



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 160

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MARCH 25, 2014

No. 47

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable CORY A. BOOKER, a Senator from the State of New Jersey.

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Eternal God, as the snow falls gently to the Earth, we are reminded of the shifting seasons of our lives. As we continue to look to You for guidance, guide our lives and inspire our hearts.

Today, strengthen our Senators as they deal with unattended needs and unresolved problems. Make them eager to lift burdens, to bring deliverance to captives, and to give hope to the oppressed. May our lawmakers serve humanity in a way that glorifies Your name. Lord, keep them open to a growing faith and a maturing set of convictions.

We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

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

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

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

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, March 25, 2014.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable CORY A. BOOKER, a

Senator from the State of New Jersey, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. BOOKER thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

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

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. 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 half, the Republicans the final half. Following morning business, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 2124, the Ukraine act. That will be postclosure time.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate recess from 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m. to allow for the weekly caucus meetings and that the time during the recess count postclosure on the Ukraine bill.

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

Mr. REID. Very, very soon we hope to work out an agreement to begin consideration of the bill. Senators will be notified when votes are scheduled. I have spoken this morning to Senator MENENDEZ, chairman of the committee, and I spoke last night to Senator CORKER and Senator MCCAIN. I talked to Senator MCCAIN this morning, and he was going to talk to Senator CORKER. Hopefully, we will move forward very quickly on this legislation.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—S. 2149

Mr. REID. I am told S. 2149 is due for its second reading and is at the desk.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the bill by title for the second time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2149) to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I object to any further proceedings with respect to this legislation.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

UKRAINE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, last night the Senate took the first steps in supporting the people of Ukraine, sending a clear message to Russia. I am pleased the Senate voted overwhelmingly in a bipartisan fashion to consider this bipartisan bill that was reported to the Senate floor. The measure includes a number of provisions: a loan guarantee, sanctions, and security assistance. This certainly is a step in the right direction. It is not everything, but I certainly applaud the efforts of the Members from both sides of the aisle who have labored diligently to get us this far.

I hope the bipartisan support will continue so we can finish the bill this week and provide the people of Ukraine with the critical support they need while imposing strong sanctions against those in Russia and Ukraine who created this crisis. There is no reason why we can't pass the bill today.

According to all reports, the situation regarding Ukraine is getting worse, not better. Russian troops are seizing facilities in the Crimea. All they have to do is make a phone call. They didn't need to have all the brute force, knocking down doors and injuring people in the process. They have

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S1697

done this throughout Crimea. The Government of Russia looks foolish. The world community understands that. They are levying foolish retaliatory sanctions, mocking the efforts of the international community to bring about a peaceful and fair resolution to the illegal invasion and the annexation of Crimea.

Yesterday President Obama and other European leaders meeting in The Hague formed a strong, united front in denouncing Russia's unlawful actions against the people of Ukraine. Under President Obama's leadership, the United States, Canada, France, Italy, Japan, Germany, and the United Kingdom took further action by suspending Russia from the G8—as of today it is the G7—and canceling the planned summit in Sochi this summer.

I mentioned those seven countries, but over in Europe yesterday, the President was there with some 42 other nations, all of them looking with an eye toward what Russia had done that was totally contrary to international law. By excluding Russia from the G8, President Obama and our allies have sent the message loudly and clearly that bullying behavior and rhetoric will not go unchallenged. I applaud the efforts of our allies to take a stand against Russia's aggression and welcome their further commitment to hold accountable President Putin and his cronies—and they really are his cronies. If there were ever a thugocracy, this is it. This is a government that is corrupt, and they need to be held accountable for violating international law. This cannot go unnoticed and unretaliated against.

As for action here in the Senate, I look forward to stabilizing Ukraine and imposing new sanctions against Russia by passing the bill that is before us. We should do that today. One way or the other, we need to get it done as quickly as possible.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

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

UKRAINE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I wish to start with a few words about the legislation the Senate is considering this week on Ukraine. It touches on the jurisdiction of many committees and is of high interest to Senators on both sides of the aisle. How the

United States meets the Russian invasion of Crimea matters. It is related to the future vitality of NATO, the negotiations with Iran over its nuclear program, and our own energy policy regarding the export of natural gas.

We have Members on both sides of the aisle working closely, and there is a decent amount of common ground here, which is good. Nearly everyone agrees the Ukrainian people deserve our support. Most of us also agree we should back up that support with meaningful legislation, not just to show our support for an independent, democratic, and free Ukraine but also to show President Putin there will be costs for his actions.

So one would think it wouldn't be that difficult to get a solution here, but roadblocks keep popping up. First, there was a House-passed bill prior to the recess that would have provided loan guarantees to Ukraine. It was blocked by the majority leader. We should have passed that and sent it to the President. Now the majority leader seems determined to blow up the process too. Yesterday he actually came to the floor to effectively blame the Republicans—believe it or not—for the invasion of Crimea. I mean, who writes this stuff? It is not just completely unhelpful, it also injects hyperpartisanship into the process at a time when we should all actually be working together. At this point it is not at all certain the majority leader might not even make things worse by shutting down the amendment process. I hope that is not where we end up. This issue is way too important for that.

Look, this bill in the Senate cannot pass the House or become law in its current form. It has to be amended. Not only have many Members not yet had a chance to offer amendments in committee, but so many developments have unfolded in this crisis in the weeks since the bill was drafted, the legislation has to be at the least modified to take those realities into account. In order for this bill to become law, the controversial IMF provision must be removed.

This simply cannot be a “take it or leave it” situation. That is just nonsensical. The people who sent us here to represent them deserve better. We should give them that. That means allowing a sensible amendment process, and it means dropping the kinds of wild partisan accusations we have seen—attacks that will only make it that much harder to get an effective bipartisan solution.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the

Senate will be in a period of morning business for 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with the majority controlling the first half.

The Senator from Illinois.

UKRAINE

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I listened carefully to the comments of the minority leader, Senator MCCONNELL, and he is asking for bipartisanship and quick action on the Ukrainian matter before the Senate today. I agree with him completely.

In fact, it was about 10 days ago when Senator JOHN MCCAIN, on the other side of the aisle, joined with me and six of our colleagues, and we took a late-night flight on a Thursday evening, flew all night long to go to Kiev, Ukraine. We spent the whole day on Friday meeting with government leaders. We had one night in a hotel room and then the next day, Saturday, a whole day of meeting with their leaders as well. Late that night we caught a plane back to Washington, arriving at 5 in the morning.

It was a whirlwind trip but an important one because it came just hours before the Russians staged this phony referendum in Crimea—a referendum that had been condemned by the United Nations Security Council, with the exception of Russia's vote. They voted against the condemnation, which was to be expected. China abstained.

So the question before us is, What can and should the Senate do, and when should it do it? Well, we have a measure before us that passed out of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. I believe the vote was 14 to 3. I may be mistaken by a vote or two there, but it was a strong bipartisan majority. Senator MENENDEZ then brought it to the floor.

When it came to the floor before our trip to Ukraine, Senator REID offered to bring it to the floor and pass it and do this on a bipartisan basis quickly—just what the Senate minority leader is now asking for—but there was an objection. The objection came from the Senate minority leader's side of the aisle. A Republican Senator objected to moving this bipartisan measure forward quickly. So Senator REID set up the vote that happened yesterday when 78 Members voted in the affirmative to move to this measure. That is a good thing. I hope we can bring it up this week, and if the other side or any Senator has a proposal for an amendment, I hope they won't keep it to themselves and conceal it but bring it forward. Let's talk about it and see if we can amend this measure, change this measure in a constructive fashion, without introducing a lot of amendments which might bog us down in long-term debate.

The Ukrainians are waiting to hear from the United States. What they

want to hear from us is very simple. Are we on their side? Will we stand with them as they resist Russian aggression and the possibility of Russia moving from Crimea into Ukraine proper. This is a legitimate concern in Ukraine.

We met with the governor of Donetsk in the eastern reaches of Ukraine, where there are more Russian-speaking people and perhaps more Russian loyalty than perhaps in other parts of the country, and he is concerned about provocateurs coming in from Russia stirring up the local people in demonstrations. Several people have been killed in the process. They want to see things stabilized and quieted. In order to do that, I think the United States and freedom-loving nations around the world need to stand with Ukraine. This is the purpose of our resolution: to sanction Russia for its aggression in Crimea, to warn them off from any further aggression into Eastern and Southern Ukraine, to provide some basic assistance to Ukraine, and to set up a process where this new government in Ukraine can borrow—underline “borrow”—money under conditions from the International Monetary Fund to rebuild their economy. It is an economy on the ropes.

The previous leader Yanukovych was loyal to Moscow. People came to the streets and said they felt the government was insensitive to their own feeling that there also should be an attachment to the West and that Ukraine could in fact at least look to the West in terms of its economic future. Yanukovych resisted—demonstrations on the street, hundreds of thousands of people in the Maidan and Kiev, Ukraine, and 103 of those demonstrators gunned down, shot and killed in the streets, by snipers firing from government buildings.

There is a high state of emotion in the Ukraine today, as Yanukovych fled the country and the parliament took control. The new prime minister is a man who, at the age of 39, has an awesome responsibility. He carries the burden of his nation on his shoulders. He came to the United States asking for our help. President Obama met with him. He met with Members of the Senate, and I thought that conversation was positive—moving us forward. Now it is up to the Senate this week to move on this measure. Let's not bog down in partisan debates. Let's not get off on tangents.

One of the issues I think will be brought up in the course of this week is the question of energy, and it is an important question because Putin has to be viewed for what he is today. He is the leader of Russia, and he is trying to save and sustain a failing Soviet franchise. He said: The most disappointing event of the 20th century was the elimination of the Soviet Union. Those were Putin's words. He has this dream of restoring an empire, reaching out to countries which used to be republics of the Soviet Union and members of the

Warsaw Pact nations, and trying to bring them back into the Russian fold. We saw it 8 years ago when he invaded Georgia and took territory there.

I have been there. I have seen it. Behind the barbed wire in South Ossetia we see the Russian troops. They are garrisoned trying to protect that region of Georgia which they seized 8 years ago. The same thing is true now in Crimea. This is Putin's idea. If he can't win the hearts and minds of neighboring nations, he will take them over with masked gunmen, Russian soldiers, and energy extortion.

There was a debate in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee about whether or not we can come to the assistance of those surrounding nations being preyed upon by the Russians and Putin—and to do it with assistance through energy. In the last several years we have found an abundance of natural gas in the United States. Somewhat surprisingly, our country, 5 years ago dependent on foreign energy sources, now has a surplus of natural gas.

So the question was raised: Can we transport this gas to these countries, liberating them from dependence on Russia for energy sources? It is a very important question. It is a timely question. But it is one we should view in the context of where we are today.

The good news is companies are moving back to the United States to reestablish manufacturing in our country—good-paying jobs. Why? We have skilled workers, some of the most productive in the world. Secondly, we now have this surplus of natural gas—an important feedstock for manufacturing jobs. With those two elements and transportation costs, we find more companies coming back to the United States, and we need them—in Illinois, in New Jersey, and desperately around the United States.

So the question then is raised—an important question: Would we jeopardize our economic growth, our creation of manufacturing jobs, if we started exporting the natural gas which we have discovered? It is a worthy debate, an important debate. It is one that is really important when we consider the future of building manufacturing jobs in America.

Secondly, we take a look at this natural gas debate, and we have to put it in historic context. Those who say to export, just to sell it, and that it is another commodity, need to put this in historical context. If 5 years ago the United States had gone through a famine, would we be exporting agricultural goods today without concern? I don't think so. We would think twice about it because we can remember that not that long ago we were vulnerable. Thank goodness we weren't and haven't been. But think about the energy famine we suffered some 5 years ago. We were dependent on OPEC. We were dependent on foreign suppliers. We were worried about where our Nation was going from an energy perspective.

The discovery of new sources of natural gas, new methods of extraction and new sources of oil, for example, have given us hope that we are going to be an energy surplus Nation. But it is a newfound treasure, and it is one about which we ought to be careful and measure carefully.

Some say we have plenty, more than we can use, and it should be an international commodity. Others say take care and make certain we make the decisions best for America, number one.

Should we debate that and decide that in a matter of minutes or hours on the floor of the Senate this week or take the time to look at it carefully? I think the latter.

When I went and spoke with the new Prime Minister of Ukraine, Yatsenyuk, I mentioned this possibility: What if we exported liquefied natural gas to Ukraine? He said: We don't have a place to receive it today. It is a pretty substantial investment of infrastructure to receive LNG into our country and to use it effectively. We are not in the position with our economy to make that investment today. We are going to look to other energy sources in the near term.

So the notion that natural gas exports will have benefit for Ukraine or any nation in the near term may be wishful thinking. Shouldn't we look at that part of the equation honestly about what they can absorb, when they can absorb it, and whether they want it? I think these are all legitimate and critically important energy policy debates in which we should engage.

But let's not make any mistake about it. We need to pass a resolution condemning what Russia has done in Crimea and threatens to do in Ukraine. They have gathered at the borders of Belarus and in Russia, on the eastern reaches of Ukraine—military forces far beyond what was necessary to guarantee an orderly referendum in Crimea a little over 9 days ago. They are poised to move forward. I pray that they won't.

We have to make it clear in the West—whether it is President Obama's visit with the G-7 nations, whether it is the European Union in resolution or even our Senate and House—that we stand with Ukraine. We want to stand by their sovereign and territorial integrity.

Many people didn't notice—they should have—but in 1994, Ukraine was the third strongest nuclear power in the world. After the breakup of the Soviet Union, Ukraine had more nuclear weapons than any country on earth, save the United States and Russia.

In 1994, they came forward and said: We are prepared to eliminate and destroy our nuclear arsenal if we have the assurance of major nations this won't jeopardize our future and it won't jeopardize our territorial integrity. They produced what was known as the Budapest Memorandum. The Budapest Memorandum was signed by the United States, the United Kingdom,

Ukraine, and Russia, guaranteeing that at least in principle all those nations would respect the territorial integrity of Ukraine. Within the last 2 weeks, Russia has not only reneged on that promise—it has in fact invaded Ukraine and taken over territory there.

It is important for us, when it comes to Ukraine, to not only stand by the Ukrainian people as they move toward a more democratic form of government, but it is important for us to reinforce the premise that if a country will give up its nuclear weapons, will not pursue the development of nuclear weapons, and become part of the nuclear club, we will basically say: That will not create a dangerous situation for your future. This is what the Budapest agreement was about, recently violated by Russia, one of the signatories.

If we want to make the argument in Iran, North Korea, and other countries, that they should forswear their nuclear weapons, shouldn't we also be standing by the premise that if they do, at least civilized nations will stand behind them if they and their sovereignty are threatened? This is what is happening today in Ukraine and Crimea.

It is not just a question of the survival of the Ukrainian Government but also a question as to whether civilized countries around the world trying to lessen the threat of nuclear weapons will stand with one voice and condemn the Russians for what they have done.

It is very clear Putin has ambitions far beyond the Republic of Georgia and far beyond Ukraine. He engaged in this charm offensive at the Sochi Olympics and talked about the modern Russia and what it meant in the 21st century. The very same troops who were protecting the athletes from terrorism in Sochi, as soon as the final ceremony ended, were shifted and transferred into Crimea to invade that nation. The charm offensive was clearly over. NBC may have covered the Sochi Olympics, but it didn't cover the invasion of Crimea in real-time. But it happened, and we know it happened.

Having been to Ukraine with Senator McCain and six other colleagues, our bipartisan delegation found a deep attachment in Ukraine to the United States. It is an attachment sometimes linked to specific families. I happen to represent the City of Chicago, where there is a prominent section known as Ukrainian Village. When I returned from Ukraine and went back to this section of Chicago, near the church where the Ukrainians worship on Sunday, we had over 500 people who gathered to hear what I had seen and heard and to talk about where we should go when it came to the future of Ukraine.

But it is worthy to note that there weren't just Ukrainian Americans in that room in Chicago when I returned a week ago. In the front row were Polish people—and we have more Poles in Chicago than almost any other city

outside of the nation of Poland—Lithuanians, Latvians, Georgians, and even Venezuelans. They had all come there to listen carefully, many of them with memories that not that long ago they were under Soviet domination and lived in fear of what would come from Moscow. These same people were standing together. They were standing in league with their Ukrainian-American neighbors, with the understanding that throughout its modern history Russia and the Soviet Union have taken over countries nearby when they could, and many times we didn't speak out.

I have heard the argument made that perhaps, if the United States showed more military force in other places in the world, we might have discouraged Vladimir Putin. That argument doesn't make sense. Look at history. We were in the midst of the Vietnam war and we had committed half a million troops. The greatest military in the world was engaged in Southeast Asia when Brezhnev, the head of the Soviet Union, invaded Czechoslovakia. We were engaged in two wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, actively showing the power of our military in those countries, under President George W. Bush, when Vladimir Putin invaded the Republic of Georgia.

So I think it is an empty argument to say if we just show our muscles and start a war someplace, the rest of the world will be fearful. I don't think it is a recipe for the future. What the President is trying to do is to establish political and economic sanctions on Russia which will cost their economy and put pressure on them to stop this aggressive conduct. That, to me, is sensible.

Let's take up this measure. If Members have amendments, bring them to the floor. Let's pass it today, not later this week. Let's show that we stand with the Ukrainians and oppose Russian aggression, support sanctions when needed, and prepare to loan to the Ukrainians the money they need to sustain their economy and to build it in the future.

Ukraine is the second largest country in Europe. It is moving toward the West. Let us welcome them. As long as they are going to make certain their future is consistent with our democratic values, I think it is important we not only continue this dialogue but show we can truly be their allies and friends.

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

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

HEALTH CARE

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I come to the floor to discuss the fourth anniversary of ObamaCare.

Four years ago this past Sunday the President signed his health care legislation into law. The measure was jammed through Congress on a party-line vote against the strong objections of Republicans and the American people. Democrats and the President assured everyone this opposition was temporary. When people find out what is in the law, they will like it, Democrats and the President promised.

Four years later, however, that isn't the case. The majority of the American people still disapprove of the law. Why do they still disapprove? Because the President's health care law has failed in every possible way. We have canceled health care plans. We have seen people who have lost their doctors and lost their hospitals. We have seen soaring premiums, higher out-of-pocket costs, lower pay, disastrous Web sites that have left thousands in limbo, confusion in the health insurance market, and widespread damage to the economy.

The President's law has failed so badly that some of the President's strongest supporters are rejecting it. Young people whose support of the President was so successful in his election and reelection are turning their backs on the President's law. Unions which pushed for the law's passage and the President's reelection are now protesting that the law will destroy their health care plans and damage workers' livelihoods. Democrats running for reelection are running from the health care law as fast as they can for fear that association with ObamaCare will doom their chances of reelection. People are finding out what the law truly means for them and they don't like it.

When the President was trying to pass his health care law, he made a few promises. I think a lot of people remember when the President said: If you like your health care plan, you can keep your health care plan. He said: If you like your doctor, you can keep your doctor. The reality of the law has proven to be quite different.

Six million Americans so far have lost their health care plans as a direct result of ObamaCare, and far too many of them found their only alternative was a plan that offered less coverage for more money. Millions of other Americans have lost their doctors and hospitals. ObamaCare placed a number of new taxes and regulations on insurance companies that left them facing huge cost increases. In an effort to manage their costs without raising health care premiums even further, many companies have narrowed their network of doctors and hospitals, especially in exchange plans. As a result, many Americans have lost doctors they have been seeing literally for years. Cancer patients in the middle of treatment have found their doctors are not covered by the new health care plans. Patients are also discovering their hospital options are now far more limited, as many plans exclude top hospitals.

A recent article in the Associated Press reported:

Some of America's best cancer hospitals are off-limits to many of the people now signing up for coverage under the Nation's new health care program.

Practically speaking, the AP reports:

Those patients may not be able to get the most advanced treatment including clinical trials of new medications.

In a particularly cruel twist, many of the patients who lost access to doctors and hospitals didn't know they would lose access when they signed up for their plans as provider information on the health care exchange Web sites is often, to quote a Business Week article, "missing, wrong, or difficult to navigate."

In addition to promising that patients would be able to keep their health care plans and their doctors, the President promised his health care law would reduce health care costs, but in fact health care costs have only risen since the Affordable Care Act passed. Families and individuals who were effectively dumped into the exchanges have frequently found that their only health care options cost far more than their previous health care plans and offer far less.

Family shopping for so-called silver plans now can face deductibles up to \$12,700, a staggering amount of money that very few families are able to afford. For many families that number represents a full quarter of their income before taxes.

Last week news emerged that already-high premiums on the exchanges are set to increase substantially next year. This was the headline in *The Hill* newspaper: O-Care premiums about to skyrocket. The *Fiscal Times* reported that Americans should "expect premium prices to soar." In fact, *The Hill* reported that "health industry officials say that ObamaCare-related premiums will double in some parts of the country." The *Wall Street Journal* reports that "one recent analysis finds that 80% of firms offering employee coverage have raised deductibles or other cost-sharing provisions, or are considering doing so . . . to avoid a new tax that's set to hit more lavish plans in 2018 and to counter health-cost increases. Thus, employee out-of-pocket costs could rise." Perhaps a more accurate name for the law would have been the "Unaffordable Care Act."

The havoc ObamaCare has wreaked on our health care system would be ample reason to dislike the law. ObamaCare's damage isn't limited to our health care system; it is also damaging our economy.

The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office reports that ObamaCare will result in 2½ million fewer full-time workers over the next 10 years and reduce wages by more than \$1 trillion. Those are real-world economic impacts.

Household income has already dropped by almost \$3,700 over the course of the Obama Presidency, and

American families are already struggling. Unemployment is high and economic growth is sluggish. The last thing we need is fewer workers and lower wages.

On top of that, ObamaCare is discouraging employers from hiring and reducing employees' hours, thanks to the slew of new taxes, mandates, and regulations ObamaCare levies on businesses large and small. Chief among these, of course, is the requirement that businesses with 50 or more employees provide health insurance to all of their full-time employees, which the law defines as those working 30 hours or more. If they don't do that, they pay fines. Faced with this mandate, State and local governments, nonprofits, and businesses with small profit margins have been forced to cut employees' hours to avoid health care bills or fines they can't afford to pay. Other businesses have been forced to keep their businesses under 50 workers instead of creating new jobs and hiring new people.

Larger businesses are also deciding not to hire or even letting workers go as a result of the costly taxes and regulations the health care law imposes. According to a recent study, ObamaCare's tax on lifesaving medical devices, such as pacemakers and insulin pumps, has already affected more than 30,000 jobs in the medical device industry.

I don't care what party you are from, you cannot think this law is working. Our health care system may have needed reform, but this was not the way to do it. Instead of improving our health care system, ObamaCare is making it far worse. It is time to repeal this law and pursue real solutions to our health care challenges.

Instead of the failing government health care exchanges, we could create affordable health care plans by allowing the purchase of insurance across State lines. This would allow for interstate competition when it comes to the purchase and sale of insurance. That would increase competition among health plans, which in turn would drive prices down, not up, as is happening now.

We could allow businesses to pool together to negotiate lower rates with health insurance companies.

We could improve high-risk pools to help people with preexisting conditions and expand health savings accounts to allow families to put away money tax free to pay for future health care-related expenses.

We could end the rampant lawsuit abuse that is driving up the cost of care for all Americans.

We do need real reform of our health care system—the kind of reform that will actually drive down costs and expand access to care while allowing Americans, not the government, to make decisions about the health care plans they choose and the doctors they visit. ObamaCare is doing the opposite.

ObamaCare isn't working. We need to repeal it now and replace it with real

health care reforms so that Americans don't have to endure another 4 years like the last 4.

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

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RUSSIA

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, sometimes it takes a sudden, flagrant breach of international order to dispel a President's naivete about an adversary. The 1979 Soviet invasion of Afghanistan had that effect on President Carter, and one can only hope that Russia's annexation of Crimea will have a similar impact on President Obama.

Only recently the President was describing his Russian reset—those were his words—as a success. In other words, he was still calling the reset a success after Moscow had done the following things—and I think it is worth recalling the litany of things Vladimir Putin and Russia have done notwithstanding President Obama's hopeful intention to reset that relationship. Here is what Moscow has done:

They brutalized domestic human rights activists.

They tortured and murdered anticorruption whistleblower Sergei Magnitsky.

They unleashed a barrage of anti-American propaganda.

They threatened to target U.S. missile defense sites with offensive weapons.

They vetoed numerous United Nations resolutions regarding Syria, where Bashar al-Assad has now killed roughly 150,000 civilians. They vetoed those resolutions. They also ignored U.S. demands to stop aiding Bashar al-Assad, period. It is well known and documented that Russia regularly sends weapons to Assad to use on his own people.

Russia has denounced U.S. sanctions against Iran as undisguised blackmail. This is a country seeking a nuclear weapon that would destabilize the entire region—and perhaps worse—in the Middle East.

Russia has expelled USAID from their country and pulled out of the Nunn-Lugar Cooperative Threat Reduction Program designed to reduce the threat of nuclear weapons.

Russia has also banned American citizens from adopting Russian children and offered asylum to NSA leaker Edward Snowden.

That is quite a list. As you can see, while President Obama said he wants to reset that relationship with Russia, Vladimir Putin has basically thumbed

his nose at the United States and the international order. Yet none of that has kept President Obama from calling this relationship with Putin and Russia a success.

If we consider the three biggest U.S. diplomatic victories often attributed to this reset the President likes to talk about—greater Russian cooperation in Afghanistan, the New START arms control treaty, and the Russian support for U.S. sanctions in Iran—only the first one looks like a genuine, durable achievement from the vantage point of March 2014.

The New START treaty was a dangerous giveaway. In addition to jeopardizing U.S. missile defense plans, it reduced the number of American nuclear launchers and warheads while allowing Russia to increase the size of its own arsenal.

As for the Iran sanctions endorsed by the U.N. Security Council members in June of 2010, these were less significant than the unilateral U.S. sanctions that Congress forced upon President Obama despite his objections in December 2011. For that matter, the administration has now unilaterally decided to loosen U.S. sanctions—and thereby relinquish some of the best leverage we have on Tehran—to keep them from crossing that red line and acquiring a nuclear weapon. What did we get for that? We got minor concessions and more hollow promises.

As with other U.S. adversaries, the Iranians are watching Ukraine to see how President Obama responds. In the modern era, cross-border military invasions of sovereign States have been a blessedly rare occurrence. Yet Vladimir Putin has now launched two of them in less than 6 years. The Secretary General of NATO has called Russia's armed seizure of Crimea "the gravest threat to European security and stability since the end of the Cold War." Europe remembers the primary location for two world wars during the last century. They remember, and they remember what happened in 1938 which, unfortunately, bears an eerie resemblance to some of the initial steps being taken by Vladimir Putin and Russia today, and they remember what happened after that, casting the world into a terrible war in which millions of people lost their lives in World War II.

President Obama's initial response was to sanction 11 Russians and Ukrainians, leaving Putin's inner circle and his favorite oligarchs untouched, and they drew mocking rebukes from the Kremlin. Last Thursday, the President decided to ramp up the sanctions by issuing new sanctions that did go a little further, targeting four oligarchs and 16 government officials, including Putin's Chief of Staff, along with a prominent Putin-linked financial institution.

In addition, President Obama declared he had now signed a new Executive order. Remember, the President said he has a phone and a pen. Well, he has been using them—not necessarily

working with Congress but he has been using them. He has issued a new Executive order that gives us the authority to impose sanctions not just on individuals but on key sectors of the Russian economy. The problem with that is that sanctions imposed on Russia's economy are going to hurt Europe and invariably end up inflicting damage even on the U.S. economy. But I hope the President uses this authority to send Putin a message and finds a way to thread the needle to exact the costs he said he would exact on Putin for this lawless act.

In my view, the sanctions should also target Rosoboronexport. This is a State-owned Russian arms dealer that has been supplying the Assad regime and Syria with weapons, and it has become the Grand Central Station of corruption. The U.S. Pentagon has inexplicably been buying Mi-17 helicopters from Rosoboronexport to supply the Afghan military, despite numerous alternatives. I am happy to report the senior Senator from Indiana Mr. COATS has introduced an amendment that would terminate these contracts and prohibit all business dealings with companies that cooperate with Rosoboronexport, and I am a proud cosponsor of that amendment. I hope the majority leader, as Senator MCCONNELL, the Republican leader, implored this morning, will allow an open amendment process so reasonable amendments designed to improve this bill will be allowed to be voted on.

