



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 160

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JULY 8, 2014

No. 105

## Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

### PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Be exalted, O God, above the highest Heavens, for we look to You each day for our protection and peace. Fulfill Your purposes by using our Senators as agents of Your grace. Lord, surround them with Your favor, as their labors bring honor to You. Deliver them from the traps set by their enemies. Give them hearts filled with confidence in Your prevailing providence, sustaining them with Your unfailing faithfulness and love.

We pray in Your great 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.

### SALUTING THE FLAG

Mr. REID. Mr. President, just by chance last night I was reading a book and it included a speech given by JOHN MCCAIN, our fellow Senator. What Senator MCCAIN talked about was some of his experiences in the prison camp in Vietnam where a man by the name of Mike Christian had spent an inordinate amount of time sewing on the inside of the pajama-like outfit they gave him to wear, and he put a flag inside his jacket—his shirt. This jacket was discovered, the flag was discovered by the

prison officials, and he was beaten really very much. He was beaten severely. Of course, they ripped the flag out of his coat.

We take for granted saluting the flag. We come in here and we do it every morning. By rote, we stand and do it. I am not too sure that we shouldn't think a little bit more about what we are doing when we salute the flag. I am going to bring that excerpt from home and I am going to submit it for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for everybody to see, about people who have been—for example, Senator MCCAIN was in prison for 5½ years. As we know, he was, on many different occasions, tortured. So when JOHN MCCAIN salutes the flag and when Mike Christian, a fellow pilot—he was actually a navigator on an airplane—salute the flag, it means a lot to them, and we should encapsulate that when we think about saluting the flag.

I will submit that excerpt for the RECORD tomorrow. I read that last night, late. I thought, when we salute our flag, we should think about it more than, I am sure, we do all the time.

### SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following my remarks and those of the Republican leader, the Senate will be in a period of morning business for 1 hour. The majority will control the first 30 minutes and the Republicans will control the final 30 minutes.

Following morning business, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 2363, the Bipartisan Sportsmen's Act, postcloture.

The Senate will recess from 12:30 until 2:15 today to allow for our weekly caucus meetings.

### ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the majority control the time from 2:15 until 3:15 and the Republicans control the time from 3:15 to 4:15.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOOKER). Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

### BIPARTISAN SPORTSMEN'S ACT

Mr. REID. Mr. President, it is no secret that the Senate, as of late, has been beset by partisan rancor and obstruction: one Republican filibuster and then another, and then another, and still more filibusters. That is why the legislation that is before us today represents a rare opportunity for the Senate to complete work on a bill that enjoys broad bipartisan support.

Senator KAY HAGAN's sportsmen's bill is overwhelmingly popular with Democrats and Republicans around the country, and for good reason. Forty million Americans who hunt and fish stand to benefit from this legislation.

The sportsmen's package represents years of bipartisan work—years—combining some 20 bills important to the sportsmen's community. The bill expands opportunities for sportsmen, promoting an industry that contributes almost \$200 billion annually to our Nation's economy. In Nevada, over 200,000 people hunt and fish every year. It is good for tourism. People come to Nevada to hunt for game, including antelope, elk, and bighorn desert sheep. We have wonderful fishing. We don't have a lot of lakes and rivers, but what we have is terrific. That is why fishermen come from around the country to fish in Nevada. To Nevada, it is a \$1 billion industry.

I was talking to my friend Senator BENNET from Colorado and he said in Colorado it is a \$4 billion industry. I would bet that even in a heavily populated State such as New Jersey there is a lot of hunting and fishing that goes on. It is good for the economy.

Senator HAGAN's legislation promotes hunting, fishing, and recreation, all while fostering habitat conservation through voluntary programs. Because of her tireless efforts building bipartisan consensus, Senator HAGAN's

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S4233

bill is cosponsored by 25 Republicans and 19 Democrats. This legislation also enjoys the support of more than 50 national sportsmen and conservation groups all over this country.

As Benjamin Disraeli, the famous statesman from Great Britain, said, "The secret of success is to be ready when your opportunity comes." This bill is ready and the opportunity is now. After years of hard work by Senator HAGAN and others, now is the time to consider and pass this legislation. But, as always, our success in moving this legislation will depend on the co-operation of all Senators in putting aside political games and petty disputes over amendments in order to pass a bill that will benefit millions of Americans.

This is a bill that is as much a Republican bill as it is a Democrat bill. So why should this bill be killed for procedural reasons? This is a bill they have worked on for many years.

I am hopeful that through bipartisan support we can get this bill over the finish line, as we were able to do with the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act earlier this year, and the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act a few weeks ago.

I urge my colleagues to respect the hard work of those Senators who have put this measure before us and allow this matter to pass—and quickly.

#### RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader is recognized.

#### ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, just some information for my friend from Vermont. We had anticipated after my remarks of going to the comments of Senator ALEXANDER and Senator CORKER in connection with the life of Senator Howard Baker. So I ask unanimous consent at this point that the Senators from Tennessee follow my remarks on Senator Baker.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I shall not, of course, because as I told the press in Vermont last week, I had the privilege of serving with more than 10 leaders in both parties since I have been here, and it is impossible to find a finer leader than Howard Baker. I considered him to be a Senator's Senator and one of the finest people I have ever served with. So of course I will wait.

I would ask to amend the unanimous consent request so that following the remarks of the Republican leader and the two Senators from Tennessee I then be recognized for my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the leader modify his request?

Mr. MCCONNELL. Yes.

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

#### HEALTH CARE

Mr. MCCONNELL. First, a few observations about ObamaCare. It may not have existed in the English language a few years ago, but in short order it has become a battle word for broken promises and almost cartoonish inefficiency. It is no wonder why: You can keep your plan. You can keep your doctor. Premiums will go down. The law will create millions of jobs.

We knew the promises wouldn't hold up. Many of us said so. One even earned the dubious distinction of being declared the "lie of the year." And that is why it is so hard to trust much of what the Obama administration claims about ObamaCare these days, such as back in December when administration officials issued another promise—that they would make sure any taxpayer-funded ObamaCare subsidies would go only to enrollees who actually qualify for them under the law.

We wanted this assurance not only because so many other promises had been broken; we wanted it because eligibility verification is so important. Middle-class taxpayers are feeling enough pain from this law already. They shouldn't have to subsidize inaccurate or even fraudulent ObamaCare claims on top of all the rest. So I helped pass a law that requires a non-partisan watchdog to keep an eye on the procedures the administration claimed would protect taxpayers to see how they will work and then report back to us in Congress.

Last week that watchdog, the inspector general, issued the first two reports on the issue, and it turns out we were pretty correct to be worried. The inspector general concluded that the administration was often ineffective at verifying such basic details about ObamaCare enrollees as their citizen status, their income, their Social Security number, and whether they were even eligible to purchase ObamaCare in the first place. The administration, the IG reported, didn't even follow its own eligibility verification procedures in many cases.

And that wasn't all. The IG also discovered nearly 3 million inconsistencies in the information ObamaCare enrollees provided in their applications, nearly 90 percent of which couldn't even be resolved because the necessary software—the necessary software—wasn't even operational.

It is completely ridiculous.

And the administration is still struggling to get a handle on the problem. Computer systems that should have been ready to go last October have not been built yet. It is the kind of scenario we would expect to see in a Leslie Nielsen movie, not in real life.

Worse still, administration officials are now indicating they are going to keep chugging ahead with their deeply flawed verification practices, even after everything the government's own watchdog uncovered. Many individuals enrolled with the current flawed enrollment process will automatically be en-

rolled for the same taxpayer subsidies next year.

They are defiant—defiant—in the face of all of this. This is precisely the kind of flippant attitude that is so infuriating to many of our constituents.

Many of us predicted these kinds of problems would be the likely outcome of giving government such expansive power over a huge segment of our economy. Of course we are going to have massive inefficiency and probable fraud and migraines for middle-class families who already have enough to deal with. Of course we are going to see all this. It seems inevitable.

That is why Republicans say we need to start over with actual health care reform—reform that can actually lower costs and increase the quality of care without resorting to this tired sort of government-centric approach.

ObamaCare is built upon the intellectually lazy idea that we can simply legislate a desirable outcome into existence, that we can tell a hulking Federal bureaucracy to simply bureaucratize affordable health care into being. Unfortunately, life does not work that way. Reality always intervenes, as we have been seeing with the pain of ObamaCare these past few years—pain that will only continue until Washington Democrats join us to enact a serious bipartisan solution that actually addresses many of our health care challenges and dispenses with the failed policies of this administration. Yet that is exactly the opposite of what we have seen from our friends on the other side so far.

Instead of working with us to solve massive problems, such as the ones the inspector general identified, Democrats in Washington are simply hiding from the issue altogether. They are trying to change the subject. Even hinting at it prompts the Democratic majority to shut down the legislative process altogether and cancel committee markups. They block votes and amendments. They will not allow the Senate to consider numerous bipartisan House-passed bills that would address some of ObamaCare's most glaring problems.

Even when a bipartisan group proposes a plan to address a flaw in the law that is reducing incomes for working families, they reject it. Instead, they schedule show votes designed to inflame one group or another.

As for the President, he is traveling around the country this week to give campaign speeches—not working with Congress to help middle-class families struggling under the weight of his policies. So the Democratic plan seems to be to double down on the mess they created and to hope Americans can be distracted enough to forget about it come November.

If that is the plan, it is not going to work. Middle-class Americans know who has been standing by their side throughout this entire ObamaCare fiasco. They know who has been standing against them, serving as a shield for the President and the hard left.

It is not too late for Democrats in Washington to work with Republicans to address the massive problem they created. If they truly care about the millions they have already hurt in this country with this law, it is time to do just that.

#### REMEMBERING HOWARD BAKER

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, the Senators from Tennessee and I had an opportunity 1 week ago today to attend the funeral of Senator Howard Baker, who led the Senate Republicans for 8 years and was a truly wonderful American.

Actually, it was just an honor to attend his funeral down in Huntsville, TN, a town of 1,248 souls that Senator Baker often referred to as the "center of the known universe." It was a wonderful tribute, and it carried a lot of lessons about the work we do.

Senator CORKER was there too, and I am sure he felt the same way. Just before the funeral, he noted that Senator Baker was the kind of person who seemed to evoke "wisdom in everything he did." I was glad to hear the two men got to spend some time together a few months before Senator Baker passed away.

Anyway, a real highlight of the funeral for me was a magnificent—absolutely magnificent—eulogy by Senator ALEXANDER. It captured not only the closeness of their friendship but also the qualities that made Senator Baker such an important figure. This morning I would like to take just a moment to thank Senator ALEXANDER for those thoughtful words and at this point insert his eulogy into the RECORD. I ask unanimous consent that be done.

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

[Eulogy of Senator Howard Baker, Jr., July 1, 2014]

"HOWARD BAKER, JR.: TENNESSEE'S FAVORITE SON AND ONE OF OUR COUNTRY'S FINEST LEADERS"

(By Lamar Alexander)

On behalf of the Baker family and all of us Tennesseans, let me welcome Vice President Biden, Senator Reid, Senator McConnell, and Senator Danforth, who married Howard and Nancy.

It was August, 1960. Republican Day at the Illinois State Fair. Senator Everett McKinley Dirksen was warming up the crowd of 30,000, explaining why Vice President Richard Nixon should be president of the United States instead of Senator John F. Kennedy.

Seated on the platform behind him were Dirksen's daughter Joy, and her husband Howard Henry Baker, Jr., a 34-year-old lawyer from Huntsville, Tennessee, who looked about 24.

"Jack Kennedy is a nice young man," Dirksen was saying. "But all they can say he has ever done was serve on a PT boat in World War II."

Turning toward his son-in-law with a flourish, Dirksen said, "Why, my own son-in-law, Howard Baker, Jr., was on a PT boat in World War II, and I've never heard anyone suggest that he was qualified to serve in any public office."

Four years later, instead of running for the safe congressional seat that his father and stepmother had held, Howard Baker, Jr., ran to become the first Tennessee Republican popularly elected to the United States Senate. He probably would have won if presidential candidate Barry Goldwater hadn't stopped at the Knoxville airport a few days before the election and promised to sell the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Howard ran again in 1966. I remember standing at that same airport being embarrassed by his prediction to the media that he would win by 100,000 votes, and then, a few days later, he did just that.

Behind Howard Baker's pleasant demeanor was a restless ambition that would propel him to the heights of American politics and government for forty years.

He learned quickly. His maiden address in the Senate lasted about an hour. Afterwards, he asked Senator Dirksen, the Senate Republican Leader, "How did I do?"

"Howard," Dirksen replied, "perhaps you should occasionally enjoy the luxury of an unexpressed thought."

In 1968, Howard and Congressman George Bush were runners-up to Governor Spiro Agnew when Nixon picked a vice president. In 1969, when Dirksen died, after only three years in the Senate, he ran for Republican Leader, only to be defeated by Senator Hugh Scott.

In 1971, President Nixon asked him to be on the Supreme Court. Howard declined, then called back and said he would accept if the president insisted, but Nixon had already appointed Bill Rehnquist.

In 1973 came the Watergate hearings. Eighty-five percent of Americans saw those hearings, broadcast most days by all of the only four television networks that then existed. And the most famous words were Howard Baker's: "What did the president know and when did he know it?"

Howard suspected that Senator Scott had made him Ranking Republican on the Watergate Committee to "get rid of me as a competitor." He had run against Scott a second time for Leader, and lost. But instead, the exposure made Baker a national hero and, once again, runner-up in the vice-presidential sweepstakes in 1976 when Gerald Ford picked Bob Dole instead of Howard.

Senator Scott retired, and a few months later, in January, 1977, Howard was elected Republican Leader by one vote. He served for eight years. When, in 1980, the Republican sweep made him majority leader, he visited the wily Democratic Leader Robert Byrd. First, Howard surprised Byrd by suggesting that Byrd keep his ornate office.

Having softened up Byrd, Baker then said, "Senator Byrd, I'll never learn the rules as well as you know them, so I'll make a deal with you: I won't surprise you if you won't surprise me."

Byrd replied, "Let me think about it." The next day he agreed. And they ran the Senate together for four more years.

Baker then commandeered an additional set of offices next to the Republican Leader's less-spacious quarters that are today called the "Howard Baker Rooms." He always said that the view from the Howard Baker rooms was the second best view in Washington. The best, of course, is from the White House, which he also occupied—but not in the way he had planned.

In late 1986, while the Bakers were vacationing in Miami, the phone rang. Joy answered. It was President Reagan.

"Where's Howard?" asked Reagan.

"At the zoo with the grandchildren," Joy said.

"Wait till he hears about the zoo I have planned for him," the president said.

Howard became White House chief of staff, helping to cleanse the Reagan presidency of its Iran-Contra troubles.

President Reagan and Howard Baker began each day telling each other a little story. "It got to be a lot of stories," Howard said. I always felt a little better about our country knowing we had two men at the top with such temperament.

Joy died in 1993. In 1996, Howard married Nancy. Those of us at the wedding were happy because we had never seen two people so happy.

In 1996, the two Senators Baker moved to Tokyo where Howard became U.S. Ambassador to Japan. When he returned, he headed the law firm that is a descendant of a law firm his grandfather founded in Huntsville.

What skills allowed Howard Baker to accomplish so much?

He was an eloquent listener. He said in 2011, "There is a difference between hearing and understanding what people say. You don't have to agree, but you have to hear what they've got to say. And if you do, the chances are much better you'll be able to translate that into a useful position and even useful leadership."

He was called "The Great Conciliator" for his habit of gathering disputing senators into one room, listening for a while, and then his summary of the discussion would become the senators' agreement.

He demonstrated courage. He supported civil rights when most southerners didn't. He and Senator Byrd found 68 votes to ratify the Panama Canal Treaty. Several Republican senators signed a letter asking Baker to resign as Leader because of that.

Roy Blount, Jr., says you start getting into trouble when you stop sounding like where you grew up. Howard Baker never stopped sounding like where he grew up. He always went home to Huntsville, which he called the "center of the known universe."

He had an eye for talent. In 1969, he told me, "You ought to meet that smart young legislative assistant who works for Senator Marlow Cook." That assistant was Mitch McConnell. Howard mentored another Tennessee majority leader, Bill Frist; Senators Thompson and Corker; and Governors Sundquist and Haslam; Ambassadors Ashe and Montgomery; Congressman Duncan—as well as many others in this congregation.

With Bill Brock and Winfield Dunn, he kept the door open to Republican primaries, attracting hundreds of thousands of "discerning Democrats" and independents and creating the majority status the Tennessee Republican Party enjoys today.

Howard Baker knew how to make the Senate work. He understood that the Senate's unique role is as a place for extended debate and amendment on important issues until there is a consensus. That is how he fixed Social Security with Tip O'Neill and Ronald Reagan, how he passed the Reagan tax cuts and the Clean Air and Water laws.

One thing he did not do well was fundraising. He left that to Ted Welch and Jim Haslam and Bill Swain. According to Jim, "Howard would not raise any money at all, until he started raising money for the Baker Center and then he made every call with me."

In the new version of Lamar Alexander's Little Plaid Book, there is this rule: "When invited to speak at a funeral, remember to mention the deceased at least as often as yourself."

I have done my best to follow that rule today, but I hope you understand how difficult that is for me, as it would be for many of you.

So let me just get it out all at once:

For the last half century, Howard Baker has had more influence on my life than anyone outside my own family. He inspired me to help him build a two-party system. I babysat for Darek and Cissy. I met Honey at

a softball game between the Baker staff and the John Tower staff. My favorite photograph of her is one Howard took at the Baker home when we were celebrating our marriage. Our daughter Leslee was flower girl at Darek and Karen's wedding. I occupy the same Senate office Howard once had in the Dirksen Senate office building. My desk on the Senate floor was once his desk.

As his legislative assistant, I wrote his speeches, prompting him to tell the story at least 100 times of how I once asked to see him privately to determine if there was some problem with our relationship because I had learned that he never said in his speeches any of the words that I had written.

"Lamar," he replied, "we have a perfect relationship. You write what you want to write—and I'll say what I want to say."

Occasionally a young person will ask me, "How can I become involved in politics?"

My answer always is, "Find someone you respect, volunteer to help him or her do anything legal, and learn all you can from them. That's what I did."

How fortunate we were to know, to be inspired by, and to learn from Tennessee's favorite son and one of our country's finest leaders, Howard Baker.

Dan Quayle, when he was a senator, summed it up: "There's Howard Baker," he said, "and then there's the rest of us senators."

Mr. MCCONNELL. I would like to share some of Senator ALEXANDER's observations about Senator Baker because, as I said, I think they are important, timely lessons about the purpose and potential of our service.

One of the things that stands out in all the tributes to Senator Baker, including Senator ALEXANDER's, is the way in which he embodied the rare trait of taking himself lightly even as he took his duties seriously.

I will give you an example. One of the time-honored traditions around here is for new Senators to labor over their maiden speeches as if Pericles himself were standing in judgment from the Presiding Officer's chair. Senator Baker was no exception. His maiden speech was long, thoughtful, and dense—so much so that when he asked his father-in-law, then-Senate Republican Leader Everett Dirksen, for his reaction, Dirksen is said to have remarked: "Howard, Howard, perhaps you should occasionally enjoy the luxury of an unexpressed thought."

It was the kind of comment that might have stung a lesser Senator, but as Senator ALEXANDER pointed out in mentioning that last week, Baker was a quick learner. About a week or so later, Howard rose again—this time to challenge one of his Democratic colleagues to a game of tennis. The Senator in question had just taken a swipe at the vigor of his Republican colleagues, particularly the new ones, and Senator Baker decided to rise to the challenge, tongue firmly in cheek.

It was a star performance. The Senator that Baker challenged even interrupted him at one point to suggest that it was "one of the best maiden speeches that has ever been delivered in this chamber." Evidently he had missed Baker's actual maiden speech. But Senator Baker's legendary ability to adapt

was now firmly established and it set the tone for a two-decade run in which he would be called upon to deploy his many other talents and skills to defuse tensions, resolve conflicts, repair trust, build consensus, and, frankly, just to put people at ease—because sometimes in this business there is nothing more important than just that: to just keep the bearings oiled.

We have all been recently reminded of how Senator Baker put his own ambitions aside to help rebuild the Reagan White House after Iran-Contra. It was a great testament to his values and to his feel for priorities. What Senator ALEXANDER reminded us last week was that these former political rivals—Baker and Reagan—started every day in the White House together telling each other a little story. They had no problem putting their past disputes behind them and building a close working friendship based on mutual respect, common purpose, love of country, and of course good humor. They were adults, busy about serious business, and they conducted that business with dignity and with grace.

The larger point is that while people talk a lot about the importance of having political skill in Washington these days, the importance of temperament cannot be overstated. The way Senator Baker conducted himself here and in the White House is eloquent testimony of that.

It is not that he was laid back. As Senator ALEXANDER put it, behind Baker's pleasant demeanor was a restless ambition that would propel him to the heights of American politics and government for 40 years, but he could subordinate that ambition when he felt the moment or the country needed him to. He was persistent about achieving a result but never insisted that his way was the only way to do it. It is a quality that required an ability to listen. In Baker's case that meant being an eloquent listener, a trait Senator ALEXANDER put above all the others in Baker's formidable arsenal.

Here is how Senator Baker himself once put it:

There is a difference between hearing and understanding what people say. You don't have to agree, but you have to hear what they've got to say. And if you do, the chances are much better you'll be able to translate that into a useful position and even useful leadership.

Senator ALEXANDER pointed out Howard Baker had courage. He helped round up the votes to ratify the Panama Canal Treaty even though he must have known it would not help him much in a Republican primary for President, to put it mildly. When the integrity of our politics was at stake, he did not hesitate to take on a President of his own party in a very public way—an impulse that one hopes lawmakers in both parties could muster today if the integrity of our system called for it again.

But perhaps most important of all, Howard Baker was grounded. He had an

important job to do, and he did it well, but he also kept a healthy distance from his work. His photograph of President Reagan's inaugural in January 1981 illustrates the point. Just behind the new President we can spot the Speaker of the House Tip O'Neill and the new Vice President George Bush. Then right there between them is a man holding up a camera to capture the moment. It is the new Senate majority leader standing there like an ordinary spectator with a very good seat. It was Howard Baker.

Senator ALEXANDER summed up Baker's groundedness this way: "Howard Baker never stopped sounding like where he grew up."

Senator Baker was a fixture here for decades, but Huntsville was always home. Perhaps that is also why Senator Baker took his stewardship of the Senate so very seriously. He knew he was not going to be around forever and that meant he had a duty to make the Senate work and to preserve it as a place where disputes and disagreements are sifted and sorted out and where stable, durable solutions are slowly but surely achieved. It is how he earned the nickname "the great conciliator."

When Dan Quayle was a Senator here, he used to say: "There's Howard Baker, and then there's the rest of us."

Over the past week, we have been reminded of why that was, and I thank Senator ALEXANDER for helping us remember why his friend and mentor meant so much to this country and this institution.

May the memory of Howard Henry Baker inspire us to be our best selves and even better Senators.

#### RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

#### MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business for 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the majority controlling the first 30 minutes and the Republicans controlling the second 30 minutes.

The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Thank you, Mr. President. I believe it is correct that Senator CORKER and I, before morning business begins, have a few minutes to reflect on Senator Baker.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That understanding is correct.

Mr. ALEXANDER. That is correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is under morning business right now, but the Senator from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask consent that before morning business begin that Senator CORKER and I be permitted to reflect on Senator Baker.

Mr. President, I ask consent that we have a few minutes to speak about Senator Baker before morning business begins.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—I am not going to object because we have an understanding, but I would like to have a similar amount of time to reflect on Senator Alan Dixon, who passed away over the weekend, after the Senators from Tennessee have paid homage to Senator Baker.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Thank you, Mr. President. I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Illinois.

#### REMEMBERING HOWARD BAKER

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I thank Senator MCCONNELL from Kentucky for his eloquent remarks. One other thing I said at the funeral was that Senator Baker had an eye for talent. In 1969, when I was a young aide in the Nixon White House, Senator Baker came to me and said: "You might want to get to know that smart young legislative assistant for Senator Marlow Cook." That young legislative assistant was MITCH MCCONNELL. So I did get to know him.

I thank Senator MCCONNELL for coming to the funeral. I thank Senator REID, our majority leader, for being there as well. They were there at the front of that small church in Huntsville, TN. The Vice President came. He sat there, met everybody, showed his respect for both former Senator Baker and his wife, former Senator Nancy Kassebaum Baker. We Tennesseans appreciated that courtesy by the Vice President, the majority leader, and the minority leader very much.

There were a number of others there. Our Governor was there; Senator CORKER and I, of course, were there; Senator Fred Thompson; majority leader Bill Frist, whom Senator Baker had mentored; Senator Pete Domenici, Senator Bill Brock, Senator Elizabeth Dole, and Senator Bennett Johnston were also there; as well as Senator Jack Danforth, who married Howard and Nancy; and our former Governors, Winfield Dunn and Don Sundquist. It was a small church, but along with former Vice President Al Gore and the current Vice President and the majority leader, as well as the minority leader, there was real respect for the former majority leader of the Senate.

I will not try to repeat what I said at the funeral, and it was a privilege for me to be asked by the family to speak, but I did want to make two comments briefly, one personal and one about the Senate.

The personal one that I said at the funeral was that I had tried to follow the rule in LAMAR ALEXANDER's "Little Plaid Book" that when invited to speak at a funeral, remember to mention the deceased more often than yourself and to talk more about How-

ard Baker than my relationship with him, but that was hard to do. I waited until the end of my remarks to try to do that.

No one had more influence on my life over the last half century than Howard Baker. I came here with him in 1967 as his only legislative assistant. That is how many legislative assistants Senators had then. They dealt mainly with one another, not through staff members. I came back in 1977 when suddenly he was elected Republican leader on his third try by one vote, and I worked in the office that is now the Republican leader's office for 3 months helping him find a permanent chief of staff until I went back to Tennessee.

Throughout my entire public life and private life, no one has had more effect on me by virtue of his effort to encourage me—as well as many other younger people who were working their way up in a variety of ways—and as an example for how to do things.

My advice to younger people who want to know how to become involved in politics is to find someone whom you respect and admire, volunteer to go to work for them and do anything legal they ask you to do and learn from them, both the good and the bad. I had the great privilege of working with the best.

To give one small example of how closely intertwined our lives have become, I had the same office he had in the Dirksen Office Building. I had the same phone number he had in the Dirksen Office Building. If you open the drawer of this desk, you will find scratched in the drawer the names Baker, Thompson, and my name. I have the same desk on this floor.

As far as the Senate, just one story. A remarkably effective presentation at the funeral was made by the Reverend Martha Anne Fairchild, who for 20 years has been the minister of the small Presbyterian church in Huntsville. She told a story about lightbulbs and Senator Baker.

He was on the Session, which is the governing body of the church. He was an elder, and he insisted on coming to the meetings. She said that at one of the meetings of the Session the elders, who represent the maybe 70 members of the church, fell into a discussion about new lightbulbs. It was pretty contentious, and eventually they resolved it because Senator Baker insisted that they discuss it all the way through to the end.

She talked with him later, and he said: "Well, I could have pulled out my checkbook and written a check for the new lightbulbs, but I thought it was more important that the elders have a full and long discussion so they all could be comfortable with the decision they made."

That story about lightbulbs is how Howard Baker saw the U.S. Senate—as a forum for extended discussion where you have the patience to allow everyone to pretty well have their say in the hopes that you come to a conclusion

that most of us are comfortable with and therefore the country is comfortable with it. He understood that you only govern a complex country such as ours by consensus. And whether it was lightbulbs or an 9-week debate on the Panama Canal during which there were nearly 200 contentious amendments and reservations and arguments, you have those discussion all the way through to the end.

It is said that these days are much more contentious than the days of Howard Baker. There are some things that are different today that make that sort of discussion more difficult, but we shouldn't kid ourselves—those weren't easy days either. Those were the days when Vietnam veterans came home with Americans spitting on them. Those were the days of Watergate. Those were the days of Social Security going bankrupt and a 9-week contentious debate on the Panama Canal. Those were the days of the Equal Rights Amendment. Those were difficult days too. Senator Baker and Senator Byrd on the Democratic side were able, generally speaking, to allow the Senate to take up those big issues and have an extended discussion all the way through to the end and come to a result.

Most of us in this body have the same principles. Those principles all belong to what we call the American character. They include such principles as equal opportunity, liberty, and *E pluribus unum*. And most of our conflicts, the late Samuel Huntington used to say, are about resolving conflicts among those principles. For example, if we are talking about immigration, we have a conflict between rule of law and equal opportunity, so how do we put those together and how do we come to a conclusion? Howard Baker saw the way to do that as bringing to the floor a subject, hopefully with bipartisan support, and talking it all the way through to the end until most Senators are comfortable with the decision. His aid in that was, as Senator MCCONNELL said, being an eloquent listener. That is why he was admired by Members of both parties. In one poll in the 1980s, he was considered to be the most admired Senator by Democrats and by Republicans. That is why Dan Quayle said: There is Howard Baker "and then there's the rest of us Senators."

So I think the memory of Howard Baker, his lesson for us, is that—without assigning any blame to the Republican side or the Democratic side—we don't need a change of rules to make the Senate function, we need a change of behavior. Howard Baker's behavior is a very good example, whether it was the Panama Canal, whether it was fixing Social Security, whether it was President Reagan's tax cuts, or whether it was resolving whether how to buy new lightbulbs for the First Presbyterian Church of Huntsville, TN.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the remarks of Martha Anne Fairchild, the pastor of

the First Presbyterian Church of Huntsville, TN, as well as two other documents, one by Arthur B. Culvahouse, Jr., who was Senator Baker's legislative assistant and President Reagan's counsel. According to Culvahouse, Howard Baker told him that if the President did not truly know about the diversion of Iranian arms sales proceeds to the Contras, he was to help him—if he did not truly know. The other is an article by Keel Hunt from the Tennessean about Senator Baker, and finally the funeral order of worship from the Baker ceremony.

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

IN MEMORY OF HOWARD H. BAKER, JR.

FUNERAL SERMON BY THE REV. MARTHA ANNE FAIRCHILD, PASTOR, FIRST PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH, HUNTSVILLE, TENNESSEE

Dear friends, thank you for your presence here this afternoon. Thank you for joining us as we gather to remember and give thanks for the remarkable life of Howard H. Baker, Jr.. We are grateful and honored that you are here with us.

I would like to read one more Scripture lesson, one with opening words that may surprise you. But as I continue reading, you will understand why I chose it. It was written by the Apostle Paul, from a prison cell, perhaps within a very short time before his own death. He was writing to a community of faithful Christians he held in such high esteem that he considered them to be equal co-workers with him in the work of Christ, and he wrote these words at the end of a letter full of tender concern and advice for dear friends he knew he might never see again. Here are Paul's words from the fourth chapter of his letter to the church at Philippi: (Philippians 4:4-9)

"Rejoice in the Lord always; again I will say, Rejoice! Let your gentleness be known to everyone. The Lord is near. Do not worry about anything, but in everything by prayer and supplication with thanksgiving let your requests be made known to God. And the peace of God, which surpasses all understanding, will guard your hearts and your minds in Christ Jesus.

"Finally, beloved, whatever is true, whatever is honorable, whatever is just, whatever is pure, whatever is pleasing, whatever is commendable, if there is any excellence and if there is anything worthy of praise, think about these things. Keep on doing the things that you have learned and received and heard and seen in me, and the God of peace will be with you."

"Rejoice in the Lord always," Paul says. I'll admit it, those are odd words for a funeral sermon. We may be celebrating the life of a great man, but we do not feel much like rejoicing. Our feelings are too bittersweet for that. We have lost someone we loved deeply, someone who was an immense influence for good not only in our own country but around the world. How is rejoicing part of this picture? How can we say, "Rejoice!"

Rejoicing is part of the picture for us for the same reason it was part of the picture for Paul. Paul was nearing his own death. He had already lost his freedom—he was writing this letter from a prison cell. He was writing to people he would never see again. In the stark conditions of imprisonment in the first century, he was suffering physically, in chains and without sufficient food or clothing, often alone and in pain, with no certainty about what would happen to him. Yet he invites us to rejoice, because the sources

of his joy were not tied to his particular difficult circumstances. They were tied to the kind of man he was.

Can we quiet our hearts enough to hear his words? "Let your gentleness be known to everyone." In gentleness Paul found the key that led him into the surrender of worry, into a life of prayer, and above all else into a peace beyond human understanding. This gentleness, this prayer, this peace, made it possible for him to live in joy whatever his circumstances and to invite his friends to do exactly the same.

I chose to read these words today because we are saying goodbye to a supremely gentle man. Howard Baker embodied in his life all the qualities Paul commends to our reflection and attention. He was a true, honorable, and just man. He lived a pure, pleasing, and commendable life, and surely he was a man of excellence and worthy of praise. In a public life spanning decades of serious, selfless service to his country, Howard Baker embodied every public virtue.

Of his public virtues, in fact, so much has been said over the past few days that I can add very little. So I share with you something of the gentleness Howard Baker shared with his church. He was a member of this congregation from his childhood, and one of the most faithful attenders of public worship I have ever known. When he was in town, he was in church on Sunday morning—it was one of his priorities. There is an old catch phrase about sharing time, talents, and treasure with one's church, and Howard Baker shared all those things: He shared his time with his faithful attendance at worship and church events. He shared his talents with his photography of church happenings from Homecoming to Easter egg hunts, and of course his cooking prowess when got up early on Easter Sunday to join the other church men cooking breakfast—his particular talent was putting the biscuits in the oven and getting them out on time. He shared his treasure in a lifetime of generous financial support of the church. But most of all Howard Baker supported this church with his presence.

Here is an example. Some years ago the congregation of this church elected him as a ruling elder, a lifelong position in our denomination. His election placed him in active service on our church board, called the Session, for a three year term. Now, I must share a little secret with you. Session meetings only rarely concern matters of any great import. So I mentioned to him that I understood the many demands he had on his time, and offered him a blanket excused absence for any meeting he needed to miss. That was a mistake. He was quite offended by this suggestion of mine and told me firmly—but very gently—that he intended to make every meeting. And that is what he did, on one occasion even flying in for our evening meeting and flying out again that very same night to meet a commitment elsewhere the following day. When Howard Baker made a promise, he kept it.

At every meeting, he was an attentive, helpful, encouraging elder among fellow elders. He tried to get all of us to call him Howard, and some of us managed to do that and some of us never could. Even when the discussion revolved around the purchase of new light bulbs—yes, I know all those jokes, too—he was patient and helpful in not only contributing to the discussion but in helping me as his moderator to guide it to a conclusion. He told me later he considered just pulling out his checkbook and writing a check for the bulbs we were dithering over, but he wanted his fellow elders to go through the process of making a decision we were all comfortable with. And for that he was willing to devote a little more time, a little

more patience, and, yes, a little more love to the task.

When he accepted President Bush's appointment to become the United States Ambassador to Japan, his term of active service on the Session was not quite over. It was necessary for him to resign, and he called me to apologize that he could not complete his term. It may seem that no apologies would be necessary, but he reminded me that he had made a commitment to serve his church, and he truly regretted being unable to complete that commitment.

I am humbly grateful that he was so willing to accept me as his pastor when I came here almost 20 years ago, a woman only a few years out of seminary who still had much to learn about the serious business of Christian ministry. From the very beginning he treated me with affection and respect, and I hope I have learned from him.

One of the things we all admire him for was his gift of attention. Dietrich Bonhoeffer, the great 20th century Christian theologian and martyr, once remarked, "The first duty one owes to others in the fellowship is to listen to them." Howard Baker had a deep commitment to listening. When you talked to him he paid attention to you—even if he could only speak to you for 60 seconds, you had his focused attention for that entire 60 seconds. You knew he heard you. And every time you came away a little encouraged, a little cheered, a little more content, because he had paid attention—that great gift of being listened to that we all hunger to receive.

Among the questions a Presbyterian elder must answer in the affirmative at his or her ordination is this one: "Will you seek to serve the people with energy, intelligence, imagination, and love?" That is a vow every leader should take. It is a vow Howard Baker lived up to in his entire life of service, for that is what he was: a servant leader, one who embodied not only the qualities of courage, confidence, and consensus-building that were the hallmarks of his public life, but also the qualities of humility, good humor, and selfless love that made those other qualities possible. He was a servant leader in the truest sense of the term.

As we remember him for his gentleness, his good humor, his deep wisdom, as we recall shared moments of tears and laughter, tense times of debate and controversy, satisfying times of concord and shared accomplishment, as we pay tribute to him for his deep love for his family, for his unwavering devotion to the well-being of his country, and even for his unfailing appetite for all things chocolate and sweet, perhaps you can see why I think we must say with Paul, "Rejoice in the Lord always!" By God's great gifts to him, Howard Baker became a great gift to us. And surely that great gift is worth rejoicing over always.

Shortly we will follow his casket out to the cemetery adjacent to this church. When we go I invite you to remember that across the street from that cemetery once stood the house where Howard Baker was born. We will be laying him to rest just a few hundred feet from where his life began. In the completion of that great life well lived, I hope that, even in the midst of our sorrow, we will find cause to rejoice always.

Thanks be to God for the life of Howard Baker. Thanks be to God.

[From the National Review Online, July 2, 2014]

HOWARD BAKER JR., COURAGEOUS CONSTITUTIONALIST

(By Arthur B. Culvahouse, Jr.)

Many of the recent obituaries of Howard Baker, the former Senate majority leader,



White House chief of staff, and U.S. ambassador to Japan, quote Jim Baker's accurate observation that Howard was a "mediator, negotiator, and moderator." As a son of a congressman, a son-in-law of Senator Everett Dirksen's, and a three-term senator, Howard understood that transacting the people's business required at least 51 votes in the Senate and 218 votes in the House. On the tough votes that require leadership and political courage, he knew that the necessary majority was to be found on both sides of the aisle.

Contrary to recent suggestions by approving left-leaning news commentators and critics on the inexperienced right, Howard Baker's interpretation of acceptable "compromise" did not entail splitting the difference or seeking a watered-down consensus. As Bob Dole observed, Howard Baker believed, along with Ronald Reagan, that achieving 70 percent or more of one's priorities is a victory in our democracy. Above all, Howard Baker was the most civil and respectful person I have known. As a consequence, he had many friends across the political and policy spectrums who would give him views a fair and careful hearing.

Howard Baker exercised political courage wisely and with the intention to win. His views, even when they were in the minority in the Republican caucus and among Tennessee voters, were the result of careful study and measured against long-term national interests. His support for the Panama Canal Treaty, for instance, clearly damaged his prospects in the 1980 Republican presidential primaries, and his leadership in securing passage of the Clean Air Act and strip-mine reclamation disappointed his friends and neighbors in the coal country of East Tennessee. Those and other unpopular votes did not occur in isolation; they were co-joined and hedged by his unrelenting support for a strong military, for nuclear power and coal gasification, and for dispensing with the prolonged environmental review of the Alyeska Pipeline.

Jim Neal, the renowned Tennessee trial lawyer and Kennedy-administration prosecutor, presciently predicted that Howard, owing to his "strong moral compass," would be the star of the Senate Watergate Committee. From announcing at the beginning of the Watergate Committee hearings that "he would follow every lead, unrestrained by any fear of where that lead might ultimately take us," to assembling a minority staff that discovered the existence of the Nixon Oval Office tapes, to making the motion that the Committee subpoena the tapes, Howard set aside partisan considerations and led the effort to find the answers to the key question: "What did the President know and when did he know it?" In 1987, when he was the new Reagan White House chief of staff, Howard instructed me that my job as the recently appointed White House counsel was to guide and advise President Reagan through the Iran-Contra investigations without his being impeached—if the president truly did not know about the diversion of Iranian arms-sales proceeds to the Contras. Query how many current and recent senior officials would append that all-important modifier: if.

