibit certain abortion-related discrimination in governmental activities, and for other purposes.

S. 1251

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1251, a bill to establish programs with respect to childhood, adolescent, and young adult cancer.

S. 1349

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) 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. 1456

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1456, a bill to award the Congressional Gold Medal to Shimon Peres.

S. 1733

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1733, a bill to stop exploitation through trafficking.

S. 1737

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1737, 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. 1811

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1811, a bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to prohibit voice communications through mobile communication devices on commercial passenger flights.

S. 1817

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1817, a bill to require the Secretary to implement standards for short-term custody of individuals held in facilities of U.S. Customs and Border Protection and for other purposes.

S. 1828

At the request of Mr. DONNELLY, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1828, a bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to modify the definitions of a mortgage originator and a high-cost mortgage.

S. 1875

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) were added as cosponsors of S. 1875, a bill to provide

for wildfire suppression operations, and for other purposes.

S. 2000

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2000, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to repeal the Medicare sustainable growth rate and improve Medicare payments for physicians and other professionals, and for other purposes.

S. 2013

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the names of the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2013, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the removal of Senior Executive Service employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs for performance, and for other purposes.

S. 2048

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the names of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) were added as cosponsors of S. 2048, a bill to include New Zealand in the list of foreign states whose nationals are eligible for admission into the United States as E-1 and E-2 non-immigrants if United States nationals are treated similarly by the Government of New Zealand.

S. 2066

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2066, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the intentional discrimination of a person or organization by an employee of the Internal Revenue Service.

S. 2067

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2067, a bill to prohibit the Department of the Treasury from assigning tax statuses to organizations based on their political beliefs and activities.

S. 2072

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2072, a bill to prohibit the Department of the Treasury from assigning tax statuses to organizations based on their political beliefs and activities.

S. 2073

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2073, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the intentional discrimination of a person or organization by an employee of the Internal Revenue Service.

S. 2074

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) were added as cosponsors of S. 2074, a bill to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes.

S. CON. RES. 32

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr.

KAINE) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 32, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding the need for investigation and prosecution of war crimes, crimes against humanity, and genocide, whether committed by officials of the Government of Syria, or members of other groups involved in civil war in Syria, and calling on the President to direct the United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations to use the voice and vote of the United States to immediately promote the establishment of a Syrian war crimes tribunal, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 357

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 357, a resolution expressing concern of undemocratic governance and the abuse of the rights of individuals in Ukraine.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 369—TO DESIGNATE MAY 22, 2014 AS “UNITED STATES FOREIGN SERVICE DAY” IN RECOGNITION OF THE MEN AND WOMEN WHO HAVE SERVED, OR ARE PRESENTLY SERVING, IN THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES, AND TO HONOR THOSE IN THE FOREIGN SERVICE WHO HAVE GIVEN THEIR LIVES IN THE LINE OF DUTY

Mr. MENENDEZ submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 369

Whereas the Foreign Service of the United States (referred to in this resolution as the “Foreign Service”) was established through the passage of the Act entitled “An Act For the reorganization and improvement of the Foreign Service of the United States, and for other purposes” (43 Stat. 140, chapter 182, commonly known as the “Rogers Act of 1924”) and is now celebrating its 90th anniversary;

Whereas the Rogers Act of 1924 established a career organization based on competitive examination and merit promotion;

Whereas, approximately 16,000 men and women of the Foreign Service are serving at home and abroad in 2014;

Whereas the diplomatic, consular, communications, trade, development, security, and numerous other functions these men and women perform constitute the first and most cost-effective instrument of our Nation to

protect and promote United States interests abroad;

Whereas the men and women of the Foreign Service and their families are increasingly exposed to risks and danger, even in times of peace, and many have died in the service of their country;

Whereas employees of the Foreign Service work daily—

(1) to preserve peace and freedom around the world;

(2) to promote economic prosperity and mutual understanding around the world;

(3) to reduce poverty, end hunger and malnutrition, fight disease, combat international crime and illegal drugs, and address environmental degradation;

(4) to promote economic development, commercial enterprises, economic prosperity, global food security, American agricultural products, and United States jobs and trade;

(5) to promote American ideals and values, human rights, freedom, gender equality, and democracy; and

(6) to provide emergency and humanitarian assistance to respond to crises around the globe;

Whereas employees of the Foreign Service are often the first line of defense against international terrorism;

Whereas more than 250 members of the Foreign Service, and many more locally employed staff of the Foreign Service, have made the ultimate sacrifice on behalf of the United States;

Whereas employees of the Foreign Service personify the virtues of patriotism, sacrifice, service, and duty;

Whereas the families of employees of the Foreign Service make important and significant sacrifices for the greater good of the American people and the United States; and

Whereas it is appropriate and just for our Nation—

(1) to recognize the dedication of the men and women of the Foreign Service; and

(2) to honor those who have given their lives in the loyal pursuit of their duties and responsibilities representing the interests of the United States and its citizens:

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) honors the men and women who have served, or are presently serving, in the Foreign Service for their dedicated and important service to country;

(2) calls on the people of the United States to reflect on the service and sacrifice of past, present, and future employees of the Foreign Service, wherever they serve, with appropriate ceremonies and activities; and

(3) designates May 22, 2014 as United States Foreign Service Day to commemorate the 90th anniversary of the Foreign Service.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 4, 2014, at 2:30 p.m.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EAST ASIA AND PACIFIC

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Com-

mittee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 4, 2014, at 3 p.m., to hold an East Asia and Pacific subcommittee hearing entitled, “Strengthening U.S. Alliances in Northeast Asia.”

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

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 2077

Mr. REID. Mr. President, S. 2077 is due for its first reading, I am told.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title for the first time.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2077) to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes.

Mr. REID. I ask for a second reading of this legislation but object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill will be read a second time on the next legislative day.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, MARCH 5, 2014

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m. on Wednesday, March 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 proceed to executive session to consider the nomination of Debo Adegbile under the previous order.

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

NOMINATION OF DEBO ADEGBILE

Mr. REID. Debo Adegbile is a fine man, and the fact that I don’t pronounce his name very well takes nothing away from his credentials. He is a very outstanding individual. I will have more to say about him tomorrow.

PROGRAM

Mr. REID. There will be up to three rollcall votes at 11:45 a.m. tomorrow. We expect to recess, following those votes, for the weekly caucus meetings and continue to work through nominations throughout the afternoon.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M.
TOMORROW

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 6:14 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, March 5, 2014, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nomination received by
the Senate:

IN THE COAST GUARD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT
AS COMMANDANT OF THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD
AND TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 14, U.S.C.,
SECTION 44:

To be admiral

VICE ADM. PAUL F. ZUKUNFT