As America responds to Vladimir Putin's invasion of Ukraine, sanctions will remain a critically important tool, but sanctions alone are not enough. They should be accompanied by at least three other U.S. policy moves.

First, the United States needs to assess the military needs of Ukraine and other Eastern European countries and then swiftly dispatch—or facilitate the purchase of—whatever resources may be required. Offering military ration kits rather than serious military assistance is a joke. It is a bad joke, and it is an insult to our friends in Kiev and freedom-loving people within the orbit of Russia.

Second, we should enhance and expand our European missile defense system with upgrades such as a new X-Band radar and more capable interceptors. We should also increase our overall missile defense budget. This is something Putin hates but which is a legitimate expenditure of self-defense monies to help keep the world safer, particularly from the threat of an Iranian missile.

Third, we should dramatically accelerate the approval process for U.S. companies seeking to export liquefied natural gas. Congress can take the lead here by amending the 1938 Natural Gas Act, an antiquated, Depression-era law that has become an obstacle to economic growth and U.S. foreign policy interests. Even in the short term, most of our LNG exports would go to Asia, it is true, rather than Europe, but it

would increase overall the supply, and expediting and expanding those exports would increase that global supply, help push down prices, and signal to Vladimir Putin that Washington is determined to squeeze his gas revenues and break his energy stranglehold on Eastern Europe. That is why members of both political parties have called for boosting and accelerating LNG exports as quickly as possible. Those can begin to flow from the United States as early as 2015, thus increasing supply, alleviating dependency on other sources, and send a very important message to Mr. Putin.

All of the actions I have described would send a powerful message to Moscow and help maximize our diplomatic leverage in the current crisis. The March 20 sanctions were a good start. The legislation that is crafted by my friend from Tennessee, the ranking Republican on the Foreign Relations Committee, along with Senator MENENDEZ, the chairman, are a good start, but there is more that can be done and should be done. I hope the majority leader will allow a reasonable and rational process to allow other Members in the body to participate by adding their constructive ideas to this legislation, which will pass by the end of the week, but I think there are a multitude of good ideas that could be added to it to make it even stronger and send an even more effective message to Vladimir Putin and, hopefully, discourage him from acting further in his naked aggression in Ukraine.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHATZ). The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I wish to ask about my time, but before the Senator from Texas leaves, I wish to thank him for his comments and his involvement in this issue. I appreciate his coming to the floor. I think this is an important issue for us to be debating and I firmly support the open amendment process that has been alluded to.

If I could, I wish to inquire as to how much time is remaining at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 4 minutes remaining on the Republican side.

Mr. CORKER. I was afraid that might be the case. I wonder if I could ask unanimous consent to speak for 8 minutes or so.

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

UKRAINE

Mr. CORKER. I thank the Chair. Mr. President, I rise to speak on the pending business before the Senate, which is the aid package and sanctions package and the IMF package relative to Ukraine. I wish to thank Senator MENENDEZ for the way he conducted our hearings and markup relative to this bill.

I think most people in this body understand this is a bill that came out of

the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on a 14-3 vote. We had one Member who was absent, dealing with some business in Florida. It is my understanding had that Member been there, this actually would have come out of committee on a 15-3 vote. So I emphasize, first of all, this bill has been through the committee process. On the other hand, events on the ground have changed since the bill came out of committee. Things have evolved since it came out of committee. I hope there is an open amendment process to make adjustments to the bill to take into account some of the things that have occurred on the ground since that time.

Look, I know all of us want to strongly support Ukraine. I know all of us strongly condemn what Russia and Putin have done recently in Crimea, and I think all of us understand that what we want to do is to stop that aggression from moving on into the southern and eastern portions of Ukraine. So we are trying to respond in a way that sends a signal to Russia, sends a signal to those who have been involved in these illicit activities, that they should at least stop on the Crimean border and, hopefully, over time they will recede from Crimea. What we are trying to do is prevent further aggression in this area.

I think everyone understands it has been our policy for 70 years as the United States to promote a democratic whole and free Europe. So what is happening with Russia and Crimea—and hopefully not in Ukraine, although there is no doubt they have fomented many of the problems that have occurred there—what we are attempting to do is to ensure that Europe remains free, democratic, and whole.

I know everybody here remembers the fact that Ukraine was a place of numbers of nuclear weapons from Russia. When the Soviet Union broke apart in 1991, there was a huge arsenal of nuclear weapons and warheads in Ukraine. We signed an agreement called the Budapest Memorandum with the United Kingdom, Russia, and Ukraine relative to Ukraine's sovereignty if they were willing to give up these nuclear weapons. So it is very much in our national interests that we prevent Russia from breaking up and dealing nefariously with the sovereignty of Ukraine.

We have crafted a bill which does three things. No. 1, it provides economic aid. I think everyone in this body understands the tremendous economic problems Ukraine is experiencing. I think we all understand the first thing that has to happen in Ukraine is it has to be stabilized economically. Therefore, the administration has pledged \$1 billion in aid. This bill backs that up in a way that allows that to occur. Obviously, Congress has to approve spending, which is associated with loan guarantees. These loan guarantees, by the way, would not take effect until after Ukraine has signed an IMF agreement that makes sure they

are going to go through the structural processes necessary to make sure they do what actually causes them to be a more successful country.

The bill also deals with sanctions. I think everyone knows there have been numbers of people who have been involved nefariously in dealing internally in Ukraine with their sovereignty issues, but there also have been numbers of corrupt officials in Russia who have affected what is happening in Ukraine, and this bill sanctions both. We are sending a very strong message. Economic aid is important, but I also think sanctioning the bad behavior and Russia understanding there are going to be additional sanctions put in place is important.

I wish to thank the administration for the sanctions that have been put in place. I thought it was a big step to put in place sectoral sanctions, or when they said they had the ability through Executive order to do that. What I hope will happen, and what we have pressed for out of our office, is they will implement some of those sectoral sanctions to send a shock wave through the Russian economy that in the event they do anything to come into Ukraine while they are amassing troops on the border—if they do anything in that regard—this is just the beginning.

I think all of us understand Russia is in a place where their economy is weak and we know the ruble has depreciated greatly in value. We understand our best asset against them right now is sanctions that would hurt them economically and certainly affect those people who sit around Putin and affect him in big ways.

The third piece of this bill is IMF reform. I join a number of people who believe the IMF reforms that have been laid out are important. They are important to the world. I talk to my friends on this side of the aisle who I think may have more of an isolationist bent, and I say that one of the things that is most important for us as a nation is to have an entity such as the IMF—it is not perfect, it makes mistakes, but it is the entity that everything in the world is looking to right now to help usher Ukraine from where they are to a place that is prosperous and has the ability to improve the standard of living of Ukrainians, which is very important from the standpoint of their stability.

So we are all focused on the IMF. We have people on my side of the aisle who again have become more isolationist, less adventurous, if you would, relative to—which is where the country is, I understand. But what the IMF does is allow us to share the risk of stabilizing countries such as Ukraine with other countries around the world. I think all of us understand the threats to global stability are greater today than they have been in the past. So there was an agreed-to set of reforms that took place back in 2010. I strongly support—I strongly support—those reforms and,

as a matter of fact, would say Ukraine is the poster child for why we need to have an IMF that is functioning at a much higher level.

We account for a transfer from something called the NAB, if you will—it is a line of credit that we have; it is out there; it is a liability our Nation has—and we transfer \$63 billion of that \$100 billion over to something that is in a basket of currency. So we are not taking on any additional liabilities. Yet there is a pay-for aspect of this through the budgeting process that is fully accounted for in this bill.

Again, I join Dr. Henry Kissinger, Dr. Condoleezza Rice, former Secretary Jim Baker in saying and knowing we should adopt these IMF reforms.

These are the three big elements of this bill. We have some democracy assistance. We have some authorized sums to help us build stronger relationships with our allies. But I strongly support this piece of legislation. I think this piece of legislation is a full package. It is a package that deals with the three aspects that need to be dealt with at this time.

Ukraine is, again, the poster child of why we want to have a fully functioning IMF. Look, I know there are going to be amendments offered. There actually have been some already. I hope we will have a full and open process, with amendments that are relevant to what we are dealing with on the floor. I think the bill can be improved.

It is my hope, as we move through this week, that we will have the opportunity for those amendments to be heard and voted on but, at the same time, by the time the week ends and we head back to our respective States we will have, in a unified way, sent a message to Russia, sent a message to the people of Ukraine as to where this body stands relative to their support economically, relative to sanctions that we believe strongly should be put in place against Russia, and how we believe the IMF should be functioning as a stabilizing force in the world.

With that, I yield the floor.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

SUPPORT FOR THE SOVEREIGNTY, INTEGRITY, DEMOCRACY, AND ECONOMIC STABILITY OF UKRAINE ACT OF 2014—MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 2124, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 329, S. 2124, a bill to support sovereignty and democracy in Ukraine, and for other purposes.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, 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. RUBIO. 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. RUBIO. Mr. President, my understanding is we are on the motion to proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are.

Mr. RUBIO. I wanted to speak about the issue of Ukraine. I get a lot of questions, phone calls, emails about it. It has certainly been on the minds of a lot of people across the country. The most common question that I get is: What do we do about it? What can we do? Related to that is the question of: Why does this even matter?

I am going to get to that in my conclusion. But on this motion that is now before the Senate, where we are being asked to vote on a package of sanctions and also assistance to Ukraine, I wanted to first outline what it is we can do moving forward in addition to this bill that is before us, but also why this bill that is before us is so important.

I think there are a couple of things that we really need to focus on in terms of our reaction to what has happened with regards to Crimea and with Ukraine, in particular, because of the Russian actions that have been taken.

First and most important we need to help the Ukrainian people and the interim government in Ukraine to protect its nation's sovereignty but also to protect its transition to democracy—to full democracy.

They have elections scheduled in May of this year. For these elections it is going to be critical that they go off smoothly, that they are free and they are fair because that is an important step in their transition to democracy.

But we should anticipate that Russia, through Putin, is going to do everything it can to disrupt these elections, to delegitimize these elections. We already see evidence in open source reporting in the media that, in fact, there are highly trained agitators sponsored by the Kremlin that have found their way into Ukraine and could potentially participate in ways to try to disrupt these elections.

So I think one of the first things we can do, working with our allies in Europe, is to help them with the logistical support they need to carry out in May elections that are free and are fair and to help them with the biggest step they are going to take so far towards a transition to democracy in Ukraine.

The second action we need to take to help Ukraine to protect its sovereignty and to make its transition to democracy is to help them stabilize their economy. You can imagine that this disruptive change in government, combined with an invasion of its terri-

tories, has been highly disruptive to their economy, which was already feeling some real constraints. That is why the bill before us is so critical. In addition to some of the direct assistance, it will help them access loans that will allow them to stabilize their economic situation.

What we can anticipate is that Russia is going to do everything it can to disrupt their economy. Again, the Russian argument here is—it is a ridiculous argument. But the argument they are making to the world is: Ukraine is a failed state. The Russian-speaking population is being threatened. So we have to get involved. We must intervene to try to stabilize that situation.

That is the argument they have made in Crimea. Increasingly, that is the argument they seem to be making with regard to Eastern Ukraine. So the bill before us is critical because it will be a major step on the part of this government to do its part, in conjunction with our allies in Europe, to help Ukrainians stabilize their economy.

As I have shared before, I have some real concerns about some of the language that is in this bill. It has to do with these changes to the IMF that I do not think belong in this legislation. I do not think they belong in this legislation for two reasons. One, I do not think that we should be taking up an issue of that importance in this manner. We should have a full debate. That should be dealt with separately. But I also think it was a mistake by this administration to include the IMF language in this bill because what we need as much as anything else is not just to pass this bill out of the Senate but to pass it with the most amount of support possible.

I want to see it be 100 to 0 or 95 to 5 so we can send a very strong message to Russia and the world that the United States of America and her people are firmly on the side of Ukraine's sovereignty and Ukraine's desire for independence from Russia and its ability to stabilize itself in moving forward. That, quite frankly, is endangered as a result of the administration's decision to push this divisive language into this bill. There was no reason for them to do that.

In fact, that sentiment is not a Republican sentiment. It is being echoed in the House, where a number of Democrats today are quoted in newspaper articles as saying that this is a mistake, that they should never have done this. If they were to take this language out, you would pass a bill in the House and Senate this week. We could have passed one before we left 2 weeks ago. Instead, it continues to have to go through a prolonged debate and divisiveness.

There are people who have had to vote against it here on the floor because they feel so strongly about the IMF language. We could have had their support. We could have sent a stronger message than the one that is being sent now.

I have those concerns. By the way, there was a statement made on the

floor yesterday that I think deserves to be addressed. The majority leader stood here and said that, basically, the reason that—Republicans are responsible for the loss of Crimea in an effort to help a family that is engaged in American politics. I think that statement is absurd and ridiculous. I think it is the kind of hyperbole that in issues such as this has no place.

At some point there have to be issues so big and so important to the national security of this country that they are above politics and above that sort of statement. That being said, while I share the same concerns that many of my colleagues do about the IMF language, and initially expressed my position that I was not willing to vote for this bill with it, after much thought and consideration over the last couple of weeks, researching the issues, I made the conclusion that in the cost-benefit analysis, helping Ukraine stabilize itself, helping Ukraine stabilize its economy, given the importance of this issue, it is so important that I am prepared to vote for this despite the fact that it has something in it that I do not like. That is how important I think this issue truly is.

Oftentimes in foreign policy that is what we are called to do. We are called to make pragmatic decisions that are in the best interests of America and our allies around the world, even if it is less than ideal or perhaps not the complete solution that we want. That is why I voted to proceed with the debate on this bill yesterday. That is why I am prepared to support it despite the inclusion of IMF language that I am strongly against—because I think this issue is that important.

The third thing we can do to help Ukraine protect its sovereignty and make its full transition to democracy is to help them with their defense capability. Now, understand that when the Soviet Union fell in the early 1990s, Ukraine was left with the world's third largest stockpile of tactical nuclear weapons and strategic nuclear weapons on the planet.

But they signed this agreement with the United States, the United Kingdom, and Russia that basically said: If you give up your nuclear weapons, we, these three countries that signed this, will provide for your defense and assure you of your defense. So Ukraine did that. They gave up these weapons. This was signed in 1994, and 20 years later, one of the three countries that signed that agreement has not just not provided for their defense, they actually invaded them.

I want to make a point on this for a second. Think about if you were one of these other countries around the world right now that feels threatened by your neighbors, and the United States and the rest of the world are going to you and saying: Listen, do not develop nuclear weapons. Do not develop nuclear weapons, South Korea. Do not develop nuclear weapons, Japan. Do not develop nuclear weapons, Saudi Arabia.

We will protect you. We will watch out for you.

What kind of lesson do you think this instance sends to them? I think the message this is sending to many nations around the world is: Perhaps we can no longer count on the security promises made by the free world. Perhaps we need to start looking out for ourselves. That is why the Ukrainian situation is so more important than simply what is happening in Europe. This has implications around the world.

There are a number of countries around the world now that are considering increasing their defense capabilities, including a nuclear capacity, because they feel threatened by neighbors that have a nuclear capacity themselves. So far they have held back because they have relied on the United States and our partners to assure them that they do not need these weapons, that we have their back. But now when something like this happens, these countries see it as further evidence that potentially those sorts of assurances are no longer enough in the 21st century.

That raises the real risk that over the next 2 decades, you could see an explosion in the number of countries around the world that possess a nuclear weapons capability because they now feel that they must protect themselves and can no longer rely on other countries to do it for them.

So how can we help Ukraine with its military and defense capabilities? By providing them assistance. By the way, the Ukraine military capability degraded not just because of their overconfidence in these assurances that were made to them, but there was also corruption in that government. In fact, the previous president who was ousted by a popular revolt, that president actually undermined the defense capabilities of that country and took a lot of that money and used it for internal control, to be able to control his own population instead of being able to protect his country.

So what can we do to help? The first thing that I have called for us to do is to provide Ukraine with more military equipment and more training. We should work with our NATO allies and the European Union to help equip and train the Ukrainian military forces so that they can protect the country now and moving forward. We can also share intelligence information with them to help them better position their assets and understand and have a better awareness of what is going on around them.

We can also help them with logistical support. These are the sorts of things that I hope this administration will take steps toward in the next couple of days. So that is the first thing we can do. We can help Ukraine protect its sovereignty and make its full transition to democracy.

The second thing we need to do is we need to continue to raise the price on

Putin for the invasion of Crimea. We need to change the calculation, the cost-benefit calculation that he is going to go through as he decides whether to move into Eastern Ukraine now and potentially even parts of Moldova.

So already some steps have been taken in that regard. I applaud the administration for having additional sanctions announced last week. I think we are going to have to continue to do more in conjunction with our allies. I think we need to add more names of individuals, of financial institutions, and of businesses, primarily those who have links to this invasion, but also Russia's involvement in supporting the Syrian regime as it carries out the mass slaughter of its own people.

I think we need to suspend our civil and nuclear cooperation agreement that was entered into as part of the 123 agreement 4 years ago as a strong message to them. I think we need to reassess the role that NATO plays in Europe. NATO was largely built around the Soviet risks in Western Europe.

Then, after the fall of the Soviet Union and the end of the Cold War, NATO kind of lost its way a little bit in terms of its role in Europe because there was no threat. In fact, you saw some of these countries saying, you know, it is likely that NATO's role now will be about operations in the Middle East or in Africa and being involved in threats there as opposed to actually having to defend our own territory.

The facts on the ground in Europe have changed dramatically in the last 2 months. You now, in fact, do have a powerful military force in the region that has shown a willingness to invade a neighbor. They did this in 2008 in Georgia. They are doing it again now in a way that is even more egregious and outrageous. I think it is time for NATO to reevaluate its capabilities, given this new threat that is here to stay.

Also, the time has come for NATO to reposition its assets to face this threat and this risk. I think and I hope that those conversations are happening now. I think for NATO, in many respects, it is time to reinvigorate this alliance. It has a clear and present danger in Europe in the form of the government of Vladimir Putin, who threatens his neighbors and the stability of Europe. So now I think NATO has found a reason to reinvigorate itself.

The last point I would make, in terms of changing the calculus, is the real stranglehold Russia has on Europe. It is not simply its military capabilities, it is its natural resources. Much of Europe depends on Russia for its oil and natural gas. This creates a tremendous amount of leverage on their neighbors. One of the reasons we have seen some countries in Europe reluctant to move forward on even higher sanctions is because they are afraid of losing access to the natural gas and oil from Russia that their economy depends on.

We need to change that. That can't happen overnight, but we need to begin to change that; first, by increasing our exports to those countries and particularly Ukraine. I know Senator BARRASSO will have an amendment as part of this debate that I hope will be considered that will allow us to export more natural gas to Ukraine. But what also needs to happen is other countries in Europe need to develop their own domestic capabilities in natural gas so they can become less reliant on Russia for these resources and become more reliant on themselves and free countries in the region to be able to do that. That is a critical component of a long-term strategy in all of this.

Let me close by answering the question I began with. Why does this matter? I think this matters for a lot of different reasons. I have highlighted one, in terms of decisions being made around the world and governments deciding whether they are going to pursue their own domestic nuclear weapons capability, but there is another that perhaps we need to think about.

After World War II—in fact, after the last century when the world went through two devastating World Wars—there was a commitment made that no longer would nations be allowed to aggressively invade other countries and take over territory and exercise illegitimate claims. In fact, international norms were established at the end of World War II. There were some conflicts during the Cold War with Russia, with the Soviet Union, and with the spread of communism, but by and large, especially since the end of the Cold War, that has been the established norm.

It is not acceptable in the late 20th century and in the early 21st century for a country to simply make up an excuse and invade a neighbor and take their lands and territory. That was perhaps the way of the world 300 years ago, 200 years ago, and 100 years ago, and there were massive wars and loss of life as a result of countries doing that, but the world grew tired of these conflicts and decided we will no longer tolerate or accept these sorts of things. If you recall, in the early 1990s, Saddam Hussein did that. He invaded Kuwait. The entire world community rallied around the United States of America to expel him as a result of that illegitimate action.

In the 21st century, we have the most egregious violation of that norm. We basically have Russia deciding they don't like the way things are going in Ukraine so they decide to invade. They decided to take over a territory. Think about how they did it. They denied ever doing it. They sent Russian troops into Crimea, but they had them wear uniforms that had no markings on them. In fact, the press would ask these soldiers: Where are you from, and they wouldn't answer. They invaded a country but lied about their invasion. They claimed these were local defense forces that had rallied around the Russian flag. They made up this excuse

that somehow the Russian-speaking population in the region was being oppressed and attacked and was in danger and so they needed to intervene.

To this day, Russia still will not admit the military role they are playing on the ground in Crimea. So in addition to violating this international norm, which is an outrageous behavior, they have lied about it and think they can get away with it. The point I am making is, if in the 21st century a country is allowed to invade a neighbor, lie about it and lie about the reasons for it and they can get away with it without significant costs, we have created a dangerous precedent with which we are going to have to live. All over the world there are powerful nations that can now claim land they do not control belongs to them.

I took a trip in February to Asia. I visited Japan and the Philippines and South Korea. You know what the No. 1 fear in that region is. That China has similar claims to Russia. They claim all sorts of pieces of territory and of oceans that belong to them. They claim it belonged to them 1,000 years ago and should belong to them now. They have taken a different tack, but the point is, if we now live in a world where a country can make territorial claims and then simply act on them without any repercussions from the international community, then I think the 21st century is starting to look more and more like the early 20th century, a time that subjected the world to two devastating World Wars.

We cannot allow this to go unpunished. The only way this can be punished is if the free countries of the world rally together and impose sanctions and costs on Vladimir Putin and his cronies for having taken this action. That will never happen—the free world will never be able to rally to impose those costs—unless the United States leads that effort. We can't do it alone, but it cannot be done without us.

That is why it is so important that measures such as the one the Senate now is considering happen with the highest amount of bipartisan support we can muster. We may not agree with every aspect of it—I certainly do not—but we must weigh the equities. If we were to put this on a scale, the need to do something about Ukraine so far outweighs the things about the legislation before us that we don't like because of the implications it has not just on our Nation but on the world and the role we must play. If some other country around the world fails to pass sanctions, fails to take steps or does so in a way that is divided, it might have some impact, but when the United States fails to act in a decisive way, it has a dramatic impact.

One of the arguments our adversaries around the world use is asking our allies: Why are you still in the camp of the United States? They ask: Why are you still allying yourself with the United States? They are unreliable.

Their government is always bickering and deeply divided. They can't come together in Washington to do anything. Do you think, if you are ever invaded or ever get into trouble, the United States could possibly muster the domestic political support necessary for them to come to your assistance? Don't count on America. Count on us or count on yourself.

I have already explained why there is danger in that, but that is the argument these countries use against us. What I fear is that if we fail to take decisive and unified action in this body, in the Senate, to send a strong message—and while we may not agree on every component of this, and I have already said I believe it was a mistake for the administration to push for that IMF reform language—if we do not send a strong and decisive message, then I think this will be spun against us. I think this will be used as evidence to our allies and other countries around the world why America is no longer reliable, either economically or militarily.

The consequences of that could extend far beyond Europe into other regions of the world, such as Asia. This is not a game. This is not some domestic political dispute. This issue has ramifications that will directly impact the kind of world our children will inherit. In fact, it will dramatically impact the kind of world we will have to live in over the next 20, 30, and 40 years. We cannot afford to make a mistake. We cannot afford to be wrong.

I hope I can convince as many of my colleagues as possible to support this legislation, with all of its flaws, so we can send a clear message that on these issues we are united as a people and as a nation and that we remain committed to U.S. global leadership.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant majority leader.

PHILIPPINES CHARITABLE GIVING ASSISTANCE ACT

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I understand we have an announcement from the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Under the previous order, the Senate having received H.R. 3771, the text of which is identical to S. 1821, the Senate will proceed to consideration of the measure, which the clerk will report.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3771) to accelerate the income tax benefits for charitable cash contributions for the relief of victims of the Typhoon Haiyan in the Philippines.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, H.R. 3771 is read a third time and passed, S. 1821 is indefinitely postponed, and the motions to reconsider are considered made and laid upon the table.

SUPPORT FOR THE SOVEREIGNTY, INTEGRITY, DEMOCRACY, AND ECONOMIC STABILITY OF UKRAINE ACT OF 2014—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I enjoyed very much the remarks of the Senator from Florida. He is very much concerned about this, very much plugged into the situation of what is happening in Ukraine, but I would like to make a couple of comments about that from a slightly different perspective, one that is from my current position as the ranking member on the Senate Armed Services Committee.

I would like to look at just one part of this proposal; that is, the money that would be coming out of the military to take care of a problem the military should not have to take care of at a time when things are very serious. The IMF has all the authority it needs to meet all of Ukraine's borrowing needs—that is the \$35 billion—with its existing commitments from the global community. The IMF does not need additional U.S. funds to help Ukraine. It does not make sense to double the size of the IMF by ratifying a 2010 agreement, paying for it with money that could be used by DOD to address the shortfalls which I am going to talk about.

By the way, there is another option out there because the House has a bill. Chairman ROYCE of the House Foreign Affairs Committee is marking up a bill today as we are speaking that I believe addresses our response to Ukraine in a more responsible way. The House bill is likely to provide \$68 billion in Ukraine aid that does not expand the IMF and removes it from the bans on LNG. This does not contain IMF reform. It does not take money from the DOD. I think that is good.

The Senator from Florida commented that we wouldn't be in the position we are in right now with the Europeans afraid to come to the aid of Ukraine if it weren't for the fact they are reliant upon Russia for their ability to produce LNG. We in this country have had a real boom in getting in the tight formations of the LNG. Right now we need to be exporting more of it to get the price up so it can be produced for ourselves in this country. No better way than to start exporting this to countries such as Ukraine. If we are doing this, the Western European countries would not be reliant upon Russia for that ability.

I think we have an opportunity there to do something with this bill, and hopefully we will be able to satisfy the needs of Ukraine and at the same time not provide further damage to our military.

I recognize that out of the \$315 million pricetag in total aid for the package, it rightly cuts \$150 million from the State Department. That is true. That is where it should come from. But it also then takes an equal amount—

\$150 million—away from the Department of Defense to double the size of IMF in order to give authority that isn't actually required for the IMF to adequately loan to Ukraine, and should not be included as part of this bill.

The unnecessary proposed \$157 million of defense rescission to pay for this aid has already been used by OMB, the Office of Management and Budget, and by the DOD, Department of Defense, to build the current defense budget. These funds have already been spent and we cannot get any more out of the military right now. If Defense is forced to pay for this aid, then the services will likely have to reduce their readiness accounts.

Readiness accounts mean lives because we talk about risk. If we are not ready, to the degree we are not ready, we incur more risk, and risk is translated into lives. Our national security funding can't be treated like an ATM. Mr. President, \$157 million can be used to support critical defense readiness needs, such as an Army brigade combat team for 6 months, 1,000 Marine embassy security personnel for 1½ years, about 2 months of the O&M for a second carrier air wing or almost two F-16 squadrons for 1 year.

What has happened to the military, if only people out there would understand, and they do not—there are a lot of Republicans and Democrats both out there not talking about this, the most serious problem we are facing in this country—is what the Obama administration has done to our military.

I remember so well 5 years ago going to Afghanistan so I could respond to the President's budget, which was at that time talking about what he was going to be doing to the military. I knew he would begin 5 years ago to start disarming America, and what did he do. He did away with our only fifth-generation fighter, the F-22; he did away with our carrier capability, the C-17; did away with our future combat system; and he did away with our ground-based interceptor in Poland. Of course, we are desperately looking for something to protect the Eastern part of the United States as a result of that. That was all in the first year, the first step in disarming America.

Since that time, the President in his budget has taken out of the military some \$487 billion. If he goes through with his sequestration, it will be another one-half billion dollars.

People don't realize where this all started. They will say: Wait a minute. It is just entitlements. Entitlements are a problem, because 60 percent of the total budget goes to entitlements. But keep in mind, there is also discretionary spending which is nondefense discretionary spending. When this President took office, the first thing done was to take \$800 billion for a stimulus, none of which was used for the military. That obligated us on non-defense discretionary spending for the rest of the time at the expense of defense. So now we are in a situation

which is so serious in this country that even our military leaders have come out and made statements. People have to understand how critical this situation is and how we have disarmed this country.

Secretary Hagel 2 weeks ago said:

American dominance on the seas, in the skies, and in space can no longer be taken for granted.