In his farewell speech to the Senate, Howard stated that "our wisest course is to follow the Constitution rather than improvise around it." He expressed deep concern that the Clinton impeachment proceeding votes were along party lines and that we were reaping the whirlwind of the Watergate convulsion—that we had not learned our lesson but were instead enacting ill-advised and constitutionally suspect laws that were no substitute for judging the character of our leaders on a non-partisan basis.

I have no doubt that if Howard Baker and his long-time Democratic counterpart in the

Senate leadership, Robert Byrd, were in the Senate today, both would be working together to put an end to the current (and any other) administration's blatant disregard of congressionally enacted statutes. In that vein, Howard instructed me and other senior Reagan-administration lawyers to drop our objections to the Senate's proposed "ratification record" underlying the Intermediate Nuclear Forces Treaty; that was the Senate's prerogative, Howard reminded me, and the president wanted the INF Treaty ratified as part of his strategy to end, and win, the Cold War.

Shortly before the 2010 midterm congressional elections, I visited with Howard Baker at his home in the mountains of East Tennessee. When I expressed concern about the dramatic swings in the recent election results, he replied: "I taught you better than that. Those swings are the self-corrections built into our republican form of government." All of us are well-advised to reflect upon the teachings of Howard H. Baker Jr.

[From the Tennessean, June 29, 2014]

HOWARD BAKER'S LEGACY: "THE OTHER GUY MIGHT BE RIGHT"

(By Keel Hunt)

For Tennesseans who knew Howard Baker in his day, the news of his death on Thursday brought an afternoon of emptiness, feelings of great loss, and a deep sense that one very special had left the building.

There are certainly people who knew him better than I did, but in my own memory this man of moderate height looms larger than life. Let me count the ways.

Baker was a master politician, the great conciliator and a builder of human bridges.

Especially from the vantage point of this current angry age, Baker's gifts shine brightly now: that calming voice, the steady temperament, his gift for reaching out and drawing people together, a knack for reasoned compromise, his abiding sense of how government can and should work.

Today, you hear some of those terms attacked, by the people who thrive on dividing, as being somehow unpatriotic. Baker's life was a demonstration of how politics and the skills of collaboration are noble, of how government can work to move society forward.

Hearing both sides of an issue, finding the common ground—these are the gifts we associate with Baker now and all the moderate politicians he inspired (see below). This is how good government happens.

He often quoted his own father, U.S. Rep. Howard Baker Sr., who told him: "You should always go through life working on the assumption that the other guy might be right." His stepmother once said of Baker Jr., "He's like the Tennessee River—he flows right down the middle."

Before politics, Baker was reared in tiny Huntsville, in Scott County, and educated in Chattanooga, Sewanee and Knoxville. In the early 1960s, by this time a lawyer working in Huntsville and Knoxville, he became an architect of the modern Republican Party in Tennessee.

In 1964, wanting to mount his own campaign for U.S. Senate, Baker allied with Republican organizers at the far end of the state in Memphis and Shelby County, notably the lawyers Lewis Donelson and Harry Wellford. Together, they laid the foundation for a two-party state.

Baker's aim was to fill the unexpired term of Sen. Estes Kefauver, who had died, and he came very close to winning. But it was a Democratic year driven by national factors well beyond his control: Barry Goldwater, the GOP's presidential nominee, came to Tennessee saying TVA ought to be sold; and Lyndon Johnson, who had succeeded Presi-

dent John F. Kennedy after the assassination, would win in a landslide.

Two years later, the statewide coalition that Baker and the Shelby Countians formed scored its first victory, with Baker winning the Senate seat for a full term. He was the first Republican since Reconstruction to be elected statewide in Tennessee. Four years after that, there were two more GOP victories statewide: Winfield Dunn was elected governor, and the Chattanooga U.S. Rep. Bill Brock joined Baker in the Senate.

Today, three decades on, two generations of political leaders can be seen in the Baker lineage: Lamar Alexander, Bob Corker, Bill Haslam, Fred Thompson, Bill Frist, Don Sundquist.

Alexander, very early in his career, was Baker's top legislative aide, and left that office in 1970 to be Dunn's campaign manager. In 1973, Baker made Thompson minority counsel to the Senate Watergate Committee, putting him on TV screens across America. Haslam, in 1978, worked in Baker's re-election office. Corker and Haslam became mayors of Chattanooga and Knoxville, respectively, and later on senator and governor.

Baker had a way with Democrats, too. He was the first Republican ever endorsed by The Tennessean, in its partisan Democratic heyday. The editorial on this page that supported him was a breakthrough in Democratic territory for Baker's East-West alliance.

When President Jimmy Carter proposed the Panama Canal Treaty, handing the canal over to Panama, Baker was a key advocate on the Senate floor when it passed.

Plenty will be written this week about his roles on the national and global stages—as Senate majority leader, President Reagan's chief of staff, ambassador to Japan. But through it all, and more so than many senators who have become national politicians, Baker also stayed close to his Tennessee roots.

One morning long ago, two years into his second term, I was in a room full of reporters in Washington, D.C., and heard the senator say: "I am from Huntsville, Tennessee, which is the center of the known universe."

That is where, on Tuesday afternoon, he will come to his final rest.

#### FUNERAL ORDER OF WORSHIP

Prelude

\*Entrance of the Family

\*Sentences of Scripture

\*Hymn America the Beautiful

O beautiful for spacious skies, for amber waves of grain,

For purple mountain majesties above the fruited plain!

America! America! God shed His grace on thee,

And crown thy good with brotherhood from sea to shining sea.

O beautiful for pilgrim feet whose stern impassioned stress

A thoroughfare for freedom beat across the wilderness!

America! America! God mend thy every flaw, Confirm thy soul in self-control, thy liberty in law!

O beautiful for heroes proved in liberating strife,

Who more than self their country loved, and mercy more than life!

America! America! May God thy gold refine, Till all success be nobleness and every gain divine.

O beautiful for patriot dream that sees, beyond the years,

Thine alabaster cities gleam, undimmed by human tears!

America! America! God shed His grace on thee,

And crown thy good with brotherhood from  
sea to shining sea.

#### Opening Prayer

Scripture Readings Ecclesiastes 3:1-15;  
John 14:1-6, 25-27

Psalm 23 (read by all)

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

He leadeth me in the paths of righteousness  
for His name's sake.

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

Thou preparest a table before me in the pres-  
ence of mine enemies: Thou anointest  
my head with oil; my cup runneth over.  
Surely goodness and mercy shall follow me  
all the days of my life: and I will dwell  
in the house of the Lord forever.

Sermon The Reverend Martha Anne Fair-  
child

Remarks Senator Lamar Alexander  
Anthem May the Road Rise to Meet You  
First Presbyterian Church Choir

#### Prayers

\*Hymn Shall We Gather at the River

Shall we gather at the river,  
Where bright angel feet have trod,  
With its crystal tide forever  
Flowing by the throne of God:

#### Refrain:

Yes, we'll gather at the river,  
The beautiful, the beautiful river;  
Gather with the saints at the river  
That flows by the throne of God.

Ere we reach the shining river,  
Lay we every burden down;  
Grace our spirits will deliver,  
And provide a robe and crown.

Soon we'll reach the silver river,  
Soon our pilgrimage will cease;  
Soon our happy hearts will quiver  
With the melody of peace.

#### \*Commendation

#### \*Blessing

#### \*Recessional

#### \*Dismissal of the Family

#### \*General Dismissal

#### Postlude

Pastor: The Reverend Martha Anne Fair-  
child

Music Director: David Mayfield

If you release a baby sea turtle on ChiChi-  
Jima, (a small island off the coast of Japan),  
and your turtle heads to the sea, you are  
guaranteed good luck for 100 years.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I thank the Sen-  
ate for this time, and I yield the floor  
for my colleague from Tennessee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sen-  
ator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. I would like to join our  
distinguished leader MITCH MCCONNELL  
in seconding the comments about the  
presentation the senior Senator from  
Tennessee made at the Howard Baker  
funeral.

It is a great privilege for us to serve  
in this body. While times are tough rel-  
ative to our ability or willingness to  
solve some of the major problems,  
many of the major problems of our Na-  
tion today—and sometimes there are  
comments made about serving in the  
Senate—what I say to people back  
home is that if any of us ever forget  
what a privilege it is to serve, we  
should go home. That privilege allows  
us to meet people and to be in con-

versation with people like Howard  
Baker who affect us and cause us to be  
better people. It also allows us to wit-  
ness what took place last week. I have  
to say I have seen Senator ALEXANDER  
on many occasions say and do things  
that I thought were impressive. I don't  
think I have ever seen anything that  
measures up to what was said in that  
small Presbyterian church last week. I  
think all of us were touched. The Sen-  
ator had a lot of good material to work  
with and was describing a man who  
probably has had more effect in a posi-  
tive way on Tennessee politics—in  
many ways, national politics—like  
Howard Baker.

He was an inspiration to all of us.  
When we were around him, his gra-  
ciousness and humility caused all of us  
to be much better people. His encour-  
agement, especially when dealing with  
tough issues, I think caused all of us to  
want to strive even harder to be better  
Senators and better people.

I certainly cannot give the comments  
with the eloquence the Senator gave  
last week and certainly the ones just  
given. I know you and he were very  
close, and he impacted you more than  
any other person outside your imme-  
diate family, but he had an impact on  
all of us. He had an impact on this Na-  
tion. It is a great honor and privilege  
to stand with the Senator today to ac-  
knowledge Senator Baker's greatness  
as a person, his greatness as a Senator.

Many times we see presentations as  
people talk about someone's life, and a  
lot of times that is embellished. I will  
say in this case none of it was. It was  
all about the man serving here in the  
Senate but also serving in that small  
church in Huntsville, TN, to which he  
was so loyal.

I thank the Senator for the oppor-  
tunity to serve with him. I know each  
of us strives to carry out those charac-  
teristics Howard Baker so wisely  
showed us, and I do agree that the Sen-  
ate would be a much better place if all  
of us could embody those characteris-  
tics most of the time.

I thank the senior Senator for his  
leadership and for his comments.

I thank our distinguished minority  
leader, during a time of great busy-ness  
in his own personal life, for taking the  
time to be a part of something that I  
think is meaningful to him also.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sen-  
ator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. I have been moved by  
the comments from the Senators re-  
garding Senator Baker. The story the  
senior Senator from Tennessee told  
about the lightbulbs is—those of us  
who knew Senator Baker could well  
understand that. He was a man who  
brought Senators together—both par-  
ties.

I will tell two very quick stories. One  
is referencing a leadership race won by  
one vote. He had called a good friend of  
his, who was at home on official busi-  
ness, and said: I know the press says I  
am going to lose this race, but I know

you are voting for me. Can you come  
back and vote?

That Senator did. The Senator was  
the then-senior Senator from Vermont,  
Robert Stafford, and he flew back to  
get to the caucus to vote for his friend  
Howard Baker—the first one by one  
vote; all the rest by acclamation. I  
know this because both Senator Staf-  
ford and Howard Baker told me that  
story. They were also two of the finest  
Senators with whom I have ever  
served. Both tried to work things out.

My other story is we were going to be  
in session until midnight one night on  
a technically contested matter.

Senator Ted Stevens and I and a few  
others went to see Howard Baker, who  
was the majority leader. We talked  
about the issue that was divisive. We  
said: We think we have a solution. We  
have all been talking. We can work it  
out but it is going to take some time  
for the drafting. Could you recess and  
not stay until midnight when all it is  
going to do is exacerbate tempers?  
Come back in the morning and we will  
have it all worked out, and we will get  
this done.

Senator Baker knew that we were all  
Senators in both parties who kept our  
word. He said: "Of course." So we re-  
cessed. Now, as the Senator from Ten-  
nessee knows, we have cloakrooms here  
in the back of this Chamber. We all—if  
we have late-night votes, most of us  
hang around the cloakroom between  
votes. At that time they had beautiful  
stained glass windows in the alcoves.

We recessed and went home. An hour  
or so after we went home a bomb went  
off out here in the corridor. When we  
came in the next morning, this place  
looked like a war zone. Shards of glass  
from those windows in both cloak-  
rooms were embedded in the walls. The  
door to where the distinguished Repub-  
lican deputy leader has his office now  
was blown in, the stained window  
above of it was ruined. Paintings out  
here were shredded, and some of the  
marble busts of former vice presidents  
were damaged. You could smell the  
gunpowder of the explosive when we  
came to work.

I mention this because his form of  
leadership was that if we could get to-  
gether and work things out, he pre-  
ferred we do that. He would encourage  
it—both Republicans and Democrats.  
Then because he could rely on those of  
us—again both Republicans and Demo-  
crats—who would keep our word, he  
agreed to that. We knew he would keep  
his word.

I wonder how many lives of Senators  
were saved that night because of that.  
How many would have been terribly in-  
jured. Of course our staffs who work  
often long after we have gone—how  
many people could have been harmed if  
it had not been for the fact that the  
Senate was a different place, and I be-  
lieve a better place.

But I say this not so much to tell his-  
torical stories, but I say this out of my  
great respect for Howard Baker. Some-  
body calculated the other day that I



have served with 18 percent of all of the Senators since the beginning of this country. If I put my tiny handful of the best, Howard Baker is in there, hands down—a wonderful, wonderful man. He was a Senator's Senator. He believed in the Senate. He believed what a privilege it was to serve here.

He believed that the Senate could be the conscience of the Nation. I appreciate the tribute that was paid by my dear friend, the senior Senator from Tennessee, who I knew as Governor and as Cabinet member. We have always had a good personal relationship. I listened to his tales of Howard Baker. His colleague from Tennessee painted quite a picture of him. I thank them for doing that. I thank them for adding to the history of the Senate by doing it.

#### ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois be recognized once I yield the floor.

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

#### LANDMINES

Mr. LEAHY. Everyone knows the old adage that a picture is worth 1,000 words. I have been an avid photographer since I was a child. I have a strong sense of that. So I thought I would provide a few examples today, because sometimes words are not enough.

I have often spoken about the horrific toll on civilians from landmines. These tiny explosives, about the size of a hockey puck or a can of soup, can kill a child or blow the legs and arms off an adult. They are triggered by the victim. In other words, unlike a gun that a soldier aims and fires or a bomb that is dropped and explodes on a target, landmines sit there and wait for their victims.

It could be hours or days or weeks, even years. But however long it is after they are scattered and hidden beneath a layer of sand or dirt, they explode when an unsuspecting person, whether a combatant or an innocent civilian, steps on it or triggers it with a plow or a wheelbarrow or a bicycle. That person's life is changed forever.

In many countries where there are few doctors, landmine victims bleed to death. Those who survive with a leg or both legs gone are the lucky ones. This girl is an example of who I am talking about. We do not know her nationality, but the picture tells a lot. She is learning to walk on artificial legs. Her life has been made immeasurably harder because of a landmine that probably cost less than \$2. I have a granddaughter not much older than her.

Each of these photographs tell a similar story. None of these people were combatants. Each are facing lives of pain, and sometimes in their communities stigmatization because of weapons that are designed to be indiscriminate.

The Leahy War Victims Fund has helped some of them, as this photo-

graph taken in Vietnam shows. My wife Marcelle and I have seen the difference the Fund has made, but I wish there were no need for it because there would be no landmines.

Over the years, as people around the world became aware of the landmine problem, they took action. The Senate was the first legislative body in the world to ban exports of antipersonnel landmines. I am proud of writing that amendment. Other countries soon followed our example.

And there were others, especially Canada's former Foreign Minister Lloyd Axworthy and the International Campaign to Ban Landmines. Thanks to them an international treaty outlawing the weapons has been joined by 161 countries. I regret that the United States, of all the NATO countries, is the only one that has not joined, even though the U.S. military has not used antipersonnel mines for 22 years, despite two long wars.

On June 27, though, the Obama administration finally took a step—it is an incremental step, but it is a significant one—to put the United States on a path to join the treaty. Although the United States has not produced or purchased antipersonnel mines since the 1990s, the White House announced that as a matter of official policy that it will no longer produce or otherwise acquire antipersonnel mines, nor will the Pentagon replenish its stockpile of mines as they become obsolete.

Our closest allies and many others around the world welcomed this step, even though it falls far short of what supporters of the treaty have called for.

But one senior Member of the House of Representatives immediately accused President Obama of ignoring U.S. military commanders, some of whom have defended the use of landmines, just as the military defended poison gas a century ago when nations acted to ban it.

This Member of the House said: The President "owes our military an explanation for ignoring their advice", and he went on to say that this decision represents an "expensive solution in search of a nonexistent problem."

A Member of our body, the Senate, called the announcement a "brazen attempt by the President to circumvent the constitutional responsibility of the Senate to provide advice and consent to international treaties that bind the United States."

These are strong words. They make great sound bites for the press. But the truth lies elsewhere.

Over the years, the White House has consulted closely with the Pentagon, including about this decision. The policy just announced simply makes official what has been an informal fact for at least 17 years through three Presidential administrations.

It also ignores the fact that the United States has neither joined the treaty nor has the President sent it to the Senate for ratification, so the

President has obviously not circumvented the Senate's advice and consent role.

And it ignores that every one of our NATO allies and most of our coalition partners have renounced antipersonnel mines, as have dozens of countries that could never dream of having a powerful, modern army as we do—countries that look to the United States, the most powerful Nation on Earth, but they got rid of their landmines.

The naysayers' argument is simple. It goes like this: The United States is no longer causing the misery captured in these photographs, so why should we join the treaty? Does that mean they also oppose the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, such as the crippled people in this photograph? Do they oppose the Chemical Weapons Treaty, and every other treaty dealing with international relations that the United States has joined since the time of George Washington?

Does the fact that we are not causing a problem, that we do not use landmines or chemical weapons, absolve us from having a responsibility to be part of an international treaty to stop it? Of course not. The world looks to the United States for leadership.

In 1992, if the Senate had accepted the argument now being made this body would never have voted 100 to 0 to ban the export of antipersonnel landmines.

I suppose those in the House who criticize President Obama today would say the entire Senate was wrong 22 years ago. Those 100 Democrats and Republicans who voted back then to ban U.S. exports of antipersonnel mines understood that while the United States may not have been causing the problem, we needed to be part of the solution. The same holds true today.

In 1996 President Clinton called on the Pentagon to develop alternatives to antipersonnel mines, whether they were technological or doctrinal alternatives. He was Commander in Chief, but the Pentagon largely ignored him. But now 18 years later it needs to be done. Not at some unspecified time in the future but by a reasonable deadline—because it can be done.

Now, I am not so naive to think that a treaty will prevent every last person on Earth from using landmines. But if people use them, they pay a price for using them. Bashar Assad used poison gas, but look at the political price he paid. Are those who oppose the landmine treaty so dismissive of the benefits of outlawing and stigmatizing a weapon like IEDs, which pose a danger to our own troops?

Rather than opposing a treaty that will make it a war crime to use landmines against our troops, why not support the mine-breaching technology they need to protect themselves?

I always come back to the photographs. I have met many people like these. They may not be Americans, but what happened to them happens to

thousands of others like them each year. The United States can help stop it. It is a moral issue.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HIRONO). The assistant majority leader.

#### REMEMBERING ALAN DIXON

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, yesterday at 6 p.m. on Capitol Hill there was a gathering at a nearby restaurant known as The Monocle. It was a gathering of former staffers of U.S. Senator Alan Dixon of Illinois. They picked The Monocle because he would have picked it. It was his favorite place on Capitol Hill. And it was a sad day, because Senator Dixon passed away Sunday morning in Fairview Heights, IL.

His staff gathered at The Monocle the next day, which would have been his birthday, to toast him and to pay tribute to a great boss, a great friend, and a great Senator from the State of Illinois.

Senator Dixon passed away in his sleep in the early hours on Sunday morning. His son Jeff had dropped him off at home, and he was there with his wife Jody when he passed away. So instead of celebrating his birthday on Monday, we had a day of remembrance of an extraordinary public servant for the State of Illinois.

Alan Dixon used to be known in political circles as Al the Pal, and he loved it. It really described him. For him, friendship and loyalty were everything. It showed in his life and, I think, was a great part of his success.

He was a person who gloried in representing Illinois. He never harbored any national ambitions. Being a Senator from Illinois was his goal in life. He reached it and performed so well as Senator that he is fondly remembered by many who served with him in the House and in the Senate.

He represented an old-school style of politics. He believed in his heart that people of good will could find common ground if they worked at it. He knew how to make this government work, how to make this Senate work, and work for the State of Illinois.

In his memoir, which he published last year, he wrote:

Generally speaking, my political career was built on good will and accommodation.

He was known by Senators on both sides of the aisle as a friendly, helpful, articulate, and effective colleague.

He was a downstate guy in our State. He grew up in Belleville and St. Clair County, not too far away from my hometown of East St. Louis. He grew up just across the river from the great city of St. Louis. His dad owned and ran the Dixon Wine and Liquor Company in Belleville.

Alan served in World War II, in the U.S. Navy Air Corps. After the war, he went to the University of Illinois where they had a special arrangement for vets to earn a bachelor's degree. He went for a short time to the University of Illinois Law School and then, when

his dad's business was struggling, he transferred to Washington University Law School where he graduated second in his class.

In 1948, at the age of 21, a neighbor said: Alan, I have been watching you and I think you ought to consider running for police magistrate in Belleville, IL. Alan hadn't even graduated from law school, and his friend reminded him you didn't have to be a lawyer to be a police magistrate in those days. So he ran and he won.

Two years later, after getting out of law school and passing the bar, both in Missouri and Illinois, he was elected to the Illinois House of Representatives—the youngest member ever elected to the Illinois General Assembly. His starting salary: \$3,000.

He went on to become one of the most successful vote-getters in the history of the State of Illinois. He won 29 consecutive bids for public office, for State representative, State senator, secretary of state, and state treasurer. During one of those races, he carried all 102 counties in Illinois, all 30 townships in Cook County, and all 50 wards. That is a record I don't think anybody will ever break.

When he served in Springfield, IL, as a State representative and a State senator, he did a lot of things, but he pointed with pride to his passage of a constitutional change in Illinois to finally modernize our judiciary. He remembered his days as police magistrate and thought our system of justice had to be brought into the 20th century. Alan Dixon of Belleville, IL, led that effort—an enormous political lift. He got it done. He was effective. People trusted him and they respected him.

He led an unpopular fight against loyalty oaths during the McCarthy era, and he helped create the Illinois college system.

In 1980, the people of Illinois chose Alan Dixon to represent them here in the Senate. He teamed up with his old friend a couple years later who had joined him in the Illinois General Assembly, his seatmate in the Assembly, a man named Paul Simon. Senator Dixon and then-Congressman Paul Simon, soon to be Senator Paul Simon, were colleagues and buddies and business partners. What an unlikely duo. There was Paul Simon who might be persuaded once in a blue moon to drink a little glass of wine, and there was Alan Dixon who loved that cold beer that he grew up with in Belleville, IL. But the two of them were fast friends. I witnessed that friendship over the years. I didn't see the early days when they owned newspapers together—Paul was a newspaper man and Alan more an investor—but I did witness the political part of that friendship, and it was amazing to see.

There were moments in their lives when the two of them could have clashed over their political ambitions, but they always worked it out. They were always friends, and that made a big difference in both of their lives.

It was Alan Dixon as Senator who came up with an idea that had never been tried before in Illinois: He decided to try to get all of the members of the Illinois congressional delegation—Democrats and Republicans—together for lunch on a regular basis. Well, he had to persuade a few of the oldtimers who weren't really open to the idea, but it was his personality and his determination that got it done, a tradition which continues to this day.

In his 12 years in the Senate, Alan Dixon didn't forget where he came from. He remembered growing up in a family of modest means in Belleville. He remembered those tough summer jobs—and there were plenty of them. And he never forgot the working people he represented in St. Clair County and across the State of Illinois.

Alan was at the top of his game and in the strongest voice when it came to standing up for working people and the little guy. He fought for affordable housing and lending practices. He denounced wasteful spending and created a procurement czar to oversee spending at the Pentagon.

One of the things which he is remembered for as a Senator was deciding to personally test a new weapons system. They sent him down to test the Sergeant York gun. They put him in a helmet and sat him on the gun. He was going to test it and fire it, and he soon discovered the gun was a dud—it couldn't shoot straight. He came back and reported it to his colleagues in the Senate, including Senator Sam Nunn, and they went along with Senator Dixon and said: We are going to junk this project. It is a waste of taxpayers' money.

It was Alan Dixon who called for tougher oversight of the savings and loan industry and vigorous prosecution of scam artists who defrauded S&Ls and left taxpayers holding the bag.

In 1992, Alan lost his bid for reelection to the Senate in a hotly contested three-way primary. It was the political upset of the year. It isn't often around here that a Senator would lose in a primary race for reelection—and a lot of people were wondering, his first political loss, how would it affect Alan Dixon.

Election night, Alan stood up and gave the most heartfelt, touching speech I can ever remember of a person who lost a campaign. It was repeated over and over that he was a real gentleman, and his words that he had to say even in defeat added to his reputation as a fine, honest, great public servant. A tearful crowd listened as he said he had “loved every golden moment” of his time in politics.

His fellow Democratic Senators had twice unanimously elected him to serve as chief deputy whip. After his loss in that election and then retirement, he was praised on the floor of the Senate by not only Ted Kennedy and George Mitchell but Bob Dole and Strom Thurmond as well.

In 1995, his public life was resumed when President Clinton appointed Alan

Dixon to chair the base closure commission known as the Defense Base Realignment and Closure Commission. It made sense. As a Senator, Alan Dixon had written the section of the Defense authorization bill that created the BRAC.

Here was a man who had spent his entire career making political friends, but now he took on a job that was bound to test some of those friendships. He accepted that assignment because the President asked, and Dixon knew it was right for America. It was the same decision he made when he enlisted to serve in World War II.

Last October, Alan Dixon published his memoirs with the appropriate title "The Gentleman From Illinois." He returned to Washington briefly with Jody and members of the family to head on over to his favorite Capitol Hill restaurant, The Monocle. It is about a stone's throw from the Dirksen Senate Office Building where he used to have his old meetings in his office. The Monocle was the place where, afterwards, you joined for bipartisan dinners and a lot of good times.

Alan Dixon told his old friends gathered at The Monocle that evening:

What this country needs now is more friends on the Hill working together and talking together, and working for solutions that will serve the interest of the public.

Well, Alan Dixon was right about that. I hope that some day, in his memory, we will see the return of that spirit in this Senate Chamber. This country truly needs to work together.

Before Dixon left the Senate, then-Senator Paul Simon praised him with these words:

In generations to come, his children, his grandchildren, and his great-grandchildren will look back and say with pride, "Alan Dixon was my father, my grandfather, my great-grandfather," whatever that relationship will be.

Those words by Paul Simon about his lifelong political friend and colleague Alan Dixon ring true today as we reflect not only on his service as a Senator and public official but also as a person.

I lost a pal when Alan Dixon passed away. My wife and I extend our condolences to Alan's wife of 60 years, Jody. What a sweetheart of a woman. People don't realize what spouses put up with because of our public lives. She put up with it for many years. There were good times, but I am sure there were tough times too. Mothers have to work a little extra harder when the father happens to be in public life. She was his rock.

To Alan and Jody's three children Stephanie, Jeff, and Elizabeth, and to their families, to the grandchildren and the great-grandchildren—you can be proud of Alan Dixon. He was truly "the gentleman from Illinois."

#### GUN VIOLENCE

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, this last weekend in Chicago was memo-

rable—memorable for the wrong reasons. This last weekend in Chicago, gun violence took the lives of 14 people and wounded 82.

I am honored to represent Illinois. I am especially honored to represent a great city such as Chicago. But I am heartbroken to think about what happened this past weekend.

Mayor Emanuel and Superintendent Gary McCarthy anticipated the Fourth of July weekend would be a challenge, and they dispatched hundreds of police to the streets of Chicago in an effort to avert this violence. I wouldn't say they failed, but I would say the tragedy that followed tells us we have a lot of work to do.

I am sure Mayor Emanuel and all of the elected officials in Chicago, including Superintendent McCarthy, are looking over what happened this past weekend trying to think of what they can do to bring peace to the city and end the violence which has taken so many lives. They will be working overtime, and a lot of people will point the finger of blame and say they could have done more. I think the mayor would acknowledge he could have done more. But let me add, we all could have done more. It isn't just the city's responsibility that this kind of violence has occurred. It isn't just the misfortune of the city of Chicago that these lives were lost and that gun violence continues to plague us. It is a responsibility that goes far beyond the city of Chicago. It is a responsibility we have visited on this Chamber, of the Senate.

How can we ignore gun violence in America wherever it occurs—in Chicago, in Washington, DC, across this country? What are we doing as Members of the Senate? What efforts are we making to make America a safer place to live? We have run away from it. We ran away from our responsibility when it comes to an honest, conscientious discussion about gun control.

Some people are frightened of this issue. They think when you get near the Second Amendment, it is the third rail of politics, and that there are gun lobby groups out there just waiting to pounce on any Member who comes to the floor of this Senate and talks about changing our gun laws. That has been the case for a long time, and yet the American people, when you ask them about the basics, get it. They understand you can protect our Second Amendment rights to own and use firearms legally and responsibly and still put reasonable limits in place to keep guns out of the hands of people who will misuse them.

Is there anyone who believes it is an infringement of constitutional rights to say that no one who has been convicted of a felony should be allowed to purchase a firearm in America? That makes sense.

This weekend in Chicago convicted felons were out on the street with firearms firing away. We should do everything in our power to stop that from occurring. After all of the senseless

tragedies which we have seen over the last several years—in Connecticut, in so many different places, even in the State of Illinois—is there anyone who argues with the premise that people who are so mentally unstable they cannot accept the responsibility of a firearm should not be allowed to buy a firearm? Two categories: Convicted felons, mentally unstable people, should not be allowed to purchase firearms in America, period.

We had the vote—a bipartisan vote. Senator JOE MANCHIN of West Virginia is no liberal. Senator MANCHIN is a real conservative and pro-gun. He joined up with Senator PAT TOOMEY of Pennsylvania, who is about as conservative a Republican as you can find. Both Senators MANCHIN and TOOMEY came to the floor and said let us do background checks to make sure convicted felons and people who are mentally unstable cannot purchase a firearm. It failed. It failed because it faced a filibuster we couldn't break. The majority of Senators voted for it, but that wasn't enough because we needed 60 and we didn't have it. We lost a handful of Democrats and we attracted only a few Republicans to support us.

To me, that is not the end of the debate. It is time for us to revisit that issue. It is time for us to have another vote on the floor of the Senate. I am not sure the outcome will be much different, but we owe it to the people of this country to continue this debate, and we owe it as fellow Senators, Democrats and Republicans, to search for solutions.

Let me tell you another measure that could have helped in Chicago and other cities across America. There is a term called straw purchaser. A straw purchaser is someone who will walk into a gun store, present their identification, and purchase a firearm because they are legally entitled to purchase it, and then turn around and give it or sell it to someone who could not legally buy that same gun. Many times it turns out to be the girlfriend who is sent in to make the purchase. It is time to change that law. It is time to send out an all-points bulletin to the girlfriends of thugs that they are going to be sent away to prison for a long time for that kind of irresponsible act. Straw purchasers pass these guns into the community, and when they do, we know what happens: Innocent people die. That is another provision we should vote on on the floor of the Senate.

If there are colleagues who want to stand and defend the right of straw purchasers to buy guns and turn them over to convicted felons, be my guest. I want to hear that debate. Tell me how that is an exercise of your constitutional right. It is not.

I have thousands and thousands of people across Illinois who own firearms, who store them safely, use them legally, and enjoy their rights under the Constitution. Well, what I am suggesting today is not going to change

that at all, but they live in communities where people will misuse these firearms.

We have a moral responsibility in the Senate to do everything we can to keep firearms out of the hands of people who misuse them. We have a legal and moral responsibility to accept this opportunity in the Senate to debate these issues. We cannot run away from them any more than we can run away from the violence in our streets. I am not alone in my feelings on this issue. There are other Senators who share them. It is time for us to stand up and speak up. We have a responsibility to the people we represent, to innocent people who are being threatened and killed across America.

What happened in Chicago over the Fourth of July weekend is a wakeup call—another wakeup call—to the Senate to get about the business of our purpose here, the reason we were elected—to try to make America a better and safer place.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mrs. MURRAY. I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

(The remarks of Mrs. MURRAY pertaining to the introduction of S. 2565 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mrs. MURRAY. I yield the floor.

#### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

#### BIPARTISAN SPORTSMEN'S ACT OF 2014—MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 384, S. 2363.

The clerk will report the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 384, S. 2363, a bill to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. TESTER. Madam President, I rise in support of the Bipartisan Sportsmen's Act.

First, I thank Senators HAGAN and MURKOWSKI for their leadership in gathering support and getting this bill to the floor.

Nearly half of the Senate is cosponsoring this legislation from every cor-

ner of our country. It is truly a national bill, and that is why over 30 groups—from the National Shooting Sports Foundation and Ducks Unlimited to the Dallas Safari Club and many others—support this bill. It is an ambitious proposal that includes dozens of smart ideas from both sides of the aisle. It encourages private investment into fish habitat as well as land and wildlife management.

This bill supports public shooting ranges so more folks have a place to take their kids to teach them how to responsibly handle a firearm, and it protects some of our best places to hunt, fish, and recreate.

Make no mistake, the Bipartisan Sportsmen's Act is also a jobs bill, which is something we constantly talk about needing more of around here.

In my State of Montana, outdoor recreation supports tens of thousands of jobs. It is a \$6 billion-a-year industry. Nationwide our outdoor economy creates and sustains more than 6 million jobs every single year.

Despite the economic power of public lands to sustain the rural economy, some folks are talking about closing off the land and privatizing it. We cannot let that happen. Instead, we need to pass the Bipartisan Sportsmen's Act, which will strengthen our economy as we create more opportunities for folks to continue recreating in our great outdoors. Responsibly enjoying our outdoors is part of our way of life in Montana. In the Big Sky State we are proud hunters, anglers, sports men and women, and that is why it is critical that this bill will open more of our public lands to every law-abiding American who has a right to access them.

In Montana alone, nearly 2 million acres of public land is not easily accessible to folks, and I am proud my colleagues included the making lands public provision that I have pushed for, for years. These lands were set aside for our parents to enjoy, for all of us to enjoy, and ultimately for our children and grandchildren to enjoy. Accessing these lands is our birthright, and this bill delivers on a century-old promise to preserve our outdoor heritage.

By passing this bipartisan legislation, we will help ensure future generations get to experience the natural wonders that were passed down to us.

In the last Congress, the Senate took up a similar package only to see political gamesmanship get in the way. We cannot let that happen again. Millions of sports men and women across this country expect better. The American people deserve better. There is too much in this bill that we agree on to let it fail once again.

Senators HAGAN and MURKOWSKI have worked diligently for months to craft a bill that has an incredible amount of support in the Senate, but, most importantly, back home in the States we all represent. Let's pass this bill once and for all.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

#### HEALTH CARE

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, Americans might have noticed a trend in ObamaCare headlines over the past two days. There was Sunday's Politico story and it basically had this title: "Why liberals are abandoning the Obamacare employer mandate."

There was an Associated Press story entitled "Senate Democrats Try to Pull Focus From Obamacare."

Then on Monday, Politico published a story called "Obamacare's next threat: A September surprise" about the White House efforts to prepare Democrats to meet September rate hike announcements.

All of these stories amount to one thing. Democrats are running scared from ObamaCare.

These three articles are just a few of the many pieces to be published about Democrats' efforts to distance themselves from ObamaCare in preparation for the November election.

It is not surprising they are worried. ObamaCare is Democrats' and the White House's main legislative achievement, and Americans don't like it. They didn't like it in 2010 when the law was passed, they didn't like it when the law was being implemented, and they don't like it now. A Quinnipiac poll from last week reported that 55 percent of Americans oppose ObamaCare. Similar numbers of Americans opposed it 3 months earlier, and almost 3 months before that. In fact, when we average polling on the health care law from late 2009 until today, we find the health care law has consistently been opposed by the majority of Americans. Opposition to the health care law currently averages nearly 14 percentage points higher than support. That is not a good sign for Democrats.

Many Democrats who firmly supported the health care law in 2009 and 2010 believed the law would grow more popular when the American people found out what was in the bill and how it would benefit them. But the health care law has not gotten more popular. Americans found out what was in the bill and they didn't like it. Democrats are realizing that their support for the bill may cost them their seats in November. So now they are running in the opposite direction.

According to Monday's Politico article, the White House knows very well that Democrats are finding ObamaCare to be a big problem in their campaigns.

So it has redirected the efforts of its ObamaCare war room to prepare for the release of rate hikes that are coming in September. "The White House and its allies know"—this is a quote from the story—"they've been beaten in every previous round of ObamaCare messaging, never more devastatingly than in 2010." The story goes on to say:

And they know the results this November could hinge in large part on whether that happens again. So they are trying to avoid—or at least get ahead of—any September surprise.

That is from the Politico story.

Let me just say to the White House: Good luck with that.

There is a reason why the White House and its allies have been, as Politico notes, "beaten in every previous round of ObamaCare messaging." It is because the White House's messaging didn't match up with the reality it promised Americans.

The White House can talk all it wants about ObamaCare's supposed benefits, but if Americans aren't experiencing those benefits, no amount of talking is going to work. Most Americans aren't experiencing ObamaCare benefits. They are experiencing ObamaCare pain: higher premiums, higher deductibles, the loss of doctors and hospitals, less control and less freedom.

As have most Members of Congress, I have gotten countless letters from constituents telling me about the pain ObamaCare is causing them. Tom from Hurley, SD, wrote to me to tell me his premiums have more than doubled and his deductible has quadrupled since the President's health care law was enacted.

Harvey from Mitchell, SD, wrote to tell me that his insurance went up 16 percent effective April 1 of this year. "Biggest increase ever," he said.

Jill from Sturgis, SD, wrote to tell me that she went on line to get a health insurance estimate at [healthcare.gov](http://healthcare.gov) and found that the cheapest plan would cost her \$366 a month with a \$5,000 deductible. "Are you kidding me?", she wrote. "That's \$9,392 a year I have to pay in, every year, before it pays anything . . . which is roughly 16 percent of our combined income. I can't afford that and try to save money for retirement at the same time" she says.

Jill is not alone in not being able to afford that. Too many Americans are in similar situations, facing the prospect of huge health care bills and wondering how on Earth they are going to pay them.

All the talk in the world from the White House isn't going to make people enthusiastic about ObamaCare if they can't afford their ObamaCare premiums or have lost access to the doctor or the hospital they like.

Politico reports that 21 States—21 States—have posted preliminary health insurance premiums for 2015, and that average preliminary premiums went up in all 21 States. Those proposed in-

creases—several in the double digits—are coming on top of the State premium hikes many Americans faced this year.

The White House can attempt to defend these increases as much as it wants, but there really isn't any way to spin huge premium hikes when they promised people their premiums not only wouldn't increase but would actually go down.

ObamaCare is fundamentally broken. This bill was supposed to reduce health care premiums and lower the cost of care while allowing Americans to keep the doctors they like. Instead, it has done the exact opposite. ObamaCare isn't just driving up health care premiums; it is also devastating our already damaged economy.

The ObamaCare 30-hour workweek rule is forcing businesses, large and small, to reduce employees' hours at a time when many Americans are struggling to find full-time work. USA Today reported yesterday that Friday's unemployment report found a sharp rise in the number of part-time workers who prefer full-time jobs. So what we have is people who want to work full-time but full-time jobs are unavailable, so they are taking part-time work. Why? Well, one of the reasons they attribute it to is the ObamaCare requirement that the work week be a 30-hour week as opposed to a 40-hour week. So what is happening is employers are hiring employees for less than 30 hours a week so they won't be stuck with all of the requirements and the mandates that come with ObamaCare. So it is leading to more part-time jobs when people are actually looking for full-time work in our economy.

The law's burdensome mandates and regulations are placing a heavy burden on small businesses and making it impossible for many of them to expand and to hire employees. As Politico reported, when it comes to the employer mandate, even liberals are admitting that the rule is unnecessary and burdensome. Politico notes:

The shift among liberal policy experts and advocates has been rapid. A stream of studies and statements have deemed the mandate only moderately useful for getting more people covered in ObamaCare. And they too have come to see it as clumsy, a regulatory and financial burden that creates as many problems as it solves.