Is this America? We have taken this for granted since World War II, and all of a sudden—because of what has happened through this administration to the military in the last 5 years—we can no longer do this.

General Amos, head of the Marines, agrees with me on increased risk:

We will have fewer forces arriving less-trained, arriving later to the fight. . . . This is a formula for more American casualties.

We just said when the risk increases, then our very brave troops die.

Under Secretary Frank Kendall of this administration, on January 3, said:

We're cutting our budget substantially while some of the people we worry about are going in the opposite direction. We've had 20 years since the end of the cold war [and sort of] a presumption in the United States that we are technologically superior militarily.

That is not the case now.

The top military person, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Dempsey, was appointed to the position by President Obama. He said to our committee, the Armed Services Committee, that we are putting our military on a path where the "force is so degraded and so unready" that it would be "immoral to use the force."

The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff: Immoral to use the force. This is supposed to be America. We are supposed to be a superior country. What has happened to us?

Admiral Winnefeld, Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, the second highest position, stated:

[T]here could be for the first time in my career instances where we may be asked to respond to a crisis and we will have to say that we cannot.

Unfortunately, this is something which not many people are aware of in terms of what we are doing.

Yes, we want to do what we can for Ukraine, and we believe the State Department certainly has an obligation. But the other half of the amount, the \$157 million, cannot come from the military because we are so unready today.

When we are considering this, we have to consider we have a real serious problem with our military. Unfortunately, people are not aware of this, and a lot of politicians don't talk about it because they are uncomfortable talking about it.

SEBELIUS V. HOBBY LOBBY

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, today in the Supreme Court something very significant is happening.

I am from Oklahoma. David Green and his wife, of Oklahoma City, started a business called Hobby Lobby by mak-

ing picture frames in their garage. It wasn't that long ago. I can remember them doing that. They were able to open their first store which was about 300 square feet.

With the profits they made in their little garage operation, David Green's faith, practice, and his day-to-day business decisions led him and his family to build a successful nationwide company. Over the years, their business has grown to 602 stores. With plans to expand, Hobby Lobby has an annual revenue upward of \$2.5 billion, and David has had success despite running his business in a very countercultural way.

For instance, all of the retail stores close at 8 p.m. each night and all day on Sunday so employees can spend time with their families. This is appreciated by the company's some 16,000 employees who are paid above the minimum wage. Hobby Lobby's generous employee benefit plan includes an on-site clinic with no copay at Hobby Lobby headquarters and eligibility to enroll in medical, dental, and prescription drug plans, along with long-term disability, life insurance, and a 401(k) plan with a generous company match. This is something they have done since long before ObamaCare came along.

At one point Hobby Lobby was challenged by a competitor who said they would bury the company with their money; so the firm opened their doors on Sunday, ultimately earning the company some \$150 million in revenue each week over and above what the competitor previously had been able to raise. Eventually David Green said he was challenged by God to trust in Him with his business to go back to his policy of closing on Sundays. He did, and his business has prospered. David's Christian faith runs deeper than his desire to have a profitable, successful company. But he is getting both. When he was faced with the decision to make money or obey God, he chose to obey God, whatever the consequences.

More recently he was faced with a new test. It didn't come from a competitor. It came from the U.S. Government.

Part of ObamaCare requires employers not only to provide health insurance to their employees but also to provide free access to the pills which terminate pregnancies. David, as I and many others, believes that life begins at conception. I believe that; David believes that. We are free to believe that. Offering an option to end that life would be a violation of our moral compass as defined by his faith and our faith.

Here is a guy who feels so strongly in his belief, and as his actions have shown, he would rather pay the \$1.3 million a day in fines from the Obama administration than comply with the law—in other words, killing an unborn child.

Today the Obama administration is claiming this privately-owned business is waging a war on women for not

agreeing to provide these treatments for its employees free of charge—never mind that he has been offering his employees health insurance since long before the government mandated it.

So we have the faith of an individual and what he is willing to do for his faith: He is willing to stand up to this abusive government. If we restrict those of faith from applying their conscience to the world around, then we quench the progress of freedom.

The Obama administration is attempting to write a new moral code if it is going to tell people like David Green he no longer has the freedom to apply his faith and convictions to how he operates his private business.

The case before the Supreme Court today is about maintaining freedom, which starts by preserving the fundamental freedom of religion under the First Amendment—whether it is practiced in a temple or a public square. Hobby Lobby is not alone, but it is a leader in this battle. More than 100 institutions have filed similar claims. Four universities in my State of Oklahoma have also filed a lawsuit along the same lines.

So here we have a situation—and it is hard to believe this can happen in America—where there is a man who has built up and is actively employing 16,000 people who otherwise might not be employed. He is providing income, selling products. He is a self-made man who started out in his garage. He has built up a giant operation all throughout America and has made a great contribution. Along comes the Obama administration and ObamaCare which says: We are going to fine you \$1.3 million a day if you don't offer these abortions.

This is actually being considered right now in the U.S. Supreme Court. I think God is on our side and I think we are going to have a good outcome. But imagine, one man taking the risk of \$1.3 million a day in fines just to stand behind his faith and behind the 16,000 people who work for him to make sure that good happens.

Mr. President, I yield the floor

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HEITKAMP). The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Madam President, I wish to speak about the same topic as my good friend from Oklahoma.

I was at the Supreme Court listening to the arguments on this case, *Sebelius v. Hobby Lobby*, and another case involving a Pennsylvania company which I wish to speak about as well.

Of course, this case, as the Senator from Oklahoma has pointed out, starts with the Affordable Care Act and what many people and I believe the Supreme Court will decide is a blatant violation in religious freedom in the way that act would be applied.

There is nothing in the act that deals with the rule which sets those big fines up or establishes how those fines would be collected—or, in fact, nothing in the act which specifies specific things that have to be in the so-called model plan.

That all is up to the administration, all up to the Department of HHS—unless the Court or the Congress does what needs to be done here, which is to say there are certain boundaries you can't cross.

The so-called Affordable Health Care Act—which seems to be providing neither better health care nor better affordability—was signed into law 4 years ago this week. In that 4 years we have seen disastrous effects of the health care act. One of those is the workplace effect where more and more people work less and less.

Why do they work less and less? Because for the first time ever the government has said businesses and people had an obligation to provide insurance for somebody who worked more than 30 hours. Prior to that law, many people with insurance worked less than 30 hours. It may not have been insurance which the President of the United States would have specified they had, but it was insurance which appeared to be working for them. But once the government says: Here is what you have to do, the government ironically also appears to be saying: Here is what you don't have to do.

So we know the workplace effects are bad. We know this is one of the principal reasons given for people working part time without benefits instead of working either full time or part time with benefits. We see the cut in Medicare and the impact it has on seniors. We see the increasing amount of money you have to spend before your insurance kicks in for so many people. We know this law is not working for American families or American individuals. Now we see a case where the law doesn't work for the Constitution.

Specifically, the law forces businesses such as Hobby Lobby—mentioned by the Senator from Oklahoma, Senator INHOFE—to offer health insurance for employees which covers services that violate their religious belief. This is a company which has always prided itself in its ability to offer health care coverage better than its employees might be able to get other places. This is a company which starts its nonseasonal employees at a rate about twice minimum wage, its lowest paid employee. This is not a company which is in any way trying to take advantage of its employees. This is a company which in every indication through the existence of the company is they want to act in a certain way which is comfortable with its faith.

The penalties? If you don't do what the government says, the penalties are \$36,500 per employee per year. In the case of this company, which has locations all over the country and a significant number of employees, that is more than \$450 million a year. If you don't provide insurance at all, one of the points made by the government lawyers today, your option would be you would only pay a \$2,000 penalty. So \$2,000 a year if you don't offer insurance at all; \$36,500 a year per employee

if you don't offer exactly the insurance the all-knowing government has decided you need to have.

What a foolish position for the Federal Government to be in: Your penalty, if you are this big company but privately held, closely held by a family—this happens to be a big and successful company but not a publicly-traded company. It happens to be a company that chose to incorporate but incorporated within the ability of the family to do so in a closely-held way. If you don't pay—if you don't do what the government says, your penalty would be less than the insurance you are providing by quite a bit—if you don't provide insurance at all. If you don't do exactly what the government says, it is probably the amount of money that puts your company out of business.

Hobby Lobby, with more than 500 arts and crafts stores around the country, is being joined in the case today. The cases were joined together by *Conestoga Wood Specialties*, a company that manufactures kitchen cabinets. Their case was presented at the same time. This company was founded by the Hahns family, a Mennonite family from Pennsylvania. It is a smaller company than Hobby Lobby, but a company that still upholds their own religious beliefs and has a tradition of upholding those religious beliefs in everything they do. These two companies of very different size do not object to all of the things in the list of things the government says you have to offer. In fact, in the area of contraception, they object to only 4 of the things that happen after conception, the things that would create an abortion in their view after conception. They both traditionally offered other kinds of contraception, but this crosses their religious boundary. So for these 4 things only the government would say you have to pay \$36,500 per employee per year.

There are at least 46 cases filed concerning for-profit companies that have the same kinds of religious objections. More than 10 of those lawsuits are in my State of Missouri. It is not just about one set of religious beliefs, but it is about protecting all Americans' First Amendment rights to pursue their faith-based principles and what they believe. These happen to be a Mennonite family and an evangelical Christian family. The largest Christian group in America, the Catholic Church, has a broader sense of what they think would violate their religious beliefs. But the point here is not what the government is specifically trying to force you to do; it is that the government under the laws that we have passed should not be able to force you to do things that violate your faith principles.

There are many faith-based groups that have different views of how you deliver health services. I met with many of those groups over the course of the last 2 years since this rule came out. There are 84 different briefs that have been filed with the Court on behalf of these two cases, suggesting as

friends of the Court that here is something you should think about and look at. On those 84 amicus briefs they are at least 3 to 1 in favor of the families that own these companies that want to be able to run their companies based on their faith-based principles.

The numbers of people that are concerned about this are large, and they include a very diverse set of coalitions of people who care. One brief from a bipartisan group of 107 Members of Congress said you should uphold the law that Congress passed that protects people's freedom of religion—not to mention the Constitution itself—where freedom of religion is the first freedom mentioned and the first sentence in the First Amendment to the Constitution. It is important in our history of who we are. Twenty-one states have joined this case on behalf of these companies. Doctors' and women's organizations have filed briefs advocating that the Court respect the religious rights of companies. Protestant and Catholic theologians have filed briefs, as have the Rabbinical Council of America, the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops, the International Society of Krishna Consciousness, Crescent Foods, a halal food company, the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, and the Coalition of Christian Colleges and Universities. All have a broad diversity of religious views, but they agree on one thing: This is a principal tenet of who we are.

President Jefferson said in a letter he wrote to the New London Methodists in 1809 that of all the rights we hold, we should hold the right of conscience most dear. Once the government can start telling you what to believe and how you apply what you believe, we have given up the most fundamental of all freedoms.

Congress has a long tradition of protecting religious liberty. The Congress enacted the Religious Freedom Restoration Act to ensure broad protection of religious liberty. The HHS regulations do not satisfy the high bar set by that act. That is a position that I hope the Court upholds. The mandate is an enormous government overreach, and it violates Americans' constitutional rights.

While this mandate severely fines religious individuals, it exempts plenty of other nonreligious institutions. The administration has already exempted 100 million employees from the mandate for commercial or political reasons. People should also not be forced to give up their business to hold on to their faith or to give up their faith to hold on to their business. These family businesses are not publicly traded corporations.

I am not a lawyer, but I am told on the best authority there is not one court case that diminishes the rights of these kinds of corporations. In fact, numerous Federal courts have upheld the ability of for-profit corporations to bring racial discrimination cases. So you could have a racial profile as a cor-

poration, but you couldn't have a religious profile as a corporation. This is an untenable position for the government to take.

The Supreme Court has heard this case today. I join my colleagues on both sides of the aisle and in both Chambers to urge the Court to preserve the fundamental religious freedoms that Americans have enjoyed, the Constitution demands, that laws passed overwhelmingly by the Congress and signed by the President in 1993 continue to be the standard that is applied to our right of conscience, our right of belief, of what we want to believe, must believe, and do believe.

I am pleased to be joined by my colleagues to talk about this very same topic.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. I thank Senator BLUNT. I did not get to hear all of Senator INHOFE's comments, but as an Oklahoman I think we couldn't have a finer company or a finer corporate citizen than the Green family, in terms of their chains of stores around the country and what they have done. The reason they are successful is because they actually care, nurture, and support every one of their employees.

They work on principles that they truly believe in, and it has really been the key to their success. They are never open on the sabbath. They believe in paying somebody a livable wage. They are big in the community. As a matter of fact, they are one of the largest contributors to organizations that are funded in the charitable realm. They go down deep to actually help people. They come with pure motives.

The Senator from Missouri mentioned what Thomas Jefferson said in 1809:

No provision in our Constitution ought to be dearer to man than that which protects the rights of conscience against the enterprises of civil authority.

I want you to listen to that for a minute. Jefferson, one of the authors of the rules of the Senate, one of the key Framers of the very Constitution that we live under, recognized that it is most important to protect this conscience of the Green family to do what they think, according to their faith, is the right thing to do.

My colleague referenced the Religious Freedom Restoration Act. Why was that necessary? Because we saw civil government starting to impede into an arena that Thomas Jefferson warned about. That is why it was passed, that is why it was signed, and that is why it is the law of the land. This is going to be a seminal case, and it has nothing to do with birth control. Hobby Lobby pays for birth control. It always has and always will. It has to do with can we allow the civil government to impede to such a level, as my colleague from Missouri said, that the government can now tell you what your values are, what you have to

think, and how you have to act, on the basis of what the government says your values are.

As an obstetrician who has delivered more than 4,000 children, as somebody who has cared for every complication of pregnancy, as somebody who believes in the value of newly created human life, all the Greens are saying is: We really shouldn't have to pay our money to abort a baby when we find it unconscionable to take innocent human life. It doesn't mean that people that work for them cannot get an abortion. It just says they don't want to violate their own conscience by supplying it.

The other issue that ought to be evident to everybody is that plan B is over the counter. It is not even part of your health care. You can go buy it. As a matter of fact, there is not even an age limit on it now. A 12-year-old can go buy it over the counter. So it is not about limiting abortion; it is about the conscience of a very successful company. The reason they are successful is they follow the teachings of their faith. Now we have government in a position where they are going to tell them what their faith is.

Let me reiterate what Jefferson said:

No provision in our Constitution ought to be dearer to man than that which protects the rights of conscience against the enterprises of civil authority.

These are deeply felt and held beliefs based on their faith.

The other side of this is we see their deeply held beliefs and how they have rescued universities, how they have come to the aid of food pantries, how they have actually been active in the community. Everywhere they are involved they are out following the same deeply held beliefs of helping the poor and indigent, giving people an opportunity through a college education that they never would have had, giving people a day of rest.

Their stores are not open late. Their employees get to go home. They could sell more products if they were open later. They could sell more product if they were open on Sunday. They choose not to because they think the principles under which they operate their business based on their faith have created an environment which allows everybody who works for them to succeed. If you go through their businesses, if you go through their warehouses, and if you go to their stores, what you see is a smile on almost everybody's face. Why? Because people enjoy working there, because they are treated as human beings. They are lifted up. They are given opportunity. They are given the very things that we all want for our neighbors and for ourselves.

My hope is that the Constitution will be looked at as the Supreme Court considers this case and that the Religious Freedom Restoration Act will be looked at as the Supreme Court considers this case.

The Affordable Care Act is not affordable; it is unaffordable. For Americans it has a \$2 trillion cost over the next 10 years. It is a disaster in terms of how it has been implemented. It is going to be a disaster in terms of quality care and delayed care because of the increased deductibles that almost everybody is facing. We shouldn't let it be a disaster in terms of destroying businesses.

We ought to embrace this family and their business for what they have done. They have taken advantage of the American enterprise system in a way that has built tremendous success, that has benefited not just the Green family but hundreds of thousands of people through their generosity, and their capability to empower people to get ahead.

I am glad to see my colleague, and I yield the floor.

Mr. BLUNT. Madam President, I would ask for an additional 5 minutes for the Senator from New Hampshire.

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

Ms. AYOTTE. Thank you, Madam President.

I come to the floor today to talk about a very important case that the U.S. Supreme Court heard arguments on this morning that goes to the very core of our Nation's foundation—the future of religious freedom in the United States.

As Americans we cherish our religious liberty. It lies at the heart of who we are as a people, and we know we must always guard against threats to our religious freedom enshrined in the First Amendment of the Constitution. That is why I am joining my colleagues Senator BLUNT and Senator COBURN on the floor today and speaking in support of the constitutional rights that all Americans have under the First Amendment, which guarantees the right of freedom of conscience and religious liberty.

Here is what is at stake. Americans should not be forced to give up their religious freedom or their rights of conscience simply because they want to open a family business. American families should not be forced into choosing between their family business and complying with unlawful government mandates that infringe on the First Amendment to the Constitution, and that is why this case, which is being heard today by our Supreme Court, is so important to the American people.

A provision of President Obama's health care law includes a mandate that threatens penalties on private organizations unless they involuntarily agree to violate their deeply held religious beliefs. This is anathema to the First Amendment to our Constitution. If religious institutions and faith-based organizations are forced to comply with government mandates that violate the core principles of their faith, that is a violation of the First Amendment to the Constitution, and it is contrary to what we stand for as Americans.

I have heard from people in my State who are deeply concerned about this mandate and the issue that is being considered by the Supreme Court today. They are simply asking to have the same conscience rights they had before the President's health care law was passed—the same conscience rights that are enshrined in our Constitution that protect all Americans regardless of what our faith is and regardless of our background.

This is a fundamental matter of religious freedom and the proper role of our government. It is about who we are as Americans. If the government, through mandates, can take away our conscience rights, what does that say about other rights we have under our Constitution?

This debate comes down to the legacy left behind by our Founding Fathers and over 200 years of American history. We have a choice between being responsible stewards of this legacy or allowing the Federal Government to interfere with religious life in an unprecedented way.

Protecting religious freedom and conscience rights in the past has been a bipartisan issue. Congress has a long history of protecting religious liberty. I heard my colleague talk about the Religious Freedom Restoration Act that was signed into law by President Clinton to ensure that the government should be held to a very high level of proof before it interferes with someone's free exercise of religion. That is what is at stake in the Supreme Court decision and the mandates that are being rendered by the health care law against private companies such as Hobby Lobby and others.

This is what is at stake: Under the President's health care law, companies such as Hobby Lobby and Conestoga—and we are proud to have a Hobby Lobby in the State of New Hampshire—that want to help and provide health care coverage for their employees could be forced to pay over \$36,000 per employee unless they provide drugs and devices that violate their religious beliefs and conscience rights. Why should they be forced into this position? If the Federal Government is able to violate the First Amendment in this way, what is to stop other fundamental rights from being violated?

Protecting religious freedom was once an issue that bound Americans together. I believe this effort, which is so fundamental to our national character, must bring us together once more.

I look forward to seeing the Supreme Court's decision on this issue, but this is a case that never should have been filed. The Affordable Care Act, or ObamaCare, should have never violated the rights of conscience of these companies or of religious organizations, and it is time to turn this around. I look forward to the Supreme Court vindicating their rights under the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, which should have been respected by this administration, but that is why we

have a Supreme Court. I look forward to the Supreme Court decision, which I hope will uphold the First Amendment rights of the parties to this litigation and to all Americans.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

RECESS

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

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:35 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Ms. BALDWIN).

COOPERATIVE AND SMALL EMPLOYER CHARITY PENSION FLEXIBILITY ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate has received H.R. 4275, the text of which is identical to S. 1302. The Senate will proceed to consideration of the measure, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 4275) to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for cooperative and small employer charity pension plans.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, H.R. 4275 is read a third time and passed.

SUPPORT FOR THE SOVEREIGNTY, INTEGRITY, DEMOCRACY, AND ECONOMIC STABILITY OF UKRAINE—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I ask to speak as in morning business.

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

WASHINGTON LANDSLIDE

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I wish to take a moment to address an issue that has really been on the hearts and minds of those back home in my home State of Washington.

On Saturday, as I am sure many of my colleagues heard, the town of Oso, WA—a small, tightly knit town alongside the Stillaguamish River—was directly hit by a massive landslide. That landslide cut off the town of Darrington, which is just a few miles down State Road 530. Houses over a square mile were simply swept away. We already know we have lost several people, and yesterday we learned there could be well more than 100 who are still missing. So right now in Washington State there are dozens of families who simply don't know if their loved ones are even still alive.

Even though Oso and Darrington are 2,300 miles away from the Nation's Capital, our hearts and prayers are with them and their families. I want them to know that in the coming days and weeks and months—and even years, if that is what it takes—all of us will stand with the people of Oso and

Darrington and provide any resources they need to recover and rebuild and that they have the thoughts and prayers of everyone in this country, from their Washington to this one.

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

Let me change gears a bit and address one of the most significant pieces of legislation for women in my lifetime—the Affordable Care Act.

On Sunday this law celebrated its fourth anniversary, serving as a very stark reminder of where our Nation's health care system was just 4 years ago. Four years ago our health insurance companies could deny women care due to so-called preexisting conditions such as pregnancy or being a victim of domestic violence. Four years ago women were permitted to be legally discriminated against when it came to insurance premiums and often were paying more for coverage than men. Four years ago women did not have access to the full range of recommended preventive care, such as mammograms or prenatal screenings and much more. Four years ago insurance companies had all the leverage and all the power, and too often it was women who paid the price.

Now, thanks to the Affordable Care Act, for the first time women—not their insurance companies or their employers—are fully in charge of their own health care. In fact, women make up over half of the 5 million people who have already signed up for coverage in the new marketplace, and over 47 million women have already gained guaranteed access to preventive health services thanks to the Affordable Care Act.

That is why I feel so strongly that we cannot go back to the way things were. While we can never stop working to make improvements, we owe it to the women of America to make progress and to move forward and not allow the clock to be rolled back on their health care needs.

Unfortunately, there are efforts underway all across the country—including here today in our Nation's Capitol—to severely undermine a woman's access to some of those most critical and lifesaving services that are provided under the Affordable Care Act. No provision of this law has faced quite as many attacks as the idea of providing affordable, quality reproductive health services to the women of America.

For this reason I was very proud to lead Members of my caucus in filing an amicus brief with the Supreme Court in the two cases being considered there today. Those cases were brought by CEOs who want to take away their employees' right to insurance coverage for birth control, which is guaranteed under the Affordable Care Act.

As was the case in the many attempts before this case, there are those out there who would like the American public to believe this conversation is anything but an attack on women's health care. To them, it is a debate

about freedom—except, of course, freedom for women's access to care. It is no different than when we are told that attacks on abortion rights somehow are not an infringement on a woman's right to choose but it is somehow about religion or States rights; or when we are told that restricting emergency contraception isn't about limiting women's ability to make their own family planning decisions, it is somehow about protecting pharmacists; or just like last week when an Alaska State senator proposed placing State-funded pregnancy tests in bars but ruled out providing contraception because "birth control is for people who don't necessarily want to act responsibly."

The truth is that this is about contraception. This is an attempt to limit a woman's ability to access care. This is about women. Allowing a woman's boss to call the shots about her access to birth control should be inconceivable to all Americans in this day and age. It takes us back to a place in history when women had no voice and no choice.

In fact, contraception was included as a required preventive service in the Affordable Care Act on the recommendation of the independent, non-profit Institute of Medicine and other medical experts because it is essential to the health of women and families. After many years of research, we know that ensuring access to effective birth control has a direct impact on improving the lives of women and families in America. We have been able to directly link it to declines in maternal and infant mortality, reduced risk of ovarian cancer, better overall health care outcomes for women, and far fewer unintended pregnancies and abortions, which is a goal we all share.

What is at stake in this case before the Supreme Court is whether a CEO's personal beliefs can trump a woman's right to access free or low-cost contraception under the Affordable Care Act.

I strongly believe every American deserves to have access to high-quality health care coverage regardless of where they work or where they live, and each of us should have the right to make our own medical and religious decisions without being dictated to or limited by our employers. Contraceptive coverage is supported by the vast majority of Americans, who understand how important it is for women and families.

In weighing this case, my hope is the Court realizes that women working for private companies should be afforded the same access to medical care regardless of who signs their paycheck. We can't allow for-profit, secular corporations or their shareholders to deny female employees access to comprehensive women's health care under the guise of a religious exemption. It is as if we are saying that because someone is a CEO or a shareholder in a corporation, their rights are more important than the employees who happen to be women.

As I sat inside that Supreme Court chamber this morning listening to the arguments being made on both sides, I couldn't help but think: If these CEOs are allowed to evade this law, what would happen to the other legal protections for employees? Could a boss decide not to cover HIV treatment? Could an employer opt out of having to comply with antidiscrimination laws? Corporations should not be able to use religion as a license to discriminate.

I am proud to be joined in filing the brief by 18 other Senators who were in office when Congress enacted the religious protections through the Religious Freedom Restoration Act in 1993 and again when we made access to women's health care available through the Affordable Care Act in 2010. We are Senators who know that Congress did not intend for a corporation or its shareholders to restrict a woman's access to preventive health care. We all know that improving access to birth control is good health policy and good economic policy. We know it will mean healthier women, healthier children, healthier families, and a healthier America. And we all know it will save money for businesses and consumers.

I know many of our colleagues believe that repealing the Affordable Care Act and access to reproductive health services is somehow a political winner for them. But the truth is that this law and these provisions are winners for women, for men, for children, and for our health care system overall. So I am very proud to stand with my colleagues who are committed to making sure the benefits of this law do not get taken away from the women of America, because politicians and ideology should not matter when it comes to making sure women get the care they need at a cost they can afford.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mrs. MCCASKILL. 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. MCCASKILL. I wish to speak as in morning business.

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

HARPOOL NOMINATION

Mrs. MCCASKILL. Madam President, I rise to urge my colleagues to vote this afternoon—hopefully this afternoon or, if not this afternoon, tomorrow—for a terrific man to be a judge in the Western District of the Federal District Court in Missouri.

As an old lawyer—too old—I find myself amazed that I have the opportunity to speak to the Senate about someone I have known a long time, about a lawyer I know very well. This is a man whose name is Doug Harpool. He is from Springfield, MO.

Back in the early 1980s he and I arrived as very young lawyers in the Missouri House of Representatives. I had the opportunity to get to know him well—his character, his integrity, his work ethic. I watched him, against tremendous odds and, frankly, some inappropriate pressure, fight for a first major attempt at ethics reform in the Missouri Legislature. His journey was sometimes a very lonely journey, but he had a pit bull kind of mentality about going after this important topic, believing that if a person is in public service, a person's standards must be high; believing that if one chooses—many times at less compensation—a path in the public arena, one has a certain duty to conduct oneself with integrity and the kind of character that could make others proud of their representation.

After his time in the Missouri Legislature, he went on to be a lawyer's lawyer. I don't mean the kind who says "I am a litigator" and never goes near a courtroom, and I don't mean the kind who says "I handle serious cases" and does nothing but shuffle paper, but, rather, a real litigant—somebody who is in the courtroom, by the way, on both sides of the table. This is somebody who helped clients who were suing people and helped people who were being sued.

He has worked with great regard as a practicing attorney now for many years. There is nothing better than being respected by one's peers, especially those whom one has battled because when we battle with someone, we see it all. We see what kind of a person we are up against and what tactics the other person is willing to use. We see a person's raw intellect and their ability to think on their feet. So when I started hearing from so many lawyers who were Doug Harpool's colleagues what a terrific choice he would be, I knew that what I believed about him was shared by so many others.

He will never be a judge who gets "robitis." That is a serious disease which sometimes strikes Federal judges more often than other kinds because they are appointed for life. Practicing lawyers talk about judges who have robitis, which is a malaise that comes upon a judge who all of a sudden removes himself from the common people and that somehow makes him or her above the struggles lawyers are having, makes them above the problems clients are presenting in their courtroom. This is a grounded man. This is a man who will understand what it is like to litigate a case, why his judgments must be fair and also speedy, why he owes it to the litigants to actually read their briefs—not assign it to someone else, to thumb through and then make a decision based on a predetermined notion he might have.

This is someone who will take this work with the degree of seriousness it deserves and with the amount of compassion we all should demand.

I am so proud to be here urging his confirmation. I am confident he will be confirmed by a wide margin. But I am even more confident he will be the kind of Federal judge who will make me proud and all of Missouri proud for as long as he chooses to sit on the bench. Thank you, Madam President.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. 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. SHAHEEN. Madam President, I rise today to speak to the importance of passing the pending legislation to support the people of Ukraine in maintaining their independence at this very challenging time.