That is from the Politico story talking about many of the liberal policy experts who are now turning their backs on the employer mandate.

Then there is the potential for fraud, with the Health and Human Services inspector general's office reporting that the administration is not properly verifying that those receiving subsidies actually qualify for them. And the disastrous Web sites have cost taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars.

The list goes on and on and on. Whether they admit it or not, everyone knows that ObamaCare is not working. It is time to start over and replace this law with real reforms—reforms that

will actually lower costs and improve access to care.

Republicans have offered solution after solution to solve the many problems created by ObamaCare—from Senator COLLINS' bill to repeal ObamaCare's 30-hour workweek, which I just mentioned earlier, to a provision I came up with that would exempt schools, colleges, and universities from ObamaCare's crippling employer mandate—something that our colleges and universities across the country are feeling and it is impacting their ability to hire employees.

Instead of fleeing from ObamaCare or attempting to put a positive spin on its many failures, Democrats should join Republicans to repeal this broken law and replace it with real reforms. Then Democrats would have a real accomplishment to take home to their constituents, and they would not have to worry about having the White House send a team of people in the war room assigned to Democrats here on Capitol Hill who are trying to figure out ways to message the bad news that keeps coming out about higher premiums, higher copays, higher deductibles, fewer doctors, and fewer hospitals. That is the message that Democrats here in Congress are having to deal with when they respond to the constituents they hear from in their districts or their States. And that is why the White House is so focused on changing the subject to anything from ObamaCare.

That is the reality, and it is an economic reality that is affecting and impacting way to many American families. Middle-income families in this country are squeezed. Household income has gone down by \$3,300 since the President took office. Everything middle-income Americans have to pay for has gone up—from health care to college education to fuel, electricity, food—you name it.

So those middle-income families in this country are increasingly feeling squeezed and pinched by this economy, made much, much worse by the passage of a health care law that has driven up the cost of health care—higher premiums, fewer doctors, fewer hospitals, fewer full-time jobs or part-time jobs. Why? Because employers are trying to avoid the heavyhanded mandates and requirements to provide government-approved insurance, and so they are finding more and more part-time employees when the employees—people out there in the workforce—are looking for full-time jobs so they can provide for their families. Good-paying jobs with opportunities for advancement—that is what we ought to be focused on. Unfortunately, everything coming out of Washington, DC, and particularly the policies coming out of this administration—namely, first and foremost, ObamaCare is making it more expensive and more difficult for employers to hire. It is costing middle-income families more to cover their families with health coverage, and it is



making everything else in our economy more expensive.

That is the reality that most Americans are dealing with. We can do so much better. We should do so much better. If Democrats will acknowledge the error of their ways in the passage of this bad law to start with, we can go back to the drawing board and do this in a way that actually does reduce cost and provide better access to health care for American families.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HEITKAMP). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. MORAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak to the Senate as in morning business.

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

#### EXCESS FEDERAL PROPERTY

Mr. MORAN. Madam President, while I was home over the recess, I had the opportunity to visit with lots of Kansans. One of the conversations I had was with a county emergency preparedness director in advance of a Fourth of July parade. He brought to my attention something we had heard just in the last few days about a development at the Department of Defense.

I want to mention to my colleagues and ask them, but ask the agencies involved—which would be the Department of Defense, the Department of Agriculture, the Environmental Protection Agency—to see if we cannot find a solution to a problem that should not be a problem.

In the Presiding Officer's State and mine we have lots of volunteer fire departments. One of the developments over time has been their equipment is excess military equipment that is either loaned or given to those small town fire departments. They are volunteers. In my hometown, the fire whistle blows and men and women from across the community gather at the fire station, get in the truck, and go to the fire and fight the fire.

Their equipment is expensive and the budget they have to fulfill their mission is small. One way they have been able to overcome that small budget and expensive equipment is through the Department of Defense, which has, over a long period of time, donated excess military equipment to the local fire departments. They do this through the State forester. In fact, 95 percent of the communities in Kansas are protected by a volunteer fire department and 50 million acres of land is protected by volunteer fire departments.

Well, 3 weeks ago, the Department of Defense halted the transfer of excess trucks, generators, pumps, and engine parts, based upon emissions regulations and an agreement that appar-

ently exists between the Department of Defense and the Environmental Protection Agency.

The EPA, apparently, has to approve the transfer of those vehicles because they may not satisfy the clean air standards. So what seems to me to be a commonsense solution to the need for fire equipment—including trucks—is now being halted because of concerns of whether those vehicles—those old vehicles no longer used by the Department of Defense—meet the emissions standards.

Well, I would certainly first remind folks that these trucks are very important when there is a fire, but there is not a fire every day. It is not as if these vehicles are on the road in a constant fashion day in and day out. I would also indicate that the fires they put out increase emissions, so the marginal increase in the amount of emissions because you may be using a fire truck that does not meet the emissions standards is well overcome by the fire that burns the grass, the forest, the trees or a home by what that fire puts into the atmosphere.

Since January 1 of this year, there have been nearly 92,000 acres burned in more than 5,000 wild land fires—grass fires—across Kansas.

For most of those rural fire departments, the Federal excess equipment is the only equipment they can afford to handle those natural or manmade disasters.

The Kansas Forest Service, as I said, administers this program through the U.S. Department of Agriculture. They provided 40 to 50 trucks per year, and they were able to set aside again that number for Kansas—40 to 50 trucks—for Kansas fire departments for this year.

We currently have 445 trucks issued in Kansas, valued at about \$21 million, and there are 52 fire departments in Kansas waiting for a replacement truck.

The Department of Defense decision to implement this policy will cost fire departments in Kansas and across the country the opportunity to utilize excess equipment, save lives, and protect property.

My request is that my colleagues who have an interest in this issue work with me and others and help us bring to the attention of the Secretary of Defense, Secretary Hagel, and the EPA Administrator, Gina McCarthy, as well as USDA, which administers the program for the fire departments, that we work together to find a commonsense solution.

Apparently the alternative is if these trucks are not available to be transferred to Kansas and elsewhere, to local fire departments, then the trucks are destroyed, smashed, and somehow disposed of in a landfill. Again, I would suggest that the conservation, the environmental opportunity to see the life of these vehicles extended, as compared to being destroyed, smashed, and disposed of, would work in the favor of the environment as well as in the oppor-

tunity to provide safety and security for hundreds of thousands of Kansans, hundreds of thousands of Americans, who depend upon rural fire departments, hometown fire departments, to meet the needs of their safety and security.

It seems to me we are asking for something simple. We need a little common sense and cooperation among an agency and two departments. I would ask my colleagues that you help me find a solution to this problem by getting those agencies, the Department of Defense in particular, to explain why this is a good policy with such detriment to the American people.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

#### HEALTH CARE

Mr. BARRASSO. I come to the floor today because it seems day after day there is another story or two in the paper about what is happening with the President's health care law. As I go home to Wyoming each week, I go through Denver and the airport there. Today the headline in the Denver Post has to do with the Colorado health exchanges. The first line says: "Colorado's health care exchange is expecting nearly twice as many people to drop or to decline to pay for their policies." You know, they predicted how many people would continue to make payments if they had signed up under the President's health care law. Today they are predicting that twice as many as they anticipated would be either dropping or failing to pay for their health care premiums.

The Wall Street Journal today, above the fold, front page, "Newly Insured Face Coverage Gaps." So you get people who may have signed up under the President's health care law, coverage gaps, not paying, dropping, truly not the deal the President has said was something he felt would be helpful to Americans. More and more people are finding out they are having bigger problems under the President's health care law, problems with the promises that were made by this President, by this administration, and by those who voted for the health care law.

I get home just about every weekend in Wyoming to talk with people, to listen to them, to hear what they have to say. But also as chairman of the Republican Policy Committee, one of my responsibilities is also to see how policies such as the President's health care law come out across the country, what happens in other States, how policies out of Washington affect people all across America.

Today I wish to talk a little about how the health care law is impacting people not just in my home State of Wyoming but all across the country. In addition to being in Wyoming last week, I had a chance to visit Alaska. What I heard from people there as well as people in Wyoming is that people



have been hurt by the President's health care law. They are anxious about it in terms of their own health care, and they are angry about insurance they have had that they have lost, and the implications of the President's health care law where many promises were made and now people are finding out the President's promises, in terms of their own lives, their own health and their own families, have not actually been kept.

The President, Democrats here in the Senate, promised their law was going to be great for the American people. That is the promise. Well, I can tell you the people I talk to in Wyoming, people I heard from in Alaska, are very worried about the terrible side effects they are feeling specifically as a result of this awful health care law.

Small businesses—and small businesses are a major part of the economy in rural States. Small businesses and the people who specifically work in those small businesses are the backbone of the economy for so many of our communities. So it is very troubling when I read about something in the health care law that threatens the very health of the people who work in these small businesses.

When Democrats were trying to sell their health care law, they bragged. They bragged about something called the SHOP program. That is the exchange where small businesses in a State were supposed to be able to buy insurance for their workers, to be able to shop for it, be able to get something that is affordable. That is the promise made by Democrats who voted for this health care law.

Democrats actually gave speeches on the floor about small businesses being able to find affordable insurance. This program was supposed to open last year, but just like the failed exchanges the President set up, when the exchanges opened October 1, this was not ready to go. So what the Obama administration did is they said: We will delay it for a year, because the program was not ready. So they left all of the businesses kind of in a lurch. Now they say it might be ready this fall. Well, time will tell.

Here is what the Wall Street Journal found in an article last month, June 10. They ran a headline that said, "Some small business employees to have only one health plan choice: 18 states will offer only one plan when small-business exchanges open."

The Democrats promised a lot more than that. Those who voted for that promised a lot more. Those who gave speeches promised a lot more. But in 18 States, there will be only one plan when they finally get it open, 18 States where workers and small businesses will not have any choice among insurance plans and no competition, and Alaska is one of them. Less choice, less competition, and of course that means higher premiums.

People all across the country are experiencing higher premiums. That is

the thing that causes so much anger and anxiety among families all across the country. When that letter comes—and the newspaper stories are already starting to get out there, as well as television, radio, reading about it on the Internet—the question is: How much higher?

The President promised \$2,500 lower premiums. Nobody believes that. Nobody in America believes the President of the United States and the promise he made. It is a sad situation when the President is not believed by anyone. But yet that is what we have. He made a promise: \$2,500 per family lower. People all know that prices are going higher. The question is: How much higher?

This is what an article said in the Alaska Dispatch: "Alaska's small businesses feel pinch of rising health care costs." The article tells a story of a restaurant owner with 24 employees. He is paying about \$5,000 a month more than he paid last year for his share of his workers' insurance. That is about a 40-percent increase over last year—40 percent. The President said it was going to go down. This is a 40-percent increase. This small business owner in Alaska says the costs are "crippling" and he said it is like meeting another payroll every month. This small business owner says:

It's killing me. I just don't know how long we can keep absorbing these costs.

Those costs are a devastating side effect of the health care law. Democrats voted for it. Every Democrat in the Senate voted for that. There was a story on television up there, channel 13, a television station in Anchorage, KYUR. They aired a story last month about Linda Peters. She is another local business owner. She had 14 employees. She pays for the health insurance for her employees. Her share of the premium has gone up, gone up from \$600 per person 2 years ago to \$950 today. She says it has gotten so expensive that she has had to shift the cost of employees' dependents back to her workers.

So she was providing insurance for the dependents of the employees, but now she is not able to do that. Why? Because of the President's health care law. She told the TV station, "It was really tragic, it's enraging in fact, as employers who care about our employees." "Tragic and enraging."

But the President forced this on her and every Democrat in this body, every Democratic Senator who voted for this.

This woman in Alaska: Tragic and enraging. She is looking into dropping insurance coverage altogether. She pays her employees well so they will not get a subsidy in the State exchange. So here is a small business owner who can speak personally about the expensive, the tragic, and the enraging side effects of the Obama health care law on her employees.

Of course, there is a lot of uncertainty about what happens next and how much rates might continue to go up. Of course, that makes it even worse. The business owner said:

I just can't penalize my employees by dropping the plan, and I can't figure out: Where am I going to get the money? It's frightening. What happens next year?

That is a big concern, what happens next year. People worry about next year. They budget for next year. They plan for next year. They think about their expenses, balancing it with their income. President Obama says: The Democrats who voted for this law—in the President's own words—should forcefully defend and be proud—should forcefully defend and be proud—of the health care law.

Are Democrats in this Senate who voted for this health care law proud? Are they proud of what the law is doing to these people in Alaska and other States? Are Democrats willing to come to this floor and forcefully defend and be proud of the extra stress, the extra costs they are causing for these people all across the country?

According to a recent study by the Manhattan Institute, people in Alaska are paying a hospital more for their coverage. They found the premiums of the average 64-year-old woman in Alaska would have been \$693 a month in 2013. That is before they were forced onto the ObamaCare exchange. But in 2014, buying insurance from the exchange, her premiums jumped to \$813 a month. She is paying \$1,400 more this year than she did last year because of the specifics of the health care law.

For a 27-year-old man, he would have paid an average of \$130 a month in 2013. But under the health care law and the exchange, he now pays \$284 a month. That is more than double. That is an extra \$1,800 more this year than it was last year.

Is there a Senator in this body who will come to the floor and forcefully defend the fact that there are these people all across America who are paying twice as much for insurance because of the health care law?

Democrats did not solve the problem with our health care system. They just mandated coverage, and mandated more expensive coverage. They made it more expensive and they have more mandates. People wanted reform that gave them access to quality affordable care, not more expensive coverage.

Republicans have offered solutions, solutions for patient-centered care, for patient-centered health care reform. We have talked about things such as increasing the ability of small businesses to be able to join together and negotiate better rates, about expanding health savings accounts, and allowing people to shop for and buy health insurance in other States that work best for them and for their families.

In 18 States, including Alaska, the small business exchange will offer just one choice for insurance. Shopping in other States could increase competition and help lower premiums for people who work for those small businesses.

That would have been a simple solution that works and helps people actually afford coverage and care. It is not

what Democrats did with their health care law, but it is what Republicans are offering. We have suggested ideas to get people the care they need from a doctor they choose at lower costs—not higher costs with a subsidy for some people, but actually lowering the cost for everyone.

Republicans are going to keep coming to the floor. We are going to keep offering real solutions for better health care without all of these tragic side effects.

I am sure that tomorrow there will be another headline and another one the day after that of people who have been harmed by the health care law as we see more and more and hear from more and more Americans who feel the President has not kept his promises, that the Democrats who voted for the health care law have failed the American people and have failed to answer the concerns of the American people, which was affordable quality care.

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

#### RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:31 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Ms. BALDWIN).

#### BIPARTISAN SPORTSMEN'S ACT OF 2014—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 3:15 p.m. will be controlled by the majority and the time from 3:15 p.m. to 4:15 p.m. will be controlled by the Republicans.

The Senator from Vermont.

#### COST OF WAR

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, I wanted to say a few words about the conference committee in terms of legislation protecting the health of our veterans. We are working hard on it in the Senate, the House is working hard on it, and our staffs have been meeting. I have been in touch often with Chairman MILLER in the House. We had, I thought, a very productive conference committee before we left.

As we continue to proceed, if there is anything I have learned since I have been chairman of the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs, it is that I think as a people, as a nation, we underestimate the cost of war, and before anyone votes to go to war again I think they should fully appreciate the repercussions of that vote.

What going to war means is not—as in the case of Afghanistan and Iraq—losing some 6,700 brave men and women. That is a terrible loss, but I also want people to remember the families, the wives, the kids, the mothers, and the impact that loss has had on their lives and the need for us to pro-

tect those wives and those children to make sure they can have the quality of life they are entitled to despite their loss.

But it is not only loss of life. We have had in this war a horrendous epidemic of men and women coming home with post-traumatic stress disorder. I am not sure of exactly the number, but it could be as high as 500,000 men and women coming home from war with PTSD and that is a very difficult illness which needs a lot of care and that illness, again, impacts the entire family—wives, kids. It impacts the ability of a worker to go out and get a job to earn an income. That is a cost of war.

Needless to say, the cost of war is the many who came home without legs, who came home without arms, who came home without eyesight. The cost of war is a high divorce rate for folks who come home who cannot readjust well into their family life. The cost of war is an extremely high rate of suicides. The cost of war is widows who are now having to rebuild their lives. And on and on it goes. The bottom line is the cost of war is enormous in terms of human suffering and the impact on not only the individual who fought in that war but on the entire family.

As I think our colleagues know, several weeks ago Senator MCCAIN and I put together a proposal to deal with the current crisis at the VA, and I am very proud that legislation passed the Senate by a vote of 93 to 3.

What are we dealing with? What is the cost of this proposal? This is an expensive proposal because the cost of war is expensive. What a VA audit told us is that more than 57,000 veterans are waiting to be scheduled for medical appointments. These are the folks who are on these waiting lists, some of which were secret, some of which had data manipulated. These are folks who should have been getting into the VA for timely health care but who were not. On top of that, there is an unknown number of veterans who are on no lists because of poor work being done at the VA. They were not on any list. How many there are we don't know, but many of those people need to be seen.

So what our legislation does is say we are going to make certain that all of these veterans who are waiting for health care—who have waited far too long for health care—will, in fact, get health care as soon as they possibly can, and they will get that health care either through private physicians, they will get that health care in community health centers, they will get that health care at the Department of Defense military bases, they will get that health care at the Indian Health Service, but they will get that health care in a timely manner, and that is going to be an expensive proposition. We cannot provide health care to tens and tens of thousands of veterans in a short period of time outside of the VA without spending a substantial sum of money.

No. 2, long-term, what is clear to me and I think to anybody who has studied the issue is that if we are serious about eliminating these waiting lists and getting people into the VA in a timely manner, we have to make sure that at every facility in this country the VA has the requisite number of doctors, nurses, and other types of personnel they need in order to accommodate the growing numbers of people who are coming into the VA.

If we are talking about hiring thousands of doctors in a moment, by the way, where we have a very serious doctor shortage in this country, that is going to be an expensive proposition, as well as hiring the nurses and other personnel and building or leasing the space we need. That is issue No. 2. That is going to be expensive, but long term, if we are serious about keeping our commitment to the men and women who put their lives on the line to defend this country, that is exactly what we have to do.

The third area in this legislation which is going to be expensive is we have now for the first time said to veterans that if they are living a distance away from a VA facility, more than 40 miles, they are going to be able to go to a private doctor. That will cost us some money as well.

Mr. DURBIN. Will the Senator from Vermont yield for a question through the Chair?

Mr. SANDERS. I am happy to yield the floor to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. I don't ask the Senator to yield the floor, but I would, through the Chair, address the Senator from Vermont.

First, I thank the Senator for his bipartisan effort with Senator JOHN MCCAIN which led to an overwhelmingly bipartisan vote on the floor of the Senate to address what we consider to be a crisis in the Veterans' Administration. Press reports have suggested in the most extreme situation that some veterans' lives were being compromised because of the failure of providing timely care to these veterans. It resulted in an investigation of VA facilities all across the United States. It resulted in the resignation of the Secretary of the Veterans' Administration and promises for dramatic reform, but I have to say to the Senator from Vermont what he has accomplished with Senator MCCAIN is tangible.

I would like to ask him two or three questions about the current state of affairs. How long ago was it that we passed on the floor of the Senate this bipartisan measure?

Secondly, did this measure involve emergency spending to deal with the emergency in the Veterans' Administration?

Third, did the House version of their VA reform include the resources the Senator from Vermont mentioned, the new doctors, the new nurses, the new facilities to accommodate this wave of veterans. Those are the three questions that I think are critical.

I close by saying thank you again and again, because as chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the Senator has reminded us of the real cost of war.

There are many people who vote quickly to go to war who will not vote quickly to pay for the care we promised our veterans when they come home. Thank you for caring.

Mr. SANDERS. I very much thank the Senator. Let me answer the very last question first, and I will go through the others.

I think throughout the history of this country, not only in Iraq and Afghanistan, I think as a people we have underestimated the real cost of war. There was no word called PTSD at the end of World War II, but anyone who thinks that men and women did not come home from war suffering from that ailment would be very mistaken. So the cost of war is real, and it is not just missiles and tanks and guns. If this country means anything, we take care of all of those who serve, to the last day of their lives, when they need that care. I don't have the date in front of me, but I think it was about 3 weeks ago when we passed that legislation by a huge vote. I think there were only 3 people who voted against it. It was a vote of 93 to 3—huge bipartisan support for the bill.

But equally important, to answer the important question raised by the Senator from Illinois, there was also an overwhelming understanding that paying for this bill is a cost of war. It has to be emergency funded, and in a strong bipartisan vote the Senate said, yes, that is how we are going to pay for it.

In terms of the House bill, the House bill was a reasonable bill, but they did not go into the detail we did in terms of how it will be paid. But the major point I do want to make—I was just going to get to that and I appreciate the Senator from Illinois raising it. This bill is not going to be paid for by cutting education or food stamps. That isn't going to happen. That isn't going to happen, first of all, because it is not going to happen and, second of all, it would be grossly disrespectful to the veterans of this country. The veterans of this country need help. They need help now. This legislation must be passed as soon as possible, and it must be passed in terms of the emergency funding. This is a cost of war.

I would ask my friend from Illinois, the whip, can he recall what kind of programs were offset and what kind of taxes were raised to pay for the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan?

Mr. DURBIN. Through the Chair, I would answer the Senator, without asking him to yield the floor, and say this: When we decided to embark on the invasion of Iraq and the invasion of Afghanistan, it was with at least the understanding of then-President Bush that these would be costs that would be added to the deficit of the United States. We would not be paying as we

fought. We would be waging a war, spending the money necessary to wage it successfully, and we would deal with the cost of it at a later moment in time. Many of us, even those of us who voted against the invasion of Iraq—and I was 1 of 23 on the floor of the Senate voting against it—voted for the resources to wage the war, saying if our men and women in uniform are risking their lives, we will stand by them, equip them, and bring them home safely. I also believed and understood that I had an obligation to every one of those men and women in uniform, having promised them that if they would risk their lives for America and come home needing our help, whether it is health care or education or the basics of life, we would be there.

I say to the Senator from Vermont thank you for reminding us of the pledge made by America to these veterans and I believe the pledge made by Republicans and Democrats in Congress to stand by them when they came home.

Mr. SANDERS. The Senator is exactly right. While no one is quite exactly clear how much those two wars will end up costing us, the estimate is between \$3 and \$6 trillion. The point Senator DURBIN made is even those who voted against the war—and I did as well—understood that when we sent men and women off to battle they would have to have all of the resources they needed to do their mission. Equally important, what we are saying now is when they come home wounded in body, wounded in spirit, we need them to have the resources they require to make their lives whole again. That is a moral obligation. I thank the Senator for raising that point.

I will yield the floor in a second, but first I will conclude by saying that I want to see this bill passed as soon as possible. We are working as hard as we possibly can, but anyone who magically thinks the only problem facing the VA is more accountability and better management is not correct. We do need better management at the VA, we do need more accountability at the VA, and this legislation will provide that.

People who are incompetent and people who are dishonest should be fired. There must be more transparency, and there certainly must be a much clearer chain of command that goes from Washington to regional hospitals and facilities and back up again.

At the end of the day, the best management in the world is not going to provide the quality and timely health care veterans need unless we have the doctors, nurses, and other medical personnel, and that is the simple fact. Excellent management, yes; transparency, yes; fire incompetent people, yes; but we also need the doctors and nurses to provide quality and timely care to the veterans of our country.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Ms. HIRONO. Madam President, it has been 2 weeks since the House and

Senate Veterans' Affairs Committees held our first conference meeting to fix the VA health care system. It is a disservice to our veterans that we have not met again. My fellow conferees and I should be at the table actively negotiating a path forward.

Chairman SANDERS is right when he says the situation at the VA is an emergency. I had the opportunity to meet with veterans last week in Hilo, HI. My discussion with them underscored the urgency of addressing the longstanding issues at the VA.

For those who have not visited Hawaii, Hilo is on the Big Island of Hawaii, and it is home to volcanoes, rain forests, and just about every other climate. It is also twice as big as the rest of Hawaii's islands combined. In fact, it is roughly the size of Connecticut but with only a fraction of the population. It can take hours to drive from Hilo to the second largest town, Kailua-Kona. Of the roughly 143,000 people living on the island, 15,000 are veterans.

I am raising these facts because I want my colleagues to understand that veterans in communities like those who live on Hawaii Island need our help and they need it now.

The veterans I met in Hilo expressed to me that they cannot get care anywhere other than the VA on the Big Island, as private physicians are few and far between. In fact, while 90 percent of Hawaii Island residents have health insurance, there is a serious physician shortage. This results in long wait times for non-VA health care. Given these long wait times for private physicians, Big Island veterans rely on VA for their primary care. Those Hawaii Island veterans who have private insurance have, out of their own pockets, paid for flights to the island of Oahu to get the care they need. This means over \$300 out-of-pocket just to get to their medical appointments. The \$300 does not include any costs associated with the care itself.

This is another reason that expanding access to non-VA providers is needed to immediately address the VA health care emergency. With this expansion, we must ensure that every veteran in our country, whether rural or urban, can more easily get the care they need if the VA is unable to accommodate them. Rural and urban veterans in Hawaii and across our Nation deserve better.

A recent audit of the VA in Hawaii found that veterans were waiting over 140 days to receive care. A more recent update found that while progress is being made, the wait is still over 100 days. Nationwide, nearly 60,000 veterans are waiting simply to get an appointment, and of course that is unacceptable. This is why I stand eager and ready to work with my Senate and House colleagues to ensure that the veterans of this country get the care they need and the benefits they have earned.

This conference committee must reconvene as soon as possible to move

forward on the important task to finalize legislation that does three important things: No. 1, directly addresses the emergency circumstances that have been uncovered at the Veterans' Administration; No. 2, ensures that all of our veterans receive access to the care they deserve; and No. 3, begins the long-term work of restoring veterans' trust not only in the VA but in Congress's ability to effectively oversee the VA and provide the resources necessary to care for our veterans.

Nearly the entire Senate agrees that the current VA situation is an emergency and that Congress must act. I am hopeful we can all agree on that point, but my fellow conferees need to be at the table now, face to face, to work out solutions to make the VA work for our veterans.

I hope we will include provisions in the Senate-passed legislation that will provide for 26 major medical facility leases and provide for the resources and authority to expedite hiring of VA doctors and nurses.

In addition, while I agree that accountability of executives is needed, we should avoid politicizing the non-appointed civil service process and allow some due process for VA employees.

Furthermore, our veterans rely on the services of qualified, committed professionals at the VA. In fact, the veterans I met with last week indicated that they really liked VA care; however, they were concerned that VA doctors were already overstretched in terms of patients. I don't believe that simply telling VA doctors to see more patients is the only or best answer, nor is it enough to allow veterans to seek care from private providers. We should be doing more to attract more health professionals to VA, especially primary care providers. We have to recognize the long-term benefits of attracting a high-quality workforce to VA and that we can improve accountability in a carefully balanced way.

Investing in the VA is an essential step toward building back the trust of our veterans.

I understand my colleagues' concerns with the cost of the proposals before us, but inaction will not overcome those concerns. Those of us serving as conferees need to sit down and discuss how to get our veterans what they need quickly. The time for action is now. Veterans in Hawaii and across the country are counting on us and deserve no less.

I yield the remainder of my time and note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### GUN VIOLENCE

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Madam President, I wish to begin by thanking my

colleague, the senior Senator from Illinois, for his very eloquent and powerful remarks on the need to address gun violence in this country and to do it as part of our consideration of the Bipartisan Sportsmen's Act. I look forward to joining with him in the coming days—in fact, perhaps in the coming hours—in offering commonsense, sensible measures that will give us the opportunity to help stop gun violence in this country, addressing domestic violence as well, which so often leads to gun violence. Women are five times more likely to be killed in domestic violence when there is a gun in the home. The Senator from Illinois also addressed straw purchases and issues relating to drug trafficking. We have raised those and other issues in the past but have not yet successfully passed legislation in the Senate, not even addressed it in depth.

So I hope we will have the opportunity in these next couple of days to consider these kinds of measures, because the scourge of gun violence is continuing in our neighborhoods and on our streets, just as it took the lives of 20 beautiful children and 6 great educators in Newtown, CT, almost a year and a half ago, and 2 more people on Sunday on the east side of Bridgeport alone, and tens of thousands of others. It continues to cause death and injury and costs in lost lives and dollars throughout this country. We have an obligation as part of this measure to do better than we have in dealing with this tremendous, horrific, and unspeakable problem. It affects so many innocent children, particularly the children who are affected in urban neighborhoods where there are driveby shootings; in rural neighborhoods all across the country; in our cities and on our streets and in our schools.

We have an obligation to do better and to put priorities first when it comes to the use of guns. I understand the reasons for expanding or providing more opportunities in this bill that may involve firearms, but first things first. Let's cure the safety of the country. Let's consider commonsense, sensible measures on gun control before we expand the use of guns and firearms in this country.

#### VETERANS' HEALTH CARE

I am here as well to address the separate, unrelated issue of doing better to care for our veterans. The Veterans Access to Care Through Choice, Accountability, and Transparency Act of 2014 is now in conference. I am on that conference committee. This body passed that bill by an overwhelming bipartisan majority of 93 to 3 on June 11. It is a comprehensive bill to start addressing the problems that came to our attention so dramatically. There were reports of deadly delays, destruction of documents, manipulation of data, and falsification of records, as well as tragic reports of unacceptable wait times that were concealed at VA health care facilities. Books were cooked and criminal wrongdoing was covered up.

That is the reason I have called for a criminal investigation, and one has now begun. I hope it will produce accountability from the health care system of the VA.

More fundamentally, we have an obligation in the Senate and in the Congress to address the underlying issues that led to those deadly wait times and delays, the cooking of books and covering it up that has so dramatically undermined trust and confidence in the VA health care system. If anything, since June 11, the problem seems to have worsened. In fact, comparing May to July, the recently released figures of July 3—just last week—the numbers of medical appointments delayed for longer than 30 days has tripled in Connecticut and doubled nationwide. Nationwide, that number has gone from 242,069—roughly a quarter of a million veterans whose appointments were postponed by 30 days or more—to 636,436. That is the number of veterans waiting longer than 30 days for an appointment. In Connecticut, the comparable numbers are 998 to 2,727—a tripling of the appointments delayed for longer than 30 days. In other parts of the country at other clinics and facilities, those numbers quadrupled.

The possible good news is that maybe—just maybe—the doubling, tripling, quadrupling of those numbers of appointments longer than 30 days delayed means the numbers are more accurate and truthful. We don't know. I have demanded an explanation. I have written to the Acting Secretary of the VA, Sloan Gibson, calling for a public explanation for these numbers and the very alarming and astonishing trends, drastic and dramatic increases in those numbers of appointments suffering from delays.

Justice Brandeis once said:

Publicity is justly commended as a remedy for social and industrial diseases. Sunlight is said to be the best of disinfectants.

These chronic failings at the VA demand a better explanation. Veterans deserve to know if things have gotten worse or is the reporting just better. All of us—the public whose taxpayer monies fund the VA—deserve the same kind of explanation. There should be a criminal investigation if there has been obstruction of justice and destruction of documents and falsification of records which involve Federal criminal wrongdoing.

The act we now have in conference committee will help address many of these problems looking forward, moving ahead, by providing more access to private doctors and private hospitals outside the VA system to minimize and reduce and perhaps even eliminate those unacceptable waiting times of longer than 30 days for an appointment. It will provide more doctors—more than \$500 million for that purpose alone. It will impose accountability by enabling easier firing and seeking to, in effect, claw back, or at best stop, some of the financial incentives that may have driven the false reporting.

In those ways and a variety of others, this bill will help us move forward and achieve progress.

No one should be under any illusion that this bill alone will solve all the problems. It is not a panacea. It is not a permanent solution to the VA's problems. We need, for starters, a new leader. The VA has no permanent Secretary. The confirmation of a new one is imperative. But tough questions are absolutely essential to determine whether the President's nominee should be the one to lead this agency, and I am certainly hoping he will be.

The Veterans' Affairs conference committee met on June 24. I emphasized the importance at that hearing of honoring the commitment of our men and women in uniform by addressing the VA challenges with adequate funding and essential legislation. I am hopeful we will move quickly and effectively after that first June 24 meeting now to present to both Houses a final version of this bill so we can truly address the problems our veterans deserve to have solved and the VA has an obligation to eliminate. We need to assure that the differences between the two bodies are resolved and send this bill to the President for his signature. A country that really values its veterans, truly honors their service, should not subject them to waiting delays, secret waiting lists, and false records. This broad, bipartisan, historic bill to ensure that delays in treatment are eliminated and bad actors at the VA health centers are held accountable is a critical step to keep faith with our veterans and let us move forward quickly and responsibly with this bill.

Thank you, Madam President. I yield the floor and 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. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

#### AFGHANISTAN

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, there are a few of us who want to come down and talk a little bit about specific things in our States that are reaching a crisis point by having to participate in ObamaCare. But before doing that I want to make just one comment to make sure it is in the RECORD and that we can talk about the election that took place over in Afghanistan.

We have had quite a time over there. We have lost actually 2,197 of our own troops in Afghanistan, and we have had about ten times that many who have been injured. So it has been a real crisis for a lot of people. For a long period of time things had been going well. I think when the decision was made by this President to pull everything out at a given time things started turning

around a little bit. Now they are in the middle of a—in Afghanistan the election took place. I know we are not supposed to say this, and there is no official position—I want to make that clear—by the United States of America, but to me there are two people running against each other. There is a good guy and a bad guy—that holdover from the old administration, whose name is Ashraf Ghani, who is Karzai's chosen one, who is one who would continue to go in a lack of leadership and not take advantage of the opportunities they have right now; then Abdullah Abdullah is the other one.

My concern with this—and I expressed this concern on the Senate floor about 3 weeks ago. I said: I know we have deadlines. We are going to have a primary, which we already had. Then we are going to have a primary runoff. Then on June 22, which is 2 weeks from today, there will be an official declaration as to who won the primary runoff.

The Presiding Officer is fully familiar with this. We talked about that this morning. Well, in this runoff situation, we have found a lot of discrepancies. It seems to me that while I consider one guy to be the good one and one to be the bad one, all of the mistakes that were made and the irregularities that were found were found in favor of Ashraf Ghani, as opposed to Abdullah Abdullah.

Let me give you an example. In one of the provinces—it was the Wardak Province—Ghani's vote count went from about 17,000 in April to 170,000 in the runoff. Stop and think about that. That is almost mathematically impossible. When you consider the number of registered voters there, this number actually exceeds the number of registered voters. So you went from 17,000 in the same province when they went through the primary back in April, and then that jumped up by tenfold to 170,000 in the runoff. That is an increase of 1,000 percent over April's result. All of those, of course, were in an area where—it is in a part of the country where Ghani's vote was more favorable.

Then the other thing I think is unprecedented, I think we all know in our own States, whether it is in West Virginia, Oklahoma, or any of the rest of them, the vote percentage turnout is less in rural areas than it is in urban areas. In urban areas you have to go next door to vote. It is very convenient. In many rural areas, certainly in my State of Oklahoma, you have to drive maybe 30 or 40 miles to vote. So the percentage turnout is less. It happens that Ghani's support comes from the rural areas. In this runoff election that just took place, they had a 75-percent turnout in those areas. At the same time, in the urban areas, they only had a 24-percent turnout.

First of all, I do not think we can name one election in history that had a larger turnout in a rural area than it did the urban areas in the same elec-

tion. So we are looking at something that could not happen and logically it did not happen. That was something that certainly worked in the favor of Ghani's election.

Right now everyone agrees on one thing; that is, that the election was at least falsified. If not, it was just a rigged election. There are a lot of organizations out there—the European Union, for example, and the U.N. and other groups such as OSCE, which is the Office of Security and Cooperation in Europe—that all agree we should have an audit of this election—at least an audit which should include some independent source. So I want to get on record now, because I fear if nothing is done in the next 14 days, he will be declared the winner, with these discrepancies, I think that would be doing a great disservice to the people of Afghanistan. They would lose faith in their system, because what I am saying here on the Senate floor they already know.

#### HEALTH CARE

Let me jump into another area I am very interested in, as is every Member of this body. I can remember back in the 1990s we had what was referred to as "Hillary health care." At that time, there were several members of Parliament—one of them was up here and we had a hearing. That person said: You know, it is hard for us in the United Kingdom to understand why we have had this type of socialized medicine for as many years as I can remember—this is his quote. He said:

Yet we are now finally realizing that your system over in the United States is a much better system. We are now starting to discard the whole socialized medicine system.

That is something we saw way back in the 1990s. It came again with the Affordable Care Act or ObamaCare. We have a lot of examples in my State of Oklahoma, heartbreaking accounts. Since the rollout last fall, my office has been flooded with stories from Oklahomans who found ObamaCare to be one massive broken promise from President Obama.

These stories include a woman from Broken Arrow, OK, who reported a 20-percent increase in her monthly premiums.

A father from Owasso, OK, shared a story—I talked to all of these individuals personally—of his son and daughter who serve as missionaries in Indonesia. Their health care deductibles in the United States have more than doubled from \$1,200 per person to \$2,600 a person.

One teacher, a public schoolteacher from Copan, OK, who teaches—actually not in public school, it is adjunct college classes. She shared that not only did she have her work hours cut but is now paying \$950 a month in premiums for health care with a \$6,000 deductible.

Another teacher from Sallisaw, OK—that happens to be the strawberry capital of the world in case you guys did not know that—shared that her deductible increased by \$1,000 from last year.

A man from Noble told us his company modified health plans to match the ObamaCare requirements. It is a company he owns. He says these changes cost him a 40-percent increase in his out-of-pocket expenses and his premium costs.

A man from Tulsa who lives actually in my same neighborhood has a family of five. He works for a small business. He shared with us that he is now paying \$4,000 more for insurance than he had paid a year ago.

This November, a new open enrollment period will begin in at least one State, Virginia, which has already reported an astounding 22-percent increase over the past year.

All of that is happening. People from any State, any of the 50 States, could come down and talk about the individual cases in their States. We have one good thing that is going on right now. We have a great attorney general by the name of Scott Pruitt. Scott Pruitt, the attorney general from Oklahoma, has a lawsuit. It is called *Pruitt v. Burwell*. Oklahoma has standing to proceed on a case that the IRS acted beyond Congress's intent in its effort to impose penalties in States that have Federal exchanges.

We have 36 States that have Federal exchanges. These exchanges are—well, first of all, the administration had a motion to dismiss. It was overruled 11 months ago, so this is a real case. The State has asked for summary judgment.

Success in this case would mean the dismantling of the ObamaCare employer and individual mandates for all 36 States that have at least a partially federally facilitated exchange. I guess you can say it might end up being our attorney general from the State of Oklahoma is going to be the one who is going to be the most successful in doing something about this thing we should have learned a long time ago was not going to work.

I have a personal interest in this, having had—there are states or countries that have socialized medicine. We have Canada, we have Great Britain, we have many other countries. In making a study of these, you find there is limited coverage for people when they reach a certain age.

I see our good friend from Wyoming who is a medical doctor. He has given his second opinion many times. In one of those he talked about you get past a certain age, you are unable to get the treatment. I happen to have had occasion to have four bypasses at an age when in some countries I would not have qualified.

It is something we have been very active in. We are going to hopefully be the heroes from the State of Oklahoma in offering relief to at least 36 of our States.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I appreciate the comments from the Senator

from Oklahoma who, like the Senator from Wyoming who is on the floor here with us here today, has heard from many of his constituents about the impact ObamaCare is having on them, the real-world economic impact.

I have received countless letters from my constituents in South Dakota telling me about the challenges they are facing because of ObamaCare. Those challenges consist of the economic costs associated with the new health care law: higher premiums, higher deductibles, higher copays, the loss of the doctors they like, the burden the law is placing on their businesses if they are an employer, and less control and less freedom, which is something that is important to so many Americans, particularly when it comes to their health care.