Russia's illegal annexation of Crimea marks the first time one European nation has seized territory from another since the end of World War II. Now President Putin is continuing his military buildup along Ukraine's eastern border, and Russia's actions in the Crimea fly in the face of the basic principles of sovereignty that have underpinned security in Europe and around the world for decades. The United States and the international community must stand with Ukraine and reaffirm our commitment to Ukraine's independence and territorial integrity.

This moment is a real test for the international community. It tests whether the nations of the world can respond in a unified way to support Ukraine and to check Russia. It will also test whether we in Congress can overcome political differences and leave partisanship at the water's edge.

I believe we can and that we will rise to the occasion. We had a very good vote last night and hopefully that will continue as we take up the pending legislation.

First, we should provide Ukraine with much needed economic assistance. That is why I strongly support the legislation that is currently before us. It authorizes the administration to extend \$1 billion in loan guarantees to Ukraine.

Second, Congress needs to continue to push the administration to impose costs on Russia for its illegal and escalating actions.

I applaud yesterday's decision by the G7 nations to cancel their participation in the upcoming Sochi summit, to suspend Russia's participation, and to convene energy ministers for talks to strengthen our collective energy security.

The latest round of U.S. and EU sanctions are another very important step. However, Congress must continue to explore options for additional bipartisan sanctions legislation. In addition, the administration should be aggressive in responding to Russian provocations using the authorities we give them.

Third, we need to demonstrate support for our other allies and partners in the region who are threatened by Russia's expansionist agenda.

NATO has already taken some commendable actions in the past week. They have deployed additional aircraft and early warning systems, and we are reinforcing our commitment to Poland and our Baltic partners.

This is a significant moment for Ukraine, for Europe, and for the United States. It is imperative that we do our part to help the people of Ukraine secure the bright independent future they deserve. The people of Ukraine and of Ukrainian descent—whether they be in Kiev or in Manchester, NH—are watching and counting on our support.

Our European allies are watching and are counting on our continued leadership. And maybe most important, Vladimir Putin is watching and counting on our acquiescence.

So let us be committed and resolute. Let us stand together in support of the people of Ukraine. And let us start by passing this important legislation.

I thank the Presiding Officer and yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Mr. REED. Madam President, the Senate needs to do everything it can to help create jobs, improve our economy, and address the basic needs of the average American. Unfortunately, many efforts to make meaningful progress on these issues have been thwarted in the last 2 months. Specifically, for the last 87 days, emergency assistance for job seekers has been blocked by gridlock.

Despite the best efforts of several of my colleagues, including my colleague and friend Senator DEAN HELLER of Nevada, today over 2.2 million Americans are being denied vital assistance in what remains a very difficult economy, but I am pleased to say that a group of five Republicans and five Democrats have reached a principled compromise to end this impasse and help get people back on their feet.

Indeed, I along with Senators Heller, Merkley, Collins, Booker, Portman, Brown, Murkowski, Durbin, and Kirk have introduced a bill to continue emergency unemployment insurance for 5 months retroactive from December 28.

As I have advocated, this bill contains no cuts to the weeks of benefits available or the structure of the tiers of benefits, nor does it include other problematic policy changes. It is, however, fully paid for and includes some positive reforms that better align the unemployment insurance and workforce systems to help get people back to work sooner.

It also includes language my colleagues on the other side of the aisle sought—and that was previously passed in the Senate 100 to 0—which would prohibit millionaires from receiving Federal emergency benefits.

I wish to thank Senator HELLER for his commitment to this issue, for his steadfastness, and for his recognizing that this should not be a partisan issue. He has been an extremely thoughtful, collaborative, and constructive colleague in trying to bring this issue to the floor.

I also wish to particularly thank Senators Collins, Murkowski, Portman, and Kirk because they also have been extremely thoughtful, tireless, and resolute in their efforts to find a pathway forward. They have all brought constructive ideas to the table. We have been able to craft a principled compromise that will provide aid to an estimated 2.7 million Americans, including 12,000 Rhode Islanders.

This is a vital lifeline that can mean the difference between making a rent payment, putting enough food on the table, and keeping the heat on as our constituents search for work in an economy where there are still more than two job seekers for every opening and in fact in some places three job seekers for every opening.

I have been working since last year to extend these benefits. Every day that passes is another day that hard-working Americans do not have the same type of aid as those who were unemployed and looking for work last year had. I am glad we have reached a principled bipartisan compromise. It deserves to move forward quickly so we can provide much needed relief to our constituents and can strengthen our economy.

I understand there have been administrative concerns raised about this bill by the National Association of State Workforce Agencies, which Speaker BOEHNER appears to be using as a reason to not take up this bipartisan compromise. Frankly, administrative challenges should not be a reason to deny aid to working Americans who have lost their jobs through no fault of their own and are out there hitting the pavement searching for work in a challenging economy.

The Secretary of Labor has sent Congress a letter addressing all of the concerns raised by the national group. This letter notes the Secretary of Labor is “confident that there are workable solutions for all the concerns raised by NASWA. From the Great Recession to the present, the Congress has worked in a bipartisan fashion to enact twelve different expansions or extensions to the EUC program. A number of extensions included changes to the program that were as or more complex than those included in the current bill. The Department of Labor has consistently worked with states to implement these extensions in an effective, collaborative and prompt fashion, and will do so again.”

Indeed, the States have implemented benefits retroactively several weeks after the program has expired previously. I would like to add that my colleagues who have joined as cosponsors of this bill, out of an abundance of caution and a desire to allay these administrative concerns, have included clarifying language to ensure that administrative funding constraints related to the prohibition on millionaires receiving emergency unemployment insurance could not be read in an overly broad fashion, so that it will make this bill administratively easier to implement.

I look forward to debating this bill later this week. I am hopeful that with this strong bipartisan showing, we can convince our colleagues on the other side of the Capitol that this is the right thing to do for the economy and for working Americans who lost their job through no fault of their own and who are searching for work.

Again, I am delighted to join Senator HELLER in this effort and our other Republican cosponsors. They have been extraordinarily thoughtful, constructive, and collaborative. They have served not only their constituents but this Senate and this country with great and deeply appreciated effort.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. HELLER. Madam President, I would like to begin by thanking my friend from Rhode Island for his continued work to help the American people by temporarily extending unemployment insurance benefits. This is something he and I have been working on together since this past December. I am pleased to have finally reached a bipartisan agreement that can pass this Chamber.

I admire my colleague's dedication and am greatly pleased that we are here this week to support our efforts to help keep American families on their feet during this tough economy. I also wish to thank Senators COLLINS, PORTMAN, MURKOWSKI, and KIRK for their continued willingness to come to the table to craft a bill that can garner enough support to pass in this Chamber.

I would also like to recognize some of my other colleagues: Senator COATS, Senator AYOTTE, who though not cosponsors on this bill today were instrumental in these negotiations from the beginning. I understand their concerns and I also share their desire to see additional reforms to these programs.

Regardless, I am grateful for their contribution over the past few months. I would also like to thank Senator ISAKSON and Senator HOEVEN for their input and am appreciative of their efforts throughout the process. Though it has not always been easy, this process has truly been a collaborative effort at every level.

Fortunately, I believe we have reached a compromise that will garner enough support in the Senate to help 1.3 million unemployed Americans get

back on their feet as they look for work in the toughest job market in decades.

This bill is a responsible, fully paid for, temporary extension of unemployment insurance benefits that expired in December. It addresses concerns that any further extension ought to be paid for. As our economy recovers and people find new jobs, the demand for social safety net programs should naturally diminish, but States such as Nevada, Rhode Island, and many others still have long economic recoveries ahead of them.

I know some may feel there is little reason to extend these benefits, especially since they were allowed to expire at the end of last December, but the fact remains that too many Americans are out of work but want to return to the workforce. I have heard from many Nevada job seekers who in addition to trying to find a job are also struggling to put food on the table for their families, pay their rent or mortgage, and are running out of ways to make ends meet. Extending these benefits will help these families before their situation goes from bad to worse.

My colleagues and I have worked together to come to a reasonable bipartisan agreement on both policy and pay-fors. I think we would all agree there are certain provisions that I think each side would prefer to see included in this bill, such as additional reforms, but this is the nature of compromise.

We also recognize the challenge of dealing with a patchwork of State UI systems of varying capabilities, but I believe we are all open to finding ways to ensure that this extension is implemented as efficiently as possible. This task may not be easy, but I firmly believe it is worth doing.

Again, thanks to all of my colleagues, especially my colleague from Rhode Island who has been involved in this process. I look forward to moving to this bill very soon and am hopeful Congress can finally resolve this matter as soon as possible to help restore some stability for the millions of unemployed Americans looking to get back to work.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I rise to express my robust concern about Russia's actions and the continuing escalation of tensions in Central and Eastern Europe. Even with Ukrainian troops leaving Crimea, Russia continues to extort Ukraine, disavowing an agreement on gas prices that was part of a bilateral agreement

allowing Russia to lease the Black Sea port in Crimea for its fleet. Russia is now arguing it no longer has to provide the discounted gas—because it illegally seized the port—but that it also must be paid back \$11 billion for prior discounts.

At the same time Russia has amassed more than 100,000 troops at Ukraine's border, in addition to 23,000 troops that are in Crimea, making clear the threat of an outright invasion of Ukraine and possibly a portion of Moldova. Putin is watching to see what we will do, to see if we have the resolve to act or if he, in essence, gets the green light to take the next step.

I believe we need to act now. Although I also believe our response to Russia's annexation of Crimea should include the International Monetary Fund reforms that passed in a bipartisan way out of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and that obviously received a rather strong procedural vote yesterday in the Senate—and these are critical to strengthening the assistance package for Ukraine and to strengthen U.S. global leadership—I recognize our ability to move this package with those reforms in it at this point is unlikely.

The House Republican leadership has proven itself intransigent on IMF reform, and we all know why. Trying to link support for IMF reforms to C-4 political committees that may have violated campaign finance laws and may involve individuals who illegally used them to influence Federal elections is pretty outrageous. I cannot believe the House leadership will not put national security interests above their partisan political interest but, obviously, politics clearly don't stop at the water's edge on this issue.

So while I am not happy about it, I believe we need to move forward on a bill today that sends the necessary message of support to Ukraine and resolve to Russia. But as we take that step, let us realize it is the IMF that is leading the effort to stabilize Ukraine's fragile economy. Congressional ratification of the 2010 IMF reforms would increase IMF emergency funding to Ukraine by up to 60 percent and provide an additional \$6 billion for longer term support, setting an important marker for other donors, such as the EU and the World Bank.

Let us be clear about what keeping the IMF provisions would have done. The IMF is strengthened at no cost to U.S. finances or influence. The United States retains its executive board seat and the sole veto power at no net cost because the \$63 billion increase in the U.S. quota is totally offset by an equivalent decrease to a separate emergency facility. However, other countries would put in new money, increasing the IMF's lending power.

The fact is this would be a pure win for the United States. We would fully have paid for the \$315 million budget impact of the bill with real cuts and from funds that were underperforming

or no longer needed. Given that the IMF helps to stabilize countries, often an ingredient precluding future need for military action, the minor cost would have been paid back many times over. And we will have another crisis in the future, in which the IMF will be critical to whether that crisis can be diffused and solved.

I repeat what I have said before. This should not be a partisan issue. Presidents Reagan, Clinton, and both Presidents Bush backed legislation to increase IMF resources. Ronald Reagan called the International Monetary Fund “the linchpin of the international financial system.”

In a letter to the House and Senate leadership last week, members of the Bretton Woods Committee, the original entity that created some of the international organizations that have created global stability, such as the IMF, wrote that “Implementing the IMF quota reforms . . . bolsters our leadership in the fund” . . . and provides the United States with “leverage to continue to preserve our national security and economic interests abroad.”

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the letter I am referring to.

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

THE BRETTON WOODS COMMITTEE,
Washington, DC.

Hon. HARRY REID,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Minority Leader, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MAJORITY LEADER REID, SPEAKER BOEHNER, MINORITY LEADER MCCONNELL AND MINORITY LEADER PELOSI: We write to urge Congress to maintain strong U.S. leadership in the International Monetary Fund (IMF) by enacting IMF quota reform legislation. For over 60 years, the IMF has been a principal tool for advancing U.S. national security and economic interests globally.

The immediate importance of a strong IMF role for countries in crisis is apparent now in Ukraine, which seeks help from the U.S. and IMF to maintain its independence and economic health, and to reduce its energy dependence on Russia. Implementation of IMF quota reform would mean Ukraine would be able to borrow 60% more in rapid IMF financing (from \$1B to \$1.6B) than is possible today. Coupled with the U.S. \$1 billion in new loan guarantees for Ukraine currently being considered by the Congress, Ukraine would have a total of \$2.6 billion in emergency resources to draw upon to stabilize its economy. This enhances the geopolitical position of Ukraine's government in the current crisis with Russia.

The IMF doesn't always get it right but it has been doing important work in countries for decades to stabilize their financial situation and put them on a path toward economic growth for decades. This clearly serves our interests.

ADVANCING NATIONAL SECURITY INTERESTS

The IMF is often the first responder of choice for the United States and our allies, to help countries prevent or manage finan-

cial crises before they destabilize an economy and give rise to conditions of economic stagnation, poverty, and political instability, which can embolden terrorism. When Russia went to war with Georgia in 2008, the U.S.-backed IMF \$750 million emergency loan to Georgia countered the early financial fallout and kept our friend on a path of market-friendly economic policies. It was the IMF that stepped in to provide financial assistance to the former Eastern European countries after the fall of the Berlin Wall. U.S.-supported IMF loans helped stabilize Pakistan after 9/11, and have reinforced fragile economies such as Jordan, Tunisia and Morocco to help ensure our partners can focus on counter-terrorism cooperation and combating radical extremism.

PROMOTING U.S. ECONOMIC INTERESTS

In its role to promote the stability of the international monetary and financial system, the IMF consistently promotes a growth-oriented agenda based on open markets and strong macroeconomic and structural policies. IMF support to the Euro Area during the recent financial crisis lessened the global fallout and financial instability of highly interconnected economies, and forced long-needed structural reforms to begin to take place. The IMF was first responder to the Asian crisis in the late 1990s, and helped restore growth to Asian economies and create robust export markets for U.S. businesses, which supports American jobs.

Implementing the IMF quota reforms negotiated by the United States in 2010 bolsters our leadership in the Fund without increasing the overall U.S. financial commitment. It requires other countries to make additional financial commitments, effectively providing a larger and more stable source of financing that the U.S.—as the largest shareholder and only country with veto power over major IMF decisions—can leverage to continue to preserve our national security and economic interests abroad. A stronger IMF keeps emerging economies secured in the system we designed without sacrificing any of our influence.

We would therefore urge the Congress to continue its longstanding, bipartisan support of the International Monetary Fund for our national self-interest and for the good of the global system.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Let me cite the names of some of the folks who signed that letter: Madeleine Albright, former Secretary James Baker, Zbigniew Brzezinski, William Cohen, Stephen Hadley, Henry Kissinger, Tom Ridge, Condoleezza Rice, Clayton Yeutter, Robert Zoellick, Lee Hamilton, Brent Scowcroft, Frank Carlucci, Robert Rubin, Larry Summers, John Snow, and Henry Paulson. This is a bipartisan list of “Who's Who” in foreign policy, all saying this is critical to do.

Let me be very clear. Opponents have argued that IMF reforms provide no added relief to Ukraine, so it is superfluous to this bill. That argument is patently false. The 2010 IMF reforms strengthen the IMF. That is why they were done. And as it relates to Ukraine, by increasing Ukraine's quota, the reforms increase available short-term lending from \$1 billion to \$1.6 billion, and longer term resources the IMF can leverage for Ukraine by up to \$6 billion. It also strengthens our ability to shape an IMF support package for Ukraine.

Critics say IMF reforms undermine U.S. influence and increase Russia's influence in the IMF. They are dead

wrong again. We remain the largest IMF shareholder even after reform, we are guaranteed our executive board seat, and we will continue as the only country—the only country—with veto power over major IMF decisions.

Meanwhile, the reforms rationalize the voting structure of the IMF to increase buy-in of dynamic emerging economies in a way that ensures continued U.S. leadership in a more relevant international institution. On the other side, the reforms matter little to Russia, which already has a board seat.

Opponents say IMF reforms cost American taxpayers billions and put taxpayer money at risk. Again, wrong. There is no cost to American taxpayers. The reforms included in the Senate Ukraine bill preserve U.S. leadership, the veto position in the IMF, without increasing—without increasing—our financial commitment to the IMF. The IMF is the most solvent financial institution in the world, and the risk of IMF default is de minimis.

We would have paid for all of this budget impact through real cuts, as my colleague and ranking member on the committee BOB CORKER asked. We came together and we figured it out. The appropriators helped us determine underperforming funds, programs from which we could take these funds, and we ultimately came to a very successful conclusion.

I regret the failure to strengthen the IMF to support Ukraine and other unforeseen crises around the world will endanger the system we have so painstakingly built. And it shouldn't need arguing that fragmentation of global economic governance is not in our national interest. The fact is IMF reform, combined with the aid package for Ukraine, would send a clear and unambiguous message to the world that the annexation of Crimea will not stand.

But I understand this institution and our political realities, so I have come to the floor to ask that we come together to at least send our message of support to Ukraine and another message to Putin. We should act today. We cannot and should not stand for the violations of international norms perpetrated on Crimea by Russia. The world is watching, and the world's superpower cannot be seen as incapable of rising to Russia's challenge. That is the responsibility before the Senate today.

So for those who have criticized the IMF reforms—and because the House leadership doesn't want to pursue it because of extraneous matters having to deal with politics and not policy, willing to risk national security issues—they are going to get their way today. I would hope, therefore, the rest of this package, which provides a loan guarantee to Ukraine of \$1 billion, that provides sanctions against the Russian regime and others who corrupted Ukraine, the previous Ukrainian Government, and who have violated its territorial integrity, that provides assistance to ensure democratic elections

can be held this May in Ukraine, that provides for greater defense cooperation with Ukraine, all other elements of this legislation, should have universal support. We should do it today in order to ensure that we send a clear, unambiguous message, as 100,000 Russian troops are on the eastern front of the Ukraine. I believe this is a critical moment for us to answer affirmatively.

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

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

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to talk about an issue that has been in the news quite a bit, and quite a bit on the minds of people, I think, all around the Capitol, which is what is happening with, specifically, Vladimir Putin and Russia and the invasion and takeover of Crimea and the activities in Ukraine.

On March 15 Russian forces seized a natural gas distribution station in a Ukrainian village. I think this is key because this was right at the time they were getting ready to have a vote on Crimea leaving Ukraine, joining Russia, and I was in Ukraine at the time. I was there with a bipartisan group. We had eight Senators—Republicans and Democrats from across the aisle and across the broad spectrum of politics in America. What we saw at the time, right before the vote, was the helicopters heading in to take over the gas plant. To me that showed how Vladimir Putin thinks of energy, thinks of politics, and thinks of power.

In the Washington Post that Sunday morning, the day of the vote in Crimea: "Ukraine decries Russian Invasion, Natural Gas Facility Seized." Their first action before the vote even occurred, the Russians came in and seized a natural gas facility. It showed his willingness, his desire, to use energy as a weapon. It is also a reminder that energy for us can be a powerful weapon to counter Russian aggression.

President Putin has repeatedly made it clear that he does not care about democracy, about freedom or about the Ukrainian people. What he does care about is money and power. As the United States considers how to help the Ukrainian people, as we are doing right now on the floor of the Senate with sanctions and aid, I think we need to make sure we take steps to hit Putin exactly where it hurts, which is in his wallet, in his power. Right now some may say: How does this matter? How important is this? Right now about half of Russia's revenue comes from oil and natural gas.

We heard it today in the energy committee. The chairman of the committee stated that in her remarks be-

fore hearing testimony. Fifty-two percent, she said, of Russia's revenue comes from oil and natural gas. I think Senator JOHN MCCAIN was exactly right when he said this past Sunday on CNN that "Russia is a gas station masquerading as a country." He was part of that group of eight Senators who went to Ukraine, went to Kiev, went and saw where the massacres occurred and visited with the new Prime Minister and the new President.

That is why I believe my amendment to this sanctions bill, this aid bill on the floor of the Senate, is so very important not just to us as a Nation but to the people of Ukraine, the people of Europe, those who are trying to regain some freedom from the yoke and the tyranny of what Russia is doing by charging outrageous energy prices to people across Europe and across the Ukraine. We have an opportunity right now to make it easier for the United States to export our own gas to NATO countries and Ukraine. That is what my amendment will do. It is simple. It is two pages. By expediting the approval of facilities to export liquefied natural gas, we can send a very powerful signal to European markets that alternative supplies will be available soon. We can undermine Russia's leverage with its European customers today and undercut Russia's ability to make so much money off gas exports in the future.

Some Washington Democrats continue to act as though the conflict in Ukraine has nothing to do with energy. Other Democrats see it differently. The Obama administration claims that speeding up LNG exports to Europe would not have an immediate effect. That is not what we heard today in the energy committee. That is not what a bipartisan group of Senators has heard and believes.

We cannot ignore Russia's economic dependence on energy and the reality about how energy markets work. Remember, half of Russia's revenue comes from oil and natural gas. That is why the United States shale gas revolution is already undermining Russia's negotiating position with its European neighbors.

This all has come about in the last decade—new techniques of horizontal drilling, directional drilling, all of which makes energy in the United States easier, cheaper to get, and then more available so it can then be more easily exported. By reducing U.S. demand, that frees up supply that can be bought on European markets. Because there is more supply, that forces Russia's state-owned gas companies to adjust their prices. Every molecule of American gas that can get anywhere else in the world is going to be a molecule that those in Europe and those in Ukraine cannot be held hostage to buy from Russia.

That is what The Economist said earlier this year. The more supply there is, then Russia's state-owned gas company will have to adjust its prices. It

ran an article on European efforts to reduce the control Russia has had over gas prices. We can immediately apply more pressure to the region's gas prices and further erode Russia's revenues by approving additional liquefied natural gas export capacity.

I think about that hearing earlier today in the energy Committee, when every witness endorsed LNG exports to undercut Russia. So what is stopping us? Some Washington Democrats have denied any need to act more quickly. The administration has approved just seven applications for LNG export facilities over many years. It spent an average of 697 days processing each of them. The Energy Department has still not processed another 24 applications that are waiting and waiting and waiting.

My amendment would speed up that process, force the administration to act on applications to be able to allow energy to be sent to our NATO allies and to the Ukraine. We don't need more hearings to tell us what we already know. Natural gas and the pricing continues to be a boot on the neck of the Ukrainian people and in Europe.

Majority Leader REID needs to allow a vote on my amendment. To me, it strengthens the Ukrainian relief package. It strengthens the economics in terms of money going from the United States. It strengthens aid, and it strengthens sanctions because it actually works to specifically undercut, undermine Russia's ability to hold others hostage. Plus, it has bipartisan support. There are a number of Democrats who would vote to support it. I think it is time to send a signal to Russia that we are finally ready to use energy to help stop their aggression.

I will point out that I am not alone in this, and there is significant across-the-board support. It is interesting, the number of headlines in the past week or so from papers with various different approaches, including the New York Times: "U.S. Hopes Boom In Natural Gas Can Curb Putin," directly tying natural gas to the Russian President. That is the New York Times.

The Wall Street Journal: "West Tries To Loosen Russia's Gas Grip."

Investor's Business Daily: "Bold Energy Policy Best Response To Russia In Ukraine."

The Wall Street Journal: "Energy Exports as Foreign-Policy Tool" and "Moscow Tightens Squeeze on Ukraine Over Energy."

It is evident the export of liquefied natural gas from the United States will help us as a Nation. It will help us in terms of our foreign policy, and it can be used and should be used and must be used to undermine the Russian economy at a time when they are—with Putin on the move, Putin on a daily basis evaluating the consequences of his actions to decide what he is going to do, planning to do, with the possibility of additional incursions into Ukraine. He continues with troops along the border between Russia and

the Ukraine ready to act, ready to go in, ready to cross the border. All he understands is strength and power, and the way to undercut that is by undercutting his economic strength and power, by exporting liquefied natural gas.

So I come to the floor asking that Senator REID allow an amendment that would strengthen the bill we are discussing right now and making it better for the people in Ukraine, better for the people here at home, and actually doing something significant about the problem we see existing with the additional use of power by Vladimir Putin.

I thank the Chair. 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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. WARREN). The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. 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. HOEVEN. Madam President, I come to the Senate floor today to address the legislation that we are considering, legislation that will provide economic and diplomatic sanctions to deter Russian aggression and also provide financial assistance in the form of a loan guarantee to the Ukraine to provide financial assistance that will be combined with \$15 billion in loan guarantees from the European Union as well as assistance from the International Monetary Fund that can truly make a difference for Ukraine in helping them to stand up to this Russian aggression, while at the same time undertaking sanctions that I believe can be effective in deterring the incursions Russia is making into Ukraine.

A very important part of what we do is to be united with the European Union in this effort. For the sanctions to work, for the economic assistance to Ukraine to work, we have to have a united front. We have to work with our allies throughout Europe. But the European Union's ability and willingness to stand with us is greatly impacted by their energy situation. So how do we help? How do we help them address a very difficult situation in energy so that they will stand with us in putting forth the kinds of sanctions that can truly make a difference now? And the time to take action is now. The time to stand up to Russia's action of invading another country unlawfully, taking part of that country, holding an election that is not bona fide, and amassing troops on the border of a country and threatening to make additional incursions into a country—the time to stand up and put sanctions in place that will deter that behavior is now.

But the European Union finds itself in a situation where fully one-third if not more of its energy comes from Russia. Half of that is piped through the Ukraine and 50 percent or more of

Ukraine's energy comes from Russia as well—specifically, natural gas. So the EU finds itself in a very difficult position when it comes to energy, and obviously that is a very important factor as they deliberate their steps in terms of both sanctions against President Putin and Russia and the activities he has undertaken and may undertake in the future and also in terms of their willingness to stand up and to halt those actions and to assist Ukraine.

So as part of this legislation we are considering, we have offered to help provide energy to Europe. The good Senator from Wyoming, Mr. BARRASSO, was on this floor. He is the prime sponsor of legislation that would help move natural gas in the form of LNG—liquefied natural gas—from this country to Europe. I am a cosponsor of that legislation. We filed that legislation as an amendment to the bill we are considering, and we are asking for a vote on that legislation. I think there would be very strong bipartisan support in this Chamber, and I have no doubt whatsoever that the legislation will pass the House as well. Representative GARDNER has introduced the same or very similar legislation on the House side, and there is no question that the support is there to pass the legislation.

So as we look this week—and I think we will pass a bill this week—to both put sanctions on Russia in place and to assist Ukraine, we can add this energy legislation which is an integral piece in helping the EU stand with us in standing up against Russian aggression—very simple, straightforward legislation.

What the legislation provides is that for companies in the United States that are willing to build LNG facilities and export liquefied natural gas, which they are prepared to do—and we will expand the countries to which they can export. Right now we have a limitation in terms of the exports. They can go to countries with which we have free-trade agreements, but there are many other countries that we have strategic security interests in that make a huge difference in terms of our security and security in the world, NATO countries, the EU, Ukraine.

I understand it would take time to build the facilities and move that product, but there is no question in the near term that if we pass this kind of legislation, we will be sending a very strong signal to world markets and, even more importantly, a very strong signal to President Putin that we are serious about working with the EU to provide energy so that they have sources other than Russia. That strengthens the EU, and it also weakens Russia because Russia is entirely dependent for revenue on their sales of energy. So as we take this step, we not only strengthen our allies, we weaken Russia's ability to make the kinds of incursions they have made into the Ukraine.

This is a very straightforward amendment. It has bipartisan support.

We are offering it as part of this bill. As we work through the amendment process and we determine the form this bill is going to take—and again, I think there is strong bipartisan support to move this legislation. I believe we can move it this week. I believe we can get agreement to have the votes and to move it this week. But I call on our leadership, I call on the leadership of the majority party in a bipartisan way to come together and give us the opportunity to vote on this amendment. It is part of a commonsense, comprehensive approach to truly deal with the situation in Eastern Europe.

In addition, I would like to take a moment to call on the President of the United States to take concrete steps that could make a big difference in the energy equation. The President is negotiating with our NATO allies right now, with the EU, which is now the G7—formerly the G8 but the G7 without Russia—talking about what steps can and should be undertaken to address what Russia has done and may do in the future.