I want to take a few moments to highlight some of the stories that constituents of mine have shared with me. I know the Senator from Wyoming is here to do the same, to talk about the impact not only in his State of Wyoming but all across the country.

One person named Erik from southeast South Dakota wrote to me to tell me his family's health care plan was cancelled thanks to ObamaCare. His old plan was \$448 a month, with a \$5,000 deductible and a 20-percent copay after that. The cheapest bronze plan he could find was \$987 a month, more than double what he was paying before, with a \$6,500 deductible and a 40-percent copay. He said, "This means that I would need to incur about \$26,000 in eligible medical expenses each year before insurance is a benefit to me."

Then there is Megan from McCook County, SD, who contacted me to tell me the cheapest plan she could find for her family of 4 would cost her a staggering \$17,000. Seventeen thousand dollars. That is more than some people pay for their mortgage in an entire year.

Randy from Hot Springs, SD, contacted me to tell me an exchange plan similar to his old insurance plan is \$1,222 a month, almost 2½ times the cost of his old insurance plan.

Sheri, from a small town in Minnehaha County, said:

Next year, our insurance is changing, and I will lose my family practice doctor of 22 years—the doctor that delivered all my children and that has cared for our teenage children all of their lives. We'll also lose all of the back-up doctors our family has seen when we couldn't see our regular doctor. . . . I was happy with my insurance, and now I have to lose my doctor.

Then there is Denny from Rapid City, SD, who told me the following:

My insurance company cancelled my policy. I am currently paying over \$800 a month for a family of four. . . . If I sign up for ObamaCare, I would be paying over \$2,500 a month. I cannot think of any way this is considered affordable health care!

Linda, a small business owner and operator from a small town along the Missouri River, wrote this:

We need your help. . . . We have one full-time employee, and we provide health care

coverage for him, his wife, and their children. . . . Our monthly premium in 2013 was \$2,964.20 or \$35,570.40 annually. Our monthly premium—as a result of the "Affordable Care Act"—for 2014 is \$3,524.75 or \$42,297 annually.

A huge increase from what they were paying before, from 2013 to 2014.

She says:

I have been told by our agent to expect even more substantial increases in 2015. This is very frightening for us.

Lyle from Brookings, SD, said that thanks to ObamaCare, his monthly premium almost doubled and his deductible doubled.

He says:

I'm a small business owner, and would like to hire an employee next spring. Well, that's not going to happen!

We were told that ObamaCare would lower costs and make health care more affordable. Instead, it has driven up costs for these Americans and for many others. What middle-class family can afford to spend \$17,000 a year on insurance? How can a small business with one employee afford a \$7,000 yearly hike in insurance premiums? The answer is they cannot.

As if high health care prices were not enough, ObamaCare is also damaging many Americans' job prospects.

There is the 30-hour workweek rule, which is forcing many employers to cut their employees' hours. There is the medical device tax, which has already resulted in thousands and thousands of lost jobs in the industry and will likely result in many more if it isn't repealed. There is the employer mandate, which is discouraging many employers from expanding and hiring new employees. And there are the many rules and regulations that are placing a huge financial and logistical burden on small businesses.

ObamaCare isn't working. It was supposed to help Americans. Instead, it is hurting them. It is time to start over and to replace this law with real health care reforms—reforms that will actually lower costs for Americans, give them back their health care choices, and improve access to care.

That is what we ought to be doing. But, unfortunately, we have lots of folks here in this Chamber who are trying as desperately as they can to run away from the issue without fixing it.

So as we get into these November elections and the run-up to them, a lot of vulnerable Democrats who voted for this are looking for a way out. But in many cases this was their signature achievement. This is the President's signature law. So they own it. They own that vote. Yet they are trying to figure out a way to spin it to the American people so that it will come across in a different way than the reality the American people are experiencing.

This is the headline in Politico from yesterday: ObamaCare "War Room Prepares for Sept. Surprise." They know there is more bad news coming out in September of this year when the new insurance rates are announced to kick in.



So what is the White House doing? They have six people assigned to congressional Democrats to help do damage control in their States or their districts when this bad news comes out. And it inevitably will because there is no way that all the new mandates and requirements associated with this law don't lead to higher prices—in addition to all the higher taxes that go with it.

So the headline is the “War Room Prepares for Sept. Surprise,” and it goes on to detail how they are trying their best to spin this in a way that confuses the American people into thinking it is something better than it is. Unfortunately for the spinners, the reality that most Americans are confronting and experiencing is a very different one—and that is the reality I talked about earlier: higher premiums, higher deductibles, higher copays, fewer choices when it comes to doctors and hospitals, fewer full-time jobs and more part-time jobs as employers look for ways to avoid dealing with these mandates and requirements that are imposed under ObamaCare. But it is forcing more and more people onto part-time jobs when they would like to be working full time. That is why last week when the jobs numbers came out and people were hailing the numbers—sure, there was some good news there. But there was an awful lot of bad news, and one of the bad news items was that a good majority were actually part-time and not full-time jobs.

Why? One of the reasons is the mandates and requirements under ObamaCare and the institution of a 30-hour workweek, which is forcing employers to hire employees for fewer than 30 hours so they don't get stuck with having to provide government-approved health care, which would dramatically increase what they are paying for health care today.

That is the reality that most Americans are confronting. I hope at some point, as these realities continue to sink in with the American people, their elected officials here in Washington will come together and realize this isn't working; it is not working for employers; and it is not working for middle-class families in this country who are increasingly squeezed by these higher costs; and it certainly isn't working for our economy.

I know the Senator from Wyoming, Mr. BARRASSO, who has been mentioned by the Senator from Oklahoma, is a physician and understands these issues very well and has spoken at great length here on the floor about ObamaCare and its impacts. I know he is going to share some of the stories that he has received from not only the people he represents from the State of Wyoming but from those around the country who are feeling the impacts of this law.

So would I yield for the Senator from Wyoming.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I join my colleague from South Dakota and

agree with what he is seeing in South Dakota and I am seeing in Wyoming and that people all across the country are seeing with regard to the President's health care law. People are very concerned because it hits them in their pocketbook.

What we are seeing is that people's premiums are going up. The deductible that they have to pay before they get to use their insurance is going way up. The copay that they have to make has gone way up.

So in terms of people's actual pocketbook issues and the things that concern them, they are paying more and getting less, and it is because of the mandates in the Obama health care law.

The President of the United States says: “Forcefully defend and be proud” of this law. Yet day after day, I don't see Democrats who voted for the health care law coming to the floor to forcefully defend or be proud of it. And there is very little to be proud of.

We all get letters from people in our home States. I was home over the Fourth of July visiting around the State, going to many communities. I haven't run into anyone who says this has actually significantly helped make their life better. People have come up to me at parade routes, rodeos—all the different places we have been—and they have great concerns about the health care law and the impact on their own personal life, what money is left over at the end of the day to help put food on the table, to get the kids off to school, clothing for the kids, and how the impact of the health care law is making it harder and lowering the quality of life in spite of the President's promises, which they say are just not true.

I got a letter from a young woman, Shelly in Worland, WY, in Washakie County, in the center of the State. I know the community very well. She writes to me:

I know you have heard my story a hundred times, but I feel maybe one more won't hurt.

She wanted to share what is going on in her specific life in Wyoming related to the health care law.

Yesterday in the mail I received a notice that my . . . health insurance will go from \$637 to \$897, and my \$10,000 deductible is now \$11,000.

So her premiums have gone up and the deductible has gone up. It is a double whammy hitting her. But, she says:

My plan now meets the requirements of the health care reform law.

And let's be serious about this. The requirements of the health care law mandate that many people all across the country end up buying much more insurance than they ever will need, ever will want, and will ever use. But it has to comply with what the Federal Government says they need.

The families of Wyoming have a better idea of what they need for their health insurance than Barack Obama has in terms of what he thinks they might need. The families of Wyoming

know what they need much more so than the Democrats in this body who voted the mandates onto these people and said they have to have all of this insurance. This woman doesn't need it, doesn't want it, and is not going to use it. Yet she is paying more out of her pocket, impacting that family's life so it can comply with the health care law instead of what is best for her and her family.

She goes on to say:

My husband is self employed on the family farm, and I am also self employed at a beauty shop. Needless to say we have always pinched our pennies. My children are all grown, my two daughters are both kindergarten teachers in our wonderful state, and my son is working with us on the farm. We have worked very hard not to use any of the government assistance raising our children on less than \$30,000 a year.

We are talking about hardworking families from all across the country pinching their pennies, making sure that they use their money wisely, not relying on the government. That is what we have here.

So now I am forced to enter the health care reform circus.

That is what this is. This is a circus forced down the throats of the American people by the Democrats in this body and by the President of the United States who forced this onto the American people, this health care reform circus.

I know I missed the deadline because I was determined to not be a part of this, but now I simply cannot afford this insurance. I tried to navigate the website last night and finally gave up after being kicked off three times.

To make matters worse my insurance was offering one decreasing deductible that we were counting on. We also lost that in our new policy. We had our deductible down to 3,000. We have been saving in an HA, but I'm afraid it won't last long. I have just been told I have a rare bone disease called fibrous dysplasia. It is causing some eye issues, and I am facing some sort of surgery to remove the diseased bone behind my eye.

This hardworking Wyoming family:

After working so hard to take care of ourselves my husband and I are faced with having to have help. This makes no sense to us. We were doing fine until the government stepped in.

There has to be an answer somewhere. Thanks for your time.

I practiced medicine for 25 years in Wyoming and took care of many families just like we have here with Shelly, knowing how hardworking people are—and the Presiding Officer knows that as well—in rural communities, people who roll up their sleeves, go to work every day, and don't want assistance from the government. They just do their job. And this is a family that has been hurt by the President's health care law—hurt dramatically. They had gotten their deductible down to \$3,000, and now it is up to \$11,000. Their premiums are higher than they were before, and she has a lot more insurance than she is ever going to want, need, can afford or will ever use.

But we are seeing this all around the country. It is not just in stories from

Wyoming. CBS Money Watch in the middle of June came out with a report called "For some, Obamacare delivers sticker shock."

It is interesting, just trying to follow the press from around the country. These aren't isolated cases. We are seeing this all across the country.

The article goes on:

... Obamacare is delivering a hefty dose of sticker shock.

What did the President of the United States promise the American people? He promised the American people that under his plan insurance premiums would drop \$2,500 per family by the end of his first term—not stay flat, not go up a little—would actually go lower \$2,500 per family per year by the end of his first term. "Obamacare is delivering a hefty dose of sticker shock."

Now, who is getting hurt by this? All Americans are getting hurt, but the Washington Post had an interesting story on June 24. I wish the President would pay attention to this. The President of the United States needs to know that it is "Older women who bear the brunt of higher insurance costs under Obamacare"—the headline in the Washington Post June 24.

The new government report is out:

... women age 55 to 64 will face a huge spike in cost when they go out to buy individual insurance on the federal exchange. These women bear the brunt of the increased premiums and out of pocket expenses after the Affordable Care Act.

Winners and losers—and President Obama has chosen older women to bear the brunt of higher increased insurance costs under the President health care law.

We are going to hear that again and again as Democrats stand up to talk about the issues facing our country. It is older women who are bearing the brunt of the higher insurance costs under the President's health care law, as reported in the Washington Post.

Then, how incompetent is the Web site? Let's take a look at what the New York Times said July 1: "Eligibility for Health Insurance Was Not Properly Checked, Audit Finds."

An independent audit of insurance exchanges established under the health care law has found that federal and state officials did not properly check the eligibility of people seeking coverage and applying for subsidies, the latest indication of unresolved problems at HealthCare.gov.

I remember listening to President Obama talk and be interviewed by President Clinton in September of last year in New York City at the Clinton Global Initiative, or something like that. President Obama said: Easier than shopping on Amazon. Cheaper than your cell phone bill.

This is in a report to Congress on Tuesday:

In a report to Congress on Tuesday, the inspector general for the Department of Health and Human Services ... said that the exchanges ... did not have adequate safeguards "to prevent the use of inaccurate or fraudulent information when determining eligibility."

Moreover, in a companion report, the inspector general said that the government had been unable to verify much of the information reported by people applying for insurance coverage and financial assistance to help pay premiums.

We are talking about the Inspector General of the Department of Health and Human Services of the Obama administration.

"As of the first quarter of 2014," [the Inspector General] said, "the federal marketplace was unable to resolve about 2.6 million of 2.9 million inconsistencies"—

—because the Web site that President Obama has said would be easier to use than Amazon, cheaper than your cell phone was not fully operational. What kind of government incompetence are we talking about?

The Associated Press on July 1: "Health law sign-ups dogged by data flaws." Unable to resolve 2.6 million so-called inconsistencies—it is astonishing. And they call it "another health care headache for the White House." The problems continue out of sight. The President is trying to hide these problems—trying to hide them from the American people. The President says one thing, tries to sell a story. The President now has his own war room set up—not to solve the problems. Oh, no. He is not trying to solve the problems. He has a war room to try to spin the information so the voters don't get to see what they are not being deceived by. They can see through this. You have a war room with six people trying to spin the health care numbers rather than trying to solve the problems, trying to lower the cost of care, trying to help patients get care—not empty coverage and expensive coverage. There are so many problems in the world, and what the White House has decided to spend its time and money on is set up a war room to try to spin the issues of the Obama health care law, not to solve the problems.

Go around the country, State by State. California: ObamaCare massive backlog stalls medical expansion. Connecticut: Anthem seeks 12.5 percent rate increase. Back to California: Confusion over doctor list is costly for ObamaCare enrollees in the State.

You can work your way around the country, and State by State, whether you do it from east to west, north to south, do it in alphabetical order, in every State there are horror stories about the impact of this health care law.

Connecticut again: ObamaCare glitch leading to canceled policies. Constituents calling to talk to their State representatives say their insurance policies have been canceled because the subsidies that helped discount the premiums hadn't been paid—hadn't been paid. According to people involved with the insurance companies, the issue of mistaken policy cancellation "is real." So the insurance companies are saying it is absolutely true, it is absolutely real.

I see other colleagues on the floor.

I would say that in Colorado, a State that I go through every weekend at

least twice going to Wyoming and coming back to DC from Wyoming, people in Colorado are very concerned. "Colorado health exchange site needs surgery." This is NBC 9 News, Colorado. A reporter said:

I'm not going to sugar-coat this: The official state website where Coloradans can shop for health insurance is a mess. Sure [the web site] looks pretty slick at first glance. It lets you window shop for plans and offers some (but not all) good info about the health care law. But when you actually create an account and start shopping, the site offers an experience that is clunky, counter-intuitive, and often confusing.

That sounds to me like the Obama administration—clunky, counterintuitive, and often confusing.

That's the web product being offered to Coloradans after receiving more than \$179 million in federal grants to develop the state exchange.

This reporter says:

If you are looking for a passionate argument of the pros and cons of [ObamaCare], as a reporter I avoid making public policy arguments.

However, if this is the official system the people of Colorado are getting to shop for individual coverage, it should be a good one. Nine months after it began selling health plans, this website is not a good one. It should be upsetting to everyone in the state of Colorado, especially supporters of the healthcare law.

I would apply that to anyone from Colorado who is on this Senate floor or in the House of Representatives who voted for the health care law.

He said:

It should be upsetting to everyone in the state, especially supporters of the healthcare law. My family obtained a health plan despite the website.

By way of background, I am not remotely anti-technology. I grew up in Silicon Valley. I built my own computers as a kid. I once had a job working in tech support for [a dot-com company], a sophisticated e-commerce platform ... My goal in this review is to shine a light on some really basic (and deeply frustrating) problems that any commercial dot-com would be pulling all-nighters to fix.

Well, that shows you the difference between a commercial dot-com and the government of the United States.

It says:

For some reason, these issues have been allowed to hang around for the better part of a year by the Connect for Health Colorado.

And then today, the Denver Post: "Colorado exchange expects more to drop health coverage"—giving up, not paying their premiums, not renewing their coverage. They are expecting double what was initially anticipated of the number of people who aren't paying their premiums. They realize this empty coverage they are paying a lot of money for isn't actually good for them. They are paying too much in premiums. Their deductibles are high, their copays are high.

I can go on and on. The people of America know what they wanted with health care reform. They wanted to be able to get care they need from a doctor they choose at lower costs. That is not what they got from President

Obama's health care law that the Democrats in this body voted for. What they got are higher premiums, higher copays, higher deductibles, maybe cannot keep their doctor, cannot keep their hospital—not what the President promised, not what people wanted, and it is time to go back and start over to work on a health care system that gives the American people what they truly want, truly need, and deserve.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. I thank my friends who have been here talking about this. Both Senator THUNE and Senator BARRASSO spent so much time on figuring out ways this could work better and obviously it is not working as well as people hoped it would.

There is a series of headlines I saw on my desk today. CNN Money said: "Were ObamaCare applications accurate? Who knows?"

Reuters says, "Obama care exchange is not properly verifying applicant data."

The New York Post: "Obamacare data errors could jeopardize coverage for millions."

The Washington Times: "ObamaCare markets foul up eligibility and verification parts in applications."

The New York Times: "Eligibility for health insurance was not properly checked audit finds."

Wall Street Journal: "Reports Fault Controls of Health Exchanges."

This is simply not working. It wasn't as though there was a lot of time to make it work either. It was from early in 2010 until the law was implemented in the end of 2013, and there is one problem after another, which is a good indication of what happens when the government tries to do more than the government is capable of doing, when the government tries to prescribe all kinds of decisions that would be so much better left to individuals as long as the government has done what it could to ensure a more aggressive, active, competitive marketplace. But that is not what happened here.

The Associated Press this weekend had a headline that read: "Senate Democrats try to pull focus from ObamaCare." Of course they would, because every Democrat who is in the Senate when this bill passed voted for the bill.

You know, if there is one long-term political lesson to learn here, surely it is that when you do something this big, you should do it in a way that no matter what you have to do you find a way to get people on both sides involved. Don't do this in a way that shoves it down the throats of the country or your colleagues.

More bad news, more broken promises, higher premiums. The anticipation this fall is that premiums, notices of which are going to go out later this year, are going to go up. They are going to go up in double digits. The

promise in 2009 was not only that families would pay less money but they would pay \$2,500 less money. Somehow the people who were for this bill in the administration knew so much about health care and so much about the impact of what government having more control of people's health care would do, told us not only that the premiums were going to go down, but that they were going to go down \$2,500 per family. Now most families are finding that there is a \$2,500 number, but it is the number that you would feel lucky to have if your insurance for your family just went up that much.

July 1, Health and Human Services Office of Inspector General released a report that was the subject of all those headlines I just read. The report said they didn't do enough to verify, haven't checked this closely enough, don't know if people are eligible for the government assistance they are getting for their insurance. It said the administration was unable to put safeguards in place to protect taxpayers and prevent incorrect subsidy payments from happening.

The report also found the administration didn't even follow its own eligibility verification in many instances. They didn't go through the procedures they had set up for themselves. In fact, of the 2.9 million verification inconsistencies, they were unable to resolve 2.6 million of them. They wind up with 2.9 million problems when they find out their verification inconsistencies, and 2.6 million of the 2.9 million—hey, we cannot figure this out. We didn't get enough information. We don't know why the system is not working, but it is not.

In January 2014, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, Secretary Sebelius, certified to Congress that the ObamaCare exchanges could verify that individuals receiving tax credits and cost-sharing assistance were actually eligible to receive taxpayer-provided assistance. Now apparently by July of 2014, 6 months later, the people who check to see if that was true or not find out it is not true at all.

Middle-class Americans have enough pain with this law already without finding out their tax dollars are going to pay bills of people who don't qualify to have that much of their bill paid or maybe not even any of their bill paid. Recently I spoke on the floor about a contract in Missouri and three other States with a British company, Serco, about the lack of transparency and accountability in the act. As the St. Louis Post-Dispatch recently reported: "Whistleblower allegations last month claimed that workers slept, read or played games at Wentzville"—this is the Wentzville facility—"played games at Wentzville and provoked a flurry of questions from congressional delegation[s]."

Further quoting, "We played Pictionary. We played 20 Questions. We played Trivial Pursuit," one employee told the Post-Dispatch. She estimated

she processed six applications the entire month of December.

CMS didn't acknowledge these allegations but they said they had "adjusted Serco's work to accommodate changing operational needs."

Two months ago Senator ALEXANDER and I called these reports into question and we sent a letter to CMS and said: What are you doing there and why is this not working? I don't know if we said it in the letter but we could have said: Why did you contract with a British company that was already in trouble with the British Government for not providing these services?

These are not particularly technical services. If there is only one country in the world that can provide services to the United States, we found the one place in the world where we found a company that was already in trouble with their own government for not providing services and said you're the company for us. We want you to be the ones that provide these services for people who cannot apply over the Internet and send in their applications in some other way.

So to Senator ALEXANDER I say: What about these charges that people simply don't have anything to do and rather than admit that they have nothing to do, you see library books stacked up on the table. Here is the Trivial Pursuit game. Touch your computer every once in a while. Refresh your computer once every 10 minutes so it looks as though you are doing something.

Two weeks ago we finally received a reply after 2 months of having this question out there, and I think I put that reply in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It was so much of a non-answer answer. It was more like: We got your letter. We are going to look into this and see if we can figure out what's happening.

I don't think it would be that hard to figure out.

I recently learned that CMS determined that Serco had met the terms and conditions of the contract which apparently involved, if you believe these employees, playing board games and reading library books, and CMS decided this British company does such a great job they were going to exercise the first option of the contract and on June 28 they awarded an extended contract to the company through what they said was "a full and open competition" to provide these services.

The lesson here is that the government needs to think long and hard before it gets into the world of making decisions for people that people can better make for themselves. The government doesn't need to think long and hard to believe there is a government responsibility to ensure a certain amount of consumer protection, that what companies say they are going to do they are required to do, that they clearly tell you what they are going to do. Families can decide what they want in their insurance policy better than

the government can decide what they want in their insurance policy.

I am sure every Member in the Senate gets stacks of letters—I know I get them—from those who are retired and don't understand why they need pediatric dental care and policies that cover a half dozen things they could never possibly use. They don't understand why those policies are now so expensive that they can no longer afford to have the policy they had. They don't understand the reason for cutting Medicare and starting a new government program. It doesn't make sense to them. It doesn't make sense to cut funding to a program—a program which is clearly facing challenges as our society gets older—by \$600 or \$700 billion over 10 years in order to start a new program where the costs will be so much more than anybody anticipated.

I am pleased to join my friends today who have been here for the better part of this last hour talking about the challenges we face. We know there are better solutions. More competition and buying health care insurance across State lines would have been a couple of solutions. Associated health plans where a small business or an individual can find some group to become part of—the government could have made that easier instead of making it illegal and impossible.

There should be more transparency by providers. I would like to know what hospitals and doctors charge and what their results are. And they know. There is no reason that cannot be made available. In fact, one of the better provisions in the Affordable Care Act said the government is supposed to do that, but of all the things the government could have done, that is something the government has not found time to do.

They could address medical liability reform. There was a double handful and maybe even just a single handful of things we could have done to say: Let's try these things and see if they don't make the system work better and see what lesson we learn by injecting these two or three or four or five things into a health care system that was the best health care system in the world; it just didn't have the amount of competition, transparency, and access it needed to have.

I will continue to hope we will move forward, learn the hard-learned lessons of the implementation of this plan, and go back and find what was working so well and figure out what we need to do to make that work even better.

I yield the floor.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The senior Senator from Texas.

#### IMMIGRATION

**Mr. CORNYN.** Mr. President, yesterday I came to the floor and spoke about President Obama's reluctance to see firsthand the ongoing and growing humanitarian crisis occurring on the U.S.-Mexico border.

Today I come to the floor to renew my call—as other elected officials from both sides of the aisle have done—urg-

ing President Obama to please come to the border, where this humanitarian crisis is unfolding. It has been reported that the President will be in Texas for 2 days starting tomorrow. He will be there Wednesday and Thursday on a fundraising trip.

I am not suggesting a handshake on the tarmac or a roundtable 500 miles away from the border, but please come and see it with your own eyes, as I have. Talk to the Border Patrol. Learn from not only the migrants who have traversed Mexico at the risk of their own lives to come to the United States, but find out what we need to do to deal with the ongoing crisis and what we need to do to solve it.

I urge him to do so not as a political statement but so he can witness what is a very sad and in many ways tragic situation and one that could have been mitigated if not prevented. Unfortunately, this is a humanitarian crisis that his policies and the perception about his commitment to enforce our laws have helped create.

Given the recent White House announcement that the President refuses to visit the Rio Grande Valley this week, it unfortunately appears that my request today will fall on deaf ears and therefore suggests to the American people that either the President doesn't really understand this border crisis or he simply doesn't care.

To give the President a fair shake, I was with the President after the tragic shootings at Fort Hood in 2009 and last year. I was with the President at the memorial service in West, where first responders were tragically killed as a result of an explosion. Why he is so stubborn and hardheaded that he refuses to visit the Rio Grande Valley and witness this ongoing humanitarian crisis with his own eyes is really mystifying.

Governor Perry has been doing what I have been doing and urging the President to visit the border. He happened to share with the media—Governor Perry, that is—last night a White House letter inviting him to an immigration roundtable in Dallas. This crisis is unfolding on the border and not in Dallas. I brought a map of Texas with me so the President can see this for himself. This is Dallas. This is where the crisis is unfolding in the Rio Grande Valley, which is about 500 miles away.

Thankfully, the President doesn't have to fly commercial; he flies on Air Force One. My guess is that it would probably take him an hour out of his scheduled activities in Texas to go to the border and maybe another hour on the ground to talk to the Border Patrol, as I did last week. If he did that, he would see these children jammed in detention facilities at the Border Patrol detention stations. It would give him an opportunity to talk to some of them, as I did in my visit last week. I think it would be helpful to the President.

I think one of the biggest problems Presidents have is they end up living in

a bubble. They only get access to information that is filtered through their advisers and counselors, and sometimes Presidents simply don't understand; they are tone deaf to the problems which confront the country. That is why it would be in the best interests of my constituents in Texas, it would be in the best interests of these children who are part of this humanitarian crisis, and it would be a contribution toward a solution to this crisis if the President would simply travel 500 miles from Dallas, TX, where he invited Governor Perry to a roundtable, down to the Rio Grande Valley.

As I said, the President's trip to Texas will focus on fundraising, and I understand that. But the problem is his policies have had a disproportionate impact upon my constituents who live along the U.S.-Mexico border. In fact, it is my recollection that the President of the United States has not once visited the Rio Grande Valley, where a majority of this ongoing crisis is taking place.

He did come to El Paso back in 2011. When people suggested we had a problem with security at the border, he ridiculed them by saying: Well, maybe we ought to build a moat along the border. That is actually insulting coming from a person who has never actually been to the border, particularly the Rio Grande Valley, where a majority of these children are crossing.

Indeed, over time what has happened is much of the illegal immigration that comes across the border has migrated from Nogales, AZ, to the Rio Grande Valley. You can't see it on this map, but if you understand the geography here, most of these children are coming from Central America. The shortest distance from Guatemala and Honduras to the United States is through the Rio Grande Valley of Texas.

The President should also visit Brooks County, which is a place I have visited. This is where the Falfurrias checkpoint is located. They have found many dead bodies of immigrants who died from exposure while trying to circumvent the checkpoint at Falfurrias. What happens is coyotes, as they call them—human smugglers—will bring them across the border, put them in stash houses on the border, and many of those conditions are inhumane in and of themselves. What will then happen is that the coyotes—smugglers—will bring them in trucks up the highway, and before they hit the checkpoint in Falfurrias, they will tell them to get out of the truck, give them a milk jug full of water, and tell them they will see them on the north side of the checkpoint.

So dozens, if not hundreds, if not thousands of immigrants over time try to walk—some in the 100-plus-degree Texas weather—around this checkpoint, and some simply don't make it. If you understand where they have come from—some from Central America—many are terribly dehydrated, already ill from exposure, and for many

of them their last steps are in Brooks County while trying to walk around this checkpoint in Fallfurrias.

I think the President would benefit from doing what I have done. He should visit the residents in Brooks County, talk to the Border Patrol, and learn more about the problem and how we might effect a solution. If he refuses to go out of stubborn pride or whatever the reason is, then he will simply be ignorant of the best ways we can work together to solve this underlying problem.

In recent weeks I have shared only a few of the many horrific stories regarding the dangerous journey countless numbers of children take to get to the United States from Central America. They call the train that many of them ride in the corridors controlled by the cartels who treat human beings as a commodity—like drugs and guns. They treat human beings as a commodity that makes money for them. These immigrants go through the corridors on a train system they call The Beast.

There is a chilling book written by Salvadoran journalist Oscar Martinez about The Beast. In it, you find out that 6 out of 10—maybe more—women who come up along this train system known as The Beast are sexually assaulted. Migrants are routinely kidnapped and held for ransom by the gangs and cartels that patrol this area, and many of them simply don't make it.

I shudder to think of how many of the young children—some as young as 5 have been detained at the border region—never make it to the border because they die in the process. That is not humanitarian. That is not friendly. That is cruel. We ought to be telling the truth about this horrific journey and discouraging parents from sending their children from Central America up through Mexico on the back of The Beast only to die in the process or to be assaulted, kidnapped, or horribly injured and maimed.

Well, this is one of the many reasons why I think the President would benefit from a visit. It is hard to ignore the facts, especially when you see them with your own eyes and you get a chance to talk to our hard-working professional Border Patrol, doing an incredible job with limited resources.

When you have 52,000 children coming across the southwestern border at the Rio Grande sector since October and 39,000 women with minor children detained in the Rio Grande sector, unless you go and talk to the Border Patrol and learn about this with your own ears and eyes, you may not realize that drug interdictions are depressed because our Border Patrol is basically trying to change diapers and deal with the humanitarian crisis. They are overwhelmed and are unable to do one of their principal jobs, which is to interdict illegal drug importations into the United States.

So I hope the President will reconsider. He is not going to Texas until to-

morrow. My understanding is he will be there for 2 days, and certainly he has an hour or 2 hours out of his schedule that he could dedicate to seeing the crisis for himself and learning more about it, and then coming back and working with us to try to stop it.

Of course, we all feel nothing but sympathy for the children and families who sacrifice their lives trying to make it to the United States but fail because of the impression that our immigration laws simply will not be enforced. Many of my colleagues have come to the floor and said, If we would pass the comprehensive immigration bill the Senate passed last year, that would do it. Well, I would say, with all respect, that is demonstrably false, because even the President and Secretary Johnson of the Department of Homeland Security have conceded that none of these children would be eligible, under the President's deferred action Executive order—none of them would be eligible for entry and to stay in the United States. So passing that law would have nothing to do with this current crisis.

Between President Obama's failure to enforce our immigration laws and his ever-shifting explanations, it is no wonder he has lost credibility on this issue. Many Americans simply don't have confidence that the President is willing to faithfully execute the laws of the United States, including our immigration laws. No wonder Speaker BOEHNER and so many of our House colleagues have gotten so frustrated they have decided maybe the only alternative is to take the President to court. We know the President has had a pretty bad couple of weeks when it comes to overreach, and he has been rebuked several times recently for unconstitutional acts such as trying to determine when the Senate is in recess and evade the confirmation process in the Senate.

If the President wants to know why we haven't been able to pass immigration reform, all he has to do is look in the mirror. All he has to do is look at his own policies which have created an enormous amount of distrust between not only Congress and the executive branch but in his agencies so that they will actually do what they are supposed to do, such as the Department of Homeland Security, Immigration and Customs Enforcement—ICE—and the other components of the Department of Homeland Security.

Given all the differing narratives coming out of the White House concerning this surge of unaccompanied minors, it is time for the President to directly address the problem.

I know the President has sent over today a \$3.7 billion request for more money. I have no doubt that some pieces of it are justified. For example, we need enhanced detention facilities. We need more immigration judges and other people as part of that process so hearings can be conducted on a timely basis and a legal determination made

according to existing law whether people can stay or whether they have to be returned to their country of origin.

Visiting the border is just one in a series of steps the President could take to regain some of his own credibility but also to help address this crisis.

This is not just a humanitarian crisis; this is also a national security crisis, as recently testified to by the head of Southern Command, General Kelly, a Marine general who is head of that combatant command. He is in charge of that area of the globe from Mexico south known as Southern Command, and he says because of inadequate resources and equipment and manpower to deal with the drug cartels moving illegal drugs from South America up through Central America through Mexico to the United States, 75 percent of the time, General Kelly said, they simply have to sit and watch because they don't have the resources. I would hope that some of the money included in this \$3.7 billion request would be dedicated to making sure that General Kelly and our law enforcement agencies have the resources and equipment necessary to stop the drug cartels from moving drugs from South America through Central America and up through Mexico.

As General Kelly said, we have this intersection of criminal conduct and terrorism that sometimes takes place with organizations such as Hezbollah, for example, that has established a presence in South America, historically, and it doesn't take a rocket scientist to figure out this vulnerability can be exploited by other people and not just the drug cartels.

The question remains, if one has enough money, can one make it into the United States? Unfortunately, I think we have to answer that question in the affirmative. Last year alone, 414,000 people were detained on our southwestern border from 100 different countries—100 different countries. So this isn't just about people who have no hope and no opportunity trying to come to the United States from Mexico and trying to get a job; this is about uncontrolled immigration through our southwestern border from all over the world. Admittedly, most of them come from Mexico and Central America, but this is a vulnerability where people can come from Pakistan, they can come from Afghanistan, they can even come from Iran—countries of special interest, countries that are state sponsors of international terrorism. So this is worthy of the President's attention and worthy of a Presidential visit, and I hope he will change his mind and do that.

I think President Obama needs a wakeup call. He needs to realize that the situation along the border is not as rosy as perhaps he is under the impression it is. Only by visiting the border and visiting firsthand and seeing with his own eyes and listening with his own ears to the professionals who are working there so hard and are simply overwhelmed will he be able to get a good

idea of not only what the problem is but what the solutions are. Then and only then, I believe, will he be ready and will we be ready to sit down and work together through this request the President has sent us and figure out how we can solve the problem.

Once again, I hope the President will reconsider his decision, since he is going to be in Texas anyway on Wednesday and Thursday, and go to the border, just 500 miles away. On Air Force One it is easy to get there. It won't take much time. He could spend an hour on the ground, and then I think he will come away glad he has taken advantage and accepted this invitation by Governor Perry and me and other Texans to come see the problem for himself.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

#### VA HEALTH CARE

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I believe when it comes to caring for our Nation's heroes, we can't accept anything less than excellence.

As have many of my colleagues, I have been very troubled by the most recent allegations of the VA failing to provide veterans timely health care. The VA generally offers very high-quality health care and does many things as well or better than the private sector. But when you are caring for our Nation's heroes and you have the backing of the full resources of the Federal Government, "just as good" is not enough. We expect more. So I am very frustrated to be here again talking about these deeply disturbing issues and the Department's repeated failures to change.

GAO and the inspector general have reported on these problems many times over the years. Last Congress we did a great deal of work around wait times, particularly for mental health care. I think the VA is starting to see that business as usual is not acceptable.

The administration has taken steps to begin addressing some of the major systemwide problems, but much more needs to be done. Tomorrow, when I meet with the President's nominee for the VA Secretary, I am going to ask him how he plans to make these changes. That is why I am very glad to be serving on the veterans conference committee, because Congress needs to act as well.

The most important thing we can do right now is to pass responsible and effective legislation to bring much-needed reforms to the VA, and we need to do it soon.

There have been major bipartisan efforts in both the House and in the Senate to move legislation addressing these problems. Many Members have been part of those efforts, and I commend them all for their commitment

to bipartisanship and for putting the needs of our veterans first. It is vital that we continue to build on this bipartisan momentum and to continue making progress if we are going to address some of the immediate accountability and transparency concerns that are plaguing the VA and to fix its deep-seated structural and cultural challenges.

I know Members have a wide range of concerns with the bill, and I believe we can address those concerns responsibly and in a way that puts our veterans first and gives the VA the tools it needs to address the challenges it faces. That means building and strengthening the VA system so it delivers the best care for the long term. But it is important for us to act quickly to start making these changes. We cannot allow this process to break down. Veterans are still waiting to get the care they need.

Many of us were rightly outraged the VA did not act to help veterans because the Department ignored all the information and did nothing. This Congress must not do the same and fail veterans by not acting.

I urge all of our colleagues to work as hard and as quickly as possible to finalize an agreement and get it to the President. More problems will be uncovered and the investigations will proceed, and we will need more action from the VA, the administration, and Congress, because our Nation made a promise to the men and women who answer the call of duty, and one of the most important ways we uphold that is by making sure our veterans can get access to the health care they need and they deserve, no matter what it takes.

#### HIGHWAY TRUST FUND

I also wish to speak about another important issue Congress needs to act on, and that is the looming crisis with the highway trust fund.

As is the case with other States around the country, my home State of Washington relies on the highway trust fund to pay for construction projects. These are projects that ease traffic on our highways, repair bridges, and make safety improvements. This year, for example, officials in Washington State plan to use money from the highway trust fund to improve safety at railroad crossings in Centralia. They plan to replace anchor cables on bridges in Seattle, and they plan to repave roads across the State to fix potholes and to make roads smoother for our drivers. But here in DC, the Department of Transportation and many of us in Congress have been warning for months that the highway trust fund needs more revenue to pay for these critical projects in my home State and across the country. Without that revenue, the trust fund is going to reach critically low levels next month.

This is coming now just a few months after Republicans pushed us into a government shutdown. If Congress fails to act soon, families and businesses and States would see another shutdown,

this time with highway projects around the country.

I had hoped we would be able to get this done by now. The last thing, I can tell my colleagues, the American people want to see right now is another countdown clock on the evening news. But we still have a chance to get this done before it is too late. Instead of lurching to yet another crisis and putting our construction projects at risk, let's work together and do the right thing for our families and our workers and the economy.

The clock is ticking for Congress to find the much-needed revenue. Starting August 1, the Department of Transportation said it will start delaying payments to our States for projects that ease traffic on clogged highways and make important repairs to our bridges. On average, States will lose 28 percent of their Federal funding. Without that money, many States are going to have to delay or stop work on their construction sites. Officials in my home State have said up to 43 highway projects could be threatened, and across the country more than 1,000 construction projects could be at risk, according to the Department of Transportation.

If there is one thing Democrats and Republicans should be able to agree on, and usually do, is that we should be investing in and improving our transportation infrastructure, not letting it crumble. A construction shutdown would threaten jobs and businesses. If States have to scale back their plans, companies are going to hire fewer workers to repair and improve roads and bridges across the country. Without a fix, nearly 700,000 jobs will be at risk next year, according to the Department of Transportation. And let's remember, the construction industry was one of the hardest hit sectors after the economic downturn and has not yet fully bounced back. In fact, weakness in the U.S. labor market is actually due to the lack of growth in the construction sector, according to the Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis. Allowing our highway trust fund to dip to critically low levels would deliver another blow to the construction sector as it is struggling to recover.

Last fall, families and communities across our country were forced to endure a completely unnecessary government shutdown. That shutdown, we all know, hurt our people and threatened a very fragile economic recovery and shook the confidence of the American people who expect their elected officials to come together and avoid such an unnecessary crisis. I was proud to work with Democrats and Republicans at the end of last year to pass a bipartisan budget deal that prevented another government shutdown. It restored critical investments in families and the economy and it put a halt to the constant budget crises.

I was proud to build on that bipartisan momentum and work with my friend Senator ISAKSON and others on a



workforce investment deal that passed the Senate with strong bipartisan support. We hope, by the way, that will pass the House tomorrow and get signed into law.

We know bipartisanship work is possible. We know the country is better for it when it happens. We know it is what families we represent expect from all of us. So today I am calling on Republicans to work with us in good faith to do the right thing and help us avoid this construction shutdown. I know Republican leaders once again are worried about their tea party fringe pushing them into another unnecessary crisis, but I hope they are able to push them aside and work with us to get this done. Republicans saw how devastating it was for them—and their constituents—when they hurt the country with the government shutdown. I am hopeful that gives them any additional incentive they may need to work with us this time.

State and local governments, workers, businesses, and drivers are looking to us to resolve this crisis and avoid another shutdown. States cannot afford important highway construction projects without this important highway trust fund. Families cannot afford to have a few Members of Congress putting jobs at risk again. With the clock winding down fast, we cannot afford to put this off any longer. So let's resolve this looming crisis. Let's work together and prevent a construction shutdown this summer for our economy, for our businesses, and for our families across the country.

Thank you.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CASEY. 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. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

#### SUMMER FOOD PROGRAMS

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I rise this afternoon to talk about the challenge we have to make sure every child in America who is eligible for one of the programs that help children have enough to eat and have nutritious food is getting served. The problem across the country is we have a number of children who are receiving meals during the school year, either school breakfast as part of the School Breakfast Program, or the School Lunch Program. So at some point in time they are getting a meal at school, and maybe more than one meal. Then they go home for the summer, and even though they are eligible for the summer programs, which tend to be in different locations, may not be at one

school or one central location, a lot of children do not get the benefit of those programs. The program name is the Summer Food Service Program. Many Americans may have heard of the School Lunch Program, the School Breakfast Program, probably have heard less about the Summer Food Service Program.

We know that even though children are taking a summer vacation from school, hunger does not take a summer vacation. Hunger is always a clear and present danger, a reality for children, especially children in low-income communities from low-income families. This is a reality for so many children, millions of them across the country and their families. But it is also preventable. It is a tragedy when a child does not have enough to eat. But this is preventable if we do the right thing.

We know that during the school year, when you add up all of the children who receive a meal at school, it amounts to about 21 million. That is the good news, that that many children are being served. The bad news is when they go home for their summer vacation, by one count, the last count we have, only 3 million children are getting a summer meal, even though as high as 21 million are eligible—or 21 million receive that kind of help during the school year.

In my home State of Pennsylvania, the dropoff, the last number we have, is during the course of the year, just about 777,000 children received a meal, about three-quarters of a million children. The problem, though, is the summer number goes way down to, at last count, 105,000, just a little more than 105,000, so there is a little more than a 7-to-1 difference between the school year and the summer program.

One of the things we have to do is to get the word out. That is why I brought along this poster that highlights this. To find a site in your State, in your community—there are many sites, tens of thousands of them across the country—you may need to inquire about it. You may need to make a phone call to find out about the sites—1-866-3-HUNGRY, and then a different one, 1-877-8-HAMBRE.

We want to make sure that in addition to knowing the 800 numbers, you have a Web site. It is [pasummermeals.com](http://pasummermeals.com). That, of course, applies to Pennsylvania, [pasummermeals.com](http://pasummermeals.com). So if you live in Pennsylvania, that is your Web site.

These numbers are national numbers, the 1-866-3-HUNGRY, and then 1-877-8-HAMBRE. That is one way to find out, for families to find out, for advocates, anyone who is concerned about this or wants to know more about what their community has available for them, because, as I said before, it is different than the circumstances during the year. During the year, children go to a school and that school has a School Breakfast Program and/or a School Lunch Program. In the summer, you have the same services available, the

same opportunities, same eligibility for children, but the sites are—there are more sites. And sometimes, when people do not know, when they cannot be served by a school, they may have to go to another place in their community.

This is a major issue. Because we know that all the science tells us if we want children to learn more now and earn more later, that is what we all hope is not just the right thing to do, but if you have enough to eat you probably learn better. Obviously if you can learn more, you are going to earn more, literally, in your lifetime. This is not just a rhyme, it has a scientific foundation.

We want to make sure that in addition to having the best possible educational programs for children to learn, we want to also create the best circumstances for them to learn. I do not know about people here, but in the course of my day, if I do not eat breakfast and then it gets to noontime or 1:00 and I have not had something to eat, it is pretty hard for me to be as functional and as effective as I want to be. I can only imagine what it is like for a child who does not have enough to eat, not just on one particular day of the week but maybe more than one day or a couple of days in a row. I do not know how they can function, let alone learn and study, take tests and achieve and be successful over time. They need the same kind of help in the summer as they have during the year.

So if we are making it possible, if our government and communities around the country are making it possible for a child to have a school breakfast and/or a school lunch, why would we not make sure they have meals during the summer as well, especially when there is a program in place they are eligible for?

We have to call attention to it. I know this is a challenge in all of our States. We want to make sure we are highlighting, getting information out so our children can have opportunities not only to have enough to eat but to eat meals that are nutritious.

I was at a site in Philadelphia yesterday, the Gesu School, which is in north Philadelphia. I taught there as a volunteer 31 years ago. I actually not only handed out the lunches to the children at that site, but I was able to see what was in them. They were good meals, but they were also very nutritious, something that can help a child grow and learn and move into the future. We are grateful we have these programs. But if we do not tell people enough about them, we are going to continue to have that terrible dropoff from the number of children served during the year—again, as I said, 21 million children, dropping off to only 3 million children served in the summer. There is no reason why we should allow that to happen. There is no reason why we should say that is anything other than unacceptable.

I am grateful to have this opportunity and grateful for the support this

program has across the country. We need to get the word out. We need to get these 800 numbers out as much as we can.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. WARREN). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for 10 or 12 minutes.

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

#### RESEARCH MISCONDUCT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Earlier this year I learned about a case of research misconduct that happened at Iowa State University. A team of scientists was working on a vaccine to fight HIV. One of the researchers, Dr. Han, committed fraud to make it appear as though the vaccine for HIV was working. He purposely spiked the testing samples so it looked as if the vaccines actually fought HIV. Dr. Han's fraud helped his team get \$16 million in national grant money from the National Institutes of Health or around here we refer to that as the NIH. NIH is part of the Department of Health and Human Services or what we refer to as HHS.

HHS gives out billions of dollars in research grants every year. In 2013 NIH gave out over \$20 billion in research grants. Obviously that is a huge amount of money by any standard.

The government has a responsibility to make sure this money is well spent. Unfortunately, it looks as if the government is relying on the grant recipients to do oversight instead of the government seeing that the money is well spent.

In this case officials at Iowa State University were unaware of the fraud until another team of scientists couldn't duplicate the results. Iowa State University took the problem very seriously and notified Health and Human Services. I compliment them for that. But if it weren't for Iowa State University's actions, I doubt the Government ever would have found out about this tremendous amount of fraud.

The Office of Research Integrity at Health and Human Services was created for the specific purpose to prevent and investigate research misconduct. The Office of Research Integrity investigated the allegations of misconduct at Iowa State University and in fact confirmed that Dr. Han knowingly committed fraud. Dr. Han even admitted to the fraud. The Office of Research Integrity imposed only a 3-year ban on Dr. Han from receiving any more Federal grant money.

That is basically a slap on the wrist from the Office of Research Integrity. It makes absolutely no sense that

someone who admitted to that level of fraud could be eligible for another Federal grant in just 3 years.

I asked the Office of Research Integrity why the penalty for Dr. Han was so light and if it would try to recover any of the \$19 million in research grants. The taxpayers subsidized what was supposed to be promising HIV research, but it was based on Dr. Han's fraud. His phony results were the basis for those grant applications. The Office of Research Integrity says it considers a 3-year ban a very strict penalty. To Iowans, that doesn't sound like a very commonsense penalty.

In fact, the Office of Research Integrity says that 3 years is the maximum penalty it can give unless there are aggravating circumstances. That 3-year limit is set by the White House Office of Management and Budget. So the Office of Research Integrity claims that somehow its hands are tied. But in this case the Office of Research Integrity did not even try to demonstrate aggravating circumstances to enforce a longer debarment than 3 years against Dr. Han.

The Office of Research Integrity admitted that there is nothing to keep Dr. Han from conducting research again funded by American taxpayers after those 3 years. The Office of Research Integrity claims it does not have the authority to recover funds in case of research conduct.

Now, think about that for a minute. This Office of Research Integrity, with the responsibility to make sure money is wisely used and research is honest, says it does not have the authority to recover funds obtained by fraud.

The Office of Research Integrity—we are talking about research integrity—says it is the responsibility of the agency that issued the research grant to recover money obtained by fraud.

So I asked the National Institutes of Health about its involvement in this case. The National Institutes of Health first said that only \$500,000 of the \$19 million in research grants would be recovered. The National Institutes of Health also claimed it was not responsible for recovering the fraudulent grant money. According to the National Institutes of Health, oversight is the responsibility of the educational institution receiving the money. NIH said:

ISU as grantee is legally responsible and accountable for the use of funds provided for the performance of grant-supported project or activity.

It looks as if each office I asked just simply passes the buck along to somebody else. But a pass-the-buck attitude doesn't work when it comes to government oversight.

I also asked Health and Human Services about the case. Health and Human Services said that:

Grant recipients have the primary obligation to conduct investigations of their own researchers.

Universities need to be responsible and accountable with Federal research

grants. By taking action when it learned of the fraud, Iowa State University did that in this case. But that does not give the government an excuse not to do oversight. And if the government is relying on universities to report fraud instead of doing the oversight, there are probably other cases of fraud that are never caught.

If someone writes a taxpayer-funded check, they should be responsible for making sure the money is being well spent. The funding agency, and Health and Human Services as a whole, should do more to protect taxpayers' dollars, especially when many are calling for even more taxpayer funding for the National Institutes of Health.

The Office of Research Integrity has a clear mission to prevent and investigate cases of research misconduct.

But I am concerned not only about this case but allegations about the Office of Research Integrity made by its former director, Dr. David Wright. Dr. Wright resigned only days after I started my investigation.

In his resignation letter, Dr. Wright said that bureaucratic red tape was keeping him—Dr. Wright—from doing his job. He said up to 65 percent of his time was spent “navigating the remarkably dysfunctional HHS bureaucracy to secure resources and . . . get permission for ORI to serve the research community.”

We ought to take his allegations very seriously, and HHS should do so as well. When researchers abuse the public's trust, the Office of Research Integrity should use all the powers at its disposal to resolve the problem.

I recently learned that Dr. Han has been indicted for four felony counts of making false statements. Regardless of the outcome of this indictment, it is encouraging to see an effort to increase accountability for spending of taxpayers' money.

Also earlier this week the National Institutes of Health confirmed for the Des Moines Register that it would stop the final grant payment. That of course will save taxpayers \$1.4 million.

So it is good news that the National Institutes of Health is taking action to recover taxpayers' money in this fraud case. But this is only one case, and the National Institutes of Health's actions came after months of public attention and my investigating. I worry that more cases may go unnoticed and even unaddressed if there isn't a public outcry. We can't afford that. We can't afford to have cases like this go unnoticed and unaddressed.

Federal oversight of research funds is far too weak. The government is doing far too little to recover money lost to fraud. We can't afford a “fund it and forget it” attitude. Fraudsters need to be held accountable, and people handing out taxpayers' money need to know that if they are careless with that money, Uncle Sam will come knocking at the door for a refund.

Although Secretary Sebelius recently left Health and Human Services, I expect the new Secretary Sylvia Mathews

Burwell to take this issue very seriously. Ultimately, the Secretary of HHS has the responsibility to ensure that health research grants are not abused. She needs to ensure that agencies within HHS have all the tools they need to recover money lost to fraud and to prevent it from happening in the first place. Secretary Burwell should investigate Dr. Wright's allegations about the Office of Research Integrity and fix the problems that Dr. Wright outlined before his resignation.

Oversight is an extremely important part of the government's role. Unfortunately, it is often ignored and taxpayers' dollars are abused. When researchers abuse the public's trust, Health and Human Services and its components should use all the power they have to investigate, resolve the problem, and get the money back. They owe it to the American taxpayers.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

#### TRIBUTE TO SPECIALIST EARL WILSON

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, this past Wednesday, July 2, I was extremely pleased and honored to be a part of the awarding of the Purple Heart Medal with Bronze Oak Leaf Cluster to a brave soldier Kentucky is proud to call one of its own. SPC Earl Wilson of Liberty, KY, received his Purple Heart with Bronze Oak Leaf Cluster for wounds suffered while serving our country in Vietnam. I want to share the honor and majesty of this event with my colleagues and so therefore ask unanimous consent that the full text of my remarks at the ceremony to award SPC Earl Wilson his Purple Heart with Bronze Oak Leaf Cluster, as well as the text of the two proclamations for the Purple Hearts, be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD:

SENATOR MCCONNELL'S REMARKS AT AWARDING OF PURPLE HEART WITH BRONZE OAK LEAF CLUSTER TO SPECIALIST EARL WILSON, JULY 2, 2014

Thank you for that kind introduction. It is my great honor to be here for the presen-

tation of the Purple Heart Medal with Bronze Oak Leaf Cluster to Army Specialist Earl Wilson of Liberty, Kentucky, for wounds received in action while in service to our country in Vietnam.

It's a long-overdue honor that is finally upon us, thanks to Earl's many family and friends who helped make this moment possible. This event today is a testament to the unbreakable bonds of family and friendship.

Because this ceremony is a high honor and a prestigious occasion, we have several dignitaries with us who I want to recognize, including State Senator Jimmy Higdon and Casey County Judge-Executive Ronald Wright. Casey County Sheriff Jerry Coleman and the county circuit court clerk, Craig Overstreet, are with us. And I'm pleased to welcome Casey County Attorney Tom Weddle and Liberty Mayor Steve Sweeny.

It's a pleasure to have Chris Smrt of the Kentucky chapter of the Military Order of the Purple Heart here today to welcome Specialist Wilson into their ranks, as well as VFW Post 5704 Commander Claude Wyatt. Both organizations are strong advocates for our veterans.

I'd like to recognize Glen Phillips, a veteran who played an important role in today's ceremony.

Let me also say a special hello to my longtime friends, Betty Lou and T.M. Weddle.

It's also an honor to recognize Sergeant Jesse T. Wethington, fellow resident of Liberty and fellow member of the Military Order of the Purple Heart, here today. Jesse, welcome.

Finally, I'd like to welcome the members of Earl Wilson's family who are from right here in Liberty and came to join us today, including Earl's wife, Brenda, and family members Crystal and John Davis; Melissa Wilson Durham; Addison and Ian Davis; Tanner and Blake Durham; Jimmy Couch, Cierra Couch, and Dave Brown.

The original Purple Heart was established by General George Washington himself, and as such the Purple Heart is the oldest existing military award that is still given to servicemembers.

For a period in our country's history, however, the honor fell into disuse. In 1932, to mark the bicentennial of Washington's birth, it was General Douglas MacArthur who spearheaded its revival.

We remember MacArthur for many things, not least of which are his words. To an audience at West Point Military Academy, he once said:

"'Duty, Honor, Country'—those three hallowed words reverently dictate what you ought to be, what you can be, what you will be. They are your rallying point to build courage when courage seems to fail, to regain faith when there seems to be little cause for faith, to create hope when hope becomes forlorn."

As it turns out, these words have particular meaning for the life and service of Specialist Earl Wilson. In the jungles of Vietnam, he found courage where we could have not blamed him for his courage failing, he found faith where there was little cause for it, and he created hope when it might have been lost.

Earl's time of service ended nearly 40 years ago, but our admiration of it has not. Earl was drafted into the U.S. Army and inducted on November 17, 1969. After completing basic training, he was sent to Fort Polk, Louisiana, for infantry school. Earl has said that in those days, if you went to Fort Polk, you knew you were going to Vietnam, because Fort Polk was the hottest, most miserable place there was. It was like training for the intense heat.

Sure enough, Earl was deployed to Vietnam and served there for one year, from July

1970 to July 1971. Traversing the mountains and jungles of Vietnam, in an entrenched battle with the enemy, was hazardous duty. Earl spent as long as 40 days on patrol in the sweltering jungles, without hot food, without showers, without any of the luxuries or amenities so many of us take for granted here at home.

Deployed with Company D, 1st Battalion, 6th Infantry Regiment, 23rd Infantry Division, Earl and his unit came under attack one night in January 1971. As daylight broke on the morning of January 7, Earl's unit went in pursuit of the enemy. Following a blood trail, they were in hot pursuit when they came upon a gate along their path.

One of Earl's fellow soldiers tried to open the gate. It was stuck, so he yanked on it, not knowing the gate was booby trapped. A hand grenade went off, knocking Earl and several other soldiers clean to the ground. Earl got pieces of shrapnel lodged in his leg, and had to be flown out for medical treatment.

Earl may have been down, but he was not out. After receiving care for his wound, he was back in action with the 1st Battalion, and was present on January 25 later that year on patrol in Quang Ngai.

As his unit proceeded on foot patrol, Earl was at the point. Earl circled back to the rear to check on his fellow soldier and best friend Specialist William Creech Jr. of Paris, Illinois. Earl's entire company had trekked the same path through the bushes, but as Specialist Creech entered the bushes along the same path he stepped on a hidden landmine and was killed.

Shrapnel from the landmine struck Earl in his head and arm and threw him backwards onto the ground. Earl suffered not only the loss of his best friend but also a severe hearing loss, which he still carries to this day. But Earl's injuries could have been worse. The landmine was so powerful it tore down trees that were up to five inches thick within the blast radius. Earl is lucky to be alive today.

Earl spent another six months in Vietnam before shipping out on July 8, 1971. It's ironic that as he was handed a four-inch thick stack of paperwork to process out of Vietnam, Earl accidentally dropped one of the folders—and learned from one document that he had received the Bronze Star Medal for bravery. But Earl never received the Purple Heart he earned with his blood and sacrifice—until now.

It is thanks to the unbreakable bonds of family and friendship that Earl is receiving his Purple Heart with Bronze Oak Leaf Cluster today. Earl's daughter, Melissa Wilson Durham, wrote me to ask for help getting her father the medals he deserved. Thank you, Melissa, for honoring your father's service.

Earl was also helped by his friend and fellow soldier, and friend to Kentucky soldiers everywhere, retired Staff Sergeant Glen Phillips. It was Staff Sergeant Phillips who helped gather the facts in order for Earl to receive his Purple Heart today.

Glen, who is also from Liberty, has helped look out for many veterans in the area over the years. Thank you Glen, for your service and for your efforts on behalf of Earl and so many other fellow veterans.

Earl, I know you accept this award with humility and grace, and with reverence and respect for your fellow soldiers who fought alongside you in the jungles of Vietnam, including the many who did not make it home, such as Specialist William Creech.

We're grateful for your service, Earl, and we're grateful to celebrate your sacrifice. It's never too late to honor the brave.

By the way, for those who do not know, the Bronze Oak Leaf Cluster is to signify that

Earl is actually eligible to receive two Purple Hearts, for the incident on January 7 and then also on January 25.

The presentation of this Purple Heart with Bronze Oak Leaf Cluster is just a small recognition of the wealth of respect you deserve for your service to our country and your service in protecting all of us.

And to the values of duty, honor, country that you hold in abundance, as General MacArthur prescribed—in a way that you have demonstrated to all of us that it is possible to build courage where there is none, to regain faith when it seems lost, and to create hope when hope is what's most needed.

Now, the solemn moment we're gathered here for today has arrived. Specialist Earl Wilson, Brenda, and members of the Wilson family—please join me for the reading of the proclamation and the presentation of the Purple Heart Medal with Bronze Oak Leaf Cluster.

Text of first Purple Heart Medal Proclamation:

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

To All Who Shall See These Presents, Greeting:

This is to Certify That the President of the United States of America Has Awarded the PURPLE HEART

Established by General George Washington

At Newburgh, New York, August 7, 1782 to:

Private First Class Denver E. Wilson

United States Army

For Wounds Received in Action

On 7 January 1971 in the Republic of Vietnam

Given Under my Hand in the City of Washington

This 15th Day of May 2014

David K. MacEwen

THE ADJUTANT GENERAL

Re-creation per General Orders 510, 13 January 1971

Headquarters, 23d Infantry Division  
APO San Francisco 96374

John M. McHugh

SECRETARY OF THE ARMY

Text of second Purple Heart Medal Proclamation:

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

To All Who Shall See These Presents, Greeting:

This is to Certify That the President of the United States of America Has Awarded the PURPLE HEART

Established by General George Washington

At Newburgh, New York, August 7, 1782 to:

Private First Class Denver E. Wilson

United States Army

For Wounds Received in Action

On 25 January 1971 in the Republic of Vietnam

Given Under my Hand in the City of Washington

This 15th Day of May 2014

David K. MacEwen

THE ADJUTANT GENERAL

Permanent Order 135-25, 15 May 2014

United States Army Human Resources Command

Fort Knox, Kentucky 40122-5408

John M. McHugh

SECRETARY OF THE ARMY

#### REMEMBERING PETER M. WEGE

Mr. LEVIN. Madam President, on July 7, Michigan lost a great champion. Over his 94 years, Peter M. Wege accomplished many lifetimes worth of goals. He helped the company his father founded, Steelcase, into one of the world's leading office furniture companies, employing thousands of

Michiganians and helping cement the status of Grand Rapids as the world's hub of office furniture making. And had he done no more than lead a great company and provide jobs to great workers, he would be worthy of celebration.

But as his hometown paper, the Grand Rapids Press, described him with typical West Michigan understatement, Pete Wege was "an unconventional industrialist." In a community that has benefited greatly from the public spirit of its business leaders, few have rivaled the impact of this remarkable man. Always aware of his good fortune and of the needs of his community, he poured money that could have made him one of the world's wealthiest people into the Grand Rapids area and beyond. Libraries and schools, theaters and museums, churches and civic buildings, parks and wilderness areas all benefitted from his generosity and vision.

And he had those two qualities—generosity and vision—in abundance. He was more than a philanthropist; he was a man on a mission. That mission began when he was on another kind of mission, serving his country during World War II, when he flew as a transport pilot. Piloting an aircraft to Pittsburgh during the war, the landing field was so shrouded in smog that he couldn't land. That polluted air launched him on a lifetime of dedication to environmental causes. He created the Wege Foundation in 1967 to promote educational, cultural, environmental and scientific efforts. Two years later, he established the Center for Environmental Study. He wrote two books laying out his argument that environmental stewardship would boost the economy, rather than harming growth.

Perhaps nowhere was Pete Wege's impact more strongly felt than in his love for the Great Lakes. In 2004, he sponsored the Healing Our Waters conference in Michigan. His agenda was simple and powerful: "The lakes are our life support system, and we've got to treat them that way," he said. The conference brought together environmental leaders from across the country, and led to publication of a report on the need for a plan to restore the Great Lakes. That powerful call helped lead to the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative, which has devoted millions of dollars to habitat restoration and environmental cleanup on the lakes. The Healing our Waters Coalition continues today to advocate for restoration and preservation of the lakes Pete Wege cared about so deeply.

Peter Wege dedicated his life to preserving this world's natural beauty, and to promoting the beauty that humankind creates. His legacy will live in the cleaner waters of the Great Lakes he loved, and in the artistic and scientific endeavors he helped to promote. He represents the best part of Michigan, the best part of America, that part that celebrates what makes

our world and its people so irreplaceable. I will miss him and Michigan will miss him.

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, I too wish to pay tribute to a great industrialist who became an even greater philanthropist, a passionate protector of our Great Lakes, and a dear friend, Peter Wege, who passed away yesterday at the age of 94.

A man of profound faith, with a deep love for his country, Peter was born in Grand Rapids, MI. After the bombing of Pearl Harbor in 1941, Peter left the University of Michigan to serve his country as a multi-engine pilot for the Army Air Force.

When he returned from World War II, he became a salesman for an office furniture company founded by his father. He wasn't given any breaks—he was forced to rise through the company by virtue of his own hard work, not his name.

He eventually became vice chairman of that company, whose name was changed to Steelcase, Inc., in 1954. The company became the world's largest manufacturer of office furniture, and Peter was eager to use the wealth he had earned to make a difference in the many causes that mattered to him.

Through the Wege Foundation, Peter made generous donations to the arts, to education, to health care, and to other human services.

His greatest passion, however, was the environment and our beautiful Great Lakes.

When he gave money to be used for the construction of a building, Peter never asked to see his name in gold. He only wanted the building to be green: He insisted on sustainable, LEED-certified design.

I can remember how proud Peter was to give me a book he had written. The title "Economicology," was a word he coined to describe his belief that you could make profits without making pollution.

As an outgrowth of his love for Michigan, Peter was a champion for the Great Lakes: His sponsorship of the "Healing Our Waters" conference brought conservationists and environmentalists from around the world. This helped provide the vision for the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative, which has provided over \$1 billion in funding for nearly 3,000 projects around the Great Lakes since 2010.

Throughout his life, Peter strived to make the world a better place for future generations. In that respect—as in every other endeavor he devoted himself to—Peter was an unqualified success.

He will be deeply missed, but Peter's generous spirit will live on.

Peter will be remembered every time a child plays in the sand on one of our beautiful Michigan beaches.

Peter will be remembered every time a family gathers around a dinner table to enjoy fish caught in one of our beautiful Great Lakes or the many fresh, clean rivers and streams across the region.

Peter will be remembered with every refreshing glass of clean water that comes from the tap and every invigorating breath of fresh air.

He will never be forgotten.

#### HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

ARMY SPECIALIST RYAN J. GRADY

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I wish to remember the life and sacrifice of a remarkable young man, Army SPC Ryan J. Grady. Ryan died July 1, 2010 in Bagram, Afghanistan, in support of Operation Enduring Freedom due to injuries sustained when an improvised explosive device detonated near his vehicle.

Ryan was born May 30, 1985 in Marion, KS and later moved to Bristow, OK. After graduating from Thunderbird Military Academy in 2003, he joined the Army as a combat engineer. He was awarded a Purple Heart from shrapnel wounds he received when his vehicle struck an improvised explosive device during his first deployment to Iraq in 2005–2006 in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom.

After returning home in 2006, he joined the Vermont National Guard. In 2008 he transferred to the Oklahoma National Guard and then returned to the Vermont National Guard in 2009 because he heard the unit was deploying to Afghanistan.

Ryan grew up in a military family, with his father and brothers serving in the Army as well. On the day of the incident, Ryan shared a meal with his brother, Kevin Grady, who was also deployed to Afghanistan with the Vermont National Guard.

Jim Grady, Jr. said Ryan's size 6-foot-4 and 240 pounds sometimes intimidated people, but said anyone who met him quickly could tell he had a warm heart. As a soldier, he would sign off on notes with the words "saving the world one mission at a time," his brother said.

At the grand opening of the Grady Dining Facility on Bagram Airfield's Camp Warrior, acting director of the Army National Guard, MG Raymond Carpenter, said "Specialist Ryan Grady represents to us what the modern National Guard is. He joined the guard because he wanted to serve his country."

Ryan was posthumously promoted from private first class to specialist and was laid to rest in Mount Pleasant Cemetery in St. Johnsbury, VT.

Ryan is survived by his wife Heaven, of Bristow, OK, his daughter Alexis, his father SFC James A. Grady of West Burke, VT, his mother Debbie Hudacek of Bristow, OK, stepfather Tom Hudacek of Bristow, OK, and his brothers: Kevin Grady of St. Johnsbury, VT and James Grady of Muskogee, OK.

Today we remember Army SPC Ryan J. Grady, a young man who loved his family and country, and gave his life as a sacrifice for freedom.

SERGEANT CHARLES S. JIRTLE

Madam President, today I also wish to remember the life and sacrifice of a

remarkable young man, Army SGT Charles S. Jirtle. Along with four other soldiers, Scott died June 7, 2010 of injuries he sustained from an improvised explosive device in Dangam district of Kunar Province, Afghanistan, in support of Operation Enduring Freedom.

Scott was born September 13, 1980 in Lawton, OK and graduated from MacArthur High School. After graduating, he served in the Navy Reserves in Oklahoma City.

The son of an Active Duty Army master sergeant, he enlisted in the Army in 2007. After completing basic training at Fort Benning, GA, he was assigned to Company A, 2nd Battalion, 327th Infantry Regiment, 1st Brigade Combat Team, 101st Airborne Division, Fort Campbell, KY as an indirect fire infantryman.

Scott, who served a tour in Iraq in 2007 and 2008, knew the impact the deployments had on his family. His final posting on Facebook read: "Savannah is having a real problem with this deployment, and I pray to God that He will watch over her and my children."

Pastor Trey Smart said Scott's four older brothers would recruit him when they heard the ice cream truck coming down the street. "They always knew if they sent Scott to ask Terry and Virginia for money, they wouldn't turn him down because he was the youngest," Smart said.

His parents said, "Our son Charles Scott Jirtle joined the Army because he wanted to take care of his children. He extended his enlistment for this deployment, knowing that he was going to a very hot spot."

Those thanking Scott for his ultimate sacrifice for the protection of this great country say John 15:13 describes his selfless virtues perfectly: "greater love hath not man than this, that he lay down his life for his friends."

On June 16, 2010, the family held church services at First Baptist Church East in Lawton, OK.

He is survived by his wife Savannah, daughters: Chelsie and Cheyenne, a son Jordan, unborn son Charles Scott Jirtle, Jr., stepdaughter Rylee Jo Jirtle, parents, MSG (Retired) Terry L. and Virginia Jirtle, Lawton, OK; 4 brothers: Joseph Elkins and wife Tammy, James Jirtle, Kendall Jirtle and wife Brandi, all of Lawton and AME2 (AW) Anthony Jirtle, Oak Harbor, WA; stepbrother, Danny Henry and wife Shauna; several nieces and nephews: Ashley, Kayla, Starr, Alexis, Skyler, Payton, Preston, Morgan, Bryce and Kolby.

Today we remember Army SGT Charles S. Jirtle, a young man who loved his family and country, and gave his life as a sacrifice for freedom.

SPECIALIST AUGUSTUS J. VICARI

Madam President, I now wish to pay tribute to a true American hero, Army SPC Augustus "Augy" J. Vicari of Broken Arrow, OK who died on July 29th, 2011 serving our Nation in Paktia Province, Afghanistan. Specialist Vicari

was assigned to Headquarters and Headquarters Company, 1st Battalion, 179th Infantry Regiment, 45th Infantry Brigade Combat Team, Oklahoma Army National Guard.

Specialist Vicari died of injuries sustained when his unit was attacked with an improvised explosive device while on patrol in the town of Janak Kheyl. He was 22 years old.

Our thoughts and prayers go out to those in his family he left behind: his wife Holly, parents Michael and Evelyn Vicari, and siblings: Joseph, Michael, Emily, and Mollie.

A native of Lowell, IN, Augy graduated from Lowell High School in 2008. After graduation, he and his wife then moved to Broken Arrow to be close to his father-in-law. Augy then enlisted in the Oklahoma National Guard and attended basic training and advanced individual training in 2009.

In addition to being a soldier, Augy enjoyed working on cars and spending time with family and friends. As evident by reading through some quotes from family and friends, he consistently impressed and touched the lives of those he interacted with on a daily basis:

John and Barb Slankard said "Augy's smile lit up every room he was in . . . a truly amazing person that was taken far too soon. We thank him for his courage and sacrifice and we are honored to have known him."

MG Myles Deering, the Oklahoma National Guard Adjutant General said, "This loss of life has shaken every member of the Oklahoma National Guard to their core. We have lost a very brave man who once raised his hand and took an oath to defend our nation. He courageously gave everything he had to ensure our freedom and safety and his sacrifice will not be forgotten."

SSG Kyle Wachtendorf of the Oklahoma National Guard praised Augy by saying, "He was a Oklahoman who chose to stand up and fight for what was right. Chose to leave his family in order to fight for others and made the ultimate sacrifice for God and their country."

Reverend Tony Janik said "Augy wanted to see the world. He wanted to see justice in the world."

U.S. Congressman PETER VISCLOSKEY from Indiana's 1st District honored and paid tribute to Augy on the floor of the House of Representatives on September 7, 2011.

A true warrior, Augy died while participating in a patrol in the town of Janak Kheyl of Paktia Province on his way back to the U.S. combat outpost just barely over a month after arriving in Afghanistan. This tough fight took Augy from us prematurely, but make no mistake; it is a fight we will win. We must continue our unwavering support for the men and women protecting our Nation and allies.

I extend our deepest gratitude and condolences to Augy's family and friends. Augy lived a life of love for his

wife and daughter, family, friends, and country. He will be remembered for his commitment to and belief in the greatness of our Nation. I am honored to pay tribute to this true American hero who volunteered to go into the fight and made the ultimate sacrifice for our protection and freedom.

#### NEWPORT, MAINE BICENTENNIAL

Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, I wish to commemorate the 200th anniversary of the Town of Newport, ME. Newport was built with a spirit of determination and resiliency that still guides the community today, and this bicentennial is a time to celebrate the generations of hard-working and caring people who have made it such a wonderful place to live, work, and raise families.

While this bicentennial marks Newport's incorporation, the year 1814 was but one milestone in a long journey of progress. For thousands of years, the region was the hunting and fishing grounds of the Abenaki, and the chain of lakes and streams formed their highway between the mighty Kennebec and Penobscot Rivers. The very name of the town a translation of Sebasticook, the Abenaki word for portage is evidence of the friendship between the first white settlers and the Native Americans.

The settlers were drawn by fertile soil, vast forests, and fast-moving waters, which they turned into productive farms and busy lumber mills that were soon followed by blacksmiths, leather manufacturing, textiles, and other endeavors vital to Maine's development. The wealth produced by the land, and by hard work and determination, was invested in schools and churches to create a true community. In the decades that followed, Newport became a center of industry and innovation with such remarkable endeavors as silk production, condensed milk manufacturing, and the fabrication of what were considered the finest carriages in Maine.

Today, the people of Newport continue to build. Their strong environmental ethic has helped make Sebasticook Lake a favorite recreation destination for residents and visitors. The Newport Industrial Center offers a home to new or expanding businesses, and the Newport Cultural Center contributes to a vibrant downtown.

A quality that runs through Newport's history is courage, best demonstrated by the memorial the town dedicated 3 years ago to SGT Donald Skidgel, who was awarded the Medal of Honor for giving his life to save the lives of his fellow soldiers in Vietnam. From the Civil War to the conflicts of our time, the names of some 500 patriots from Newport who have served our Nation with honor and defended our freedom with valor are inscribed on the Veterans Memorial.

This 200th anniversary is not just about something that is measured in

calendar years. It is about human accomplishment, an occasion to celebrate the people who for more than two centuries have pulled together, cared for one another, and built a community. Thanks to those who came before, Newport has a wonderful history. Thanks to those who are there today, it has a bright future.

#### JUSTICE FROM SERBIA

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, 15 years ago this week three American citizens—the brothers Ylli, Agron and Mehmet Bytyqi—were transferred from a prison to an Interior Ministry camp in Eastern Serbia. At that camp, they were executed and buried in a mass grave with dozens of Albanians from Kosovo.

Today, I again call upon the Serbian authorities to bring those responsible for these murders to justice. Belgrade has given us assurances in recent years that action will be taken, but no clear steps have actually been taken to apprehend and prosecute those known to have been in command of the camp or the forces operating there.

The three Bytyqi brothers went to Kosovo in 1999, a time of conflict and NATO intervention. Well after an agreed cessation of hostilities in early June, the brothers escorted an ethnic Romani family from Kosovo to territory still under Serbian control, where that family would be safer. Serbian authorities apprehended the brothers as they were undertaking this humanitarian task and held them in jail for 15 days for illegal entry. When time came for their release, they were instead turned over to a special operations unit of the Serbian Interior Ministry, transported to the camp and brutally executed. There was no due process, no trial, and no opportunity for the brothers to defend themselves. There was nothing but the cold-blooded murder of three American citizen brothers.

Serbia today is not the Serbia of 15 years ago. The people of Serbia ousted the undemocratic and extreme nationalist regime of Slobodan Milosevic in 2000, and the country has since made a steady, if at times difficult, transition to democracy and the rule of law. In 2014, Serbia began accession talks to join the European Union, and in 2015 it will chair the OSCE, a European organization which promotes democratic norms and human rights.

I applaud Serbia on its progress and I support its integration into Europe, but I cannot overlook the continued and contrasting absence of justice in the Bytyqi case. The new government of Prime Minister Aleksandar Vucic has pledged to act. It must now generate the political will to act. The protection of those responsible for this crime can no longer be tolerated.

The surviving Bytyqi family deserves to see justice. Serbia itself will put a dark past behind it by providing this justice. Serbian-American relations and Serbia's OSCE chairmanship will

be enhanced by providing justice. It is time for those responsible for the Bytyqi brother murders to lose their protection and to answer for the crimes they committed 15 years ago.

#### ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

##### PORT LIONS, ALASKA

• Mr. BEGICH. Madam President, I rise today to recognize the residents of Port Lions, AK as they celebrate the golden anniversary of the founding of their community.

Port Lions was founded after the tsunami caused by the 1964 Good Friday earthquake destroyed settlements on Afognak and Raspberry Islands. Residents of Port Lions began moving into the village in December, after receiving incredible support from the Lions Club to build anew. Over the years, Port Lions has become a community with a strong sense of pride in family, friendship, and the kind of resilience that characterizes Alaskans.

This year the city of Port Lions and the Native village of Port Lions have organized events to celebrate their 50-year history. They have honored the neighbors and relatives lost in 1964, celebrated the community they helped to build, and fostered their vision for even more growth and prosperity in the future.

I would like to thank the residents of Port Lions for their persistence, resilience, and determination in the face of difficult obstacles. Their lives are testimony to the strong spirit of Alaska. I am honored to have the opportunity to share in the commemoration of their golden anniversary.●

##### BREMER COUNTY, IOWA

• Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, the strength of my State of Iowa lies in its vibrant local communities, where citizens come together to foster economic development, make smart investments to expand opportunity, and take the initiative to improve the health and well-being of residents. Over the decades, I have witnessed the growth and revitalization of so many communities across my State. And it has been deeply gratifying to see how my work in Congress has supported these local efforts.

I have always believed in accountability for public officials, and this, my final year in the Senate, is an appropriate time to give an accounting of my work across four decades representing Iowa in Congress. I take pride in accomplishments that have been national in scope—for instance, passing the Americans with Disabilities Act and spearheading successful farm bills. But I take a very special pride in projects that have made a big difference in local communities across my State.

Today, I would like to give an accounting of my work with leaders and



residents of Bremer County to build a legacy of a stronger local economy, better schools and educational opportunities, and a healthier, safer community.

Between 2001 and 2013, the creative leadership in your community has worked with me to secure funding in Bremer County worth over \$2 million and successfully acquired financial assistance from programs I have fought hard to support, which have provided more than \$38 million to the local economy.

Of course, one of my favorite memories of working together includes the community's tremendous success with the Main Street Iowa program, particularly the great work they have done rehabilitating the Last National Bank Building.

Among the highlights:

**Investing in Iowa's economic development through targeted community projects:** In Northeast Iowa, we have worked together to grow the economy by making targeted investments in important economic development projects including improved roads and bridges, modernized sewer and water systems, and better housing options for residents of Bremer County. In many cases, I have secured Federal funding that has leveraged local investments and served as a catalyst for a whole ripple effect of positive, creative changes. For example, over many years, I fought for more than \$5.2 million in funding for ag-based industrial lubricant research, as well as \$500,000 for the 10th Avenue South corridor, and \$400,000 to rehabilitate abandoned military facility just outside of Waverly, helping to create jobs and expand economic opportunities.

**School grants:** Every child in Iowa deserves to be educated in a classroom that is safe, accessible, and modern. That is why, for the past decade and a half, I have secured funding for the innovative Iowa Demonstration Construction Grant Program—better known among educators in Iowa as Harkin grants for public schools construction and renovation. Across 15 years, Harkin grants worth more than \$132 million have helped school districts to fund a range of renovation and repair efforts—everything from updating fire safety systems to building new schools. In many cases, these Federal dollars have served as the needed incentive to leverage local public and private dollars, so it often has a tremendous multiplier effect within a school district. Over the years, Bremer County has received \$961,998 in Harkin grants. Similarly, schools in Bremer County have received funds that I designated for Iowa Star Schools for technology totaling \$89,295.