On a bipartisan basis, I joined with Senator MARK WARNER of Virginia, and on May 21 we wrote a letter to the President calling on him to undertake an energy plan. I would like to take a minute to read that letter on the Senate floor because I think it is a straightforward, commonsense energy plan that the President could undertake right now and show the world and show specifically President Putin that he is serious, that we are serious about working with the EU starting immediately. So it addresses taking short-term steps but undertaking a long-term plan that will ensure that the EU, working with the United States and others—countries such as Norway, which is producing incredible amounts of natural gas in the North Sea—working with countries that can supply natural gas to the EU, that we will end their dependence on Russia. And if Russia continues the kinds of activities it is undertaking, they will find themselves isolated.

Dear President Obama. We write to you today because we are deeply concerned with the events unfolding in Ukraine and Crimea that have been instigated and supported by Russia. President Vladimir Putin's aggressive actions and intransigence, and his continued dismissal of U.S. and European Union warnings, is of particular concern. We share your view that tough sanctions from both sides of the Atlantic will be required to provide the necessary motivation to change Putin's behavior, and to enable a diplomatic resolution of this crisis.

The sanctions that have been implemented so far are good and appropriate; however, we believe that energy security is a critical component to achieving a successful outcome in the region. Russia provides one-third of Europe's natural gas needs. With Russia in a position to slow or stop gas flowing into much of Europe, Putin retains leverage to continue to dominate European energy markets. Though Russia has publicly committed to maintaining a full supply of gas to Ukraine and Europe, their recent history contradicts those proclamations. In January 2009, Moscow cut its supply of gas

flowing through Ukraine, and at least 18 European countries saw their supplies completely or partially reduced. Some governments declared states of emergency and ordered factories and schools to close, while millions of people struggled to cope in freezing temperatures.

As long as Vladimir Putin continues to use energy as a weapon, we must take this threat seriously and take this Russian threat off the table. For the first time in a generation, America is in a position to export energy, and acting strategically to increase our natural gas exports accompanied by a more comprehensive U.S.-EU energy security dialogue will weaken Putin's grip on European energy markets.

We produce 30 trillion cubic feet of gas a year in the United States. States such as mine are producing incredible amounts. We are flaring off gas we would like to get to markets. This is a winning proposition to the United States. If we provide gas to the EU, that generates economic activity and jobs here and helps strengthen the EU and reduces our dependence on natural gas from Russia.

We urge you to take five specific actions that will have near and long term positive impacts on the energy security of Ukraine and the EU.

First, direct the Department of Energy to accelerate the natural gas export permit process by approving the pending permits within 60 days, or providing specific reasons why it cannot approve individual permit applications. Though exports would not start immediately, and though the price points in Asian markets are currently more attractive to natural gas exporters, calling for expedited approval of Liquefied Natural Gas exports will increase liquidity on the global markets and will improve the European energy security.

Second, conduct a strategic review of U.S. energy policies, and expand the group of nations that currently qualify for U.S. energy exports beyond those with free trade agreements to include our NATO allies, the EU, Ukraine, and any others that are in the national security interest of the United States.

It just makes sense.

The review could include examining the potential of additional investments of facilities capable of liquefying natural gas.

Third, launch a joint U.S.-EU initiative on energy security at next week's—

Meaning this week—

U.S.-EU summit in Brussels, with specific near-term and future deliverables. One area of critical importance to ensure greater energy security in Europe is the natural gas infrastructure. While some European countries such as Lithuania and Austria receive 100 percent of their gas from Russia, others receive far less, and by improving the interconnections, these countries could far more easily direct supplies to one another in case of an outage. One specific fix would be to reverse the flow of gas from Slovakia to Ukraine, a proposal that is under consideration by the European Commission. Additionally, we should assist Ukraine to establish and maintain a high level of security around its strategically significant gas storage facilities in Southern Ukraine.

Countries such as Norway—Statoil—can supply more gas. Working cooperatively, we could have an impact right now as well as put a long-term plan in place that sends a very clear message

to President Putin that we are going to change the energy equation.

Fourth, help Ukraine implement a significant energy productivity initiative. U.S. businesses have developed many off-the-shelf technologies that can greatly reduce energy waste and promote greater efficiency, which will reduce Ukraine's energy needs. This has the potential to greatly reduce the amount of energy required by Ukraine and lessen their dependence on Russia.

I was recently in Ukraine. We have many U.S. companies doing business over there. Many of the companies were from my State. I met with 10 CEOs from different companies in Kiev that are doing business throughout Ukraine. There is no question that by working with our companies they can have a major impact on what happens in Ukraine both in terms of conserving energy but also producing more energy, and that goes to the final point.

Finally, help Ukraine implement energy development technology to enhance domestic production and promote energy security. We have been contacted by several U.S. companies that are ready to make strategic investments to help Ukraine increase production of their own energy resources to reduce reliance on Russian energy supplies.

We urge you to support and encourage the U.S. State Department's Unconventional Gas Technical Engagement program that allows U.S. local and state-level officials to share best practices with European government officials. Already, U.S. oil and gas companies are leading EU countries in shale gas exploration and off-shore exploration in Eastern Europe to help these countries diversify their energy sources.

We urge you to use the meetings to encourage more European cooperation to solve their own energy dependency problem. A recent proposal from the United Kingdom provides a series of recommended reforms to the European energy infrastructure. We believe our proposal aligns with the British recommendations will provide a helpful starting point for the discussions next week. The U.S. has a long history of supporting the transatlantic relationship on areas of security and defense, and energy security should be part of that dialogue.

We then close the letter saying:

We look forward to working with you to implement this plan.

Think about it. These are steps the administration can and should take now. There is bipartisan support for energy legislation in this body to back it up and make it happen.

I call on my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to come together as part of an effort to deter Russian aggression, help Ukraine. To help the EU stand strong and united with us, we need to address the energy issue. We can and we should.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Madam President, I appreciate Senator HOEVEN's work on the Ukraine issue. I know he went there recently, and I have also visited the great energy resources in his State as his guest and know they have a broad range of energy sources, as does Minnesota.

I rise to talk about the importance of the Support for the Sovereignty, Integrity, Democracy, and Economic Stability of the Ukraine Act, and I urge the Senate to act as quickly as possible to get it done.

As the past week has made clear, the crisis in Ukraine is not waiting for us. We witnessed Russia's blatantly illegal annexation of Crimea and its continued efforts to bully, intimidate, and weaken the new Ukrainian Government.

It is critical we immediately demonstrate to the world, one, our support for Ukraine as it charts a new democratic future for itself; two, our abhorrence of the Russian Government's actions that violate Ukraine's sovereignty and territorial integrity; and three, our commitment to continue leading the world through a tough and determined response to the crisis.

This legislation, which was backed by our colleagues on the Foreign Relations Committee on a strong bipartisan vote, accomplishes these important goals. It provides badly needed assistance to Ukraine to help its new government stand on its own two feet.

It also punishes those who contributed to the crisis by authorizing sanctions targeting Russia's officials, Crimea's self-appointed leaders, and the former leaders of Ukraine who lined their own pockets at their country's expense.

It is unfortunate we have not passed this bill already, given that the vast majority of our colleagues agree on the basic framework of how we should respond to events in Ukraine. I understand some of our colleagues may want to add something else to this bill, but almost everyone agrees we should provide assistance, including loan guarantees to the new Ukrainian Government and impose sanctions on Russian leaders and key institutions.

Now is the time for us to move forward. Together, the United States and our allies have taken important steps, such as barring Russia from the Group of Eight and imposing sanctions on key Russian officials. President Obama is in Europe this week working to convince our allies to take even stronger measures to help Ukraine and hold Russia accountable. We in the Senate must also act.

I think it is important to step back to reflect on how we arrived at this point. This is not a crisis the United States sought. The situation in Ukraine became a crisis because the former President of Ukraine and Russian leaders sought to keep the Ukrainian people from pursuing their right to determine their own future.

The Ukrainian people rose last November after their then-President turned his back on an association agreement with the European Union. This agreement would have helped bring Ukraine into the prosperous community of European nations while also compelling it to reduce corruption and enhance the rule of law. In short, it was a treaty that would have helped

lift Ukraine to a better future with greater opportunity for its people.

When the former President abandoned that treaty, the people of Ukraine did not go quietly. They demonstrated courageously for months in the face of severe repression by the regime, including snipers shooting at civilians in the streets of Kiev. In the face of all odds, they succeeded in forcing the regime to the negotiating table.

The President fled the country, taking with him his ill-gotten wealth. It seemed the Ukrainian people would at least have the freedom they had worked so hard to achieve. The new government even signed—at long last—the association agreement with the European Union that the old regime had rejected.

Unfortunately, President Putin has long sought to keep Ukraine from charting its own course, first through economic manipulation and now through brutal force. When it became clear that the people of Ukraine would not be denied, President Putin carried out a military intervention to cut off Crimea and stage a sham referendum before illegally annexing the territory in a flagrant breach of international law and Russia's own past commitments to Ukraine's sovereignty.

Even though he claims Russia will seek no more territory from Ukraine, he continues to harass and undermine the new government by reneging on previous agreements to provide subsidies for gas and slowing deliveries, something my colleague from North Dakota has focused on. Russia's military continues to mass on Ukraine's borders.

I find it interesting that just a few months ago President Putin wrote a New York Times op-ed on the subject of international law and the use of force. He declared:

Under current international law, force is permitted only in self-defense or by the decision of the Security Council. Anything else is unacceptable under the United Nations charter and would constitute an act of aggression.

In President Putin's view, force must be approved by the U.N. Security Council or it is an act of aggression, except when it comes to Ukraine.

It should be clear by now that President Putin will use any means to advance his ends. He employs the language of ethnic nationalism while he tries to take apart Ukraine. His dissenters are sent to prison on trumped-up charges, children languish in state institutions as a result of the adoption ban, which is something we care so much about in Minnesota as one of the top States for adopting kids from Russia and across the world, and the Russian LGBT community lives under the constant threat of oppression.

All the people of Ukraine want is a simple freedom to seek a brighter future for their country, to not be a pawn to President Putin's efforts to resurrect the Soviet Union. The whole world sees that.

On March 15, 13 members of the U.N. Security Council voted for a resolution to condemn Russia for the very use of force that President Putin criticized last year. Only one country voted against it and that country was Russia.

Now the world is watching us. They are watching to see whether the Congress of the United States will act. We have talked a lot about Ukraine over the past several weeks. I was proud to cosponsor a bipartisan resolution, led by Senators DURBIN and COATS, that expressed support for Ukraine and criticized Russia's actions. That resolution passed unanimously 2 weeks ago. Now is the time to show we are actually doing something.

Ukrainians need to know that the United States stands with them, not just in the very important speeches on the Senate floor but also with real assistance and real action. President Putin needs to know we will not meekly return to business as usual and allow him to bully Ukraine with impunity.

Our allies and adversaries around the world need to know we will stand together to protect our vision of a world governed by democracy and law, where nations do not live under the threat of force by their neighbors.

This is one of those times where the impact of our votes will be felt far beyond the walls of this Chamber. In Ukraine they are going to be watching this vote. In Russia they are going to be watching this vote. All over Europe they are going to be watching this vote and in those countries from the former Soviet Union. The world is watching. So other people, other countries that may choose to engage in this illegal breach of international law, that may choose to tread on this illegal ground will be watching, and that is why this vote is so important.

I urge my colleagues, in the support of the people of Ukraine, to support this bill.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Madam President, I wish to take a moment to commend the Senator from Minnesota on her remarks. She expressed what we feel very strongly in this body. I wish to express both my agreement with her comments as well as the importance of moving this legislation. I believe there is very strong bipartisan support to move this legislation. I think we can get it done this week.

Again, I express my appreciation for her words here today and I believe that is exactly the kind of cooperative spirit we need on the part of all 100 Senators to get this done. Now is the time for action. I join with the good Senator from Minnesota in calling for that action.

With that, I yield the floor and note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

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

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—H.R. 4152

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding cloture having been invoked, the motion to proceed to S. 2124 be withdrawn; that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 328, H.R. 4152; that following the reporting of the bill, a Menendez-Corker substitute amendment, the text of which is at the desk, be made pending; that no other amendments be in order; that no points of order or motions be in order other than budget points of order and the applicable motions to waive; that on Thursday, March 27, following morning business, there be 2 hours of debate equally divided between the two leaders or their designees prior to a vote in relation to the Menendez-Corker amendment; that upon disposition of the amendment, the bill be read a third time and the Senate proceed to vote on passage of the bill, as amended, if amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, reserving the right to object, I note in the majority leader's requested consent order he stipulates that no other amendments be in order, which I think is deeply regrettable, given the fact that this matter has been considered in the Foreign Relations Committee and then came to the floor without any opportunity for the rest of the Senate to participate, either in the deliberative process or to debate important improvements to the legislation. I would note two for the majority leader's consideration.

Two amendments which seem to enjoy a tremendous amount of bipartisan support are in recognition of the stranglehold Vladimir Putin and Russia have on Ukraine's energy supply as well as the energy supply to the rest of Europe. There is a Barrasso amendment many of us support that calls for the expedited consideration and permitting of exporting liquefied natural gas.

There is another amendment I have offered that would provide military assistance to Ukraine. Right now, the underlying bill provides \$100 million. It doesn't specify the precise nature of the assistance, but it appears to be in the nature of rations, uniforms, and medical supplies. I would think at a minimum we would want to make sure the Ukrainians who are defending their country are supplied additional U.S. military assistance in order to defend themselves against this Russian aggression.

So I ask the majority leader to modify his unanimous consent request with the following: that the first amend-

ment in order be a Barrasso amendment related to the exportation of liquefied natural gas; and that following the disposition of the Barrasso amendment, the majority leader and the Republican leader or their designees be recognized to offer relevant amendments in an alternating fashion, including the Cornyn amendment on military assistance to Ukraine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the majority leader so modify his request?

Mr. REID. I reserve the right, and will just make a brief comment. The committee action on this bill was really historic. The issue my friend just suggested be part of an amendment process was discussed at some length in the committee.

As I discussed this morning, the situation in Ukraine is critical. The Senate must act as quickly as we can on the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations bill.

The bill before us gives additional aid to the fragile Ukrainian economy. As Secretary Kerry said yesterday, he wants this aid that is in our bill now, but he also wanted what was in our bill—IMF funding. But he said: If I cannot get both, the most important thing we do now is the funding that is in our bill, and he is probably right.

We already know there have been many signals—not any hidden signals—from the House that they would not accept the IMF. The Republican leader said he was concerned about the IMF.

So I am very pleased the sanctions inside this legislation that I hope will pass on Thursday is something that is going to help Ukraine. I am confident it will. It sanctions those inside Ukraine and Russia who have undetermined Ukraine's sovereignty and stability.

I think, as far as I am concerned, we will have more legislation on this in the not distant future. As far as I am concerned, I think there should be more sanctions that we look at. I think they need more aid. On Sunday shows, I heard Republican Senator AYOTTE, Democratic Senator DURBIN both talking about the need for sleeping bags, small arms fire, and things such as that that the Ukrainians simply do not have.

That is why I am pleased we have been able to come to a tentative agreement to vote on this measure Thursday. I would have preferred to include, as I have already indicated, the International Monetary Fund provisions in this bill. It is something that is needed. These provisions would have provided additional funds to stabilize this fragile Ukrainian economy, but my Republican colleagues, for reasons unrelated to Ukraine, were ready to kill the bill over the IMF issue.

Today we are ready to move forward on the bipartisan Senate Foreign Relations Committee bill without the IMF language. Let me just take a minute—a brief minute—to extend my appreciation—and I think I speak for the entire Senate—for the hard work that has allowed us to get where we are.

Chairman MENENDEZ, Ranking Member CORKER—they have worked very well together on legislation generally but on this specifically. Senator MCCAIN, who is a long-time leader on national security issues, has been very articulate and forceful in his view as to what should be done. By the way, both Senators CORKER and MCCAIN suggested we should have the IMF money in this, but I called Senator MCCAIN this morning and told him reasons why I thought we could not go forward with it, and I think he agrees with that.

I hope my colleagues will join us in voting to pass this important bill on Thursday. The people of the Ukraine are watching. The Russians are watching. It is time for the Senate to act. It is time for Ukraine to get the support it needs, it is time for this body to sanction the Russians, and it is time to send a clear message to Putin that the United States condemns the Russian annexation of Ukraine. I say once again, if he so likes these votes he created in Crimea, why doesn't he have one in Chechnya? Why doesn't he have a vote there? Because I think that would turn out much differently than what he would want.

I understand Senator BARRASSO is talking about this issue that my friend from Texas suggested, and it and other issues are something we need to bring up when we talk about further work on Ukraine.

So I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I will be brief, but further reserving the right to object to the majority leader's request, I just want to make sure the majority leader understands no one is talking about slowing down this bill. It is anticipated, I think even under the majority leader's consent request, that we will be finished with this bill no later than Thursday. It is one of those circumstances where, given the context of what is in the legislation, there is actually bipartisan support because of the importance of sending a unified message to the Russian leader about this aggression.

But I wish to be clear that my position is that sanctions are not enough. We need to go further and to provide a means for the Ukrainian people to defend themselves against this sort of aggression, which they do not presently possess. We need to find a way to relieve the stranglehold Putin has on Ukraine and much of the rest of Europe that he is going to keep using as long as he feels we have not acted to undermine or jeopardize that stranglehold.

That is the purpose of these amendments, and I regret the majority leader has seen fit to object to my request—reasonable request—for germane amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Madam President, my friend from Texas is absolutely right.

We need to do more on Ukraine—there is no question about that—and I look forward to working with him and all Senators to do that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The motion to proceed is withdrawn.

PROVIDING FOR THE COSTS OF LOAN GUARANTEES FOR UKRAINE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report H.R. 4152.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 4152) to provide for the costs of loan guarantees for Ukraine.

AMENDMENT NO. 2867

(Purpose: To provide a complete substitute)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the substitute amendment.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID], for Mr. MENENDEZ, for himself and Mr. CORKER, proposes an amendment numbered 2867.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Text of Amendments.")

Mr. REID. Madam President, is there more that the Chair needs to do?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is not on that matter.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that at 11 a.m. Wednesday, March 26, 2014, the Senate proceed to executive session, and that notwithstanding rule XXII, the Senate proceed to vote on cloture on Executive Calendar Nos. 581, 582, 583, and 584; further, that if cloture is invoked on any of these nominations, the time until 2:30 p.m. be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees and that at 2:30 p.m. all postcloture time be expired and the Senate proceed to vote on confirmation of the nominations in the order upon which cloture was invoked; further, that following Senate action on these nominations, the Senate proceed to vote on confirmation of Calendar No. 694; further, that there be 2 minutes for debate prior to each vote and all roll-call votes after the first vote in each sequence be 10 minutes in length; further, that following the disposition of Calendar No. 694, the Senate resume legislative session; further, that upon disposition of the listed nominations, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and President Obama be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROTECTING VOLUNTEER FIRE- FIGHTERS AND EMERGENCY RE- SPONDERS ACT OF 2014—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. REID. Madam President, I now move to proceed to Calendar No. 333, H.R. 3979.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The bill clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 333, H.R. 3979, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

Mr. REID. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I am now here for the 62nd weekly effort to have my colleagues wake up to the threats of climate change. Congress continues to remain sound asleep. I suspect anesthetized by the narcotic drip of polluter money into our veins. But the signs of change around us continue.

These are the Mau Loa monthly carbon dioxide concentrations. We have just passed, again, 400 parts per million of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere. This is the second year in a row this has happened. This year it happened 2 months earlier than last year. So why does it matter that we are at 400 parts per million? What does that mean to anybody?

We have actually gone back and measured where the carbon concentration in the atmosphere has been going way back. We can measure back in ancient ice so we know that for at least 800,000 years, our carbon concentration is between 170 and 300 parts per million. That is a long run for a species that has only been homo sapien for about 250,000 years. That has been a long and hospitable window, during which our species has developed from very primitive hunter-gatherers into the complex people that we are now.

So when you take something like that, the carbon concentration, and you bust out of a range that has sheltered us for 800,000 years, that is not nothing. It is particularly not nothing when you know that carbon dioxide in the atmosphere raises the temperature of the Earth. We have known that since Abraham Lincoln was President. This is not something that is debatable. This is not new news. This is established science for 150-plus years.

We also know—because you can replicate it in the laboratory—that when you put higher concentrations of carbon in the air over seawater, it acidifies

the seawater. If you doubt any of that, you can go out and measure that it is actually happening—the known provable theories, the known principles, I should say. In fact, laws of science are actually manifest in sea level rise from the warming oceans, in warming ocean temperatures, in increased acidification. These are measurements.

As this continues, we continue to do nothing about it, but we let the big polluters continue to spew carbon pollution into our atmosphere. Some of us in Congress are tired of waiting for folks to wake up. This month 31 Senators from every part of the country held the Senate floor through the night to sharpen this Chamber's focus on the threats of climate change. I thank Senator SCHATZ of Hawaii for leading us through this wake-up call, and to Senator BOXER for her leadership of the Senate Climate Action Task Force, and to the Presiding Officer, the senior Senator from Massachusetts, for her enthusiastic participation and support in that effort.

The American people tuned in, tweeting over 54,000 times at the hashtag up4climate in the 24-hour period of this effort. Also, Americans added more than 200,000 signatures to online petitions urging Congress to get with it and do something about this climate problem. The public knows it is a problem and has been pushing us to act now for years.

I have heard it from Rhode Island fishermen who now have to chase their catch further offshore into cooler waters because our coastal waters have warmed. The Presiding Officer has heard it from her Massachusetts fishermen as well. I have heard it from homeowners in South Kingston, RI, whose houses are falling into the ocean as the sea level rises and they encroach further inland into what had for generations been family homes.

Rhode Island does its part to try to address climate change. We are participating in the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative, and we are everywhere readying our coastlines for worse storms and higher seas. But the Ocean State cannot do this alone. The health, the safety, the prosperity of the people I represent in Rhode Island's communities depend on national action. We need a national groundswell of citizens and elected officials from every State.

So last week I went to Iowa to share with that State Rhode Island's climate change stories and to listen to Iowans tell me their climate change stories and how it is affecting their communities. I was invited to Iowa by Senator Rob Hogg, who is a passionate defender of the Iowan environment and way of life and a very knowledgeable expert on climate change.

I want to thank him and I also want to thank the Iowa legislature, particularly house minority leader Mark Smith and senate majority leader Michael Gronstal for their warm welcome. I also want to thank my colleague Senator HARKIN and his staff for

their assistance in planning and coordinating my visit.

Farming is not a big deal in Rhode Island. We are not known as an agricultural State. We have farms and we love them. But it is not quite the same as Iowa. Farming is the cornerstone of Iowa's economy. Disruption of agricultural productivity is one of the great climate risks in Iowa. The recent National Climate Assessment draft finds this:

In the long term, combined stresses associated with climate change are expected to decrease agricultural productivity, especially without significant advances in genetic and agronomic technology.

But we do not have to wait for the long term. Iowans are already being hit by extreme weather. In 2013, just last year, 155 science faculty and research staff from 36 Iowa colleges and universities—home State Iowa teachers from their colleges and universities, 155 of them—signed the Iowa Climate Statement, concerning the losses that farmers across the State are already experiencing due to climate change.

I ask unanimous consent that the Iowa Climate Statement be printed in the RECORD following my statement.

Iowa has had 20 Presidential Disaster Declarations since 1990 due to flooding. Damage has been more than \$20 billion. Although no one particular flood can be directly connected to climate change, we know that carbon pollution loads the dice for the extreme downpours that provoke these floods in Iowa and in the Midwest.

I call it the Barry Bonds rule. You do not know which home run was caused by the steroids, but you know for sure he was hitting extra home runs because of the steroids and you can measure that. In 1993 in Iowa, a flood exceeding once-in-500-year flood levels hit Des Moines. Ted Corrigan of Des Moines Water Works told me during my visit that the city's infrastructure was overwhelmed, leaving Des Moines without clean water for more than 2 weeks.

The Des Moines Register reports that Iowa has endured at least 10 so-called 500-year floods since 1993—10 500-year floods since 1993. That includes the big 2008 flood that cost \$10 billion statewide in Iowa.

Doug Newman, the executive vice president at the Cedar Rapids Economic Alliance, told me what it was like to live through that unprecedented flood. Doug explained that in Cedar Rapids, flood levels had never, for as long as they have measured it, exceeded 21 feet. This flood maxed out at 31 feet, 10 feet above the all time previous ever recorded record.

A thousand businesses were flooded. One-fifth of them were lost. More than 1,000 people lost their jobs. So it was tough. But what I saw was Iowans taking action—from college students to business leaders, from activists of the Iowa Citizens Climate Lobby to the conservationists to the Izaak Walton League. Iowans are preparing for the effects of climate change, and they want to see Federal action.

Like Rhode Islanders, they are tired of trying to carry this themselves. Des Moines Mayor Frank Cownie is one of over 1,000 mayors represented on this map all across the country who have signed the U.S. Conference of Mayors Climate Protection Agreement, pledging to meet or beat the Kyoto Protocol targets in their own cities and to press their State governments and the Federal Government—us—to enact meaningful greenhouse gas reductions.

I visited with TPI Composites. TPI Composites has a development and manufacturing facility in my home State, in Warren, RI. They are part of our composites cluster in Rhode Island. But they are also a leading Iowa manufacturer of wind turbine blades. In 10 years, TPI has manufactured more than 10,000 wind turbine blades. So when the Maytag headquarters closed, leaving as many as 4,000 workers jobless in Newton, IA, this helped the town get back on its feet.

If we allow the production tax credit or the PTC to lapse, loss of that tax incentive for wind energy producers will jeopardize the business that TPI has built. So the Iowa State Senate unanimously passed a resolution in January supporting the extension of the production tax credit—unanimously, bipartisan.

There is bipartisan support for the extension of both the production tax credit and the investment tax credit, and we should get that done in this Congress. I also heard in Iowa from Warren McKenna, the manager at the Farmer Electric Cooperative in Kalona, IA. Kalona is a town of about 2,400 people. It has Iowa's first community solar garden, with 25 kilowatts of capacity. For the co-op's 800 owner-members, that 25 kilowatts of energy helps reduce their monthly bills. And for members who have their own solar panels, they also get paid for the energy they add into the co-op's system. And this year, off of those successes, the co-op is breaking ground on an 800,000-kilowatt solar installation, taking advantage of a State solar tax credit that was passed by a Democratic senate and a Republican house and signed into law by a Republican Governor.

This body could learn a thing or two from the Iowa State legislature. It shows what can happen when the polluter money doesn't have a Democratic institution locked down the way Congress has been.

I also visited BioProcess Algae. This is a Rhode Island-based company. The CEO, Timmy Burns, is right here—a Quidnick Islander like myself. They design, build, and operate commercial-scale algae bioreactors. The commercial demonstration project shown here is located down in the southwest corner of Iowa in Shenandoah.

BioProcess Algae uses the wastewater and the waste heat and the carbon dioxide emissions from the nearby ethanol refinery to grow algae. The algae can then be used for animal feed,

can be used for biofuels, and, while it is growing, it eats up the carbon dioxide that would otherwise be emitted to pollute the atmosphere. Here in Shenandoah, American ingenuity is turning carbon pollution into economic opportunity.

I also visited this wind turbine. This is the base of a wind turbine. This is the stairway up into where you can go inside to serve it. You can see it is pretty big. There is the arc of the round steel base, and it towers up hundreds of feet. I think the blade diameter was 160 meters. It is a pretty serious-sized wind turbine. It is located in one of five wind parks which have a combined 500 wind turbines that are operated by a company called MidAmerican Energy.

Thanks to pioneering companies such as MidAmerican, and to the State tax incentives that encourage these projects, more than a quarter of Iowa's electricity is generated by wind. They are leading the country. More than a quarter of their electricity is generated by wind. It measures in the gigawatts. That is a lot of wind power. And they love it. The farmers get paid for having the wind turbine on their farm. If you look—I don't know how well the camera can see this—this is the turbine itself, the stand that it rises up on, the column. That is the doorway into it. We are standing on a gravel sort of service road ring around it so that equipment can be pulled up to it for maintenance purposes. But look right here. That is not too far away. That is maybe 25 feet. They are farming right up to 25 feet away from this thing. So you farm and you get paid for having the wind turbine located on your farm. It is a wonderful two-fer.