**Disaster mitigation and prevention:** In 1993, when historic floods ripped through Iowa, it became clear to me that the national emergency-response infrastructure was woefully inadequate to meet the needs of Iowans in flood-ravaged communities. I went to work

dramatically expanding the Federal Emergency Management Agency's hazard mitigation program, which helps communities reduce the loss of life and property due to natural disasters and enables mitigation measures to be implemented during the immediate recovery period. Disaster relief means more than helping people and businesses get back on their feet after a disaster, it means doing our best to prevent the same predictable flood or other catastrophe from recurring in the future. The hazard mitigation program that I helped create in 1993 provided critical support to Iowa communities impacted by the devastating floods of 2008. Bremer County has received over \$6 million to remediate and prevent widespread destruction from natural disasters.

**Agricultural and rural development:** Because I grew up in a small town in rural Iowa, I have always been a loyal friend and fierce advocate for family farmers and rural communities. I have been a member of the House or Senate Agriculture Committee for 40 years—including more than 10 years as chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee. Across the decades, I have championed farm policies for Iowans that include effective farm income protection and commodity programs; strong, progressive conservation assistance for agricultural producers; renewable energy opportunities; and robust economic development in our rural communities. Since 1991, through various programs authorized through the farm bill, Bremer County has received more than \$1 million from a variety of farm bill programs.

**Keeping Iowa communities safe:** I also firmly believe that our first responders need to be appropriately trained and equipped, able to respond to both local emergencies and to statewide challenges such as the methamphetamine epidemic. For instance, Bremer County has received \$200,000 in Community Oriented Policing Services, COPS, grants. Also, since 2001, Bremer County's fire departments have received over \$6 million for firefighter safety and operations equipment.

**Disability rights:** Growing up, I loved and admired my brother Frank, who was deaf. But I was deeply disturbed by the discrimination and obstacles he faced every day. That is why I have always been a passionate advocate for full equality for people with disabilities. As the primary author of the Americans with Disabilities Act and the ADA Amendments Act, I have had four guiding goals for our fellow citizens with disabilities: equal opportunity, full participation, independent living, and economic self-sufficiency. Nearly a quarter century since passage of the ADA, I see remarkable changes in communities everywhere I go in Iowa—not just in curb cuts or closed captioned television, but in the full participation of people with disabilities in our society and economy, folks who at long last have the opportunity to

contribute their talents and to be fully included. These changes have increased economic opportunities for all citizens of Bremer County, both those with and without disabilities.

This is at least a partial accounting of my work on behalf of Iowa, and specifically Bremer County, during my time in Congress. In every case, this work has been about partnerships, cooperation, and empowering folks at the State and local level, including in Bremer County, to fulfill their own dreams and initiatives. And, of course, this work is never complete. Even after I retire from the Senate, I have no intention of retiring from the fight for a better, fairer, richer Iowa. I will always be profoundly grateful for the opportunity to serve the people of Iowa as their Senator.●

#### FRANKLIN COUNTY, IOWA

● Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, the strength of my State of Iowa lies in its vibrant local communities, where citizens come together to foster economic development, make smart investments to expand opportunity, and take the initiative to improve the health and well-being of residents. Over the decades, I have witnessed the growth and revitalization of so many communities across my State. And it has been deeply gratifying to see how my work in Congress has supported these local efforts.

I have always believed in accountability for public officials, and this, my final year in the Senate, is an appropriate time to give an accounting of my work across four decades representing Iowa in Congress. I take pride in accomplishments that have been national in scope for instance, passing the Americans with Disabilities Act and spearheading successful farm bills. But I take a very special pride in projects that have made a big difference in local communities across my State.

Today, I would like to give an accounting of my work with leaders and residents of Franklin County to build a legacy of a stronger local economy, better schools and educational opportunities, and a healthier, safer community.

Between 2001 and 2013, the creative leadership in your community has worked with me to secure funding in Franklin County worth over \$1 million and successfully acquire financial assistance from programs I have fought hard to support, which have provided more than \$8 million to the local economy.

Of course, one of my favorite memories of working together is the great work that community leaders have done in using Main Street Iowa funds to leverage community investment and volunteerism to make major improvements in downtown Hampton.

Among the highlights:

**Main Street Iowa:** One of the greatest challenges we face in Iowa and all

across America is preserving the character and vitality of our small towns and rural communities. This is not just about economics. It is also about maintaining our identity as Iowans. Main Street Iowa helps preserve Iowa's heart and soul by providing funds to revitalize downtown business districts. This program has allowed towns like Hampton to use that money to leverage other investments to jumpstart change and renewal. I am so pleased that Franklin County has earned \$80,000 through this program. These grants build much more than buildings. They build up the spirit and morale of people in our small towns and local communities.

**School grants:** Every child in Iowa deserves to be educated in a classroom that is safe, accessible, and modern. That is why, for the past decade and a half, I have secured funding for the innovative Iowa Demonstration Construction Grant Program, better known among educators in Iowa as Harkin grants for public schools construction and renovation. Across 15 years, Harkin grants worth more than \$132 million have helped school districts to fund a range of renovation and repair efforts—everything from updating fire safety systems to building new schools. In many cases, these Federal dollars have served as the needed incentive to leverage local public and private dollars, so it often has a tremendous multiplier effect within a school district. Over the years, Franklin County has received \$1,723,499 in Harkin grants. Similarly, schools in Franklin County have received funds that I designated for Iowa Star Schools for technology totaling \$25,000.

**Agricultural and rural development:** Because I grew up in a small town in rural Iowa, I have always been a loyal friend and fierce advocate for family farmers and rural communities. I have been a member of the House or Senate Agriculture Committee for 40 years including more than 10 years as chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee. Across the decades, I have championed farm policies for Iowans that include effective farm income protection and commodity programs; strong, progressive conservation assistance for agricultural producers; renewable energy opportunities; and robust economic development in our rural communities. Since 1991, through various programs authorized through the farm bill, Franklin County has received more than \$445,420 from a variety of farm bill programs.

**Keeping Iowa communities safe:** I also firmly believe that our first responders need to be appropriately trained and equipped, able to respond to both local emergencies and to statewide challenges such as, for instance, the methamphetamine epidemic. Since 2001, Franklin County's fire departments have received over \$800,000 for firefighter safety and operations equipment.

**Disability rights:** Growing up, I loved and admired my brother Frank, who

was deaf. But I was deeply disturbed by the discrimination and obstacles he faced every day. That is why I have always been a passionate advocate for full equality for people with disabilities. As the primary author of the Americans with Disabilities Act, ADA, and the ADA Amendments Act, I have had four guiding goals for our fellow citizens with disabilities: equal opportunity, full participation, independent living and economic self-sufficiency. Nearly a quarter century since passage of the ADA, I see remarkable changes in communities everywhere I go in Iowa not just in curb cuts or closed captioned television, but in the full participation of people with disabilities in our society and economy, folks who at long last have the opportunity to contribute their talents and to be fully included. These changes have increased economic opportunities for all citizens of Franklin County, both those with and without disabilities. And they make us proud to be a part of a community and country that respects the worth and civil rights of all of our citizens.

This is at least a partial accounting of my work on behalf of Iowa, and specifically Franklin County, during my time in Congress. In every case, this work has been about partnerships, co-operation, and empowering folks at the State and local level, including in Franklin County, to fulfill their own dreams and initiatives. Of course, this work is never complete. Even after I retire from the Senate, I have no intention of retiring from the fight for a better, fairer, richer Iowa. I will always be profoundly grateful for the opportunity to serve the people of Iowa as their Senator.●

#### MONROE COUNTY, IOWA

● **Mr. HARKIN.** Madam President, the strength of my State of Iowa lies in its vibrant local communities, where citizens come together to foster economic development, make smart investments to expand opportunity, and take the initiative to improve the health and well-being of residents. Over the decades, I have witnessed the growth and revitalization of so many communities across my State. And it has been deeply gratifying to see how my work in Congress has supported these local efforts.

I have always believed in accountability for public officials, and this, my final year in the Senate, is an appropriate time to give an accounting of my work across four decades representing Iowa in Congress. I take pride in accomplishments that have been national in scope—for instance, passing the Americans with Disabilities Act and spearheading successful farm bills. But I take a very special pride in projects that have made a big difference in local communities across my State.

Today, I would like to give an accounting of my work with leaders and

residents of Monroe County to build a legacy of a stronger local economy, better schools and educational opportunities, and a healthier, safer community.

Between 2001 and 2013, the creative leadership in your community has worked with me to successfully acquire financial assistance from programs I have fought hard to support, which have provided more than \$2.9 million to the local economy.

Of course, my favorite memories of working together include the community's tremendous success at obtaining funds for firefighter safety and equipment through the Federal Emergency Management Agency, their work to improve housing for people with modest means through Housing and Urban Development, as well as their efforts to tap into funds made available through farm bill programs that I championed as Chair of the Senate Agriculture Committee.

Among the highlights:

**School grants:** Every child in Iowa deserves to be educated in a classroom that is safe, accessible, and modern. That is why, for the past decade and a half, I have secured funding for the innovative Iowa Demonstration Construction Grant Program—better known among educators in Iowa as Harkin grants for public schools construction and renovation. Across 15 years, Harkin grants worth more than \$132 million have helped school districts to fund a range of renovation and repair efforts—everything from updating fire safety systems to building new schools. In many cases, these Federal dollars have served as the needed incentive to leverage local public and private dollars, so it often has a tremendous multiplier effect within a school district. Over the years, Monroe County has received \$863,188 in Harkin grants. Similarly, schools in Monroe County have received funds that I designated for Iowa Star Schools for technology totaling \$57,500.

**Agricultural and rural development:** Because I grew up in a small town in rural Iowa, I have always been a loyal friend and fierce advocate for family farmers and rural communities. I have been a member of the House or Senate Agriculture Committee for 40 years—including more than 10 years as chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee. Across the decades, I have championed farm policies for Iowans that include effective farm income protection and commodity programs; strong, progressive conservation assistance for agricultural producers; renewable energy opportunities; and robust economic development in our rural communities. Since 1991, through various programs authorized through the farm bill, Monroe County has received more than \$146,000 from a variety of farm bill programs.

**Keeping Iowa communities safe:** I also firmly believe that our first responders need to be appropriately trained and equipped, able to respond

to both local emergencies and to statewide challenges such as, for instance, the methamphetamine epidemic. Since 2001, Monroe County's fire departments have received over \$500,000 for firefighter safety and operations equipment.

**Wellness and health care:** Improving the health and wellness of all Americans has been something I have been passionate about for decades. That is why I fought to dramatically increase funding for disease prevention, innovative medical research, and a whole range of initiatives to improve the health of individuals and families not only at the doctor's office but also in our communities, schools, and workplaces. I am so proud that Americans have better access to clinical preventive services, nutritious food, smoke-free environments, safe places to engage in physical activity, and information to make healthy decisions for themselves and their families. These efforts not only save lives, they will also save money for generations to come thanks to the prevention of costly chronic diseases, which account for a whopping 75 percent of annual health care costs. I am pleased that Monroe County has recognized this important issue by securing \$50,000 for community wellness activities.

**Disability rights:** Growing up, I loved and admired my brother Frank, who was deaf. But I was deeply disturbed by the discrimination and obstacles he faced every day. That is why I have always been a passionate advocate for full equality for people with disabilities. As the primary author of the Americans with Disabilities Act, ADA, and the ADA Amendments Act, I have had four guiding goals for our fellow citizens with disabilities: equal opportunity, full participation, independent living, and economic self-sufficiency. Nearly a quarter century since passage of the ADA, I see remarkable changes in communities everywhere I go in Iowa—not just in curb cuts or closed captioned television, but in the full participation of people with disabilities in our society and economy, folks who at long last have the opportunity to contribute their talents and to be fully included. These changes have increased economic opportunities for all citizens of Monroe County, both those with and without disabilities. And they make us proud to be a part of a community and country that respects the worth and civil rights of all of our citizens.

This is at least a partial accounting of my work on behalf of Iowa, and specifically Monroe County, during my time in Congress. In every case, this work has been about partnerships, cooperation, and empowering folks at the State and local level, including in Monroe County, to fulfill their own dreams and initiatives. And, of course, this work is never complete. Even after I retire from the Senate, I have no intention of retiring from the fight for a better, fairer, richer Iowa. I will always be profoundly grateful for the opportunity

to serve the people of Iowa as their Senator.●

#### TRIBUTE TO MARSHALL TRIMBLE

● **Mr. MCCAIN.** Madam President, on behalf of all Arizonans, I want to thank our State's official historian, Marshall Trimble, for his years of dedicated teaching service at Scottsdale Community College, from which he is retiring this year. Marshall Trimble is a true Arizona original. Born in Mesa and raised along historic Route 66 in Ash Fork, Marshall's infectious enthusiasm for Arizona's history and culture led him to begin teaching classes on the history of the southwest at Scottsdale's Coronado High School in 1969. For the next five decades, Marshall taught, sang and wrote about our State and its colorful historical characters, keeping alive our pioneering Old West spirit for generations of Arizonans. In 1997, Governor Fife Symington bestowed Marshall with the title Official State Historian, an honor continued by each successive Governor. Arizona owes Marshall a deep debt of gratitude for his many contributions to our State, and we look forward to his continuing to entertain and educate us for many years to come.●

#### TRIBUTE TO BRIGADIER GENERAL BRUCE PRUNK

● **Mr. WYDEN.** Madam President, today, I wish to pay tribute to Brig. Gen. Bruce Prunk. After 35 years of service to our Nation and the State of Oregon, General Prunk will retire from the Oregon National Guard. I know I speak for Oregonians across the State in thanking him for his service.

I got to know Bruce well during the 2005 Base Realignment and Closure Commissions, BRAC, process. He was a key player in leading the Oregon National Guard's efforts and working with my office to build an overwhelming business case for keeping the 142nd Fighter Wing open at the Portland Air National Guard Base. Everywhere you turned, it seemed like he was at community meetings, making media presentations, and doing outreach with elected officials and business leaders to build consensus. As a result of these herculean efforts, we successfully beat back Secretary Rumsfeld's recommendation to close the 142nd Fighter Wing, and the wing's airmen keep the skies of the Pacific Northwest safe to this day.

General Prunk enlisted in the Oregon Air National Guard in 1983 and worked his way up to serve in several high-level positions throughout the Oregon Air National Guard, including vice wing commander of the 142nd Fighter Wing, chief of staff for air at Joint Force Headquarters, and assistant adjutant general of the Oregon National Guard. He also held positions in the National Guard Bureau out in Washington, DC, serving as assistant and as special assistant to the Director of the

Air National Guard. And I would be remiss if I didn't mention that Bruce volunteered to deploy to Iraq in 2007 with the 732nd Air Expeditionary Group, 332nd Air Expeditionary Wing and that he earned the Bronze Star for actions during that deployment.

Rising to the level of general is quite an accomplishment and enough of a career for most folks, but not Bruce. In his civilian life, he joined the Portland Police in 1976, working his way up to captain, then to commander, and finally to assistant chief of police. In these positions, he led community policing efforts, working with local leaders and elected officials to improve neighborhood livability in Portland. He retired from the Portland Police in 2004 and was able to devote more time to the Oregon National Guard.

I think General Prunk's career epitomizes the citizen-soldier envisioned by the Founders. His civilian service and long military career have given him an appreciation for the various challenges Oregon's National Guard soldiers and airmen face balancing family, employer, and often medical issues. His ability to bring different groups together to solve problems is perhaps best illustrated through his work with Camp Rosenbaum, a free camp on the Oregon coast for low-income, inner-city children. For over 25 years he has led efforts to build a unique partnership between police, public employees, and private sponsors to help thousands of at-risk young people go to Camp Rosenbaum.

From his work on the BRAC recommendations to his service in the Portland Police to his involvement with Oregon's military crisis hotline on suicide prevention, General Prunk has just about done it all. Oregon is grateful for all of his hard work on the State's behalf and for the leadership he has displayed over his long and decorated career. It has been a privilege to get to know such a dedicated public official, and I want to thank him for his many years of outstanding service. His retirement will be a loss to Oregon, but we wish him a long, happy, and healthy retirement.●

#### REPORT RELATIVE TO THE ISSUANCE OF AN EXECUTIVE ORDER TO TAKE ADDITIONAL STEPS WITH RESPECT TO THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY ORIGINALLY DECLARED ON OCTOBER 27, 2006 IN EXECUTIVE ORDER 13413 WITH RESPECT TO THE DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF THE CONGO—PM 48

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:*

Pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C.

1701 *et seq.*) (IEEPA), I hereby report that I have issued an Executive Order (the “order”) taking additional steps with respect to the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13413 of October 27, 2006 (E.O. 13413).

In E.O. 13413, it was determined that the situation in or in relation to the Democratic Republic of the Congo, which has been marked by widespread violence and atrocities that continue to threaten regional stability and was addressed by the United Nations Security Council in Resolution 1596 of April 18, 2005, Resolution 1649 of December 21, 2005, and Resolution 1698 of July 31, 2006, constitutes an unusual and extraordinary threat to the foreign policy of the United States. To address that threat, E.O. 13413 blocks the property and interests in property of persons listed in the Annex to E.O. 13413 or determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State, to meet criteria specified in E.O. 13413.

In view of multiple additional United Nations Security Council Resolutions including, most recently, Resolution 2136 of January 30, 2014, I am issuing the order to take additional steps to deal with the national emergency declared in E.O. 13413, and to address the continuation of activities that threaten the peace, security, or stability of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the surrounding region, including operations by armed groups, widespread violence and atrocities, human rights abuses, recruitment and use of child soldiers, attacks on peacekeepers, obstruction of humanitarian operations, and exploitation of natural resources to finance persons engaged in these activities.

The order amends the designation criteria specified in E.O. 13413. As amended by the order, E.O. 13413 provides for the designation of persons determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State:

To be a political or military leader of a foreign armed group operating in the Democratic Republic of the Congo that impedes the disarmament, demobilization, voluntary repatriation, resettlement, or reintegration of combatants;

To be a political or military leader of a Congolese armed group that impedes the disarmament, demobilization, voluntary repatriation, resettlement, or reintegration of combatants;

To be responsible for or complicit in, or to have engaged in, directly or indirectly, any of the following in or in relation to the Democratic Republic of the Congo:

actions or policies that threaten the peace, security, or stability of the Democratic Republic of the Congo;

actions or policies that undermine democratic processes or institutions in the Democratic Republic of the Congo;

the targeting of women, children, or any civilians through the commission of acts of violence (including killing, maiming, torture, or rape or other sex-

ual violence), abduction, forced displacement, or attacks on schools, hospitals, religious sites, or locations where civilians are seeking refuge, or through conduct that would constitute a serious abuse or violation of human rights or a violation of international humanitarian law;

the use or recruitment of children by armed groups or armed forces in the context of the conflict in the Democratic Republic of the Congo;

the obstruction of the delivery or distribution of, or access to, humanitarian assistance;

attacks against United Nations missions, international security presences, or other peacekeeping operations; or

support to persons, including armed groups, involved in activities that threaten the peace, security, or stability of the Democratic Republic of the Congo or that undermine democratic processes or institutions in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, through the illicit trade in natural resources of the Democratic Republic of the Congo;

Except where intended for the authorized support of humanitarian activities or the authorized use by or support of peacekeeping, international, or government forces, to have directly or indirectly supplied, sold, or transferred to the Democratic Republic of the Congo, or been the recipient in the territory of the Democratic Republic of the Congo of, arms and related materiel, including military aircraft and equipment, or advice, training, or assistance, including financing and financial assistance, related to military activities;

To be a leader of (i) an entity, including any armed group, that has, or whose members have, engaged in any of the activities described above or (ii) an entity whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to E.O. 13413;

To have materially assisted, sponsored, or provided financial, material, logistical, or technological support for, or goods or services in support of (i) any of the activities described above or (ii) any person whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to E.O. 13413; or

To be owned or controlled by, or to have acted or purported to act for or on behalf of, directly or indirectly, any person whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to E.O. 13413.

I have delegated to the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State, the authority to take such actions, including the promulgation of rules and regulations, and to employ all powers granted to the President by IEEPA and the United Nations Participation Act as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of the order. All agencies of the United States Government are directed to take all appropriate measures within their authority to carry out the provisions of the order.

I am enclosing a copy of the Executive Order I have issued.

BARACK OBAMA,  
THE WHITE HOUSE, July 8, 2014.

## MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

S. 2569. A bill to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America.

## 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-6317. A communication from the Associate Administrator of the Cotton and Tobacco Programs, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Cotton Board Rules and Regulations: Adjusting Supplemental Assessment on Imports (2014 Amendment)” (Docket No. AMS-CN-13-0100) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-6318. A communication from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Organization; Funding and Fiscal Affairs, Loan Policies and Operations, and Funding Operations; Investment Eligibility” (RIN3052-AC84) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-6319. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Legislative Affairs), transmitting, legislative proposals relative to the “National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015”; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-6320. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Legislative Affairs), transmitting, legislative proposals relative to the “National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015”; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-6321. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Department of Defense (DoD) intending to assign women to previously closed positions in the Army; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-6322. A communication from the Deputy Secretary, Division of Trading and Markets, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Application of ‘Security-Based Swap Dealer’ and ‘Major Security-Based Swap Participant’ Definitions to Cross-Border Security-Based Swap Activities” (RIN3235-AL25) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 27, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-6323. A communication from the Senior Vice President and Chief Financial Officer, Federal Home Loan Bank of Dallas, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Bank’s management report for fiscal year 2013; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-6324. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency that was declared in

Executive Order 13441 with respect to Lebanon; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-6325. A communication from the Assistant Director for Regulatory Affairs, Office of Foreign Assets Control, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Zimbabwe Sanctions Regulations” (31 CFR Part 541) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-6326. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to operation of the Exchange Stabilization Fund (ESF) for fiscal year 2013; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-6327. 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-2014-0002)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-6328. A communication from the Acting Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Suspension of Community Eligibility” ((44 CFR Part 64) (Docket No. FEMA-2014-0002)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-6329. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled “Annual Report to Congress on the Activities of the Western Hemisphere Institute for Security Cooperation for 2013”; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-6330. A communication from the General Counsel of the National Credit Union Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Capital Planning and Stress Testing” (RIN3133-AE27) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-6331. A communication from the Assistant Director for Regulatory Affairs, Office of Foreign Assets Control, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Central African Republic Sanctions Regulations” (31 CFR Part 553) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 2, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-6332. A communication from the Assistant Director for Regulatory Affairs, Office of Foreign Assets Control, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “South Sudan Sanctions Regulations” (31 CFR Part 558) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 30, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-6333. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Addition of Certain Persons to the Entity List; and Removal of Person from the Entity List Based on Removal Request” (RIN0694-AG19) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 2, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-6334. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and

Regulations, Office of the Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Amendments To Reflect Change of Office Name From Office of Healthy Homes and Lead Hazard Control to Office of Lead Hazard Control and Healthy Homes” (RIN2501-AD70) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 2, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-6335. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Financial Markets, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Government Securities Act Regulations; Replacement of References to Credit Ratings and Technical Amendments” (RIN1535-AA02) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 2, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-6336. A communication from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled “High-Performance Green Building Initiative Activities”; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-6337. A communication from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled “Response to Findings and Recommendations of the Hydrogen and Fuel Cell Technical Advisory Committee (HTAC) during Fiscal Years 2012 and 2013”; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-6338. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Placer County Air Pollution Control District” (FRL No. 9910-99-Region 9) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 2, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-6339. 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; Indiana; Indiana PM2.5 NSR” (FRL No. 9912-85-Region 5) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 2, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-6340. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Ventura County Air Pollution Control District” (FRL No. 9911-91-Region 9) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 2, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-6341. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Administrative Wage Garnishment” (FRL No. 9910-14-OCFO) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 2, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-6342. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Significant New Use Rules on Certain Chemical Substances” ((RIN2070-AB27) (FRL No. 9911-05)) received during adjournment of

the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 2, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-6343. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to extending the Memorandum of Understanding Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Kingdom of Cambodia Concerning the Imposition of Import Restrictions on Archaeological Material from Cambodia from the Bronze Age Through the Khmer Era; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-6344. A communication from the Acting Commissioner, Social Security Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to Supplemental Security Income (SSI) non-medical redeterminations for fiscal year 2010; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-6345. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Participation of a Person Described in Section 6103(n) in a Summons Interview Under Section 7602(a)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code” ((RIN1545-BM25) (TD 9669)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 2, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-6346. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Applicable Federal Rates—July 2014” (Rev. Rul. 2014-20) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 2, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-6347. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Disregarded Entities; Religious and Family Member FICA and FUTA Exceptions; Indoor Tanning Services Excise Tax” ((RIN1545-BJ06; RIN1545-BK38) (TD 9670)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 2, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-6348. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Tax Credit for Employee Health Insurance Expenses of Small Employers” ((RIN1545-BL55) (TD 9672)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 2, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-6349. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Ninety-Day Waiting Period Limitation” ((RIN1545-BL97) (TD 9671)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-6350. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Annual Filing Season Program” (Rev. Proc. 2014-42) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-6351. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Case-Zablocki Act, 1 U.S.C. 112b, as amended, the report of the texts and background statements of international agreements, other than treaties (List 2014-0079—2014-0083); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-6352. A communication from the Acting Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Service, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Final Priority. National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research—Rehabilitation Engineering Research and Training Centers" (CFDA No. 84.133B-3) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 2, 2014; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-6353. A communication from the Director of Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "New Animal Drug Applications; Confidentiality of Data and Information in a New Animal Drug Application File; Confirmation of Effective Date" (Docket No. FDA-2014-N-0108) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 2, 2014; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-6354. A communication from the Acting Surgeon General, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the National Prevention, Health Promotion and Public Health Council's 2014 annual status report; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-6355. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-365, "Air Quality Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-6356. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-366, "Southwest Business Improvement District Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-6357. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-367, "Workers' Compensation Statute of Limitations Temporary Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-6358. A communication from the Chairman, National Transportation Safety Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Board's final inventory list for 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-6359. A communication from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Office's annual report on Federal agencies' use of the Physicians' Comparability Allowance (PCA) program; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-6360. A communication from the Director, Office of Civil Rights, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department's fiscal year 2013 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-6361. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department of Transportation's fiscal year 2013 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act); to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-6362. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Depart-

ment of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Final Priority. National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research—Rehabilitation Research and Training Centers" (CFDA No. 84.133B-5.) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 2, 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-6363. A communication from the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Semiannual Report of the Inspector General and the Management Response for the period from October 1, 2013 through March 31, 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-6364. A communication from the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Semiannual Report from the Office of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2013 through March 31, 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-6365. A communication from the Acting District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "District of Columbia Agencies' Compliance with Fiscal Year 2014 Small Business Enterprise Expenditure Goals through the 2nd Quarter of the Fiscal Year 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-6366. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Schedules of Controlled Substances: Placement of Tramadol into Schedule IV" (Docket No. DEA-351) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 30, 2014; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-6367. A communication from the Director of National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the 2013 Report on Apportionment of Membership on the Regional Fishery Management Councils; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6368. A communication from the Regulatory Ombudsman, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Incorporation by Reference; North American Standard Out-of-Service Criteria; Hazardous Materials Safety Permits" (RIN2126-AB73) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 2, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6369. A communication from the Deputy Assistant General Counsel for the Office of Aviation Enforcement and Proceedings, Office of the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a rule entitled "Reports by Air Carriers on Incidents Involving Animals During Air Transport" (RIN2105-AE07) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 2, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6370. A communication from the Deputy Assistant General Counsel for the Office of Aviation Enforcement and Proceedings, Office of the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a rule entitled "Nondiscrimination on the Basis of Disability in Air Travel: Accessibility of Web Sites and Automated Kiosks at U.S. Airports" (RIN2105-AD96) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Of-

fice of the President of the Senate on July 2, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6371. A communication from the Deputy Assistant General Counsel for the Office of Aviation Enforcement and Proceedings, Office of the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a rule entitled "Nondiscrimination on the Basis of Disability in Air Travel: Accessibility of Aircraft and Stowage of Wheelchairs" (RIN2105-AD87) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 2, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6372. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Reapportionment of Halibut Prohibited Species Catch Limit in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands" (RIN0648-XD347) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6373. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; 2014 Commercial Accountability Measure and Closure for Bluefin Tilefish in the South Atlantic Region" (RIN0648-XD331) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6374. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Northern Rockfish in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area" (RIN0648-XD337) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6375. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Bluefish Fishery; 2014 Atlantic Bluefish Specifications" (RIN0648-XD139) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6376. A communication from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, Greater Atlantic Regional Office, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Taking of Marine Mammals Incidental to Commercial Fishing Operations; Atlantic Large Whale Take Reduction Plan Regulations" (RIN0648-BC90) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6377. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries Off West Coast States; Coastal Pelagic Species Fisheries; Closure" (RIN0648-XD238) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6378. A communication from the Chief of the Broadband Division, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled



"Amendment Parts 1, 21, 73, 74, and 101 of the Commission's Rules to Facilitate the Provision of Fixed and Mobile Broadband Access, Educational and Other Advanced Services in the 2150–2162 and 2500–2690 MHz Bands" ((WT Docket No. 03–66) (FCC 14–76)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 7, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6379. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Navigation and Navigable Waters; Technical, Organizational, and Conforming Amendments" ((RIN1625–AC13) (Docket No. USCG–2014–0410)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 30, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6380. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Dry Cargo Residue Discharges in the Great Lakes" ((RIN1625–AA89) (Docket No. USCG–2004–19621)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 30, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6381. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Changes to the Inland Navigation Rules" ((RIN1625–AB88) (Docket No. USCG–2012–0102)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 30, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6382. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Isle of Wight (Sinepuxent) Bay, Ocean City, MD" ((RIN1625–AA09) (Docket No. USCG–2013–1021)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 30, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6383. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Hackensack River, Jersey City, NJ" ((RIN1625–AA09) (Docket No. USCG–2013–1005)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 30, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

#### 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 Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. MURRAY, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Ms. MIKULSKI):

S. 2565. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to enhance the dependent care tax credit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HELLER (for himself and Mr. REID):

S. 2566. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain public land in and around historic mining townsites located in the State of Nevada, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 2567. A bill to provide for the sealing or expungement of records relating to Federal nonviolent criminal offenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. FISCHER:

S. 2568. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the contribution limit for Coverdell education savings accounts from \$2,000 to \$5,000, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WALSH (for himself, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. WARNER, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mrs. HAGAN, Mr. COONS, Mr. REED, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. MCCASKILL, and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. 2569. A bill to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America; read the first time.

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

S.J. Res. 40. A joint resolution providing for the appointment of Michael Lynton as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

#### ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 109

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the names of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) were added as cosponsors of S. 109, a bill to preserve open competition and Federal Government neutrality towards the labor relations of Federal Government contractors on Federal and federally funded construction projects.

S. 350

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 350, a bill to provide for Federal agencies to develop public access policies relating to research conducted by employees of that agency or from funds administered by that agency.

S. 357

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 357, a bill to encourage, enhance, and integrate Blue Alert plans throughout the United States in order to disseminate information when a law enforcement officer is seriously injured or killed in the line of duty.

S. 489

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 489, a bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to increase and adjust for inflation the maximum value of articles that may be imported duty-free by one person on one day, and for other purposes.

S. 539

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr.

DONNELLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 539, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to foster more effective implementation and coordination of clinical care for people with pre-diabetes and diabetes.

S. 632

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 632, a bill to amend the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 to repeal a duplicative program relating to inspection and grading of catfish.

S. 654

At the request of Ms. LANDRIEU, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 654, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for collegiate housing and infrastructure grants.

S. 738

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 738, a bill to grant the Secretary of the Interior permanent authority to authorize States to issue electronic duck stamps, and for other purposes.

S. 916

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 916, a bill to authorize the acquisition and protection of nationally significant battlefields and associated sites of the Revolutionary War and the War of 1812 under the American Battlefield Protection Program.

S. 945

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 945, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve access to diabetes self-management training by authorizing certified diabetes educators to provide diabetes self-management training services, including as part of telehealth services, under part B of the Medicare program.

S. 1040

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1040, a bill to provide for the award of a gold medal on behalf of Congress to Jack Nicklaus, in recognition of his service to the Nation in promoting excellence, good sportsmanship, and philanthropy.

S. 1410

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1410, a bill to focus limited Federal resources on the most serious offenders.

S. 1442

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1442, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the minimum low-income housing tax credit rate for unsubsidized buildings and to provide a minimum 4 percent credit rate for existing buildings.

S. 1476

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1476, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the denial of deduction for certain excessive employee remuneration, and for other purposes.

S. 1878

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1878, a bill to better enable State child welfare agencies to prevent sex trafficking of children and serve the needs of children who are victims of sex trafficking, and for other purposes.

S. 2141

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2141, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide an alternative process for review of safety and effectiveness of non-prescription sunscreen active ingredients and for other purposes.

S. 2187

At the request of Mr. BEGICH, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2187, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for a five-year extension of the rural community hospital demonstration program.

S. 2206

At the request of Mr. COBURN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2206, a bill to streamline the collection and distribution of government information.

S. 2235

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2235, a bill to secure the Federal voting rights of persons when released from incarceration.

S. 2307

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the names of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2307, a bill to prevent international violence against women, and for other purposes.

S. 2449

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

S. 2481

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2481, a bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide authority for sole source contracts for certain small business concerns owned and controlled by women, and for other purposes.

S. 2483

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Virginia

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

S. 2508

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) were added as cosponsors of S. 2508, a bill to establish a comprehensive United States Government policy to assist countries in sub-Saharan Africa to improve access to and the affordability, reliability, and sustainability of power, and for other purposes.

S. 2520

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2520, a bill to improve the Freedom of Information Act.

S. 2532

At the request of Mr. REED, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 2532, a bill to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits.

S. 2535

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2535, a bill to amend section 1951 of title 18, United States Code (commonly known as the Hobbs Act), and for other purposes.

S. 2548

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2548, a bill to require the Commodity Futures Trading Commission to take certain emergency action to eliminate excessive speculation in energy markets.

S. 2552

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2552, a bill to enhance beneficiary and provider protections and improve transparency in the Medicare Advantage market, and for other purposes.

S.J. RES. 19

At the request of Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 19, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to contributions and expenditures intended to affect elections.

AMENDMENT NO. 3377

At the request of Mr. LEVIN, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3377 intended to be proposed to S. 2410, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military

activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3451

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 3451 intended to be proposed to S. 2363, a bill to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes.

#### STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. MURRAY, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Ms. MIKULSKI): S. 2565. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to enhance the dependent care tax credit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I am here to discuss the Helping Working Families Afford Child Care Act, which is a bill my colleagues Senators Shaheen, Boxer, Gillibrand, and I introduced today. It will update the child and dependent care tax credit to offer working families more relief from the rising costs of childcare.

When the child and dependent care tax credit was enacted originally, kids were playing with Rubik's Cubes and listening to eight-track tapes. As we all know, a lot has changed since then, and one of the most important changes our country has seen since that time is the rise of women in the labor force.

Since the mid-1970s, women's participation in the labor force has increased by 23 percent, and most women now do work full time. In two-thirds of families with dependent children, both parents work outside the home.

Over a period of time in which the middle class has been squeezed by an increasingly global economy with higher prices for everything from health care to college, women joining the labor force has helped to ease some of those burdens for families. In fact, Federal Reserve Chair Janet Yellen has called the increasing participation of women in the workforce: "A major factor in sustaining growing families incomes." A recent study by the Center for American Progress found between 1979 and 2012, the U.S. economy grew by 11 percent as a result of women joining the labor force.

As we look for ways to create jobs and expand growth in the 21st century, it is clear our country's economic success goes hand in hand with that of women and working families. We have to make sure our policies are updated to meet the needs of today's working parents, and one area we need to take a look at is childcare. The cost of childcare has skyrocketed in recent

years. Full-time childcare for just one child can cost families more than \$10,000 annually, and for families below the poverty level—those who are already struggling the most to make ends meet—childcare can, on average, swallow one-third of what those parents are able to bring home.

This is a real problem for far too many hard-working parents, and it is a problem for our economy, because when parents are struggling to find reliable, safe, affordable care for their children during the day, it is harder for them to give their all on the job. Even worse, childcare is so expensive, some parents—most often mothers—are deciding it is not even worth returning to the workforce. This means families are being held back from gaining the economic security they are working so hard to achieve.

The child and dependent care tax credit was of course intended to help parents overcome these barriers, but today the benefit working parents get from the credit is a small fraction of what childcare actually costs. Because of how it is structured, the lowest income working families cannot benefit from it at all, meaning they have to bear the full brunt of childcare costs on very low wages.

It is clear this credit is one of the policies we need to bring into the 21st century, and that is exactly what we were doing when we introduced the Helping Working Families Afford Child Care Act. This legislation will boost the benefit working families can receive for childcare costs, and it will make the child and dependent care tax credit refundable so those working parents who are struggling the most to make ends meet can better afford the childcare they need to work and support their families.

If Congress passes our bill, next year working families could see a credit of \$1,600 for one child or \$3,200 for more than one child. That is almost three times the maximum benefit many families are currently eligible to receive.

Our bill would be a real help to hard-working families who are trying to raise their children, pay the bills, save for college, and put something away for retirement. It could break down one of the biggest barriers mothers face when thinking about reentering the workforce.

The need to expand access to affordable childcare is something I often talk about with my own constituents in Washington State. During those conversations, what I hear from parents is: I am so glad you focused on this. It is a real issue for us.

Updating this tax credit to reflect the needs of families in today's economy would be a critical step forward in terms of our larger effort to ensure that working parents, dads and moms, have a fair shot.

I believe by putting in place policies to make childcare more affordable, make sure women get the equal pay they deserve by raising the minimum wage so millions of workers have a better shot at lifting themselves out of

poverty, and by taking steps to ensure students are not overwhelmed by debt after they graduate from college, we could break down some very real barriers that are holding our families and our economy back. There is no reason we should not start that right now with the bill we are introducing today.

I hope all of our colleagues will take a minute, look at this—Helping Working Families Afford Child Care Act—and take this seriously. I hope we will be able to make it easier for moms and dads to afford safe reliable care for their children while they are at work. I think we can all agree parents deserve to have that peace of mind. I believe if we enact this bill and build on it with other critical policies to help working families, our economy will be much stronger now and over the long term.

I thank Senators SHAHEEN, BOXER, and GILLIBRAND again for all of their hard work and leadership on the part of working families.

#### AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 3454. Mr. HELLER (for himself and Mr. WARNER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3455. Mr. PORTMAN (for himself and Mr. UDALL of New Mexico) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3456. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3457. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3458. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3459. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3460. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3461. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3462. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3463. Mr. BURR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3464. Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. RISCH, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. WALSH, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. BENNET, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, and Ms. STABENOW) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3465. Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2363, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3466. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3467. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3468. Mr. ALEXANDER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3469. Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself and Mr. RISCH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3470. Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. CANTWELL, and Mr. KING) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2363, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3471. Mr. MERKLEY (for himself and Mr. WYDEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3472. Mr. KAINE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3473. Mr. WHITEHOUSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3474. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3475. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3476. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3477. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3478. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3479. Mrs. FEINSTEIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2363, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

#### TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

**SA 3454.** Mr. HELLER (for himself and Mr. WARNER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title I, add the following:

**SEC. 1. . . . EXPEDITED ACCESS TO CERTAIN FEDERAL LANDS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall develop and implement a process to expedite

access to Federal lands under the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary for eligible organizations and eligible individuals to request access to Federal lands to conduct good Samaritan search-and-recovery missions. The process developed and implemented pursuant to this subsection shall include provisions that clarify that—

(1) an eligible organization or eligible individual granted access under this section shall be acting for private purposes and shall not be considered a Federal volunteer;

(2) an eligible organization or eligible individual conducting a good Samaritan search-and-recovery mission under this section shall not be considered a volunteer under section 3 of the Volunteers in the Parks Act of 1969 (16 U.S.C. 181);

(3) the Federal Torts Claim Act shall not apply to an eligible organization or eligible individual carrying out a privately requested good Samaritan search-and-recovery mission under this section; and

(4) the Federal Employee Compensation Act shall not apply to an eligible organization or eligible individual conducting good Samaritan search-and-recovery mission under this section and such activities shall not constitute civilian employment.

(b) **RELEASE OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT FROM LIABILITY.**—The Secretary shall not require an eligible organization or an eligible individual to have liability insurance as a condition of accessing Federal lands under this section if the eligible organization or eligible individual—

(1) acknowledges and consents, in writing, to the provisions listed in paragraphs (1) through (4) of subsection (a); and

(2) signs a waiver releasing the Federal Government from all liability related to the access granted under this section.

(c) **APPROVAL AND DENIAL OF REQUESTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall notify an eligible organization and eligible individual of the approval or denial of a request by that eligible organization and eligible individual to carry out a good Samaritan search-and-recovery mission under this section not more than 48 hours after the request is made.

(2) **DENIALS.**—If the Secretary denies a request from an eligible organization or eligible individual to carry out a good Samaritan search-and-recovery mission under this section, the Secretary shall notify the eligible organization or eligible individual of—

(A) the reason for the denial request; and

(B) any actions that eligible organization or eligible individual can take to meet the requirements for the request to be approved.

(d) **PARTNERSHIPS.**—The Secretary shall develop search-and-recovery focused partnerships with search-and-recovery organizations to—

(1) coordinate good Samaritan search-and-recovery missions on Federal lands under the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary; and

(2) expedite and accelerate good Samaritan search-and-recovery mission efforts for missing individuals on Federal lands under the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary.

(e) **REPORT.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit a joint report to Congress describing—

(1) plans to develop partnerships described in subsection (d)(1); and

(2) efforts being taken to expedite and accelerate good Samaritan search-and-recovery mission efforts for missing individuals on Federal lands under the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary pursuant to subsection (d)(2).

(f) **DEFINITIONS.**—For the purposes of this section, the following definitions apply:

(1) **ELIGIBLE ORGANIZATION AND ELIGIBLE INDIVIDUAL.**—The terms “eligible organiza-

tion” and “eligible individual” means an organization or individual, respectively, that—

(A) is acting in a not-for-profit capacity; and

(B) is certificated in training that meets or exceeds standards established by the American Society for Testing and Materials.

(2) **GOOD SAMARITAN SEARCH-AND-RECOVERY MISSION.**—The term “good Samaritan search-and-recovery mission” means a search for one or more missing individuals believed to be deceased at the time that the search is initiated.

(3) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture, as appropriate.

**SA 3455.** Mr. PORTMAN (for himself and Mr. UDALL of New Mexico) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . MULTINATIONAL SPECIES CONSERVATION FUNDS SEMIPOSTAL STAMP.**

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This section may be cited as the “Multinational Species Conservation Funds Semipostal Stamp Reauthorization Act of 2014”.

(b) **REAUTHORIZATION.**—Section 2(c)(2) of the Multinational Species Conservation Funds Semipostal Stamp Act of 2010 (39 U.S.C. 416 note) is amended by striking “2 years” and inserting “6 years”.

**SA 3456.** Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title I, add the following:

**SEC. 1 \_\_\_\_ . FEDERAL LAND DISPOSAL.**

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **COVERED LAND.**—The term “covered land” means—

(A) land under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior; or

(B) land under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture (acting through the Chief of the Forest Service).

(2) **EXCESS COVERED LAND.**—The term “excess covered land” means any covered land that is identified for disposal under subsection (c).

(3) **SECRETARY CONCERNED.**—The term “Secretary concerned” means—

(A) the Secretary of the Interior, with respect to land under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior; and

(B) the Secretary of Agriculture (acting through the Chief of the Forest Service), with respect to land under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture (acting through the Chief of the Forest Service).

(b) **LIMIT ON FEDERAL OWNERSHIP OF LAND.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law (including regulations), covered land shall not comprise more than 50 percent of the total land area of a State.

(c) **IDENTIFICATION OF EXCESS COVERED LAND FOR DISPOSAL.**—If the total percentage of covered land in a State exceeds the limit established by subsection (b), the Secretaries concerned shall jointly identify covered land in the State that the Secretaries concerned determine to be appropriate for disposal under subsection (d).

(d) **REQUIRED DISPOSAL.**—Not later than December 31, 2019, the Secretary concerned shall dispose of all excess covered land through—

(1) transfer to the State in which the excess covered land is located; or

(2) selling the excess covered land at auction.

(e) **RULES.**—The Secretary concerned shall issue rules to carry out the transfers and sales under subsection (d).

**SA 3457.** Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . FIREARM COMMERCE MODERNIZATION.**

(a) **FIREARMS DISPOSITIONS.**—Section 922(b)(3) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “located” and inserting “located or temporarily located”; and

(2) in subparagraph (A)—

(A) by striking “rifle or shotgun” and inserting “firearm”; and

(B) by striking “located” and inserting “located or temporarily located”; and

(C) by striking “both such States” and inserting “the State in which the transfer is conducted and the State of residence of the transferee”.

(b) **DEALER LOCATION.**—Section 923 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (j)—

(A) in the first sentence, by striking “, and such location is in the State which is specified on the license”; and

(B) in the last sentence—

(i) by inserting “transfer,” after “sell,”; and

(ii) by striking “Act,” and all that follows and inserting “Act.”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(m) Nothing in this chapter shall be construed to prohibit the sale, transfer, delivery, or other disposition of a firearm or ammunition—

“(1) by a person licensed under this chapter to another person so licensed, at any location in any State; or

“(2) by a licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, or licensed dealer to a person not licensed under this chapter, at a temporary location described in subsection (j) in any State.”.

(c) **RESIDENCE OF UNITED STATES OFFICERS.**—Section 921 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

“(b) For purposes of this chapter:

“(1) A member of the Armed Forces on active duty, or a spouse of such a member, is a resident of—

“(A) the State in which the member or spouse maintains legal residence;

“(B) the State in which the permanent duty station of the member is located; and

“(C) the State in which the member maintains a place of abode from which the member commutes each day to the permanent duty station of the member.

“(2) An officer or employee of the United States (other than a member of the Armed Forces) who is stationed outside the United States for a period of more than 1 year, and a spouse of such an officer or employee, is a resident of the State in which the person maintains legal residence.”.

**SA 3458.** Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by

him to the bill S. 2363, to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. INTERSTATE TRANSPORTATION OF FIREARMS OR AMMUNITION.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 926A of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

**“§ 926A. Interstate transportation of firearms or ammunition**

“(a) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ‘transport’ includes staying in temporary lodging overnight, stopping for food, fuel, vehicle maintenance, an emergency, medical treatment, and any other activity incidental to the transport.

“(b) AUTHORIZATION.—Notwithstanding any provision of any law (including a rule or regulation) of a State or any political subdivision thereof, a person who is not prohibited by this chapter from possessing, transporting, shipping, or receiving a firearm or ammunition shall be entitled to—

“(1) transport a firearm for any lawful purpose from any place where the person may lawfully possess, carry, or transport the firearm to any other such place if, during the transportation—

“(A) the firearm is unloaded; and

“(B)(i) if the transportation is by motor vehicle—

“(I) the firearm is not directly accessible from the passenger compartment of the motor vehicle; or

“(II) if the motor vehicle is without a compartment separate from the passenger compartment, the firearm is—

“(aa) in a locked container other than the glove compartment or console; or

“(bb) secured by a secure gun storage or safety device; or

“(ii) if the transportation is by other means, the firearm is in a locked container or secured by a secure gun storage or safety device; and

“(2) transport ammunition for any lawful purpose from any place where the person may lawfully possess, carry, or transport the ammunition, to any other such place if, during the transportation—

“(A) the ammunition is not loaded into a firearm; and

“(B)(i) if the transportation is by motor vehicle—

“(I) the ammunition is not directly accessible from the passenger compartment of the motor vehicle; or

“(II) if the motor vehicle is without a compartment separate from the passenger compartment, the ammunition is in a locked container other than the glove compartment or console; or

“(ii) if the transportation is by other means, the ammunition is in a locked container.

“(c) STATE LAW.—

“(1) ARREST AUTHORITY.—A person who is transporting a firearm or ammunition may not be—

“(A) arrested for violation of any law or any rule or regulation of a State, or any political subdivision thereof, relating to the possession, transportation, or carrying of firearms or ammunition, unless there is probable cause to believe that the transportation is not in accordance with subsection (b); or

“(B) detained for violation of any law or any rule or regulation of a State, or any political subdivision thereof, relating to the possession, transportation, or carrying of firearms or ammunition, unless there is rea-

sonable suspicion that the transportation is not in accordance with subsection (b).

“(2) PROSECUTION.—

“(A) BURDEN OF PROOF.—If a person asserts this section as a defense in a criminal proceeding, the government shall bear the burden of proving, beyond a reasonable doubt, that the conduct of the person was not in accordance with subsection (b).

“(B) PREVAILING DEFENDANT.—If a person successfully asserts this section as a defense in a criminal proceeding, the court shall award the prevailing defendant reasonable attorney’s fees.”.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 926A and inserting the following:

“926A. Interstate transportation of firearms or ammunition.”.

**SA 3459.** Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title I, add the following:

**SEC. 1. PAYMENT IN LIEU OF TAXES REFORM.**

(a) AMENDMENTS TO PILT.—

(1) DEFINITION OF ENTITLEMENT LAND.—Section 6901(1) of title 31, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “the National Park System or”; and

(B) in subparagraph (H), by inserting “, other than land that is a unit of the National Park System” before the period at the end.

(2) ADDITIONAL PAYMENTS.—Section 6904(a) of title 31, United States Code, is amended by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

“(1) the United States acquired for the National Forest Wilderness Areas; and”.

(3) REDWOOD NATIONAL PARK.—Section 6905 of title 31, United States Code, is repealed.

(4) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) Section 501 of the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1998 (16 U.S.C. 471j) is amended by striking subsection (f).

(B) The chapter analysis for chapter 69 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 6905.

(b) DEFERRED MAINTENANCE BACKLOG.—Any amounts saved as a result of the amendments made by subsection (a) shall be made available to the Secretary of the Interior, without further appropriation, to address the maintenance backlog on National Park System land.

**SA 3460.** Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 53, after line 11, add the following:

**SEC. 2. DISCOUNTED NATIONAL PARKS AND FEDERAL RECREATIONAL LANDS PASSES.**

Section 805(b)(1) of the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act (16 U.S.C. 6804(b)(1)) is amended in the first sentence by striking “\$10.00” and inserting “\$80.00”.

**SA 3461.** Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for

other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 43, strike lines 4 through 11 and insert the following:

(2) in section 204 (43 U.S.C. 2303), by striking subsection (a) and inserting the following:

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary and the Secretary of Agriculture shall establish a procedure to identify, by State, inholdings for which the landowner has indicated a desire to sell the land or interest therein to the United States.”.

(3) in section 205 (43 U.S.C. 2304)—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) by striking “, using funds made available under section 206,”; and

(ii) by striking “this Act” and inserting “the Bipartisan Sportsmen’s Act of 2014”; and

(B) in subsection (d), by striking “11” and inserting “22”;

(4) in section 206 (43 U.S.C. 2305), by striking subsections (b) through (f) and inserting the following:

“(b) AVAILABILITY.—Of the amounts in the Federal Land Disposal Account—

“(1) 50 percent shall be made available to the Secretary of the Treasury, without further appropriation, for Federal budget deficit reduction; and

“(2) 50 percent shall be made available to the Secretary and the Secretary of Agriculture, without further appropriation, to address the maintenance backlog on Federal land.”; and

(5) in section 207(b) (43 U.S.C. 2306(b))—

**SA 3462.** Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 53, after line 11, add the following:

**TITLE III—OTHER MATTERS**

**SEC. 301. PROTECTING THE SECOND AMENDMENT RIGHTS OF VETERANS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 55 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

**“§ 5511. Conditions for treatment of certain persons as adjudicated mentally incompetent for certain purposes**

“(a) IN GENERAL.—In any case arising out of the administration by the Secretary of laws and benefits under this title, a person who is determined by the Secretary to be mentally incompetent shall not be considered adjudicated pursuant to subsection (d)(4) or (g)(4) of section 922 of title 18, until—

“(1) in the case in which the person does not request a review as described in subsection (c)(1), the end of the 30-day period beginning on the date on which the person receives notice submitted under subsection (b); or

“(2) in the case in which the person requests a review as described in paragraph (1) of subsection (c), upon an assessment by the board designated or established under paragraph (2) of such subsection or court of competent jurisdiction that a person cannot safely use, carry, possess, or store a firearm due to mental incompetency.

“(b) NOTICE.—Notice submitted under this subsection to a person described in subsection (a) is notice submitted by the Secretary that notifies the person of the following:

“(1) The determination made by the Secretary.

“(2) A description of the implications of being considered adjudicated as a mental defective under subsection (d)(4) or (g)(4) of section 922 of title 18.

“(3) The person’s right to request a review under subsection (c)(1).

“(c) ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW.—(1) Not later than 30 days after the date on which a person described in subsection (a) receives notice submitted under subsection (b), such person may request a review by the board designed or established under paragraph (2) or a court of competent jurisdiction to assess whether a person cannot safely use, carry, possess, or store a firearm due to mental incompetency. In such assessment, the board may consider the person’s honorable discharge or decoration.

“(2) Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of the Comprehensive Veterans Health and Benefits and Military Retirement Pay Restoration Act of 2014, the Secretary shall designate or establish a board that shall, upon request of a person under paragraph (1), assess whether a person cannot safely use, carry, possess, or store a firearm due to mental incompetency.

“(d) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—A person may file a petition with a Federal court of competent jurisdiction for judicial review of an assessment of the person under subsection (c) by the board designated or established under paragraph (2).

“(e) PROTECTING RIGHTS OF VETERANS WITH EXISTING RECORDS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of the Comprehensive Veterans Health and Benefits and Military Retirement Pay Restoration Act of 2014, the Secretary shall provide written notice of the opportunity for administrative review and appeal under subsection (c) to all persons who, on the date of the enactment of the Comprehensive Veterans Health and Benefits and Military Retirement Pay Restoration Act of 2014, are considered adjudicated pursuant to subsection (d)(4) or (g)(4) of section 922 of title 18 as a result of having been found by the Department to be mentally incompetent.

“(f) FUTURE DETERMINATIONS.—(1) Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of the Comprehensive Veterans Health and Benefits and Military Retirement Pay Restoration Act of 2014, the Secretary shall review the policies and procedures by which individuals are determined to be mentally incompetent, and shall revise such policies and procedures as necessary to ensure that any individual who is competent to manage his own financial affairs, including his receipt of Federal benefits, but who voluntarily turns over the management thereof to a fiduciary is not considered adjudicated pursuant to subsection (d)(4) or (g)(4) of section 922 of title 18.

“(2) Not later than 30 days after the Secretary has made the review and changes required under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report detailing the results of the review and any resulting policy and procedural changes.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 55 of such title is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“5511. Conditions for treatment of certain persons as adjudicated mentally incompetent for certain purposes.”.

(c) APPLICABILITY.—Section 5511 of title 38, United States Code (as added by subsection (a)), shall apply only with respect to persons who are determined by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, to be mentally incompetent, except that those persons who are provided notice pursuant to subsection (e) of such section shall be entitled to use the administrative review under subsection (c) of

such section and, as necessary, the subsequent judicial review under subsection (d) of such section.

**SA 3463.** Mr. BURR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 53, after line 11, add the following:

#### TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS

##### SEC. 301. CAPE HATTERAS NATIONAL SEASHORE RECREATIONAL AREA.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) FINAL RULE.—The term “Final Rule” means the final rule entitled “Special Regulations, Areas of the National Park System, Cape Hatteras National Seashore—Off-Road Vehicle Management” (77 Fed. Reg. 3123 (January 23, 2012)).

(2) NATIONAL SEASHORE.—The term “National Seashore” means the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(4) STATE.—The term “State” means the State of North Carolina.

(b) REVIEW AND ADJUSTMENT OF WILDLIFE PROTECTION BUFFERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall review and modify wildlife buffers in the National Seashore in accordance with this subsection and any other applicable law.

(2) BUFFER MODIFICATIONS.—In modifying wildlife buffers under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall, using adaptive management practices—

(A) ensure that the buffers are of the shortest duration and cover the smallest area necessary to protect a species, as determined in accordance with peer-reviewed scientific data; and

(B) designate pedestrian and vehicle corridors around areas of the National Seashore closed because of wildlife buffers, to allow access to areas that are open.

(3) COORDINATION WITH STATE.—The Secretary, after coordinating with the State, shall determine appropriate buffer protections for species that are not listed under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.), but that are identified for protection under State law.

(c) MODIFICATIONS TO FINAL RULE.—The Secretary shall undertake a public process to consider, consistent with management requirements at the National Seashore, the following changes to the Final Rule:

(1) Opening beaches at the National Seashore that are closed to night driving restrictions, by opening beach segments each morning on a rolling basis as daily management reviews are completed.

(2) Extending seasonal off-road vehicle routes for additional periods in the Fall and Spring if off-road vehicle use would not create resource management problems at the National Seashore.

(3) Modifying the size and location of vehicle-free areas.

(d) CONSTRUCTION OF NEW VEHICLE ACCESS POINTS.—The Secretary shall construct new vehicle access points and roads at the National Seashore—

(1) as expeditiously as practicable; and

(2) in accordance with applicable management plans for the National Seashore.

(e) REPORT.—The Secretary shall report to Congress within 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act on measures taken to implement this section.

**SA 3464.** Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. RISCH, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. WALSH, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. BENNET, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, and Ms. STABENOW) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 53, after line 11, add the following:

#### TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS

##### SEC. 301. WILDFIRE DISASTER FUNDING AUTHORITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 251(b)(2) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(E) FLAME WILDFIRE SUPPRESSION.—

“(i) If a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for a fiscal year is enacted that specifies an amount for wildfire suppression operations in the Wildland Fire Management accounts at the Department of Agriculture or the Department of the Interior, then the adjustments for that fiscal year shall be the amount of additional new budget authority provided in that Act for wildfire suppression operations for that fiscal year, but shall not exceed—

“(I) for fiscal year 2015, \$1,410,000,000 in additional new budget authority;

“(II) for fiscal year 2016, \$1,460,000,000 in additional new budget authority;

“(III) for fiscal year 2017, \$1,560,000,000 in additional new budget authority;

“(IV) for fiscal year 2018, \$1,780,000,000 in additional new budget authority;

“(V) for fiscal year 2019, \$2,030,000,000 in additional new budget authority;

“(VI) for fiscal year 2020, \$2,320,000,000 in additional new budget authority;

“(VII) for fiscal year 2021, \$2,650,000,000 in additional new budget authority;

“(VIII) for fiscal year 2022, \$2,690,000,000 in additional new budget authority;

“(IX) for fiscal year 2023, \$2,690,000,000 in additional new budget authority; and

“(X) for fiscal year 2024, \$2,690,000,000 in additional new budget authority.

“(ii) As used in this subparagraph—

“(I) the term ‘additional new budget authority’ means the amount provided for a fiscal year, in excess of 70 percent of the average costs for wildfire suppression operations over the previous 10 years, in an appropriation Act and specified to pay for the costs of wildfire suppression operations; and

“(II) the term ‘wildfire suppression operations’ means the emergency and unpredictable aspects of wildland firefighting including support, response, and emergency stabilization activities; other emergency management activities; and funds necessary to repay any transfers needed for these costs.

“(iii) The average costs for wildfire suppression operations over the previous 10 years shall be calculated annually and reported in the President’s Budget submission under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, for each fiscal year.”.

(b) DISASTER FUNDING.—Section 251(b)(2)(D) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)(2)(D)) is amended—

(1) in clause (i)—

(A) in subclause (I), by striking “and” and inserting “plus”; and

(B) in subclause (II), by striking the period and inserting “; less”; and

(C) by adding the following:

“(III) the additional new budget authority provided in an appropriation Act for wildfire



suppression operations pursuant to subparagraph (E) for the preceding fiscal year.”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(v) Beginning in fiscal year 2017 and in subsequent fiscal years, the calculation of the ‘average funding provided for disaster relief over the previous 10 years’ shall include the additional new budget authority provided in an appropriation Act for wildfire suppression operations pursuant to subparagraph (E) for the preceding fiscal year.”.

(c) **REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.**—If the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture determines that supplemental appropriations are necessary for a fiscal year for wildfire suppression operations, such Secretary shall promptly submit to Congress—

(1) a request for such supplemental appropriations; and

(2) a plan detailing the manner in which such Secretary intends to obligate the supplemental appropriations by not later than 30 days after the date on which the amounts are made available.

**SA 3465.** Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2363, to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title II, add the following:

**SEC. 2 \_\_\_\_ . FUNDING FOR LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION PROGRAMS.**

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **FUND.**—The term “Fund” means the land and water conservation fund established under section 2 of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (16 U.S.C. 4601–5).

(2) **LEVEL OF RECEIPTS.**—The term “level of receipts” means the level of taxes, receipts, bonuses, and rents credited to the Fund for a fiscal year as set forth in the budget baseline projection of the President, as determined under section 257 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 907), for that fiscal year submitted pursuant to section 1105 of title 31, United States Code.

(3) **TOTAL BUDGET RESOURCES.**—The term “total budget resources” means the total amount made available by appropriations Acts from the Fund for a fiscal year for making expenditures under the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (16 U.S.C. 4601–4 et seq.), as determined by the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate.

(b) **LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION TRUST FUND GUARANTEE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—For each fiscal year, the total budget resources made available from the Fund shall be equal to the level of receipts credited to the Fund for that fiscal year.

(2) **USE OF AMOUNTS.**—The amounts described in paragraph (1) shall be used only to carry out land and water conservation activities authorized under the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (16 U.S.C. 4601–4 et seq.).

(3) **GUARANTEE.**—No amounts may be appropriated for land and water conservation activities authorized under the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (16 U.S.C. 4601–4 et seq.) unless the requirement under paragraph (1) has been met.

(c) **ENFORCEMENT OF GUARANTEE.**—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives or the Senate to consider any Act making appropriations that would cause total budget resources for a fiscal year for land and water conservation activities described in subsection (b)(2) for that fiscal year to be less than the amount required by subsection (b)(1) for that fiscal year.

**SA 3466.** Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 53, after line 11, add the following:

**SEC. 2 \_\_\_\_ . DEFERRED MAINTENANCE BACKLOG ON FEDERAL LAND.**

Section 7(a) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (16 U.S.C. 4601–9(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(4) To address the maintenance backlog on Federal land.”.

**SA 3467.** Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 44, strike lines 16 through 20, and insert the following:

(b) **DEFICIT REDUCTION.**—

(1) **FISCAL YEARS 2015 THROUGH 2024.**—For each of fiscal years 2015 through 2024, of the amounts deposited in the Federal Land Disposal Account, there shall be transferred to the Treasury and used for Federal budget deficit reduction, \$1,000,000.

(2) **FISCAL YEAR 2025 AND SUBSEQUENT FISCAL YEARS.**—For fiscal year 2025 and each subsequent fiscal year, 10 percent of the amounts deposited in the Federal Land Disposal Account shall be transferred to the Treasury and used for Federal budget deficit reduction.

**SA 3468.** Mr. ALEXANDER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title II, add the following:

**SEC. 2 \_\_\_\_ . ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT OF 1973.**

Section 11(f) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1540(f)) is amended—

(1) by inserting “(1)” after the subsection heading; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(2)(A) Except as provided in this paragraph, regulations promulgated under paragraph (1), including policies, orders, or practices pursuant to such regulations, may not—

“(i) prohibit or restrict the possession, sale, delivery, receipt, shipping, or transportation, within the United States, of elephant ivory that has been lawfully imported into the United States;

“(ii) change any methods of, or standards for, determining if such ivory has been lawfully imported that were in effect on February 24, 2014, including any applicable presumptions with respect to such determinations;

“(iii) prohibit or restrict the importation of such ivory that was lawfully importable into the United States on February 24, 2014; or

“(iv) prohibit or restrict the possession of such ivory that was lawfully possessable in the United States on February 24, 2014.

“(B) Subparagraph (A) does not apply to regulations, including policies, orders, or practices pursuant to such regulations, that were in effect on February 24, 2014.

“(C) Regulations promulgated under paragraph (1), including policies, orders, or prac-

tices pursuant to such regulations, that became effective during the period beginning on February 25, 2014, and ending on the date of enactment of this paragraph, shall be revised, as necessary, to comply with the requirements specified in subparagraph (A) for regulations promulgated after such date of enactment.”.

**SA 3469.** Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself and Mr. RISCH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 14, line 25, insert “use the funds apportioned to it under section 4(c) to” after “a State may”.

**SA 3470.** Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. CANTWELL, and Mr. KING) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2363, to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title I, add the following:

**SEC. 1 \_\_\_\_ . NATIONAL RECREATIONAL PASSES FOR DISABLED VETERANS.**

Section 805(b)(2) of the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act (16 U.S.C. 6804(b)(2)) is amended as follows:

(1) By inserting “and for the lifetime of the passholder” after “without charge”.

(2) By striking “charge, to” and inserting “charge, to the following”:

(3) By striking “any United States” and inserting the following:

“(A) Any United States”.

(4) By inserting after “residency.” the following:

“(B) Any veteran with a service-connected disability, as defined in section 101 of title 38, United States Code.”.

(5) By striking the last sentence.

**SA 3471.** Mr. MERKLEY (for himself and Mr. WYDEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

**TITLE III—CROOKED RIVER  
COLLABORATIVE WATER SECURITY**

**SEC. 301. SHORT TITLE.**

This title may be cited as the “Crooked River Collaborative Water Security Act of 2014”.

**SEC. 302. WILD AND SCENIC RIVER; CROOKED, OREGON.**

Section 3(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(a)) is amended by striking paragraph (72) and inserting the following:

“(72) CROOKED, OREGON.—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The 14.75-mile segment from the National Grassland boundary to Dry Creek, to be administered by the Secretary of the Interior in the following classes:

“(i) The 7-mile segment from the National Grassland boundary to River Mile 8 south of Opal Spring, as a recreational river.

“(ii) The 7.75-mile segment from a point ¼-mile downstream from the center crest of Bowman Dam, as a recreational river.

“(B) HYDROPOWER.—In any license application relating to hydropower development (including turbines and appurtenant facilities) at Bowman Dam, the applicant, in consultation with the Director of the Bureau of Land Management, shall—

“(i) analyze any impacts to the scenic, recreational, and fishery resource values of the Crooked River from the center crest of Bowman Dam to a point ¼-mile downstream that may be caused by the proposed hydropower development, including the future need to undertake routine and emergency repairs;

“(ii) propose measures to minimize and mitigate any impacts analyzed under clause (i); and

“(iii) propose designs and measures to ensure that any access facilities associated with hydropower development at Bowman Dam shall not impede the free-flowing nature of the Crooked River below Bowman Dam.”.

#### SEC. 303. CITY OF PRINEVILLE WATER SUPPLY.

Section 4 of the Act of August 6, 1956 (70 Stat. 1058; 73 Stat. 554; 78 Stat. 954), is amended—

(1) by striking “during those months” and all that follows through “purpose of the project”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following: “Without further action by the Secretary of the Interior, beginning on the date of enactment of the Crooked River Collaborative Water Security Act of 2014, 5,100 acre-feet of water shall be annually released from the project to serve as mitigation for City of Prineville groundwater pumping, pursuant to and in a manner consistent with Oregon State law, including any shaping of the release of the water. The City of Prineville shall make payments to the Secretary for the water, in accordance with applicable Bureau of Reclamation policies, directives, and standards. Consistent with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.), the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.), and other applicable Federal laws, the Secretary may contract exclusively with the City of Prineville for additional quantities of water, at the request of the City of Prineville.”.

#### SEC. 304. ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS.

The Act entitled “An Act to authorize construction by the Secretary of the Interior of the Crooked River Federal reclamation project, Oregon”, approved August 6, 1956 (70 Stat. 1058; chapter 980; 73 Stat. 554; 78 Stat. 954), is amended by adding at the end the following:

##### “SEC. 6. FIRST FILL STORAGE AND RELEASE.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Other than the 10 cubic feet per second release provided for in section 4, and subject to compliance with the flood curve requirements of the Corps of Engineers, the Secretary shall, on a ‘first fill’ priority basis, store in and when called for in any year release from Prineville Reservoir, whether from carryover, infill, or a combination of both, the following:

“(1) 68,273 acre-feet of water annually to fulfill all 16 Bureau of Reclamation contracts existing as of January 1, 2011.

“(2) Not more than 2,740 acre-feet of water annually to supply the McKay Creek land, in accordance with section 305 of the Crooked River Collaborative Water Security Act of 2014.

“(3) 10,000 acre-feet of water annually, to be made available first to the North Unit Irrigation District, and subsequently to any other holders of Reclamation contracts existing as of January 1, 2011 (in that order), pursuant to Temporary Water Service Contracts, on the request of the North Unit Irrigation District or the contract holders, consistent with the same terms and conditions as prior such contracts between the Bureau

of Reclamation and District or contract holders, as applicable.

“(4) 5,100 acre-feet of water annually to mitigate the City of Prineville groundwater pumping under section 4, with the release of this water to occur not based on an annual call, but instead pursuant to section 4 and the release schedule developed pursuant to section 7(c).

“(b) CARRYOVER.—Except for water that may be called for and released after the end of the irrigation season (either as City of Prineville groundwater pumping mitigation or as a voluntary release, in accordance with section 4 of this Act and section 306(c) of the Crooked River Collaborative Water Security Act of 2014, respectively), any water stored under this section that is not called for and released by the end of the irrigation season in a given year shall be—

“(1) carried over to the subsequent water year, which, for accounting purposes, shall be considered to be the 1-year period beginning October 1 and ending September 30, consistent with Oregon State law; and

“(2) accounted for as part of the ‘first fill’ storage quantities of the subsequent water year, but not to exceed the maximum ‘first fill’ storage quantities described in subsection (a).

##### “SEC. 7. STORAGE AND RELEASE OF REMAINING STORED WATER QUANTITIES.

“(a) AUTHORIZATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Other than the quantities provided for in section 4 and the ‘first fill’ quantities provided for in section 6, and subject to compliance with the flood curve requirements of the Corps of Engineers, the Secretary shall store in and release from Prineville Reservoir all remaining stored water quantities for the benefit of downstream fish and wildlife.

“(2) REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary shall release the remaining stored water quantities under paragraph (1) consistent with subsection (c).

“(b) APPLICABLE LAW.—If a consultation under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) or an order of a court in a proceeding under that Act requires releases of stored water from Prineville Reservoir for fish and wildlife downstream of Bowman Dam, the Secretary shall use uncontracted stored water.

“(c) ANNUAL RELEASE SCHEDULE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commissioner of Reclamation shall develop annual release schedules for the remaining stored water quantities in subsection (a) and the water serving as mitigation for City of Prineville groundwater pumping pursuant to section 4.

“(2) GUIDANCE.—To the maximum extent practicable and unless otherwise prohibited by law, the Commissioner of Reclamation shall develop and implement the annual release schedules consistent with the guidance provided by the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon and the State of Oregon to maximize biological benefit for downstream fish and wildlife, after taking into consideration multiyear water needs of downstream fish and wildlife.

“(3) COMMENTS FROM FEDERAL FISH MANAGEMENT AGENCIES.—The National Marine Fisheries Service and the United States Fish and Wildlife Service shall have the opportunity to provide advice with respect to, and comment on, the annual release schedule developed by the Commissioner of Reclamation under this subsection.

“(d) REQUIRED COORDINATION.—The Commissioner of Reclamation shall perform traditional and routine activities in a manner that coordinates with the efforts of the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon and the State of Oregon to monitor and request adjustments to releases for downstream fish and wildlife on an

in-season basis as the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon and the State of Oregon determine downstream fish and wildlife needs require.

“(e) CARRYOVER.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Any water stored under subsection (a) in 1 water year that is not released during the water year—

“(A) shall be carried over to the subsequent water year; and

“(B)(i) may be released for downstream fish and wildlife resources, consistent with subsections (c) and (d), until the reservoir reaches maximum capacity in the subsequent water year; and

“(ii) once the reservoir reaches maximum capacity under clause (i), shall be credited to the ‘first fill’ storage quantities, but not to exceed the maximum ‘first fill’ storage quantities described in section 6(a).

“(f) EFFECT.—Nothing in this section affects the authority of the Commissioner of Reclamation to perform all other traditional and routine activities of the Commissioner of Reclamation.

##### “SEC. 8. RESERVOIR LEVELS.

“The Commissioner of Reclamation shall—

“(1) project reservoir water levels over the course of the year; and

“(2) make the projections under paragraph (1) available to—

“(A) the public (including fisheries groups, recreation interests, and municipal and irrigation stakeholders);

“(B) the Director of the National Marine Fisheries Service; and

“(C) the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service.

##### “SEC. 9. EFFECT.

“Except as otherwise provided in this Act, nothing in this Act—

“(1) modifies contractual rights that may exist between contractors and the United States under Reclamation contracts;

“(2) amends or reopens contracts referred to in paragraph (1); or

“(3) modifies any rights, obligations, or requirements that may be provided or governed by Federal or Oregon State law.”.

##### SEC. 305. OCHOCO IRRIGATION DISTRICT.

(a) EARLY REPAYMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 213 of the Reclamation Reform Act of 1982 (43 U.S.C. 390mm), any landowner within Ochoco Irrigation District, Oregon (referred to in this section as the “district”), may repay, at any time, the construction costs of the project facilities allocated to the land of the landowner within the district.

(2) EXEMPTION FROM LIMITATIONS.—Upon discharge, in full, of the obligation for repayment of the construction costs allocated to all land of the landowner in the district, the land shall not be subject to the ownership and full-cost pricing limitations of Federal reclamation law (the Act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388, chapter 1093), and Acts supplemental to and amendatory of that Act (43 U.S.C. 371 et seq.)).

(b) CERTIFICATION.—Upon the request of a landowner who has repaid, in full, the construction costs of the project facilities allocated to the land of the landowner within the district, the Secretary of the Interior shall provide the certification described in section 213(b)(1) of the Reclamation Reform Act of 1982 (43 U.S.C. 390mm(b)(1)).

(c) CONTRACT AMENDMENT.—On approval of the district directors and notwithstanding project authorizing authority to the contrary, the Reclamation contracts of the district are modified, without further action by the Secretary of the Interior—

(1) to authorize the use of water for instream purposes, including fish or wildlife purposes, in order for the district to engage in, or take advantage of, conserved water

projects and temporary instream leasing as authorized by Oregon State law;

(2) to include within the district boundary approximately 2,742 acres in the vicinity of McKay Creek, resulting in a total of approximately 44,937 acres within the district boundary;

(3) to classify as irrigable approximately 685 acres within the approximately 2,742 acres of included land in the vicinity of McKay Creek, with those approximately 685 acres authorized to receive irrigation water pursuant to water rights issued by the State of Oregon if the acres have in the past received water pursuant to State water rights; and

(4) to provide the district with stored water from Prineville Reservoir for purposes of supplying up to the approximately 685 acres of land added within the district boundary and classified as irrigable under paragraphs (2) and (3), with the stored water to be supplied on an acre-per-acre basis contingent on the transfer of existing appurtenant McKay Creek water rights to instream use and the issuance of water rights by the State of Oregon for the use of stored water.

(d) **LIMITATION.**—Except as otherwise provided in subsections (a) and (c), nothing in this section—

(1) modifies contractual rights that may exist between the district and the United States under the Reclamation contracts of the district;

(2) amends or reopens the contracts referred to in paragraph (1); or

(3) modifies any rights, obligations, or relationships that may exist between the district and any owner of land within the district, as may be provided or governed by Federal or Oregon State law.

#### **SEC. 306. DRY-YEAR MANAGEMENT PLANNING AND VOLUNTARY RELEASES.**

(a) **PARTICIPATION IN DRY-YEAR MANAGEMENT PLANNING MEETINGS.**—The Bureau of Reclamation shall participate in dry-year management planning meetings with the State of Oregon, the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon, municipal, agricultural, conservation, recreation, and other interested stakeholders to plan for dry-year conditions.

(b) **DRY-YEAR MANAGEMENT PLAN.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Bureau of Reclamation shall develop a dry-year management plan in coordination with the participants referred to in subsection (a).

(2) **REQUIREMENTS.**—The plan developed under paragraph (1) shall only recommend strategies, measures, and actions that the irrigation districts and other Bureau of Reclamation contract holders voluntarily agree to implement.

(3) **LIMITATIONS.**—Nothing in the plan developed under paragraph (1) shall be mandatory or self-implementing.

(c) **VOLUNTARY RELEASE.**—In any year, if North Unit Irrigation District or other eligible Bureau of Reclamation contract holders have not initiated contracting with the Bureau of Reclamation for any quantity of the 10,000 acre feet of water described in subsection (a)(3) of section 6 of the Act of August 6, 1956 (70 Stat. 1058) (as added by section 304), by June 1 of any calendar year, with the voluntary agreement of North Unit Irrigation District and other Bureau of Reclamation contract holders referred to in that paragraph, the Secretary may release that quantity of water for the benefit of downstream fish and wildlife as described in section 7 of that Act.

#### **SEC. 307. RELATION TO EXISTING LAWS AND STATUTORY OBLIGATIONS.**

Nothing in this title (or an amendment made by this title)—

(1) provides to the Secretary the authority to store and release the “first fill” quantities provided for in section 6 of the Act of August 6, 1956 (70 Stat. 1058) (as added by section 304), for any purposes other than the purposes provided for in that section, except for—

(A) the potential instream use resulting from conserved water projects and temporary instream leasing as provided for in section 305(c)(1);

(B) the potential release of additional amounts that may result from voluntary actions agreed to through the dry-year management plan developed under section 306(b); and

(C) the potential release of the 10,000 acre feet for downstream fish and wildlife as provided for in section 306(c);

(2) alters any responsibilities under Oregon State law or Federal law, including section 7 of the Endangered Species Act (16 U.S.C. 1536); or

(3) alters the authorized purposes of the Crooked River Project provided in the first section of the Act of August 6, 1956 (70 Stat. 1058; 73 Stat. 554; 78 Stat. 954).

**SA 3472.** Mr. Kaine submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle H of title X, add the following:

#### **SEC. 1087. PETERSBURG NATIONAL BATTLEFIELD BOUNDARY MODIFICATION.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The boundary of the Petersburg National Battlefield is modified to include the land and interests in land as generally depicted on the map titled “Petersburg National Battlefield Boundary Expansion”, numbered 325/80,080, and dated June 2007. The map shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the National Park Service.

(b) **ACQUISITION OF PROPERTIES.**—The Secretary of the Interior (referred to in this section as the “Secretary”) is authorized to acquire the land and interests in land, described in subsection (a), from willing sellers only, by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, exchange, or transfer.

(c) **ADMINISTRATION.**—The Secretary shall administer any land or interests in land acquired under subsection (b) as part of the Petersburg National Battlefield in accordance with applicable laws and regulations.

(d) **ADMINISTRATIVE JURISDICTION TRANSFER.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—There is transferred—

(A) from the Secretary to the Secretary of the Army administrative jurisdiction over the approximately 1.170-acre parcel of land depicted as “Area to be transferred to Fort Lee Military Reservation” on the map described in paragraph (2); and

(B) from the Secretary of the Army to the Secretary administrative jurisdiction over the approximately 1.171-acre parcel of land depicted as “Area to be transferred to Petersburg National Battlefield” on the map described in paragraph (2).

(2) **MAP.**—The land transferred is depicted on the map titled “Petersburg National Battlefield Proposed Transfer of Administrative Jurisdiction”, numbered 325/80,801A, dated May 2011. The map shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the National Park Service.

(3) **CONDITIONS OF TRANSFER.**—The transfer of administrative jurisdiction under paragraph (1) is subject to the following conditions:

(A) **NO REIMBURSEMENT OR CONSIDERATION.**—The transfer is without reimbursement or consideration.

(B) **MANAGEMENT.**—The land transferred to the Secretary under paragraph (1) shall be included within the boundary of the Petersburg National Battlefield and shall be administered as part of that park in accordance with applicable laws and regulations.