The conclusion I drew from all of this—from the exciting new types of energy being grown from algae, from the huge commitment to wind, from the audiences that came out and expressed their support for getting stuff done on climate, for the bipartisan support from so much of this clean energy stuff—is that Iowans have awoken to the threat of climate change. And that is important. Because Iowa plays a key role in our politics. Iowa helps determine which issues our Presidential candidates will be judged on. In 2016, I will bet that Iowans are going to insist they all address carbon pollution and they are not going to accept a lot of nonsense denial out of those candidates.

In fact, I believe if the Republican Party tries to nominate a climate denier for President, they are in big trouble. Of course, the carbon fuel-funded denial machine will do its best to change the subject, to muddy the waters, to create doubt, to use its anonymous dark political money to keep candidates quiet. But all the money in the world can't change the fact that Iowans know, just like Rhode Islanders do, that climate change is real. And those Iowans are going to put those Presidential candidates on

record. If you are a denier, good luck in Iowa. Iowans see the changes taking place and they are speaking up. Farmers in Iowa and fishermen in Rhode Island may be miles from each other geographically, but they both see in their lives around them the facts of the changes that are already happening.

The time to sit on the sidelines is over. If we fight hard, if we are willing to have this fight, I am confident we can do a strong climate bill in Congress and soon—a climate bill that will strengthen our economy, because it will; a climate bill that will redirect our future, as it must; a climate bill that will protect our democracy, because the pollution of our atmosphere and oceans that the carbon polluters are doing is matched by the pollution of our democracy that they are doing with their dirty and anonymous money; and finally, a bill that will honor our duty to the generations that will follow us, because each American generation takes that duty as a very high duty. Right now we are dishonoring that duty and we are not leaving for future generations the kind of country we should.

I went recently to Ukraine. I met with one of the leaders of the Ukrainian freedom movement. His name is Vitali Klitschko. If you are a boxing fan, you know who Vitali Klitschko is because he is a huge guy who was the world heavyweight boxing champion for years, and he has now thrown himself into the struggle of Ukraine for freedom; first of all, freedom from Russian influence and control, and more recently freedom from the oligarchs who basically robbed the country blind but were finally run out after that long bloody siege at the square in Kiev, the Maidan.

Vitali has an interesting phrase that he uses. Because when he started this fight, it wasn't the least bit clear that anybody could win this thing. The oligarchs are billionaires. They have immense resources at their disposal. And they keep stealing, so there is always more. And, of course, the Russians are right there with their baleful influence, trying to make sure there is as little freedom and opportunity as possible and to keep Ukraine under their thrall. Those are some powerful forces. So people would ask him: Can you win? And he had a very simple answer. I can't imitate the good Slavic accent, and I can't imitate the basso profundo voice of a man that big, but his phrase was memorable: No fight, no win.

Well, we have had no fight in us for too long on climate. It is time to put some more fight into this thing, because I think on climate the opposite is true. This isn't a no-fight, no-win situation. This is a "if we fight, we will win" situation. The facts are there. The public is ready. There is nothing between us and doing our duty other than the barricade of lies, the polluter-funded denial beast that is out there shopping their nonsense, and we can

outdo them. It doesn't take much. Because, among other things, it is always easier for the truth to win over a lie. You just have to be willing to go out there and have that fight. So we have to wake up. When we do, we will win. I am more confident than ever, having been back from Iowa.

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

IOWA CLIMATE STATEMENT 2013: A RISING
CHALLENGE TO IOWA AGRICULTURE

Our state has long held a proud tradition of helping to "feed the world." Our ability to do so is now increasingly threatened by rising greenhouse gas emissions and resulting climate change. Our climate has disrupted agricultural production profoundly during the past two years and is projected to become even more harmful in coming decades as our climate continues to warm and change.

Swings from one extreme to another have characterized Iowa's 2013 weather patterns. Iowa started the year under the widespread drought that began in 2011 and persisted throughout 2012. But the spring of 2013 (March-May) was the wettest in the 140 years of record-keeping, creating conditions that hampered the timely planting of corn and soybean fields. During those months, sixty-two Iowa counties experienced storms and flooding severe enough to result in federal disaster declarations.

By mid-August, very dry conditions had returned to Iowa, subjecting many of the state's croplands to moderate drought. These types of weather extremes, which are highly detrimental to Iowa's crops, were discussed in our 2012 Iowa Climate Statement, where we also noted that globally over the past 30 years extreme high temperatures are becoming increasingly more common than extreme low temperatures. In a warming climate, wet years get wetter and dry years get dryer and hotter. The climate likely will continue to warm due to increasing emissions of heat-trapping gases.

Climate change damages agriculture in additional ways. Intense rain events, the most notable evidence of climate change in Iowa, dramatically increase soil erosion, which degrades the future of agricultural production.

As Iowa farmers continue to adjust to more intense rain events, they must also manage the negative effects of hot and dry weather. The increase in hot nights that accompanies hot, dry periods reduces dairy and egg production, weight gain of meat animals, and conception rates in breeding stock. Warmer winters and earlier springs allow disease-causing agents and parasites to proliferate, and these then require greater use of agricultural pesticides.

Local food producers, fruit producers, plant-nursery owners, and even gardeners have also felt the stresses of recent weather extremes. Following on the heels of the disastrous 2012 loss of 90% of Iowa's apple crop, the 2013 cool March and record-breaking March-through-May rainfall set most ornamental and garden plants back well behind seasonal norms. Events such as these are bringing climate change home to the many Iowans who work the land on a small scale, visit the Farmer's Market, or simply love Iowa's sweet corn and tomatoes.

Iowa's soils and agriculture remain our most important economic resources, but these resources are threatened by climate change. It is time for all Iowans to work together to limit future climate change and make Iowa more resilient to extreme weather. Doing so will allow us to pass on to future generations our proud tradition of helping to feed the world.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. 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.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Madam President, I am here to express my support for S. 2124, which expresses the American people's support for the sovereignty, integrity, democracy, and economic stability of Ukraine. I also support the Senate taking up a modified version of H.R. 4152 so we can get this measure to the President's desk—something we should have done weeks ago.

I thank and praise Majority Leader REID for his commitment to this issue, his fortitude, and his patience—as well as our colleagues Senator MURPHY, the head of the subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee, and my colleague from Connecticut and Senator MENENDEZ, along with Senator MCCAIN, whose leadership in spearheading this measure has been so instrumental.

I believe the people of Ukraine need and deserve the opportunity to determine their own future. This goal is not an exceedingly ambitious one. It is hardly novel. It is the universally accepted principle that forms the basis for the sovereignty of all nations.

Together with our European allies, the United States has encouraged Ukrainians to stabilize their country and hold elections this spring. We have taken these actions not to bring Ukraine closer to the European fold or separate it from its historic ties to any of its neighbors but to affirm the principle of human rights, freedom, and sovereignty, which is the bedrock of our own national security and ultimately the security of our global order and the rule of law.

Russia's territorial expansion into Crimea destabilizes and calls into question the security of Russia's neighbors from Finland to China. Who will be next? What pretext and implausible denials will Russia use next time? Who knows, other than Putin and his inner circle.

The United States needs a productive working relationship with Russia, and the world relies on us to be the one nation that can always be counted on to speak clearly and honestly about world events. Ukraine's deep internal division and chronic economic challenges are exacerbated by Russia's less than neighborly interests.

I support targeted individual sanctions already put in place by the President. I thank him for his leadership. We will vote on those this week. But we and our European allies must do more. These measures must be the beginning, not the end. What we do on this measure is a start, a good step in the right direction, but it must be accompanied by additional action—not

just words or rhetoric on the floor of the Senate but action that speaks louder than words, sanctions that bite, just as the sanctions on Iran had their effect and brought Iran to the table.

Two years ago I worked successfully with my Senate colleagues on the Helsinki Commission to impose sanctions on government officials in Russia who were complicit in the murder and coverup of Sergei Magnitsky, a Russian lawyer and auditor who died in a Moscow prison after investigating fraud. This law serves as good groundwork and a framework for expanding these types of individually targeted sanctions, which should include travel and banking restrictions on anybody inciting violence and anyone who profits from the theft of state assets.

I believe the legislation before us is an important matter of national security, and we should delay it no further. We have taken a week with extraneous amendments, and delay and time do not strengthen our hand.

The fact is, as we have seen with Iran, we will need strong and strengthening sanctions on Russia to have real effect. This first step must be followed by more, and maybe equally important we need close cooperation with our regional allies to create a really effective deterrent so the Russians know their unilateral seizure of Crimea is condemned by all law-abiding nations and we are taking positive steps to isolate Russia.

Russia's attack ought to be an alarm to the harm of Russian arms exports and military expansion that have brought effects globally and should be a focus of ours and international efforts countering Russian expansion. That expansion takes place at the expense of its neighbors, also sovereign nations, and at the expense of more than 140,000 civilian casualties.

To my dismay and to the sadness of much of the international community, Russia remains the largest arms supplier to the Syrian Government. Russia is a chief obstacle in achieving meaningful progress toward a peaceful resolution in Syria, and they have undermined progress in Geneva, obstructing or watering down efforts at the U.N. Security Council and a variety of international forums to bring humanitarian relief so desperately needed within Syria and in the refugee camps.

The Senate should take meaningful action to sanction Russia's arms exporters. These companies and individuals who benefit from contracts, both for the fuel they provide to the civil war in Syria and the takeover of Crimea, truly deserve not only our condemnation but action. That is why I am cosponsoring an amendment with my colleagues, Senator CORNYN and Senator COATS, to take exactly such action and why I introduced the Syria Sanctions Enhancement Act of 2013, which would create comprehensive sanctions against anyone who finances the murderous actions of Bashar al-Assad or sustains his military.

I have also written the U.S. Department of Treasury urging them to take action against Russian banks that have undermined U.S. sanctions by facilitating transactions with the Syrian Government. That is right—Russian banks facilitating actions with the Syrian Government. Sanctions on them can have an effect because their activities have reportedly included facilitating payments for S-300 missile batteries, Assad's personal offshore funds, as well as payments for crude oil. In my view, these institutions—Russian banks, the financial structure of Russia—are complicit in prolonging the brutal conflict in Syria and should be barred from the U.S. financial system.

Secretary Kerry said in February:

Russia needs to be part of the solution, not contributing so many more weapons and so much more aid that they are really enabling Assad to double down.

As the majority leader has said, we need to act quickly on the legislation before us. But let's begin and let this action be the beginning of the Senate working together on a bipartisan basis to push back against Russian adventurism and aggression in all its forms, whether it is in Crimea or Syria, and the institutions—financial, energy, and otherwise—that support those efforts. I look forward to joining with my colleagues in those efforts and approving this important measure.

GM CALL FOR ACTION

Madam President, there is no question at this hour on the Senate floor that serious and severe defects in the ignition switches in General Motors vehicles have caused at least 31 crashes and 12 deaths. That tragic loss of life—not even counting the damage to cars, resulting in economic loss, and the injuries to people, resulting in suffering and emotional pain—is part of a situation that calls for action. These defects meant that in a car going full speed down the highway, simply bumping or weighing down the key in the ignition could cause the engine to shut down—as well as disabling the airbags.

That situation has prompted leadership on the part of a number of my colleagues, and I want to thank Senator MARKEY for his legislative proposal on NHTSA, Senator MCCASKILL for her convening a hearing of our consumer protection subcommittee of the commerce committee, as well as others who have taken action to criticize General Motors.

There is also no question, as the New York Times reported this past Saturday, that GM was aware of that situation—those problems with the switches—as early as 2001. That was 8 years before GM went into bankruptcy. The old GM and the new GM were separated. Now the Department of Justice is investigating whether GM committed fraud when it did not disclose those defects in the context of its 2009 bankruptcy.

I have been a Federal prosecutor, and I can tell you about people who have

been prosecuted very severely for lying to banks or lying to the Federal Government—lying to banks when they got a loan sometimes for as little as a couple of thousand dollars and false statements to the Federal Government in connection with a seemingly small matter.

At the time it went into bankruptcy and then emerged, GM signed a document—section 6.12—entitled “True and Complete Disclosure,” and it said to the Federal Government that in return for not a couple of thousand dollars, not even a couple million dollars, not a couple of billion dollars, but tens of billions of dollars, more than \$40 billion—I am quoting:

There is no fact known to a Responsible Person of any Loan Party that, after due inquiry, could reasonably be expected to have a Material Adverse Effect that has not been disclosed herein.

It also said that the documents that were submitted to the U.S. Government at that time “do not contain any untrue statement of material fact or omit to state any material fact necessary to make the statements herein or therein.”

And that section is replete with other representations that now pretty clearly were false because those defects and the role of those defects in causing the crashes were known to GM. It knew also that those defects and the death, injury, and damage seem almost certainly then and now to be a material fact and have a material adverse effect on that agreement.

Well, when GM was restructured in 2009, it was split into an old GM, which took most of the bad assets, such as GM's closed-down plants, and the new GM, which took the good assets. Old GM took the liability for accidents that occurred before the bankruptcy, effectively granting the new GM a shield from responsibility but not a shield from criminal liability. That is why the Department of Justice investigation is so critically important in holding GM officials and GM itself responsible.

Although some prebankruptcy claims have been settled, they have a greatly reduced pool of money to draw upon so that the potential claims on the part of those 12 families whose loved ones perished, not to mention the injured parties who are due money for their suffering as well as economic loss and others who may have claims—all those claims will be without recourse unless something is done.

Let's be clear about the 2009 bankruptcy. It was not the kind of reorganization that involved Manville, where a fund was created with a trustee. That kind of reorganization is a way that bankruptcies are often pursued. This was a sale of assets. It was fast and easy because the government wanted it so. And, of course, the old GM and the new GM—GM officials, shareholders, everyone interested—wanted it to be so.

I was serving as attorney general of Connecticut at the time, and I warned

that this bankruptcy agreement would leave many injured victims without recourse. I led a group of eight State attorneys general in warning the Federal Government—which supported and sponsored the bankruptcy plan—that the situation we see now would come to pass. I don't take a lot of satisfaction in knowing that now we have learned the real facts GM concealed then. I don't take any satisfaction in the potential denial of what is due to the victims of GM's concealment, not to mention its reprehensible and potentially illegal failure to repair those defects rather than conceal them. But, unfortunately, that is what has happened.

Due to GM's failure to disclose that known defect in its vehicles and facts that will continue to come to light in this investigation, everything suggests that this failure to disclose was, in fact, deliberate, fraudulent concealment of information from consumers and from government officials. That is criminal, and that is why the Department of Justice is investigating.

As we stand here, we may be too early to reach conclusions but not too early for the Department of Justice to make things right and for GM to do the right thing.

Yesterday I sent a letter to Attorney General Eric Holder. I told General Holder respectfully that I believe the Federal Government has a moral if not a legal obligation to take certain steps to protect innocent consumers, and I requested that he give it his personal attention. I do that again today—make that request—and urge his personal attention.

Although consumer victims may be barred from seeking relief before the bankruptcy court, the Department of Justice can take steps now in the context of this criminal investigation that could greatly help people who have been injured—innocent victims who were driving that car down the freeway or on a country road when the ignition was bumped, when the key ring had too many keys and their car stopped, the airbag failed to operate, and some died.

I requested the DOJ to have GM establish a fund to compensate injured consumers. It is a civil remedy that can be done as an interim step in a criminal prosecution. The Department of Justice has the authority to request many kinds of relief, and in light of the continuity of personnel between the old GM and the new GM, this kind of remedy would be absolutely appropriate for the new GM and it could simply allocate some of its assets. And fortunately it is doing well. No one begrudges GM its success. We welcome its profitability. But it can do what is right and use some of those profits to correct this wrong.

If necessary, the Department of Justice also could enter into a deferred prosecution agreement, as it did recently with Toyota, and it reached a settlement there of \$1.2 billion.

There is also a precedent for criminal investigations of this nature being re-

solved by settlements in the BP oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico. A \$4 billion criminal settlement was distributed among groups working to mitigate the spill's effects and prevent future problems, including the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation, which has done great work, and the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund.

If such a settlement were reached here, there should be priority on ensuring that funds compensate consumers who suffered the worst losses—the loved ones of people killed as well as the innocent victims who were injured or suffered economic loss.

In addition to the fund, I also requested that the Department of Justice intervene in pending civil actions to oppose GM's effort to deny knowledge or responsibility for damage. What GM has done is to remove State court cases to Federal court and then asked for a transfer to the bankruptcy court, all the while knowing that the bankruptcy proceeding cannot be reopened, and in any event the old GM has vastly insufficient assets to satisfy any real judgment.

I believe there are answers here that will satisfy fairness and justice and enable GM to live up to the integrity and image that befits them. I believe that the Department of Justice, or another consumer protection agency, must ensure that consumers are aware of the potential dangers in this continuing defective series of vehicles, including the Cobalt, the Saturn, and other models over those same years.

I would never let one of my children behind the wheel of one of those cars without a major repair. I don't know that anyone else should—or anyone driving themselves—be behind the wheel of these cars.

When a large national company such as GM markets a product, they have a responsibility. They have a moral and legal responsibility to ensure that the product is safe. When one of those companies—any company—becomes aware of safety issues, it has a responsibility to disclose them.

I joined a bill—with the leadership of Senator MARKEY—that would require better, faster disclosure by NHTSA, and I will speak on another occasion about the lapses in responsibility on the part of Federal watchdogs who failed to protect the public, failed to detect a pattern of problems in these cars, and failed to blow the whistle.

GM has its own responsibility, and I know that a new era of leadership at GM under a new leader may mean a new day in its acknowledging its moral and legal responsibility, and I hope for that new day.

The innocent victims of defective cars suffered life-ending and life-changing injuries. Many of them could have been avoided but for the purposefully misleading and deceptive conduct by GM. Our responsibility now is to see that justice is done either through ensuring that compensation is made available or through appropriate criminal

enforcement or both. The criminal law, as we know in this body, is a means of seeking justice, and it can provide a good outcome if it is properly framed and enforced.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

TRIBUTE TO JEAN M. MANNING

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I congratulate Jean Manning on her retirement from the Senate and thank her for her 21 years of dedicated service. Her wise counsel will be missed in the Senate. That is why the Senate recently passed S. Res. 391 designating Jean Manning as Chief Counsel for Employment Emeritus of the United States Senate.

Jean grew up in the heart of Chicago and received three degrees from the University of Illinois—a B.A., an M.B.A., and a J.D. While pursuing her law degree, Jean was a member and the articles editor of the University of Illinois Law Review and was awarded the Rickert Award for Excellence in Legal Writing. Not forgetting where she came from, today Jean remains very active at the University of Illinois, where she is a member of the University of Illinois Foundation and of the College of Law Board of Advisors, serving as president at one time.

In the early 1990s, Congress as a workplace underwent a sea change when all major employment laws became applicable. In 1993, following a nationwide search, Jean was tapped to establish and manage the Office of the Senate Chief Counsel for Employment. She and her staff helped guide Senate offices as these employment laws were implemented and has continued to assist our offices to this day. Jean has counseled Senate offices to ensure compliance with the Equal Pay Act, the Family and Medical Leave Act, the Americans with Disabilities Act, the Age Discrimination in Employment Act and many other laws. It was her responsibility to see that Senate offices understood and followed employment laws so that Senate employees have the rights and protections the laws provide.

To Jean's credit, the Office of the Senate Chief Counsel for Employment

has earned a stellar reputation throughout the Senate. Her office provides impartial and discreet legal advice, training, and representation to Senate committees, support services, and the 247 Senators who have served in this body since Jean's hiring. Jean and the attorneys under her supervision have resolved countless administrative matters within the Senate and have always been ready to assist with any question a Senate office may have on employment matters. Considering the Senate is comprised of some 150 offices—Member, committee, and support services—this is no small task.

Jean also has represented Senate offices at all levels of the Federal court system, including the U.S. Supreme Court. And since its inception 21 years ago, the Office of the Senate Chief Counsel for Employment has never lost a case.

I thank Jean for her exceptional service to the Senate. The Senate is losing a great legal advocate, educator and source of institutional knowledge. We will miss her, though I will be among the many who will gladly welcome her back when she returns to Illinois.

SUNSCREEN INNOVATION ACT

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I am pleased to be joined by Senator ISAKSON and Representatives DINGELL and WHITFIELD in the introduction of the Sunscreen Innovation Act.

According to the American Cancer Society, skin cancer is the most common form of cancer in the United States. In 2014, over 2 million people will be diagnosed with skin cancer, and 20 percent of Americans will get skin cancer at some point during their lifetime. Melanoma, a dangerous form of skin cancer that often spreads throughout the body if not treated, will be diagnosed in an estimated 76,000 individuals this year, and will take the lives of almost 10,000 Americans. Many skin cancers are preventable with the use of effective sunscreen and by avoiding certain activities, like the excessive use of tanning beds.

Throughout my time in Congress, I have been working to ensure consumers have adequate information to prevent skin cancer. For example, I authored the 2007 Tanning Accountability and Notification Act, which has helped spur the Food and Drug Administration's, FDA review of indoor tanning bed labels. Through letters to the FDA and report language in the annual appropriations bill, I continue to press the FDA to implement new tanning bed labeling standards found to be most effective in warning consumers about the harm caused by indoor tanning.

In addition, after working with my former colleague, Senator Chris Dodd, since 1997 to compel the FDA to strengthen sunscreen labeling standards, in 2011 the FDA finally began to take action to finalize parts of the sunscreen monograph relating to the test-

ing and labeling of sunscreen lotions. These regulations were over 30 years in the making. Last year, I urged the FDA to complete its review of sunscreen sprays and the use of sun protection factor, SPF, numbers higher than 50 on product labels.

One barrier to improved sunscreens has been the rate at which new over-the-counter, OTC sunscreen ingredients have been approved by the FDA. Indeed, the last such ingredient approved by the FDA was in the 1990s, with the eight new ingredients submitted since 2002 still awaiting review. It is critical that the FDA perform its due diligence to guarantee that the sunscreen products are safe and effective, but this review process also needs to occur in a timeline that allows these necessary products to get into the hands of consumers.

Many of these ingredients have been used in sunscreen products in Europe, Asia, and Central and South America, in some cases for many years. Unfortunately, delays in the FDA review process have kept these products off the shelves in the United States for years while awaiting approval.

Our bipartisan, bicameral Sunscreen Innovation Act aims to improve the application process for these new OTC ingredients and ensure consumers have access to new and potentially more effective sunscreen products in a timely manner. Americans have waited far too long for the most advanced, effective ways to protect themselves from the sun.

I am pleased that this legislation has the support of the PASS Coalition, which is made up of such organizations as the Melanoma Research Alliance, the Prevent Cancer Foundation, the Skin Cancer Foundation, and many others.

I look forward to working with these and other stakeholders, as well as Senator ISAKSON, Representatives DINGELL and WHITFIELD, and the rest of our colleagues to pass the Sunscreen Innovation Act in order to improve access to new and more effective sunscreen products. Indeed, as we look to the coming warmer months, it is important that we undertake serious efforts that will give consumers greater peace of mind that the sunscreen products they purchase offer the strongest possible protection against the sun's harmful rays.

GOULDSBORO, MAINE

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I wish to commemorate the 225th anniversary of the town of Gouldsboro, ME. Known today as a beautiful gateway to the Schoodic Peninsula section of Acadia National Park, Gouldsboro was built with a spirit of determination and resiliency that still guides the community today.

Gouldsboro's incorporation in 1789 was but one milestone on a long journey of progress. For more than 10,000 years, the area was a favorite hunting and fishing grounds of the Abenaki, the

Native American tribe of northeastern North America. The name "Schoodic" comes from their word for a place of plentiful fish in waters kept ice-free through the winter by the moderating currents of the Gulf of Maine. The reverence of the Abenaki for nature remains strong among all who call the peninsula home today.

The original name of Acadia National Park—Sieur de Monts National Monument recognizes the ongoing influence of the French explorers who visited the area in the early 1600s. In 1763, the Seven Years' War between France and Great Britain for control of North America ended with a British victory. With peace came bold pioneers seeking opportunity.

The first recorded non-Native American settler on the peninsula was Thomas Frazer, who built a salt works at the mouth of a creek that today bears his name. Another early settler was the town's namesake, Robert Gould, whose untiring efforts and boundless optimism helped attract new members to the growing community. By the early 1800s, Gouldsboro was a thriving town of lumber and grain mills, fishing, and shipbuilding.

The character of the people of Gouldsboro of years gone by and of today is best represented by one of the town's historic treasures, the bell of the SS *Queen Victoria*. In 1864, leaders of the Canadian Confederation gathered on that great steamship anchored at Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island, and reached the agreement to found a new nation.

Two years later, the *Queen Victoria* sank in a hurricane off the coast of Cape Hatteras, NC. Captain Rufus Allen, from the Gouldsboro village of Prospect Harbor, steered his Gouldsboro-built brig *Ponvert* into harm's way and was able to rescue 42 of the 43 officers and crew. In recognition of his heroism, Captain Allen was presented with one of the few items saved from the doomed steamship—the bronze bell. He gave the 95-pound bell to the Prospect Harbor School upon his retirement in 1875.

In 2004, 138 years after Captain Allen's daring rescue, the people of Gouldsboro recognized the significance of the *Queen Victoria* to Canadian history and commissioned Prospect Harbor artist and craftsman Dick Fisher to create a replica, which was given to the people of Charlottetown.

That single gesture reaffirmed Gouldsboro's connection to the sea and strengthened the enduring friendship between the United States and Canada.

Today, Gouldsboro is a place where fishing families and summer visitors cherish that connection to the sea. Through hard work and ingenuity, Gouldsboro has become not just a gateway but an essential part of the Acadia experience. With its charming villages, working waterfronts, artist studios, and many recreation opportunities, Gouldsboro is a true gem on the Maine coast.

One of Gouldsboro's early and most influential citizens was David Cobb of Massachusetts, a hero of the American Revolution who served as General Washington's aide during the British surrender at Yorktown.

As the war neared its end and American independence was secured, General Washington urged his aide to leave rocky and cold New England and make his future in Virginia, which he argued had a superior climate and more fertile soil. With his sights already set on Maine, Colonel Cobb replied, "Sir, we have our heads and our hands."

That is the spirit that made a thriving town out of the wilderness more than two centuries ago and that sustains a vibrant community today. It is a pleasure to congratulate the people of Gouldsboro, ME, on their 225th anniversary and to wish them all the best in the years to come.

COSI 50TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I wish to honor the Center of Science and Industry, COSI, located in central Ohio as it celebrates its 50th anniversary. In 1964, COSI opened its doors as a hands-on center of science education. Fifty years later, COSI has witnessed tremendous growth and expansion as well as national recognition. COSI has welcomed more than 30 million visitors from all 50 States and in 2008 COSI was named America's No. 1 science center for families by Parents Magazine.

COSI has collaborated with schools and organizations across Ohio to provide interactive STEM education in order to prepare our children for the future, and inspire the innovators of tomorrow. Part of COSI's mission is to "motivate a desire toward a better understanding of science, industry, health, and history . . . for the enrichment of the individual and for a more rewarding life on our planet, Earth." They accomplish this mission through partnerships with organizations including WOSU@COSI, the only working television station in a science center, the Columbus Historical Society, and Battelle.

I have visited COSI a number of times, starting with my children when they were in grade school. I have been able to see firsthand the great experience it provides to visitors. I am pleased to honor 50 years of success as COSI continues to lead the way in science education in Ohio.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO ROSS ARAGÓN

• Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, today we recognize the distinguished public service of Ross Aragón on the occasion of his retirement after serving 36 years as mayor of Pagosa Springs—the longest serving mayor in Colorado. Since taking office in 1978, Mayor Aragón has fulfilled his duties with passion, dili-

gence, and honor. Over his more than three decades of service he has never missed a regular monthly scheduled meeting. For over a generation, the citizens of Pagosa Springs have known Ross Aragón as the best man for the job.

Mayor Aragón's steadfast approach to city management led to many notable accomplishments, including improving the quality of police and fire protection, expanding the community's recreational programs and facilities, and establishing the town's popular river walk. He also spearheaded the development of the San Juan River's kayaking, rafting, and tubing features, improving the community for both residents and tourists alike.

Of his many achievements, which are too many to list here, two projects in particular embody Mayor Aragón's approach to leadership more than most: his advocacy for local food produced using Pagosa Springs' geothermal resources was a clear demonstration of Mayor Aragón's ability to harness Pagosa's rich assets and translate them into a brighter future; and his successful efforts to designate Chimney Rock as a national monument exemplified the enthusiasm, dedication, and collaborative mindset Mayor Aragón brought to his job. Thanks to his leadership, an important part of Southwest Colorado's cultural heritage will forever be protected.