**SA 3473.** Mr. WHITEHOUSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 53, after line 11, add the following:

#### **SEC. 2. NATIONAL ESTUARY PROGRAM AMENDMENTS.**

(a) **PURPOSES OF CONFERENCE.**—

(1) **DEVELOPMENT OF COMPREHENSIVE CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT PLANS.**—Section 320(b) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1330(b)) is amended by striking paragraph (4) and inserting the following:

“(4) develop and submit to the Administrator a comprehensive conservation and management plan that—

“(A) identifies the estuary and estuary resources to be considered within the plan;

“(B) recommends priority protection, conservation, and corrective actions and compliance schedules that address point and nonpoint sources of pollution—

“(i) to restore and maintain the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of the estuary, including—

“(I) restoration and maintenance of water quality, including wetlands and natural hydrological flows;

“(II) a resilient and diverse indigenous population of shellfish, fish, and wildlife; and

“(III) recreational activities in the estuary; and

“(ii) to ensure that the designated uses of the estuary are protected;

“(C) identifies healthy and impaired watershed components by carrying out integrated assessments that include assessments of—

“(i) aquatic habitat and biological integrity;

“(ii) water quality; and

“(iii) natural hydrological flows;

“(D) considers current and future sustainable commercial activities in the estuary;

“(E) considers the effects of ongoing climate, hydrologic, and geologic changes on the estuary, including—

“(i) the identification and assessment of vulnerabilities in the estuary;

“(ii) the development and implementation of adaptation strategies; and

“(iii) the potential impacts of changes in sea level or coastal erosion on estuarine water quality, estuarine habitat, and infrastructure located in the estuary;

“(F) increases public education and awareness with respect to—

“(i) the ecological health of the estuary;

“(ii) the water quality conditions of the estuary; and

“(iii) ocean, estuarine, land, and atmospheric connections and interactions;

“(G) includes performance measures and goals to track implementation of the plan; and

“(H) includes a coordinated monitoring strategy for Federal, State, and local governments and other entities.”

(2) **MONITORING AND MAKING RESULTS AVAILABLE.**—Section 320(b) of the Federal Water

Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1330(b)) is amended by striking paragraph (6) and inserting the following:

“(6) monitor (and make results available to the public regarding)—

“(A) water quality conditions considered by the comprehensive conservation and management plan developed under paragraph (4);

“(B) watershed and habitat conditions that relate to the ecological health and water quality conditions of the estuary; and

“(C) the effectiveness of actions taken pursuant to the comprehensive conservation and management plan developed for the estuary under this subsection;”.

(3) INFORMATION AND EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES.—Section 320(b) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1330(b)) is amended—

(A) by redesignating paragraph (7) as paragraph (8); and

(B) by inserting after paragraph (6) the following:

“(7) provide information and educational activities on the ecological health and water quality conditions of the estuary; and”.

(4) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The sentence following section 320(b)(8) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (as so redesignated) (33 U.S.C. 1330(b)(8)) is amended by striking “paragraph (7)” and inserting “paragraph (8)”.

(b) COLLABORATIVE PROCESSES.—Section 320(d) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1330(d)) is amended—

(1) by striking “(d)” and all that follows through “In developing” and inserting the following:

“(d) USE OF EXISTING DATA AND COLLABORATIVE PROCESSES.—

“(1) USE OF EXISTING DATA.—In developing”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) USE OF COLLABORATIVE PROCESSES.—In updating a plan under subsection (f)(7) or developing a new plan under subsection (b), a management conference shall make use of collaborative processes—

“(A) to ensure equitable inclusion of affected interests;

“(B) to engage with members of the management conference, including through—

“(i) the use of consensus-based decision rules; and

“(ii) assistance from impartial facilitators, as appropriate;

“(C) to ensure relevant scientific, technical, and economic information is accessible to members;

“(D) to promote accountability and transparency by ensuring members are informed in a timely manner of—

“(i) the purposes and objectives of the management conference; and

“(ii) the results of an evaluation conducted under subsection (f)(6);

“(E) to identify the roles and responsibilities of members—

“(i) in the management conference proceedings; and

“(ii) in the implementation of the plan; and

“(F) to seek resolution of conflicts or disputes as necessary.”.

(c) ADMINISTRATION OF PLANS.—Section 320 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1330) is amended by striking subsection (f) and inserting the following:

“(f) ADMINISTRATION OF PLANS.—

“(1) APPROVAL.—Not later than 120 days after the date on which a management conference submits to the Administrator a comprehensive conservation and management plan under this section, and after providing for public review and comment, the Administrator shall approve the plan, if—

“(A) the Administrator determines that the plan meets the requirements of this section; and

“(B) each affected Governor concurs.

“(2) COMPLETENESS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—If the Administrator determines that a plan is incomplete under paragraph (1) or (7), the Administrator shall—

“(i) provide the management conference with written notification of the basis of that finding; and

“(ii) allow the management conference to resubmit a revised plan that addresses, to the maximum extent practicable, the comments contained in the written notification of the Administrator described in clause (i).

“(B) RESUBMISSION.—If the Administrator determines that a revised plan submitted under subparagraph (A)(ii) remains incomplete under paragraph (1) or (7), the Administrator shall allow the management conference to resubmit a revised plan in accordance with subparagraph (A).

“(C) SCOPE OF REVIEW.—In determining whether to approve a comprehensive conservation and management plan under paragraph (1) or (7), the Administrator—

“(i) shall limit the scope of review to a determination of whether the plan meets the minimum requirements of this section; and

“(ii) may not impose, as a condition of approval, any additional requirements.

“(3) FAILURE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR TO RESPOND.—If, by the date that is 120 days after the date on which a plan is submitted or resubmitted under paragraph (1), (2), or (7) the Administrator fails to respond to the submission or resubmission in writing, the plan shall be considered approved.

“(4) FAILURE TO SUBMIT A PLAN.—If, by the date that is 3 years after the date on which a management conference is convened, that management conference fails to submit a comprehensive conservation and management plan or to secure approval for the comprehensive conservation and management plan under this subsection, the Administrator shall terminate the management conference convened under this section.

“(5) IMPLEMENTATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—On the approval of a comprehensive conservation and management plan under this section, the plan shall be implemented.

“(B) USE OF AUTHORIZED AMOUNTS.—Amounts authorized to be appropriated under titles II and VI and section 319 may be used in accordance with the applicable requirements of this Act to assist States with the implementation of a plan approved under paragraph (1).

“(6) EVALUATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 5 years after the date of enactment of this paragraph, and every 5 years thereafter, the Administrator shall carry out an evaluation of the implementation of each comprehensive conservation and management plan developed under this section to determine the degree to which the goals of the plan have been met.

“(B) REVIEW AND COMMENT BY MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE.—In completing an evaluation under subparagraph (A), the Administrator shall submit the results of the evaluation to the appropriate management conference for review and comment.

“(C) REPORT.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—In completing an evaluation under subparagraph (A), and after providing an opportunity for a management conference to submit comments under subparagraph (B), the Administrator shall issue a report on the results of the evaluation, including the findings and recommendations of the Administrator and any comments received from the management conference.

“(ii) AVAILABILITY TO PUBLIC.—The Administrator shall make a report issued under this subparagraph available to the public, including through publication in the Federal Register and on the Internet.

“(D) SPECIAL RULE FOR NEW PLANS.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), if a management conference submits a new comprehensive conservation and management plan to the Administrator after the date of enactment of this paragraph, the Administrator shall complete the evaluation of the implementation of the plan required by subparagraph (A) not later than 5 years after the date of such submission and every 5 years thereafter.

“(7) UPDATES.—

“(A) REQUIREMENT.—Not later than 18 months after the date on which the Administrator makes an evaluation of the implementation of a comprehensive conservation and management plan available to the public under paragraph (6)(C), a management conference convened under this section shall submit to the Administrator an update of the plan that reflects, to the maximum extent practicable, the results of the program evaluation.

“(B) APPROVAL OF UPDATES.—Not later than 120 days after the date on which a management conference submits to the Administrator an updated comprehensive conservation and management plan under subparagraph (A), and after providing for public review and comment, the Administrator shall approve the updated plan, if the Administrator determines that the updated plan meets the requirements of this section.

“(8) PROBATIONARY STATUS.—The Administrator may consider a management conference convened under this section to be in probationary status, if the management conference has not received approval for an updated comprehensive conservation and management plan under paragraph (7)(B) on or before the last day of the 5-year period beginning on the date on which the Administrator makes an evaluation of the plan available to the public under paragraph (6)(C).”.

(d) FEDERAL AGENCIES.—Section 320 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1330) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (g), (h), (i), (j), and (k) as subsections (h), (i), (j), (k), and (m), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (f) the following:

“(g) FEDERAL AGENCIES.—

“(1) COORDINATION AND COOPERATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Army (acting through the Chief of Engineers), the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, the Secretary of the Department of Agriculture, the Director of the United States Geological Survey, the Secretary of the Department of Transportation, the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and the heads of other appropriate Federal agencies, as determined by the Administrator, shall, to the maximum extent practicable, cooperate and coordinate activities, including monitoring activities, related to the implementation of a comprehensive conservation and management plan approved by the Administrator.

“(B) LEAD COORDINATING AGENCY.—The Environmental Protection Agency shall serve as the lead coordinating agency under this paragraph.

“(2) CONSIDERATION OF PLANS IN AGENCY BUDGET REQUESTS.—In making an annual budget request for a Federal agency referred to in paragraph (1), the head of such agency shall consider the responsibilities of the agency under this section, including under

comprehensive conservation and management plans approved by the Administrator.

“(3) MONITORING.—The heads of the Federal agencies referred to in paragraph (1) shall collaborate on the development of tools and methodologies for monitoring the ecological health and water quality conditions of estuaries covered by a management conference convened under this section.”.

(e) GRANTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (h) (as redesignated by subsection (d)) of section 320 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1330) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(4) EFFECTS OF PROBATIONARY STATUS.—

“(A) REDUCTIONS IN GRANT AMOUNTS.—The Administrator shall reduce, by an amount to be determined by the Administrator, grants for the implementation of a comprehensive conservation and management plan developed by a management conference convened under this section, if the Administrator determines that the management conference is in probationary status under subsection (f)(8).

“(B) TERMINATION OF MANAGEMENT CONFERENCES.—The Administrator shall terminate a management conference convened under this section, and cease funding for the implementation of the comprehensive conservation and management plan developed by the management conference, if the Administrator determines that the management conference has been in probationary status for 2 consecutive years.”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 320(i) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (as redesignated by subsection (d)) is amended by striking “subsection (g)” and inserting “subsection (h)”.

(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 320 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1330) (as redesignated by subsection (d)) is amended by striking subsection (j) and inserting the following:

“(j) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Administrator \$35,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2019 for—

“(A) expenses relating to the administration of grants by the Administrator under this section, including the award and oversight of grants, except that such expenses shall not exceed 5 percent of the amount appropriated under this subsection;

“(B) making grants under subsection (h); and

“(C) monitoring the implementation of a conservation and management plan by the management conference, or by the Administrator in any case in which the conference has been terminated.

“(2) ALLOCATIONS.—The Administrator shall provide at least 80 percent of the amounts appropriated under this subsection per fiscal year for the development, implementation, and monitoring of each conservation and management plan eligible for grant assistance under subsection (h).

“(3) REQUIREMENT.—The Administrator shall include in the annual budget request of the Environmental Protection Agency a clear description of the amounts requested by the Administrator to make grants under paragraph (1)(B).”.

(g) RESEARCH.—Section 320(k)(1)(A) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (as redesignated by subsection (d)) is amended—

(1) by striking “parameters” and inserting “parameters”; and

(2) by inserting “(including monitoring of both pathways and ecosystems to track the introduction and establishment of nonnative species)” before “, to provide the Administrator”.

(h) NATIONAL ESTUARY PROGRAM EVALUATION.—Section 320 of the Federal Water Pol-

lution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1330) is amended by inserting after subsection (k) (as redesignated by subsection (d)) the following:

“(1) NATIONAL ESTUARY PROGRAM EVALUATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 5 years after the date of enactment of this paragraph, and every 5 years thereafter, the Administrator shall complete an evaluation of the national estuary program established under this section.

“(2) SPECIFIC ASSESSMENTS.—In conducting an evaluation under this subsection, the Administrator shall—

“(A) assess the effectiveness of the national estuary program in improving water quality, natural resources, and sustainable uses of the estuaries covered by management conferences convened under this section;

“(B) identify best practices for improving water quality, natural resources, and sustainable uses of the estuaries covered by management conferences convened under this section, including those practices funded through the use of technical assistance from the Environmental Protection Agency and other Federal agencies;

“(C) assess the reasons why the best practices described in subparagraph (B) resulted in the achievement of program goals;

“(D) identify any redundant requirements for reporting by recipients of a grant under this section; and

“(E) develop and recommend a plan for eliminating any redundancies.

“(3) REPORT.—In completing an evaluation under this subsection, the Administrator shall issue a report on the results of the evaluation, including the findings and recommendations of the Administrator.

“(4) AVAILABILITY.—The Administrator shall make a report issued under this subsection available to management conferences convened under this section and the public, including through publication in the Federal Register and on the Internet.”.

(i) CONVENING OF CONFERENCE.—Section 320(a)(2) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1330(a)(2)) is amended—

(1) by striking “(2) CONVENING OF CONFERENCE.—” and all that follows through “In any case” and inserting the following:

“(2) CONVENING OF CONFERENCE.—In any case”; and

(2) by striking subparagraph (B).

**SA 3474.** Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SECTION . POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT WOULD FURTHER RESTRICT THE RIGHT OF LAW-ABIDING AMERICANS TO OWN A FIREARM.**

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, amendment, resolution, or conference report that further restricts the right of law-abiding individuals in the United States to own a firearm.

(b) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term “further restricts the right of law-abiding individuals in the United States to own a firearm” means any further restriction on the right of law-abiding individuals in the United States to own a firearm not contained in law before the date of enactment of this Act, including any legislation that—

(1) prohibits, increases restrictions on, or regulates the manufacture or ownership of any firearm that is permitted under Federal law before the date of enactment of this Act;

(2) prohibits the manufacture or possession of specified categories of firearms based on the characteristics of such firearms that are permitted to be manufactured or possessed under Federal law before the date of enactment of this Act;

(3) prohibits specific firearms or categories of firearms that are permitted under Federal law before the date of enactment of this Act;

(4) limits the size of ammunition feeding devices or prohibits categories of ammunition feeding devices that are permitted under Federal law before the date of enactment of this Act;

(5) requires background checks through a Federal firearms licensee for private transfers of firearms if the transfers do not require a background check under Federal law before the date of enactment of this Act;

(6) establishes a record-keeping system for the sale of firearms not established before the date of enactment of this Act; or

(7) imposes prison sentences for sales, gifts, or raffles of firearms to veterans who are unknown to the transferor as a person prohibited from possessing a firearm that would not otherwise be imposed under Federal law before the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) SUPER MAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL.—

(1) WAIVER.—In the Senate, subsection (a) may be waived or suspended only by an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(2) APPEAL.—An affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

**SA 3475.** Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. . PROHIBITION ON ACQUISITION OF LAND.**

(a) PROHIBITION ON ACQUISITION OF LAND.—No land or interests in land may be added by acquisition, donation, transfer of administrative jurisdiction, or otherwise to the inventory of land and interests in land administered by the Bureau of Land Management until a centralized database of all lands identified as suitable for disposal by Resource Management Plans for lands under the administrative jurisdiction of the Bureau is easily accessible to the public on a website of the Bureau. The database required under this subsection shall be updated and maintained to reflect changes in the status of lands identified for disposal under the administrative jurisdiction of the Bureau.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall provide to the Committee on Natural Resources in the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources in the Senate a report detailing the status and timing for completion of the database required by subsection (a).

**SA 3476.** Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. SALE OF CERTAIN FEDERAL LAND PREVIOUSLY IDENTIFIED AS SUITABLE FOR DISPOSAL.**

(a) **COMPETITIVE SALE OF LAND.**—The Secretary shall offer the identified Federal land for disposal by competitive sale for not less than fair market value as determined by an independent appraiser.

(b) **EXISTING RIGHTS.**—The sale of identified Federal land under this section shall be subject to valid existing rights.

(c) **PROCEEDS OF SALE OF LAND.**—All net proceeds from the sale of identified Federal land under this section shall be deposited directly into the Treasury for reduction of the public debt.

(d) **REPORT.**—Not later than 4 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate—

(1) a list of any identified Federal land that has not been sold under subsection (a) and the reasons such land was not sold; and

(2) an update of the report submitted to Congress by the Secretary on May 27, 1997, pursuant to section 390(g) of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-127; 110 Stat. 1024), including a current inventory of the Federal land under the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary that is suitable for disposal.

(e) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **IDENTIFIED FEDERAL LAND.**—The term “identified Federal land” means the parcels of Federal land under the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary that were identified as suitable for disposal in the report submitted to Congress by the Secretary on May 27, 1997, pursuant to section 390(g) of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-127; 110 Stat. 1024), except the following:

(A) Land not identified for disposal in the applicable land use plan.

(B) Land subject to a Recreation and Public Purpose conveyance application.

(C) Land identified for State selection.

(D) Land identified for Indian tribe allotments.

(E) Land identified for local government use.

(F) Land that the Secretary chooses to dispose under the Federal Land Transaction Facilitation Act (43 U.S.C. 2301 et seq.).

(G) Land that is segregated for exchange or under agreements for exchange.

(H) Land subject to exchange as authorized or directed by Congress.

(I) Land that the Secretary determines contain significant impediments for disposal including—

(i) high disposal costs;

(ii) the presence of significant natural or cultural resources;

(iii) land survey problems or title conflicts;

(iv) habitat for threatened or endangered species; and

(v) mineral leases and mining claims.

(2) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

**SA 3477.** Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. PROHIBITION ON FOREIGN ASSISTANCE.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided under subsection (b) and notwithstanding any other provision of law, no amounts may be

obligated or expended to provide any direct United States assistance, loan guarantee, or debt relief to the Palestinian Authority, or any affiliated governing entity or leadership organization.

(b) **EXCEPTION.**—The prohibition under subsection (a) shall have no effect for a fiscal year if the President certifies to Congress during that fiscal year that the Palestinian Authority has—

(1) formally recognized the right of Israel to exist as a Jewish state;

(2) publicly recognized the state of Israel;

(3) renounced terrorism;

(4) purged all individuals with terrorist ties from security services;

(5) terminated funding of anti-American and anti-Israel incitement;

(6) publicly pledged to not engage in war with Israel; and

(7) honored previous diplomatic agreements.

**SA 3478.** Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

**TITLE III—SECOND AMENDMENT  
ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2014**

**SEC. 301. SHORT TITLE.**

This title may be cited as the “Second Amendment Enforcement Act of 2014”.

**SEC. 302. CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS.**

Congress finds the following:

(1) The Second Amendment to the United States Constitution provides that the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed.

(2) As the Congress and the Supreme Court of the United States have recognized, the Second Amendment to the United States Constitution protects the rights of individuals, including those who are not members of a militia or engaged in military service or training, to keep and bear arms.

(3) The law-abiding citizens of the District of Columbia are deprived by local laws of handguns, rifles, and shotguns that are commonly kept by law-abiding persons throughout the United States for sporting use and for lawful defense of their persons, homes, businesses, and families.

(4) The District of Columbia has the highest per capita murder rate in the Nation, which may be attributed in part to local laws prohibiting possession of firearms by law-abiding persons who would otherwise be able to defend themselves and their loved ones in their own homes and businesses.

(5) The Federal Gun Control Act of 1968, as amended by the Firearms Owners’ Protection Act of 1986, and the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act of 1993, provide comprehensive Federal regulations applicable in the District of Columbia as elsewhere. In addition, existing District of Columbia criminal laws punish possession and illegal use of firearms by violent criminals and felons. Consequently, there is no need for local laws which only affect and disarm law-abiding citizens.

(6) Officials of the District of Columbia have indicated their intention to continue to unduly restrict lawful firearm possession and use by citizens of the District.

(7) Legislation is required to correct the District of Columbia’s law in order to restore the fundamental rights of its citizens under the Second Amendment to the United States Constitution and thereby enhance public safety.

**SEC. 303. REFORM D.C. COUNCIL’S AUTHORITY TO RESTRICT FIREARMS.**

Section 4 of the Act entitled “An Act to prohibit the killing of wild birds and wild animals in the District of Columbia”, approved June 30, 1906 (34 Stat. 809; sec. 1–303.43, D.C. Official Code) is amended by adding at the end the following: “Nothing in this section or any other provision of law shall authorize, or shall be construed to permit, the Council, the Mayor, or any governmental or regulatory authority of the District of Columbia to prohibit, constructively prohibit, or unduly burden the ability of persons not prohibited from possessing firearms under Federal law from acquiring, possessing in their homes or businesses, or using for sporting, self-protection or other lawful purposes, any firearm neither prohibited by Federal law nor subject to the National Firearms Act. The District of Columbia shall not have authority to enact laws or regulations that discourage or eliminate the private ownership or use of firearms. Nothing in the previous two sentences shall be construed to prohibit the District of Columbia from regulating or prohibiting the carrying of firearms by a person, either concealed or openly, other than at the person’s dwelling place, place of business, or on other land possessed by the person.”

**SEC. 304. REPEAL D.C. SEMIAUTOMATIC BAN.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 101(10) of the Firearms Control Regulations Act of 1975 (sec. 7–2501.01(10), D.C. Official Code) is amended to read as follows:

“(10) ‘Machine gun’ means any firearm which shoots, is designed to shoot, or may be readily restored to shoot automatically, more than 1 shot without manual reloading by a single function of the trigger, and includes the frame or receiver of any such weapon, any part designed and intended solely and exclusively, or combination of parts designed and intended, for use in converting a weapon into a machine gun, and any combination of parts from which a machine gun can be assembled if such parts are in the possession or under the control of a person.”

(b) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT TO PROVISIONS SETTING FORTH CRIMINAL PENALTIES.**—Section 1(c) of the Act of July 8, 1932 (47 Stat. 651; sec. 22–4501(c), D.C. Official Code) is amended to read as follows:

“(c) ‘Machine gun’, as used in this Act, has the meaning given such term in section 101(10) of the Firearms Control Regulations Act of 1975.”

**SEC. 305. REPEAL REGISTRATION REQUIREMENT.**

(a) **REPEAL OF REQUIREMENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 201(a) of the Firearms Control Regulations Act of 1975 (sec. 7–2502.01(a), D.C. Official Code) is amended by striking “any firearm, unless” and all that follows through paragraph (3) and inserting the following: “any firearm described in subsection (c).”

(2) **DESCRIPTION OF FIREARMS REMAINING ILLEGAL.**—Section 201 of such Act (sec. 7–2502.01, D.C. Official Code) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(c) A firearm described in this subsection is any of the following:

“(1) A sawed-off shotgun.

“(2) A machine gun.

“(3) A short-barreled rifle.”

(3) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—The heading of section 201 of such Act (sec. 7–2502.01, D.C. Official Code) is amended by striking “Registration requirements” and inserting “Firearm Possession”.

(b) **CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO FIREARMS CONTROL REGULATIONS ACT.**—The Firearms Control Regulations Act of 1975 is amended as follows:

(1) Sections 202 through 211 (secs. 7–2502.02 through 7–2502.11, D.C. Official Code) are repealed.



(2) Section 101 (sec. 7-2501.01, D.C. Official Code) is amended by striking paragraph (13).

(3) Section 401 (sec. 7-2504.01, D.C. Official Code) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking “the District;” and all that follows and inserting the following: “the District, except that a person may engage in hand loading, reloading, or custom loading of ammunition for firearms lawfully possessed under this Act.”; and

(B) in subsection (b), by striking “which are unregistrable under section 202” and inserting “which are prohibited under section 201”.

(4) Section 402 (sec. 7-2504.02, D.C. Official Code) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking “Any person eligible to register a firearm” and all that follows through “such business,” and inserting the following: “Any person not otherwise prohibited from possessing or receiving a firearm under Federal or District law, or from being licensed under section 923 of title 18, United States Code.”; and

(B) in subsection (b), by amending paragraph (1) to read as follows:

“(1) The applicant’s name;”.

(5) Section 403(b) (sec. 7-2504.03(b), D.C. Official Code) is amended by striking “registration certificate” and inserting “dealer’s license”.

(6) Section 404(a)(3) (sec. 7-2504.04(a)(3)), D.C. Official Code) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (B)(i), by striking “registration certificate number (if any) of the firearm.”;

(B) in subparagraph (B)(iv), by striking “holding the registration certificate” and inserting “from whom it was received for repair”;

(C) in subparagraph (C)(i), by striking “and registration certificate number (if any) of the firearm”;

(D) in subparagraph (C)(ii), by striking “registration certificate number or”; and

(E) by striking subparagraphs (D) and (E).

(7) Section 406(c) (sec. 7-2504.06(c), D.C. Official Code) is amended to read as follows:

“(c) Within 45 days of a decision becoming effective which is unfavorable to a licensee or to an applicant for a dealer’s license, the licensee or application shall—

“(1) lawfully remove from the District all destructive devices in his inventory, or peaceably surrender to the Chief all destructive devices in his inventory in the manner provided in section 705; and

“(2) lawfully dispose, to himself or to another, any firearms and ammunition in his inventory.”.

(8) Section 407(b) (sec. 7-2504.07(b), D.C. Official Code) is amended by striking “would not be eligible” and all that follows and inserting “is prohibited from possessing or receiving a firearm under Federal or District law.”.

(9) Section 502 (sec. 7-2505.02, D.C. Official Code) is amended—

(A) by amending subsection (a) to read as follows:

“(a) Any person or organization not prohibited from possessing or receiving a firearm under Federal or District law may sell or otherwise transfer ammunition or any firearm, except those which are prohibited under section 201, to a licensed dealer.”;

(B) by amending subsection (c) to read as follows:

“(c) Any licensed dealer may sell or otherwise transfer a firearm to any person or organization not otherwise prohibited from possessing or receiving such firearm under Federal or District law.”;

(C) in subsection (d), by striking paragraphs (2) and (3); and

(D) by striking subsection (e).

(10) Section 704 (sec. 7-2507.04, D.C. Official Code) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking “any registration certificate or” and inserting “a”; and

(B) in subsection (b), by striking “registration certificate.”.

(c) OTHER CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 2(4) of the Illegal Firearm Sale and Distribution Strict Liability Act of 1992 (sec. 7-2531.01(4), D.C. Official Code) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking “or ignoring proof of the purchaser’s residence in the District of Columbia”; and

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking “registration and”.

#### SEC. 306. REPEAL HANDGUN AMMUNITION BAN.

Section 601(3) of the Firearms Control Regulations Act of 1975 (sec. 7-2506.01(3), D.C. Official Code) is amended by striking “is the holder of the valid registration certificate for” and inserting “owns”.

#### SEC. 307. RESTORE RIGHT OF SELF DEFENSE IN THE HOME.

Section 702 of the Firearms Control Regulations Act of 1975 (sec. 7-2507.02, D.C. Official Code) is repealed.

#### SEC. 308. REMOVE CRIMINAL PENALTIES FOR POSSESSION OF UNREGISTERED FIREARMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 706 of the Firearms Control Regulations Act of 1975 (sec. 7-2507.06, D.C. Official Code) is amended—

(1) by striking “that;” and all that follows through “(1) A” and inserting “that a”; and

(2) by striking paragraph (2).

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to violations occurring after the 60-day period which begins on the date of the enactment of this Act.

#### SEC. 309. REMOVE CRIMINAL PENALTIES FOR CARRYING A FIREARM IN ONE’S DWELLING OR OTHER PREMISES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 4(a) of the Act of July 8, 1932 (47 Stat. 651; sec. 22-4504(a), D.C. Official Code) is amended—

(1) in the matter before paragraph (1), by striking “a pistol,” and inserting the following: “except in his dwelling house or place of business or on other land possessed by that person, whether loaded or unloaded, a firearm.”; and

(2) by striking “except that:” and all that follows through “(2) If the violation” and inserting “except that if the violation”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 5 of such Act (47 Stat. 651; sec. 22-4505, D.C. Official Code) is amended—

(1) by striking “pistol” each place it appears and inserting “firearm”; and

(2) by striking “pistols” each place it appears and inserting “firearms”.

#### SEC. 310. AUTHORIZING PURCHASES OF FIREARMS BY DISTRICT RESIDENTS.

Section 922 of title 18, United States Code, is amended in paragraph (b)(3) by inserting after “other than a State in which the licensee’s place of business is located” the following: “, or to the sale or delivery of a handgun to a resident of the District of Columbia by a licensee whose place of business is located in Maryland or Virginia.”.

#### SEC. 311. REPEALS OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ACTS.

The Firearms Registration Amendment Act of 2008 and the Firearms Registration Emergency Amendment Act of 2008, as passed by the District of Columbia, are repealed.

#### SEC. 312. FIREARMS PERMITTED ON POSTAL PROPERTY.

(a) AMENDMENT.—Section 930(g)(1) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”;

(2) by striking “The term ‘Federal facility’ means” and inserting the following: “The term ‘Federal facility’—

“(A) means”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) does not include a building or part thereof owned or leased by the United States Postal Service.”.

(b) CODE OF FEDERAL REGULATIONS.—The Postal Service shall amend section 232.1 of title 39, Code of Federal Regulations, to specify that an individual who is otherwise permitted under law to carry a firearm may, in accordance with the law of the State in which the postal property is located—

(1) carry a firearm while on postal property, either openly or concealed; and

(2) store a firearm on postal property.

#### SEC. 313. PROTECTING THE RIGHT OF INDIVIDUALS TO BEAR ARMS ON PUBLIC LAND.

Section 512 of the Credit CARD Act of 2009 (16 U.S.C. 1a-7b) is amended by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

“(b) PROTECTING THE RIGHT OF INDIVIDUALS TO BEAR ARMS ON PUBLIC LAND.—

“(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

“(A) AGENCY.—The term ‘agency’ has the meaning given the term in section 551 of title 5, United States Code.

“(B) PUBLIC LAND.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘public land’ means any land owned or administered by the United States.

“(ii) EXCLUSIONS.—The term ‘public land’ does not include—

“(I) land located on the outer Continental Shelf; or

“(II) land located in—

“(aa) the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico;

“(bb) Guam;

“(cc) American Samoa;

“(dd) the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands;

“(ee) the Federated States of Micronesia;

“(ff) the Republic of the Marshall Islands;

“(gg) the Republic of Palau; or

“(hh) the United States Virgin Islands.

“(2) POSSESSION OF A FIREARM ON PUBLIC LAND.—The head of any agency shall not promulgate or enforce any regulation that prohibits an individual from possessing a firearm, including an assembled or functional firearm, on public land if—

“(A) the individual is not otherwise prohibited by law from possessing the firearm; and

“(B) the possession of the firearm complies with the law of the State in which the public land is located.”.

#### SEC. 314. SEVERABILITY.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, if any provision of this title, or any amendment made by this title, or the application of such provision or amendment to any person or circumstance is held to be unconstitutional, this title and amendments made by this title, and the application of such provision or amendment to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

**SA 3479.** Mrs. FEINSTEIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2363, to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 25, strike lines 1 through 20, and insert the following:

(1) FEDERAL PUBLIC LAND.—The term “Federal public land” means any land or water that is owned and managed by the Bureau of Land Management or the Forest Service.

## NOTICE OF HEARING

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL  
RESOURCES

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate, and the public, that a hearing has been scheduled before the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. The hearing will be held on Tuesday, July 15, 2014, at 10:30 a.m. in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building in Washington, DC.

The purpose of the hearing is to explore wildland fire preparedness and to consider the President's Proposed Budget for Fiscal Year 2015 for the Forest Service.

Because of the limited time available for the hearing, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, those wishing to submit written testimony for the hearing record may do so by sending it to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, United States Senate, Washington, DC 20510-6150, or by e-mail to john\_assini@energy.senate.gov.

For further information, please contact Meghan Conklin at (202) 224-8046 or John Assini at (202) 224-9313.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO  
MEET

## COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 8, 2014 at 9:30 a.m.

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

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN  
AFFAIRS

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 8, 2014, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled "The Role of Regulation in Shaping Equity Market Structure and Electronic Trading."

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

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR,  
AND PENSIONS

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be authorized to meet, during the session of the Senate, on July 8, 2014, at 10 a.m., in room SD-430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled "Falling Through the Cracks: The Challenges of Prevention and Identification in Child Trafficking and Private Re-homing."

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

## SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 8, 2014, at 2:30 p.m.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EAST ASIAN AND PACIFIC  
AFFAIRS

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 8, 2014, at 10:30 a.m., to hold an East Asian and Pacific Affairs subcommittee hearing entitled, "Combating Forced Labor and Modern-Day Slavery in East Asia and the Pacific."

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

## SUBCOMMITTEE ON EUROPEAN AFFAIRS

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 8, 2014, at 2:30 p.m., to hold a European Affairs subcommittee hearing entitled, "Renewed Focus on European Energy Security."

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREE-  
MENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. DONNELLY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that at 12 p.m. on Wednesday, July 9, 2014, the Senate proceed to executive session to consider Calendar Nos. 906, 797, and 904; that there be 2 minutes for debate equally divided in the usual form on each nomination; that upon the use or yielding back of time, the Senate proceed to vote, without intervening action or debate, on the nominations in the order listed; that all rollcall votes after the first be 10 minutes in length; further, that if any nomination is confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to the nomination; that any statements related to the nomination be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate resume legislative session.

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

RECOGNIZING THREATS TO  
FREEDOM OF THE PRESS

Mr. DONNELLY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 440, S. Res. 447.

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

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 447) recognizing the threats to freedom of the press and expression around the world and reaffirming freedom of the press as a priority in the efforts of the United States Government to promote democracy and good governance.

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

which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment and an amendment to the preamble.

(Strike out all after the resolving clause and insert the part printed in italic.)

(Strike the preamble and insert the part printed in italic.)

## S. RES. 447

*Whereas Article 19 of the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights, adopted at Paris December 10, 1948, states that "everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive, and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers";*

*Whereas, in 1993, the United Nations General Assembly proclaimed May 3 of each year as "World Press Freedom Day" to celebrate the fundamental principles of freedom of the press, to evaluate freedom of the press around the world, to defend the media from attacks on its independence, and to pay tribute to journalists who have lost their lives in the exercise of their profession;*

*Whereas, on December 18, 2013, the United Nations General Assembly adopted a resolution (A/RES/68/163) on the safety of journalists and the issue of impunity, which unequivocally condemns all attacks and violence against journalists and media workers, including torture, extrajudicial killings, enforced disappearances, arbitrary detention, and intimidation and harassment in both conflict and non-conflict situations;*

*Whereas 2014 is the 21st anniversary of World Press Freedom Day, which focuses on the theme "Media Freedom for a Better Future: Shaping the Post-2015 Development Agenda";*

*Whereas the Daniel Pearl Freedom of the Press Act of 2009 (22 U.S.C. 2151 note; Public Law 111-166), which was passed by unanimous consent in the Senate and signed into law by President Barack Obama in 2010, expanded the examination of freedom of the press around the world in the annual human rights report of the Department of State;*

*Whereas, according to Reporters Without Borders, 71 journalists and 39 citizen journalists were killed in 2013 in connection with their collection and dissemination of news and information;*

*Whereas, according to the Committee to Protect Journalists, the 3 deadliest countries for journalists on assignment in 2013 were Syria, Iraq, and Egypt, and in Syria, the deadliest country for such journalists, an unprecedented number of journalists were abducted;*

*Whereas, according to the Committee to Protect Journalists, 617 journalists have been murdered since 1992 without the perpetrators of such crimes facing punishment;*

*Whereas, according to the Committee to Protect Journalists, the 5 countries with the highest number of unpunished journalist murders between 2004 to 2013 are Iraq, Somalia, the Philippines, Sri Lanka, and Syria;*

*Whereas, according to Reporters Without Borders, 826 journalists and 127 citizen journalists were arrested in 2013;*

*Whereas, according to the Committee to Protect Journalists, 211 journalists worldwide were in prison on December 1, 2013;*

*Whereas, according to Reporters Without Borders, the 5 countries with the highest number of journalists in prison are Syria, China, Eritrea, Turkey, and Iran;*

*Whereas, according to Reporters Without Borders, the Government of Syria and extremist rebel militias have intentionally targeted professional and citizen journalists, causing dramatic repercussions for the freedom of the press throughout the region;*

Whereas the Government of the Russian Federation has engaged in an unprecedented campaign to silence the independent press and undermine freedom of expression, including its recent efforts to destabilize Ukraine;

Whereas Reporters Without Borders has expressed concern that journalists in Cuba have suffered physical attacks, arbitrary detention, and death threats, and have been prevented access to information;

Whereas Freedom House has cited a deteriorating environment for internet freedom around the world and has ranked Iran, Cuba, China, Syria, and Ethiopia as having the worst obstacles to access, limits on content, and violations of user rights among the countries and territories rated by Freedom House as "Not Free";

Whereas freedom of the press is a key component of democratic governance, the activism of civil society, and socioeconomic development; and

Whereas freedom of the press enhances public accountability, transparency, and participation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved,  
That the Senate—

(1) expresses concern about the threats to freedom of the press and expression around the world following World Press Freedom Day, held on May 3, 2014;

(2) commends journalists and media workers around the world for their essential role in promoting government accountability, defending democratic activity, and strengthening civil society, despite threats to their safety;

(3) pays tribute to the journalists who have lost their lives carrying out their work;

(4) calls on governments abroad to implement United Nations General Assembly Resolution (A/RES/68/163), by thoroughly investigating and seeking to resolve outstanding cases of violence against journalists, including murders and kidnappings, while ensuring the protection of witnesses;

(5) condemns all actions around the world that suppress freedom of the press, such as the recent kidnappings of journalists and media workers in eastern Ukraine by pro-Russian militant groups;

(6) reaffirms the centrality of freedom of the press to efforts by the United States Government to support democracy, mitigate conflict, and promote good governance domestically and around the world; and

(7) calls on the President and the Secretary of State—

(A) to ensure that the United States Government rapidly identifies, publicizes, and responds to threats against freedom of the press around the world;

(B) to continue to urge foreign governments to transparently investigate and bring to justice the perpetrators of attacks against journalists; and

(C) to continue to highlight the issue of threats against freedom of the press year-round.

Mr. DONNELLY. Madam President, I further ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported substitute amendment to the resolution be agreed to; the resolution, as amended, be agreed to; the committee-reported amendment to the preamble be agreed to; the preamble, as amended, be agreed to; and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

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

The committee-reported amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The committee-reported amendment in the nature of a substitute to the preamble was agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 447), as amended, was agreed to.

The preamble, as amended, was agreed to.

#### MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 2569

Mr. DONNELLY. Madam President, I understand that S. 2569, introduced earlier today by Senator WALSH, is at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

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. 2569) to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America.

Mr. DONNELLY. Madam President, I now ask for its second reading and object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill will receive its second reading on the next legislative day.

#### ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, JULY 9, 2014

Mr. DONNELLY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it

adjourn until 10 a.m. on Wednesday, July 9, 2014; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks, the Senate be in a period of morning business until 12 noon, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each and the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees; that following morning business, the Senate proceed to executive session, as provided under the previous order; and, finally, that following disposition of the Adams nomination and resuming legislative session, the Senate resume consideration of the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 384, S. 2363, the Bipartisan Sportsmen's Act, and that all postcloture time be considered expired and the Senate proceed to vote on adoption of the motion to proceed.

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

#### PROGRAM

Mr. DONNELLY. Madam President, tomorrow there will be at least one rollcall vote at 12 noon on confirmation of the Castro nomination to be Secretary of Housing and Urban Development. We expect voice votes on confirmation of the Vetter and Adams nominations and on adoption of the motion to proceed to the sportsmen's bill.

#### ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. DONNELLY. Madam 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 6:03 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, July 9, 2014, at 10 a.m.