On behalf of Pagosa Springs in particular and Southwest Colorado in general, thank you, Mayor Aragón, for your many years of public service. We wish you well in your retirement and we can't wait to see what challenges you tackle next.●

TRIBUTE TO JOHN LANIGAN

• Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I wish to honor John Lanigan, the longtime northeast Ohio radio personality, who will broadcast his final show on WMJI/Cleveland on March 31, 2014.

John and I haven't always agreed on all of the issues, but he has always been well-read and outspoken, and his at times sharp-witted, controversial personality captured the attention of Cleveland listeners, whether you agreed with him or not.

John grew up in Ogallala, NE, and got his start in radio broadcasting while still in high school. He worked in Arizona, New Mexico, Texas, and Colorado—where he would work the overnight shift in Denver and then travel to Colorado Springs for the dayshift—before coming to Cleveland in 1970.

He was hired at WGAR to replace Don Imus, and, within a year, the show's ratings had nearly doubled, no doubt thanks to his trademark style of interjecting jokes in between songs.

John would go on to Tampa for 2 years, but returned to Cleveland and WMJI in 1985, where he made his mark.

In 1989, comedian Jimmy Malone appeared on the show, and the "Lanigan and Malone Show" was created soon

after. No topic was off limits for John—politics, sports, music, and entertainment—he covered it all. And, if you were a guest, you had better come prepared because John was always ready to fire off the tough questions.

John would occasionally take the show on the road to DC and broadcast live from my office in the Senate. I would arrange for guests like then-Senators Hillary Rodham Clinton or Barack Obama, to come on and be interviewed with me.

While John cemented his loyal following on the radio, they came with him when he took his skills to the silver screen, hosting a weekly TV show named "Prize Movie" on WUAB.

While he is not on the air, John dedicates his time to benefitting his adopted city. He volunteers for the Our Lady of the Wayside, an organization that serves hundreds of children and adults with developmental disabilities throughout northeast Ohio, even winning their Starlight Guardian Humanitarian Award in 2012.

John came to Cleveland nearly 40 years ago, and though his talents could have taken him to any big city in the country, he chose to stay in Cleveland. He won the ear of his listeners and viewers because they could trust him.

It is that admirable trait that we will miss with his retirement, but it is also what has earned him this retirement—and no more early morning wake-up calls.

John, I wish you all the best in your retirement. Thank you for all you have done for your listeners, viewers, and for the city of Cleveland.●

FIGHT AGAINST CHILDHOOD HUNGER

• Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, on this day I hope Marylanders across our State can "Hear the Maryland Crunch!" of students eating a healthy school breakfast. Thanks to the leadership of Maryland Hunger Solutions, the "Hear the Maryland Crunch!" campaign offers all Marylanders the opportunity to become more aware of the daily struggle of our food insecure children and stand together in support of school breakfast. I wish to continue to highlight this critical issue facing our children.

Maryland has the highest median income in the nation. Yet even in Maryland one in five children is food insecure. These children lack consistent access to adequate food resources. Yet I am happy to announce we are making strides to ensure our children are fed and ready to learn. Approximately 262,000 students in Maryland participate in the 100 percent federally funded National School Lunch Program and receive either free or reduced price lunches. These students know that when they come to school, they are able to receive a nutritious school lunch.

Only 149,000 children or 59 percent of students receiving a school lunch start

their day ready to learn with a school breakfast. At this time, Maryland ranks 14th in the nation in school breakfast participation rate after making tremendous progress over the past 5 years to ensure all children have access to nutritious meals. Over the course of 5 years Maryland's school breakfast program participation rate has increased by 37 percent, and our school lunch participation rate has more than doubled with a 56 percent increase.

I am encouraged by these developments and efforts to continue to expand school breakfast access for all children. Marylanders are united in the vision that the ability of children to learn and succeed in our classrooms should not be impaired because they come to school hungry. Thanks to the partnership between Governor Martin O'Malley, the Maryland General Assembly, national organizations such as the Share Our Strength's No Kid Hungry campaign, the Family League of Baltimore, and Maryland Hunger Solutions, our State has continued to make efforts to expand access to school breakfast with the Maryland Meals for Achievement Program.

Maryland Meals for Achievement allows schools where 40 percent of students or more qualify for free or reduced price school lunch to provide school breakfast meals for all students at no cost to the child. This program combines the expansion of the school breakfast program with innovative efforts to encourage increased participation, including a change in the traditional breakfast delivery model of serving school breakfast meals in the cafeteria to an in-classroom setting. Schools have shown a positive increase in school breakfast participation rates from the new "Grab and Go" breakfasts or "Breakfast After the Bell" programs, allowing more students to be better prepared to succeed in the classroom. I commend Governor O'Malley for requesting additional funding this fiscal year for the Maryland Meals for Achievement Program that will allow an additional 40,000 students to receive a healthy breakfast.

According to a study sponsored by the Share Our Strength's No Kid Hungry campaign, research has shown students who receive a school breakfast are better prepared to learn and perform in their classwork, are less likely to be overweight, have more strength and endurance throughout the day, are less likely to cause classroom disruptions, and are less likely to be absent from school than if they were not receiving a school breakfast.

In closing, I am honored to join with Maryland Hunger Solutions and Marylanders across our State who are committed to do better for our children. On this Maryland day, we reflect on our rich past and look forward to a bright future in which the only hunger our schoolchildren have is a hunger to learn. I am proud that Maryland is leading the fight against childhood

hunger. Together, let's all "Hear the Maryland Crunch!"●

MARYLAND DAY

● Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I wish to celebrate Maryland Day and the proud history of my home State. Marylanders across the State are taking a moment to reflect on our proud history and contributions to the Nation. I wish to spend a few minutes to highlight the importance of this State holiday and the activities that are underway.

On this day 380 years ago, two ships commissioned by Lord Baltimore, The Ark and The Dove, carried the first English settlers to land at St. Clement's Island in what is now recognized as St. Mary's County. Leonard Calvert, a son of Lord Baltimore who eventually served as the first Governor of Maryland, led the 150 settlers who came ashore to St. Clement's Island after spending more than four months at sea. This landing represented the first time European settlers came to Maryland and those settlers eventually formed just the third English colony to be settled in British North America.

The origin of Maryland Day began with the Maryland State Board of Education placing an emphasis on State and local histories in public schools. In 1903, the Maryland State Board of Education officially recognized Maryland Day as a tool for students and teachers to increase instruction of Maryland history in public schools. The Maryland General Assembly, which held its first session in St. Mary's County not long after the landing at St. Clement's Island, enacted Maryland Day as an official State holiday in 1916. Young learners across our State will spend today learning about the significant contributions of Maryland to the Nation and important historical figures in Maryland.

I am proud to say that every region of my home State has played a role in shaping our Nation. From the Eastern Shore of Maryland, for instance, Harriet Ross Tubman was born into slavery in 1820 in Buckstown, MD along the marshes of the Blackwater River in Dorchester County. After learning she would be sold to settle her late master's debts, Tubman escaped from slavery to Philadelphia, PA, marking the first of many expeditions over the course of the next 11 years to and from the Eastern Shore of Maryland to lead nearly 70 slaves out of slavery. In addition to becoming a famous conductor on the Underground Railroad, she held a lifelong commitment to the women's suffrage movement and worked as a nurse, cook, spy, and scout for the Union Army during the Civil War in Port Royal, SC. She became the first woman to lead an armed assault during the Civil War in Combahee Ferry Raid, liberating nearly 750 slaves. In her later years, she worked tirelessly for the women's suffrage movement, speaking before countless women's groups with fellow suffrage movement

leaders Susan B. Anthony and Emily Howland. When asked if she believed women deserved the right to vote, she would reply, "I suffered enough to believe it."

In Western Maryland, Maryland citizens played a key role in the military and political struggles of the Civil War. The control of Maryland territory was crucial due to the State's proximity to Washington, DC, the State's border with Virginia and with other States that remained in the Union, and Baltimore's position as a key railroad link to the West. In 1862, GEN Robert E. Lee led his Confederate Army of Northern Virginia across the Potomac River around Leesburg, VA into Maryland, marking his first invasion into the North during the Civil War. The Maryland Campaign consisted of a number of battles along Maryland's western-most counties and often pitted Marylanders on opposite sides of the fighting. In the single bloodiest day battle in American history, the Battle of Antietam in Sharpsburg, MD formed a turning point in the Civil War. With savage close range fighting lasting over a period of 12 hours, the Union and Confederate forces suffered nearly 23,000 total casualties. This battle forced General Lee to withdraw his Confederate Army back across the Potomac River into Virginia, thus ending the invasion of the North and the last major battle that took place on Union soil. The people of Maryland honor those who valiantly fought in the Civil War, endured the hardships brought on by the conflict, and made the ultimate sacrifice in order to form a more perfect Union.

Perhaps the most recognizable contribution Maryland has provided to our Nation is the national anthem. During the War of 1812, British troops enacted heavy damage to Washington, DC, setting both the U.S. Capitol and the White House ablaze. The British forces then marched towards Baltimore. Citizens of Baltimore, including free blacks, quickly mobilized to protect their city. Barricades stretching more than 1 mile long were constructed to protect the harbor, hulls were sunk to impede navigation, and a chain of masts was erected across the harbor entrance. When the British fleet approached Baltimore at North Point, Marylanders fought the British Army and helped repulse the British Navy from Fort McHenry during the Battle of Baltimore. It's important to note that American forces during the Battle of North Point were volunteer militia, heavily outnumbered by the highly trained British infantry, but they managed to delay the British forces long enough for 10,000 American reinforcements to arrive, preventing a land attack against Baltimore. Following 25 hours of intense British naval bombardment at Fort McHenry, the American defenders refused to yield, and the British were forced to depart.

During the bombardment, American lawyer Francis Scott Key, who was

being held on board an American flag-of-truce vessel in Baltimore Harbor, took notice of the American flag still flying atop Fort McHenry. Key realized then that the Americans had survived the battle and stopped the enemy advance. He was so moved by the sight of the American flag flying following the horrific bombardment, he composed a poem called the "The Defense of Fort McHenry," which was published in the Baltimore Patriot and Advertiser newspaper later that year. This poem, and later the song, inspired love of country among the American people and not only helped usher in the Era of Good Feelings immediately after the war, but became a timeless reminder of American resolve. "The Star Spangled Banner" officially became our national anthem in 1931. The flag that flew over Fort McHenry and inspired this anthem is now a national treasure on display at the Smithsonian Institution, a very short distance from where we are today.

On this Maryland Day, Marylanders are in the midst of celebrating Baltimore's role in the bicentennial anniversary of the War of 1812. The Pride of Baltimore II, named in honor of the Baltimore clipper the Chasseur, set sail from the Baltimore Inner Harbor to the State capital while carrying a replica of the Star Spangled Banner "that was still there" after the bombardment of Fort McHenry in September 1814. Sewn by volunteers of the Maryland Historical Society, this flag will be presented to Governor Martin O'Malley and members of the Maryland General Assembly at the Annapolis Statehouse.

I am proud of the legacy of my home State and the efforts Marylanders have made and continue to make to remember those who have come before us. I thank all of those who participated in Maryland Day ceremonies and congratulate the students who learned something new about our great State today.●

CONGRATULATING PENNY REYNOLDS AND ANDREA DAVIS

● Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate Carson City teacher, Penny Reynolds, and 12th grade senior, Andrea Davis, on their Nevada Restaurant Association ProStart State culinary competition victories. Each was named Teacher and Student of the Year, respectively. Nevada is proud to offer education in a wide variety of subjects, including the culinary arts.

For nearly 30 years, Ms. Reynolds has been an educator in my home State of Nevada. Ms. Reynolds and her 173 students serve lunch four times a week to the community in their student-operated establishment. Ms. Reynolds' Teacher of the Year designation, based on her high expectations for her program and her students' knowledge, is nothing short of deserving. I commend Ms. Reynolds for her leadership and positive influence in Nevada's education system.

Along with her team of chef classmates, 18-year-old Andrea Davis competed at and won this year's ProStart State hot foods competition, making for 10 first place finishes at the annual event for my alma mater, Carson High School. The five culinary students were each awarded scholarships for their winning dish. I wish Ms. Davis the best of luck on her and the entire team's trip to the national arena.

I admire and recognize the commitment of our teachers to uphold high education standards for Nevada. Educators work tirelessly to ensure our Nation's students are prepared to compete in the 21st century, and I am grateful for Ms. Reynolds's strong leadership and positive influence on Nevada's youth. My home State of Nevada is proud and privileged to acknowledge such an extraordinary educator and leader.

Nevada is fortunate to have such strong educational leadership serving the students of the Silver State. I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Ms. Reynolds, Ms. Davis, and the entire Carson High Culinary Arts program on their appetizing successes thus far.●

REMEMBERING RAYMOND JOHN NOORDA

● Mr. LEE. Mr. President, this month, the Utah Valley Chamber of Commerce will honor Raymond John Noorda, posthumously, with the 2014 "Pillar of the Valley" Award. I would like to take a moment to recognize the achievements of this great Utahn.

Raymond Noorda, or "Ray," as everyone knew him, was born in Ogden, UT in 1924 to Dutch immigrants, Bertus and Alida Noorda. Like nearly all Americans who grew up during the Depression, Ray learned the virtue of hard work early on, and he never stopped working throughout his life. The Deseret News reports that during his youth, Ray worked "in a candy shop, setting pins in a bowling alley, as a loading clerk at a train station, picking cherries, selling magazines, and even herding sheep."

He was an outstanding baseball player, and he was asked to join a professional team right out of high school. However, his mother had other plans for young Ray, and he subsequently enrolled in classes at Weber State College. During World War II, Ray put school on hold and served in the Navy as an electronics technician, working on radar systems. At the conclusion of his military service, he returned to his studies, transferring from Weber to the University of Utah, where he earned a degree in engineering. Ray married his sweetheart Tye shortly after graduating from college, and they were together for 56 years, until Ray's passing in 2006.

After his graduation from college, Ray worked for General Electric for 21 years, where he was known as an innovator and entrepreneur. He eventually

left the company and led a number of businesses to success in the following years. In the early 1980s, Ray became the leader of a struggling Utah company called Novell Data Systems, which would shortly thereafter become Novell.

Ray worked to put together a team of engineers, dubbed "SuperSet." The team eventually invented powerful networking software, which opened the doors to modern networking. For this and other contributions, Ray has been called the "Father of Network Computing." This development set Novell on a path to success and pushed the company far ahead of their early competitors in computer networking throughout the 1980s and into the 1990s.

Of Novell's success under Ray's leadership, The Independent reported, "Novell's NetWare product was to become the de facto standard networking software from the late 1980s through to the mid-1990s. Noorda oversaw the growth of the company from 17 to 12,000 staff, whilst still maintaining a community spirit for his employees, whom he treated with immense respect and who, in turn, affectionately referred to him as Uncle Ray."●

Ray was a visionary and humble leader, who believed that cooperation with competitors would help grow the emerging computer networking industry. Thus, he led his company with a term he coined—"co-opetition"—and Novell was a leader in cooperative advancements in the computing industry. One of Novell's Vice Presidents once said of Ray, "What he preaches is what you always wanted to hear from your father—love, sharing—and he uses those words." When Ray spoke to employees, he was rarely, if ever, without a joke, and he was always positive and encouraging.

Ray's success in business was a testament to his personal character and virtues. He loved children, and enjoyed serving in his church. His philanthropy knew no bounds, and his family continues that legacy in Utah and throughout the country each day. Ray was a titan of business, and his life is a shining example for not only business leaders, but also Americans in general. I join with the Utah Valley Chamber in honoring his wife Tye and his family, and I thank them for their support of such a great man. I pray that we will honor the life of Ray Noorda by doing the best we can in our individual capacities, and by helping those around us achieve greatness, success, and happiness throughout life.●

TRIBUTE TO ELDER DALLIN H. OAKS

● Mr. LEE. Mr. President, this month, the Utah Valley Chamber of Commerce will honor Elder Dallin H. Oaks, of the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, with the 2014 "Pillar of the Valley" Award. I would like to take a moment to recognize the achievements of

this great man who is dear to my heart.

Elder Oaks was born in Provo, UT in 1932. He spent his youth in Utah Valley and Vernal, and he started working from a very young age to support his two younger siblings and widowed mother. Elder Oaks remembers that his mother was “an extraordinary mother,” who gave him “a great deal of responsibility and freedom” and “encouraged [him] to have a job.” He graduated from Brigham Young High School in 1950, where he was the senior class president and played on the football team. He also became a licensed first-class radiotelephone operator in his teenage years.

Elder Oaks was a member of the National Guard from 1949 to 1954. During this period, he met his wife June Dixon, and they were married in 1952. They raised six beautiful children together. After more than 45 years of marriage, June, stricken with cancer, passed from this mortal existence. Elder Oaks’ extraordinary faith and trust in God’s plan during this time of trial was an example for all of us who have lost a loved one to cancer.

Elder Oaks has worked tirelessly to lift those around him and to achieve greatness throughout his life. After graduating from Brigham Young University, BYU, with a bachelor’s degree in accounting, Oaks went on to law school at the University of Chicago. His hard work at Chicago led him to the tremendous opportunity of clerking at the Supreme Court for Chief Justice Warren. He subsequently returned to Chicago to go into private practice, and eventually joined the faculty at the University of Chicago.

It was during this time that my parents moved to Chicago so that my father could earn his law degree at the University of Chicago. Elder Oaks and June kindly welcomed them, and they became lifelong friends. While in Chicago, Elder Oaks also had the opportunity to serve as assistant state’s attorney for Cook County, a position in which he excelled.

After years of extraordinary work and service in Chicago, the Oaks family was called home to Utah Valley, as Elder Oaks was appointed president of BYU in 1971. He was a brilliant leader, who inspired the students to learn as much as possible and to be advocates for virtue and goodness throughout the world. He also set a high bar for his successors, one of whom was my father, who praised Elder Oaks as a man of great humility and wisdom.

After 9 years as president, he was nominated and confirmed as a justice of the Utah Supreme Court. Before and during his service as a justice, Elder Oaks was on multiple short lists for nomination to the Supreme Court of the United States. He served with distinction on the Utah Supreme Court from 1980 to 1984, when he resigned to answer a call to serve in the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.

Placing his faith above worldly success, Elder Oaks has travelled the world, bearing testimony of Jesus Christ and strengthening the faith of millions. He has been an ardent defender of religious liberty, and continually works to bring members of all faiths together to accomplish good.

Elder Oaks has been an inspiration to millions of individuals all over the world. I congratulate him and his wife Kristen on their many wonderful accomplishments over the last 14 years together. Elder Oaks is not only an example of a genius legal mind to which all jurists, including myself, aspire, but also a tireless advocate for truth, virtue, freedom, and goodness throughout the world. I am proud to say that I know such an individual, and I believe that our world would be a much better place if more men strived to emulate his virtues.●

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:03 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 3771. An act to accelerate the income tax benefits for charitable cash contributions for the relief of victims of the Typhoon Haiyan in the Philippines.

At 11:47 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1036. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 103 Center Street West in Eatonville, Washington, as the “National Park Ranger Margaret Anderson Post Office”.

H.R. 1376. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 369 Martin Luther King Jr. Drive in Jersey City, New Jersey, as the “Judge Shirley A. Tolentino Post Office Building”.

H.R. 1451. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 14 Main Street in Brockport, New York, as the “Staff Sergeant Nicholas J. Reid Post Office Building”.

H.R. 1813. An act to redesignate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 162 Northeast Avenue in Tallmadge, Ohio, as the “Lance Corporal Daniel Nathan Deyarmin, Jr., Post Office Building”.

H.R. 2391. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 5323 Highway N in Cottleville, Missouri as the “Lance Corporal Phillip Vinnedge Post Office”.

H.R. 3060. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 232 Southwest Johnson Avenue in Burleson, Texas, as the “Sergeant William Moody Post Office Building”.

H.R. 4275. An act to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for cooperative and small employer charity pension plans.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 4:24 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks,

announced that the Speaker had signed the following enrolled bill:

H.R. 3771. An act to accelerate the income tax benefits for charitable cash contributions for the relief of victims of the Typhoon Haiyan in the Philippines.

The enrolled bill was subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

MEASURES REFERRED

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

H.R. 1036. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 103 Center Street West in Eatonville, Washington, as the “National Park Ranger Margaret Anderson Post Office”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 1376. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 369 Martin Luther King Jr. Drive in Jersey City, New Jersey, as the “Judge Shirley A. Tolentino Post Office Building”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 1451. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 14 Main Street in Brockport, New York, as the “Staff Sergeant Nicholas J. Reid Post Office Building”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 1813. An act to redesignate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 162 Northeast Avenue in Tallmadge, Ohio, as the “Lance Corporal Daniel Nathan Deyarmin Post Office Building”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 2391. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 5323 Highway N in Cottleville, Missouri as the “Lance Corporal Phillip Vinnedge Post Office”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 3060. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 232 Southwest Johnson Avenue in Burleson, Texas, as the “Sergeant William Moody Post Office Building”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

S. 2149. A bill to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

S. 2157. A bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to repeal the Medicare sustainable growth rate and to improve Medicare and Medicaid payments, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-4963. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, an addendum to a certification, of the proposed sale or export of defense articles and/or defense services to a Middle East country regarding any possible affects such a sale might have relating to Israel's Qualitative Military Edge over military threats to Israel (OSS-2014-0358); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-4964. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the issuance of an Executive Order further expanding the scope of the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13660 of March 6, 2014, and expanded in Executive Order 13661 of March 16, 2014, with respect to the unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States posed by the situation in Ukraine; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4965. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Somalia that was declared in Executive Order 13536 on April 12, 2010; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4966. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Illinois Shoreline Erosion, Interim III, Wilmette, Illinois, to the Illinois-Indiana State Line (Chicago Shoreline) project; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4967. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Western Sarpy and Clear Creek, Nebraska, flood risk reduction project; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4968. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's revised Strategic Plan for the period of fiscal year 2014 through fiscal year 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4969. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revision to the Idaho State Implementation Plan; Approval of Fine Particulate Matter Control Measures; Franklin County" (FRL No. 9908-38-Region 10) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 19, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4970. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of State Plans (Negative Declarations) for Designated Facilities and Pollutants: Connecticut, Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont; Withdrawal of State Plan for Designated Facilities and Pollutants: New Hampshire; Technical Corrections to Approved State Plans (Negative Declarations): Rhode Island and Vermont" (FRL No. 9908-37-Region 1) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 19, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4971. 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;

Evansville Area; 1997 Annual Fine Particulate Matter Maintenance Plan Revision to Approved Motor Vehicle Emissions Budgets" (FRL No. 9908-16-Region 5) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 13, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4972. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Iowa" (FRL No. 9907-77-Region 7) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 13, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4973. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; Hawaii; Infrastructure Requirements for the 1997 8-Hour Ozone and the 1997 and 2006 Fine Particulate Matter National Ambient Air Quality Standards" (FRL No. 9907-73-Region 9) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 13, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4974. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; California San Francisco Bay Area and Chico Nonattainment Areas; Fine Particulate Matter Emissions Inventories" (FRL No. 9906-92-Region 9) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 13, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4975. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Regulation of Fuel and Fuel Additives: Reformulated Gasoline Requirements for the Atlanta Covered Area" (FRL No. 9907-91-OAR) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 13, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4976. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Arizona; Payson PM10 Air Quality Planning Area" (FRL No. 9908-00-Region 9) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 13, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4977. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans, State Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants, and Operating Permits Program; State of Missouri" (FRL No. 9907-79-Region 7) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 13, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4978. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Missouri" (FRL

No. 9908-02-Region 7) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 13, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4979. 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; West Virginia; Approval of Redesignation Requests of the West Virginia Portion of the Steubenville-Weirton, OH-WV Nonattainment Area for the 1997 Annual and 2006 24-Hour Fine Particulate Matter Standards" (FRL No. 9908-05-Region 3) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 13, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4980. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Virginia; Section 110(a)(2) Infrastructure Requirements for the 2010 Nitrogen Dioxide National Ambient Air Quality Standards" (FRL No. 9908-04-Region 3) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 13, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4981. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Protection of Stratospheric Ozone: Updates to HCFC Trade Language as Applied to Article 5 Countries; Ratification Status of Parties to the Montreal Protocol; and Harmonized Tariff Schedule Commodity Codes" (FRL No. 9906-75-OAR) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 13, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4982. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Partial Approval and Partial Disapproval of Air Quality State Implementation Plans; Nevada; Infrastructure Requirements for Lead (Pb)" (FRL No. 9908-09-Region 9) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 19, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 2151. A bill to enhance the early warning reporting requirements for motor vehicle manufacturers; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. HEITKAMP:

S. 2152. A bill to direct Federal investment in carbon capture and storage and other clean coal technologies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. RUBIO:

S. 2153. A bill to establish a National Regulatory Budget, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself and Mr. HATCH):

S. 2154. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the Emergency Medical Services for Children Program; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. KIRK:

S. 2155. A bill to amend the National Telecommunications and Information Administration Organization Act to create a Federal Spectrum Reallocation Commission, to provide for the use of a portion of the proceeds from the auction of reallocated Federal spectrum for deficit reduction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. VITTER (for himself and Mr. MANCHIN):

S. 2156. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to confirm the scope of the authority of the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to deny or restrict the use of defined areas as disposal sites; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. WYDEN:

S. 2157. A bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to repeal the Medicare sustainable growth rate and to improve Medicare and Medicaid payments, and for other purposes; read the first time.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BURR (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. Res. 395. A resolution designating the month of April 2014 as "Military and Veterans Caregiver Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ISAKSON (for himself and Mr. CASEY):

S. Res. 396. A resolution designating March 25, 2014, as "National Cerebral Palsy Awareness Day"; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. WARNER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. KAINE):

S. Res. 397. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that public servants should be commended for their dedication and continued service to the United States during Public Service Recognition Week; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. REID (for himself and Mr. MCCONNELL):

S. Res. 398. A resolution to authorize the production of records by the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. VITTER, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. WALSH, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. RISCH):

S. Con. Res. 34. A concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the President should hold the Russian Federation accountable for being in material breach of its obligations under the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 15

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 15, a bill to amend chapter 8 of title

5, United States Code, to provide that major rules of the executive branch shall have no force or effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted into law.

S. 84

At the request of Ms. MIKULSKI, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 84, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes.

S. 200

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) were added as cosponsors of S. 200, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the interment in national cemeteries under the control of the National Cemetery Administration of individuals who served in combat support of the Armed Forces in the Kingdom of Laos between February 28, 1961, and May 15, 1975, and for other purposes.

S. 411

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 411, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and modify the railroad track maintenance credit.

S. 635

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 635, a bill to amend the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act to provide an exception to the annual written privacy notice requirement.

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 635, supra.

S. 738

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) 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. 741

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 741, a bill to extend the authorization of appropriations to carry out approved wetlands conservation projects under the North American Wetlands Conservation Act through fiscal year 2017.

S. 1049

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1049, a bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior and Secretary of Agriculture to expedite access to certain Federal lands under the administrative jurisdiction of each Secretary for good Samaritan search-and-recovery missions, and for other purposes.

S. 1174

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1174, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the 65th Infantry Regiment, known as the Borinqueneers.

S. 1349

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. WALSH) were added as cosponsors of S. 1349, a bill to enhance the ability of community financial institutions to foster economic growth and serve their communities, boost small businesses, increase individual savings, and for other purposes.

S. 1364

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. WALSH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1364, a bill to promote neutrality, implicit, and fairness in the taxation of digital goods and digital services.

S. 1733

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

S. 1803

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1803, a bill to require certain protections for student loan borrowers, and for other purposes.

S. 1810

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1810, a bill to provide paid family and medical leave benefits to certain individuals, and for other purposes.

S. 1828

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

S. 1862

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the names of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) and the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) were added as cosponsors of S. 1862, a bill to grant the Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the Monuments Men, in recognition of their heroic role in the preservation, protection, and restitution of monuments, works of art, and artifacts of cultural importance during and following World War II.

S. 1992

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1992, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide a standard definition of therapeutic foster care services in Medicaid.

S. 2008

At the request of Ms. LANDRIEU, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2008, a bill to strengthen resources for entrepreneurs by improving the SCORE program, and for other purposes.

S. 2082

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 2082, a bill to provide for the development of criteria under the Medicare program for medically necessary short inpatient hospital stays, and for other purposes.

S. 2125

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2125, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to ensure the integrity of voice communications and to prevent unjust or unreasonable discrimination among areas of the United States in the delivery of such communications.

S. 2133

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2133, a bill to amend title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and other statutes to clarify appropriate liability standards for Federal antidiscrimination claims.

S. RES. 384

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) and the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 384, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate concerning the humanitarian crisis in Syria and neighboring countries, resulting humanitarian and development challenges, and the urgent need for a political solution to the crisis.

AMENDMENT NO. 2853

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the names of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 2853 intended to be proposed to S. 2124, an original bill to support sovereignty and democracy in Ukraine, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2853 intended to be proposed to S. 2124, *supra*.

AMENDMENT NO. 2854

At the request of Mr. COATS, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 2854 intended to be proposed to S. 2124, an original bill to support sovereignty and democracy in Ukraine, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Ms. HEITKAMP:

S. 2152. A bill to direct Federal investment in carbon capture and storage and other clean coal technologies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, today I am introducing the Advanced Clean Coal Technology for Our Nation (ACCTION) Act. This bill seeks to remedy one of the main impediments to the development of advanced clean coal technologies, in particular carbon capture and sequestration, CCS, by laying out concrete funding mechanisms to encourage investment, innovation, and collaboration between the Federal Government and companies looking to build the next generation of coal-fired power plants in this country. The Federal Government continues to put in place regulations that seek to further reduce emissions from our nation's coal-fired power plants, yet they provide little to no incentive for utilities and other coal stakeholders to invest in and develop advanced clean coal technologies.

The Federal Government invests heavily in our renewable resources and provides an environment for oil and gas producers, efforts that I wholeheartedly support. However, if we are to truly invest in an all-of-the-above energy policy that will provide the most robust and diverse portfolio of energy sources then we must find a path forward for coal-fired power. The ACCTION Act will put coal back on a level playing field with our other resources by incentivizing technologies that reduce the carbon footprint of coal-fired power through Federal funding programs, offering Federal support for private investment, and putting forth recommendations on how best to support future CCS projects in the United States.

The ACCTION Act will increase Federal investment in clean coal technology by: developing large-scale carbon storage programs to support the commercial-scale application of enhanced oil recovery and geologic storage of carbon dioxide; increasing access to and streamlining existing Federal funding programs for coal projects and; revamping existing research and development programs for advanced coal, and carbon capture and sequestration technologies by including transformational coal-related technologies; increasing to 30 percent the current tax credit for carbon sequestration from coal facilities; establishing a variable price support for companies that capture CO₂ for use in enhanced oil recovery operations; creating clean energy coal bonds to provide tax credits for coal-powered facilities that sequester CO₂ or meet efficiency targets; and requiring reports and recommendations to Congress on existing carbon capture projects and how those projects can be duplicated with a combination of public and private financing.

The ACCTION Act takes into account two very important realities and attempts to address the seemingly divergent points by looking for a solution. First, the climate is changing, and we need to recognize we will be functioning in a carbon constrained world moving forward. We will have to continue to innovate and look for new ways to reduce emissions while at the same time meeting our energy needs. Second, coal is not going anywhere. The Energy Information Administration has stated that coal will still be providing a third of our electricity decades into the future. If we continue to support and invest in advanced technologies, coal will remain in the energy mix for decades beyond that.

Finding a path forward for coal is critical for our Nation and my State. North Dakota is one of the top ten states for percentage of our electricity generated from coal, with coal-fired power providing almost 80 percent of the State's electricity needs. At the same time, our state maintains some of the lowest rates per kilowatt-hour in the Nation. North Dakota is also one of the top 10 coal producing States in the Nation. It is estimated that over 4,000 North Dakotans were directly employed as a result of lignite-related coal activities in 2012, and as many as 13,000 other jobs in the state were supported indirectly by the lignite coal industry.

Coal use continues to increase around the world, and if the United States wants to truly be a leader on emissions reduction and advanced energy technologies, then we must be fully committed in investing the necessary funding and resources to develop and implement clean coal technologies here and abroad. These efforts will come with significant costs, and will not happen overnight, but we must take the necessary steps now to further reduce emissions while providing a path-forward for coal-fired power.

Coal-fired power remains the most reliable, redundant, affordable source of electricity for major portions of this country. Coal remains an abundant resource in this country. The ACCTION Act lays out a path-forward for coal-fired power and advanced clean coal technologies, and I hope my colleagues will join me in this effort.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 395—DESIGNATING THE MONTH OF APRIL 2014 AS “MILITARY AND VETERANS CAREGIVER MONTH”

Mr. BURR (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, and Mrs. MURRAY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 395

Whereas more than 2,400,000 members of the Armed Forces have been deployed to Iraq and Afghanistan since October 2001, 6,800 have been killed in action, more than 51,000

have been wounded in action, and 1,558 have undergone an amputation for a battle-related injury;

Whereas the signature wounds of members of the Armed Forces who have served in Operation Enduring Freedom, Operation Iraqi Freedom, and Operation New Dawn are traumatic brain injury and post-traumatic stress disorder;

Whereas, between January 1, 2000, and January 10, 2014, 287,911 cases of traumatic brain injury were diagnosed among members of the Armed Forces, and approximately 7,100 cases were classified as severe or penetrating;

Whereas studies have shown that the prevalence of post-traumatic stress disorder among veterans who served in Operation Enduring Freedom or Operation Iraqi Freedom ranges between 15 and 20 percent, and reports from the Department of Veterans Affairs show that 29 percent of veterans who served in Operation Enduring Freedom or Operation Iraqi Freedom and sought health care during fiscal years 2002 through 2012 had post-traumatic stress disorder;

Whereas many of the members of the Armed Forces and veterans who served in Operation Enduring Freedom or Operation Iraqi Freedom and suffered these injuries require assistance from a family caregiver to complete activities of daily living such as bathing, dressing, and feeding, or instrumental activities such as transportation, meal preparation, and health management;

Whereas as many as 1,000,000 spouses, parents, and children of veterans have served or are currently serving as family caregivers to veterans who served in Operation Enduring Freedom or Operation Iraqi Freedom, according to a study of military caregivers conducted by the RAND Corporation;

Whereas section 1672 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110-181; 10 U.S.C. 1071 note) introduced an expansion of medical care available to family caregivers, and the Caregivers and Veterans Omnibus Health Services Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-163) facilitated a new program for access to health insurance, mental health services, caregiver training, and respite care by family caregivers of veterans who served in Operation Enduring Freedom or Operation Iraqi Freedom;

Whereas the program provided under the Caregivers and Veterans Omnibus Health Services Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-163) is limited to veterans enrolled in the Veterans Health Administration, who sustained a serious injury in the line of duty after September 11, 2001, and who require at least 6 months of personal care services because of an inability to perform activities of daily living or who require supervision due to neurological impairment; and

Whereas the primary caregivers of members of the Armed Forces and veterans injured in the line of duty make tremendous sacrifices of their own, saving the United States millions of dollars in health care and potential institutionalization costs: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the month of April 2014 as “Military and Veterans Caregiver Month”;

(2) honors caregivers of members of the Armed Forces and veterans for their service and sacrifice to the United States; and

(3) calls upon the people of the United States—

(A) to observe the month with appropriate activities and events; and

(B) to participate in activities that will show support to military families and the sacrifices endured by those families in service to the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 396—DESIGNATING MARCH 25, 2014, AS “NATIONAL CEREBRAL PALSY AWARENESS DAY”

Mr. ISAKSON (for himself and Mr. CASEY) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 396

Whereas the term “cerebral palsy” refers to a group of permanent disorders of the development of movement and posture that are attributed to non-progressive disturbances that occur in the developing brain;

Whereas cerebral palsy, the most common motor disability in children, is caused by damage to 1 or more specific areas of the developing brain, which usually occurs during fetal development, before, during, or after birth;

Whereas the majority of children who have cerebral palsy are born with the disorder, although cerebral palsy may remain undetected for months or years;

Whereas individuals with cerebral palsy also have at least 1 co-occurring condition, with 41 percent of such individuals having co-occurring epilepsy and nearly 7 percent having co-occurring autism spectrum disorder;

Whereas the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention has released information indicating that cerebral palsy is not decreasing in prevalence and that an estimated 1 in 323 children has cerebral palsy;

Whereas approximately 800,000 people in the United States are affected by cerebral palsy;

Whereas although there is currently no cure for cerebral palsy, treatment often improves the capabilities of a child with cerebral palsy;

Whereas scientists and researchers are hopeful that breakthroughs in cerebral palsy research will be forthcoming;

Whereas researchers across the United States are conducting important research projects involving cerebral palsy; and

Whereas the Senate is an institution that can raise awareness in the general public and the medical community about cerebral palsy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates March 25, 2014, as “National Cerebral Palsy Awareness Day”;

(2) encourages all people of the United States to become more informed and aware of cerebral palsy; and

(3) respectfully requests the Secretary of the Senate to transmit a copy of this resolution to Reaching for the Stars: A Foundation of Hope for Children with Cerebral Palsy.

SENATE RESOLUTION 397—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT PUBLIC SERVANTS SHOULD BE COMMENDED FOR THEIR DEDICATION AND CONTINUED SERVICE TO THE UNITED STATES DURING PUBLIC SERVICE RECOGNITION WEEK

Mr. TESTER (for himself, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. WARNER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. KAINE) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 397

Whereas the week of May 4 through 10, 2014 has been designated as “Public Service Recognition Week” to honor the employees of

the Federal Government and State and local governments of the United States;

Whereas Public Service Recognition Week provides an opportunity to recognize and promote the important contributions of public servants and honor the diverse men and women who meet the needs of the United States through work at all levels of government;

Whereas millions of individuals work in government service in every city, county, and State across the United States and in hundreds of cities abroad;

Whereas public service is a noble calling involving a variety of challenging and rewarding professions;

Whereas the Federal Government and State and local governments are responsive, innovative, and effective because of the outstanding work of public servants;

Whereas the United States is a great and prosperous country, and public service employees contribute significantly to that greatness and prosperity;

Whereas the United States benefits daily from the knowledge and skills of the highly-trained individuals who work in public service;

Whereas public servants—

(1) defend the freedom of the people of the United States and advance the interests of the United States around the world;

(2) provide vital strategic support functions to the Armed Forces of the United States and serve in the National Guard and Reserves;

(3) fight crime and fires;

(4) ensure equal access to secure, efficient, and affordable mail service;

(5) deliver Social Security and Medicare benefits;

(6) fight disease and promote better health;

(7) protect the environment and the parks of the United States;

(8) enforce laws guaranteeing equal employment opportunity and healthy working conditions;

(9) defend and secure critical infrastructure;

(10) help the people of the United States recover from natural disasters and terrorist attacks;

(11) teach and work in schools and libraries;

(12) develop new technologies and explore the Earth, the Moon, and space to help improve understanding of how the world changes;

(13) improve and secure transportation systems;

(14) promote economic growth; and

(15) assist the veterans of the United States;

Whereas members of the uniformed services and civilian employees at all levels of government make significant contributions to the general welfare of the United States, and are on the front lines in the fight to defeat terrorism and maintain homeland security;

Whereas public servants work in a professional manner to build relationships with other countries and cultures in order to better represent the interests and promote the ideals of the United States;

Whereas public servants alert Congress and the public to government waste, fraud, and abuse, and of dangers to public health;

Whereas the men and women serving in the Armed Forces of the United States, as well as the skilled trade and craft Federal employees who provide support to their efforts, are committed to doing their jobs regardless of the circumstances, and contribute greatly to the security of the United States and the world;

Whereas public servants have bravely fought in armed conflict in defense of the

United States and its ideals, and deserve the care and benefits they have earned through their honorable service;

Whereas government workers have much to offer, as demonstrated by their expertise and innovative ideas, and serve as examples by passing on institutional knowledge to train the next generation of public servants; and

Whereas the week of May 4 through 10, 2014 marks the 30th anniversary of Public Service Recognition Week: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the designation of the week of May 4 through 10, 2014 as “Public Service Recognition Week”;

(2) commends public servants for their outstanding contributions to this great country during Public Service Recognition Week and throughout the year;

(3) salutes government employees for their unyielding dedication to and spirit for public service;

(4) honors those government employees who have given their lives in service to their country;

(5) calls upon a new generation to consider a career in public service as an honorable profession; and

(6) encourages efforts to promote public service careers at all levels of government.

SENATE RESOLUTION 398—TO AUTHORIZE THE PRODUCTION OF RECORDS BY THE PERMANENT SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS OF THE COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. REID (for himself and Mr. MCCONNELL) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 398

Whereas, the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs conducted an investigation into offshore tax evasion and the effort to collect unpaid taxes on billions in hidden offshore accounts;

Whereas, the Subcommittee has received a request from a state regulatory agency for access to records of the Subcommittee's investigation;

Whereas, by the privileges of the Senate of the United States and Rule XI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, no evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate can, by administrative or judicial process, be taken from such control or possession but by permission of the Senate;

Whereas, when it appears that evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate is needed for the promotion of justice, the Senate will take such action as will promote the ends of justice consistent with the privileges of the Senate: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, acting jointly, are authorized to provide to law enforcement officials, regulatory agencies, and other entities or individuals duly authorized by federal, state, or foreign governments, records of the Subcommittee's investigation into offshore tax evasion and the effort to collect unpaid taxes on billions in hidden offshore accounts.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 34—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF CONGRESS THAT THE PRESIDENT SHOULD HOLD THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION ACCOUNTABLE FOR BEING IN MATERIAL BREACH OF ITS OBLIGATIONS UNDER THE INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES TREATY

Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. VITTER, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. WALSH, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. RISCH) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. CON. RES. 34

Whereas the Russian Federation is in material breach of its obligations under the Treaty Between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Elimination of Their Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles, commonly referred to as the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty, signed at Washington December 8, 1987, and entered into force June 1, 1988; and

Whereas such behavior poses a threat to the United States, its deployed forces, and its allies: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the President should hold the Russian Federation accountable for being in material breach of its obligations under the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty;

(2) the President should demand the Russian Federation completely and verifiably eliminate the military systems that constitute the material breach of its obligations under the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty;

(3) the President should not engage in further reductions of United States nuclear forces generally and should not engage in nuclear arms reduction negotiations with the Russian Federation specifically until such complete and verifiable elimination of the military systems has occurred; and

(4) the President, in consultation with United States allies, should consider whether it is in the national security interests of the United States to unilaterally remain a party to the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty if the Russian Federation is still in material breach of such Treaty beginning one year after the date of the adoption of this concurrent resolution.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2856. Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself, Mr. BEGICH, and Ms. HEITKAMP) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2124, to support sovereignty and democracy in Ukraine, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2857. Mr. PORTMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2124, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2858. Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin (for himself, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. VITTER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. BARRASSO, and Mr. LEE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2124, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2859. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2124, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2860. Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. WICKER, and Ms. AYOTTE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2124, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2861. Mr. RISCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2124, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2862. Mr. RISCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2124, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2863. Mr. RISCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2124, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2864. Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2124, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2865. Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2124, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2866. Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2124, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2867. Mr. REID (for Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself and Mr. CORKER)) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 4152, to provide for the costs of loan guarantees for Ukraine.

SA 2868. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2124, to support sovereignty and democracy in Ukraine, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 2856. Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself, Mr. BEGICH, and Ms. HEITKAMP) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2124, to support sovereignty and democracy in Ukraine, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 30, after line 23, add the following:

SEC. ____ EXPEDITED APPROVAL OF EXPORTATION OF NATURAL GAS TO WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION MEMBER COUNTRIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3(c) of the Natural Gas Act (15 U.S.C. 717b(c)) is amended—

(1) by striking “(c) For purposes” and inserting the following:

“(c) EXPEDITED APPLICATION AND APPROVAL PROCESS.—

“(1) DEFINITION OF WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION MEMBER COUNTRY.—In this subsection, the term ‘World Trade Organization member country’ has the meaning given the term ‘WTO member country’ in section 2 of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3501).

“(2) EXPEDITED APPLICATION AND APPROVAL PROCESS.—For purposes”; and

(2) in paragraph (2) (as so designated), by inserting “or to a World Trade Organization member country” after “trade in natural gas”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply to applications for the authorization to export natural gas under section 3 of the Natural Gas Act (15 U.S.C. 717b) that are pending on, or filed on or after, the date of enactment of this Act.

SA 2857. Mr. PORTMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2124, to support sovereignty and democracy in Ukraine, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 10, line 25, strike “integrity.” and insert the following: “integrity; and

(9) in order to strengthen long-standing treaty obligations of the United States and Ukraine related to the civil use of nuclear energy, including the Agreement for Cooperation Between the United States of America and Ukraine Concerning Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy, done at Kiev, May 6, 1998, and entered into force May 29, 1999, coordinate with the Secretary of Energy and the Secretary of Commerce to assist the Government of Ukraine in identifying nuclear fuel requirements for Ukraine's power sector, identifying and supporting commercial production capabilities for alternative nuclear fuel supplies and any other assistance determined necessary by the Secretary of Energy and the Secretary of Commerce to maintain safe, secure, and sustainable operation of nuclear reactors in Ukraine, and to consider expansion of such assistance to other Central and Eastern European countries as determined appropriate by the Secretary of Energy, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Secretary of State.

SA 2858. Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin (for himself, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. VITTER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. BARRASSO, and Mr. LEE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2124, to support sovereignty and democracy in Ukraine, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 21, strike line 9 and all that follows through page 30, line 23, and insert the following:

SEC. 10. ANNUAL REPORT ON MILITARY AND SECURITY DEVELOPMENTS INVOLVING THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

(a) **REPORT.**—Not later than June 1, 2015, and June 1 of each year thereafter through 2020, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the specified congressional committees a report, in both classified and unclassified form, on the current and future military power of the Russian Federation (in this section referred to as “Russia”). The report shall address the current and probable future course of military-technological development of the Russian military, the tenets and probable development of the security strategy and military strategy of the Government of Russia, and military organizations and operational concepts, for the 20-year period following submission of such report.

(b) **MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.**—The report required under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) An assessment of the security situation in regions neighboring Russia.

(2) The goals and factors shaping the security strategy and military strategy of the Government of Russia.

(3) Trends in Russian security and military behavior that would be designed to achieve, or that are consistent with, the goals described in paragraph (2).

(4) An assessment of the global and regional security objectives of the Government of Russia, including objectives that would affect the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the Middle East, or the People's Republic of China.

(5) A detailed assessment of the sizes, locations, and capabilities of the nuclear, special operations, land, sea, and air forces of the Government of Russia.

(6) Developments in Russian military doctrine and training.

(7) An assessment of the proliferation activities of the Government of Russia and Russian entities, as a supplier of materials, technologies, or expertise relating to nuclear

weapons or other weapons of mass destruction or missile systems.

(8) Developments in the asymmetric capabilities of the Government of Russia, including its strategy and efforts to develop and deploy cyberwarfare and electronic warfare capabilities, details on the number of malicious cyber incidents originating from Russia against Department of Defense infrastructure, and associated activities originating or suspected of originating from Russia.

(9) The strategy and capabilities of space and counterspace programs in Russia, including trends, global and regional activities, the involvement of military and civilian organizations, including state-owned enterprises, academic institutions, and commercial entities, and efforts to develop, acquire, or gain access to advanced technologies that would enhance Russian military capabilities.

(10) Developments in Russia's nuclear program, including the size and state of Russia's stockpile, its nuclear strategy and associated doctrines, its civil and military production capacities, and projections of its future arsenals.

(11) A description of the anti-access and area denial capabilities of the Government of Russia.

(12) A description of Russia's command, control, communications, computers, intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance modernization program and its applications for Russia's precision guided weapons.

(13) In consultation with the Secretary of Energy and the Secretary of State, developments regarding United States-Russian engagement and cooperation on security matters.

(14) Other military and security developments involving Russia that the Secretary of Defense considers relevant to United States national security.

(c) **SPECIFIED CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “specified congressional committees” means—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 11. RESCISSIONS FROM FOREIGN RELATIONS ACCOUNTS.

(a) **INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS CONTROL AND LAW ENFORCEMENT.**—Of the funds appropriated under the heading “International Security Assistance, Department of State, International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement” in title IV of division K of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2014 (Public Law 113-76), \$65,000,000 are rescinded.

(b) **CONTRIBUTION TO THE INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION.**—Of the funds appropriated under the heading “Multilateral Assistance, International Financial Institutions, Contribution to the International Development Association” in title V of division K of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2014 (Public Law 113-76), \$43,525,000 are rescinded.

(c) **CONTRIBUTION TO THE ASIAN DEVELOPMENT FUND.**—Of the funds appropriated under the heading “Multilateral Assistance, International Financial Institutions, Contribution to the Asian Development Fund” in title V of division K of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2014 (Public Law 113-76), \$9,000,000 are rescinded.

(d) **CONTRIBUTION TO THE AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT FUND.**—Of the funds appropriated under the heading “Multilateral Assistance, International Financial Institutions, Contribution to the African Development Fund” in title V of division K of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2014 (Public Law 113-76), \$16,475,000 are rescinded.

(e) **SUBSIDY APPROPRIATION FOR THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES.**—Of the unexpended balances available under the heading “Export and Investment Assistance, Export-Import Bank of the United States, Subsidy Appropriation” from prior Acts making appropriations for the Department of State, foreign operations, and related programs, \$23,500,000 are rescinded.

SA 2859. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2124, to support sovereignty and democracy in Ukraine, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 13 and insert the following:

SEC. 13. ELIGIBILITY FOR CHILD TAX CREDIT.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subsection (e) of section 24 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “under this section to a taxpayer” and all that follows and inserting “under this section to any taxpayer unless—

“(1) such taxpayer includes the taxpayer's valid identification number (as defined in section 6428(h)(2)) on the return of tax for the taxable year, and

“(2) with respect to any qualifying child, the taxpayer includes the name and taxpayer identification number of such qualifying child on such return of tax.”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 2860. Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. WICKER, and Ms. AYOTTE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2124, to support sovereignty and democracy in Ukraine, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 13, beginning on line 9, strike “Not later than” and all that follows through line 13 and insert the following:

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a strategy to carry out the activities set forth in subsection (a).

(2) **ELEMENTS.**—The strategy required under paragraph (1) shall include the following elements:

(A) A preliminary assessment of deficiencies in the defensive military capabilities of Ukraine and other countries in Central and Eastern Europe, including air defense systems and anti-armor capabilities.

(B) A detailed description of which types of defense articles, defense services, and areas of military training can and will be provided to help address any deficiencies.

SA 2861. Mr. RISCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2124, to support sovereignty and democracy in Ukraine, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Insert after section 11 the following new section:

SEC. 12. REPLACEMENT OF FOREIGN SERVICE NATIONALS SERVING AT UNITED STATES DIPLOMATIC FACILITIES IN RUSSIA.

The Secretary of State shall ensure that, not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, every individual employed by the United States Government and serving at a United States diplomatic facility in the Russian Federation shall be a citizen of the United States and shall have

passed, and be subject to, a thorough background check.

SA 2862. Mr. RISCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2124, to support sovereignty and democracy in Ukraine, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Insert after section 11 the following new section:

SEC. 12. INCLUSION OF RESTRICTED ACCESS SPACES IN UNITED STATES DIPLOMATIC FACILITIES IN RUSSIA AND ADJACENT COUNTRIES.

Each United States diplomatic facility that, after the date of the enactment of this Act, is constructed in, or undergoes a construction upgrade in, the Russian Federation or any country that shares a land border with the Russian Federation shall be constructed to include a restricted access space.

SA 2863. Mr. RISCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2124, to support sovereignty and democracy in Ukraine, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Insert after section 11 the following new section:

SEC. 12. DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ASSESSMENT OF WEAPON SYSTEMS PROHIBITED BY THE INTERMEDIATE RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES TREATY FROM BEING PROVIDED TO NATO COUNTRIES.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report containing an assessment of weapon systems the development and provision of which to North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) countries is prohibited by the Treaty Between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Elimination of Their Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles, done at Washington December 8, 1987 (commonly referred to as the "Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty").

SA 2864. Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2124, to support sovereignty and democracy in Ukraine, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Insert after section 11 the following new section:

SEC. 12. ENHANCED ASSISTANCE FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT IN UKRAINE.

(a) **STATEMENT OF POLICY.**—It shall be the policy of the United States to assist Ukraine to eliminate the human rights abuses associated with the Berkut forces in order to foster a democratically-reformed police force with strong public oversight, which is critical to fostering political unity and stability throughout Ukraine.

(b) **AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.**—Of amounts made available to carry out section 1207 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81; 22 U.S.C. 2151 note) for fiscal year 2014, \$8,000,000 may be made available to enhance United States efforts to assist Ukraine to strengthen law enforcement capabilities and maintain the rule of law.

(c) **NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENT.**—The congressional notification requirements contained in section 1207(l) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81; 22 U.S.C. 2151 note) shall apply to the initiation of activities under a

program of assistance under subsection (b) to the same extent and in the same manner as such congressional notification requirements apply to the initiation of activities under a program of assistance section 1207(b) of such Act.

SA 2865. Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2124, to support sovereignty and democracy in Ukraine, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 7, line 2, strike "security." and insert the following: "security; and

(18) to ensure that the United States strategically deploys defensive ballistic missile interceptors and x-band radar capabilities to provide realistic security assurances to European and NATO allies, including Ukraine.

SA 2866. Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2124, to support sovereignty and democracy in Ukraine, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 12, between lines 14 and 15, insert the following:

(2) as part of the NATO summit to be held in the United Kingdom on September 4, 2014, prioritize the expansion of NATO membership to include applicant countries.

SA 2867. Mr. REID (for Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself and Mr. CORKER)) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 4152, to provide for the costs of loan guarantees for Ukraine; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Support for the Sovereignty, Integrity, Democracy, and Economic Stability of Ukraine Act of 2014".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **ALIEN.**—The term "alien" has the meaning given that term in section 101(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)).

(2) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.**—The term "appropriate congressional committees" means—

(A) the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Select Committee on Intelligence, the Committee on Appropriations, and the majority leader and minority leader of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Speaker and minority leader of the House of Representatives.

(3) **MATERIALLY ASSISTED.**—The term "materially assisted" means the provision of assistance that is significant and of a kind directly relevant to acts described in paragraph (1), (2), or (3) of section 8(a) or acts described in section 9(a)(1).

(4) **UNITED STATES PERSON.**—The term "United States person" means—

(A) a United States citizen or an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence to the United States; or

(B) an entity organized under the laws of the United States or of any jurisdiction within the United States, including a foreign branch of such an entity.

SEC. 3. UNITED STATES POLICY TOWARD UKRAINE.

It is the policy of the United States—

(1) to condemn the unjustified military intervention of the Russian Federation in

the Crimea region of Ukraine and its concurrent occupation of that region, as well as any other form of political, economic, or military aggression against Ukraine;

(2) to reaffirm the commitment of the United States to, and to remind Russia of its ongoing commitment to, the 1994 Budapest Memorandum on Security Assurances, which was executed jointly with the Russian Federation and the United Kingdom and explicitly secures the independence, sovereignty, and territorial integrity and borders of Ukraine, and to demand the immediate cessation of improper activities, including the seizures of airfields and other locations, and the immediate return of Russian forces to their barracks;

(3) to work with United States partners in the European Union, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and at the United Nations to ensure that all nations recognize and not undermine, nor seek to undermine, the independence, sovereignty, or territorial or economic integrity of Ukraine;

(4) to use all appropriate economic elements of United States national power, in coordination with United States allies, to protect the independence, sovereignty, and territorial and economic integrity of Ukraine;

(5) to support the people of Ukraine in their desire to forge closer ties with Europe, including signing an Association Agreement with the European Union as a means to address endemic corruption, consolidate democracy, and achieve sustained prosperity;

(6) to use the voice and vote of the United States to secure sufficient resources through the International Monetary Fund to support needed economic structural reforms in Ukraine under conditions that will reinforce a sovereign decision by the Government of Ukraine to sign and implement an association agreement with the European Union;

(7) to help the Government of Ukraine prepare for the presidential election in May 2014;

(8) to reinforce the efforts of the Government of Ukraine to bring to justice those responsible for the acts of violence against peaceful protestors and other unprovoked acts of violence related to the antigovernment protests in that began on November 21, 2013;

(9) to support the efforts of the Government of Ukraine to recover and return to the Ukrainian state funds stolen by former President Yanukovich, his family, and other current and former members of the Ukrainian government and elites;

(10) to support the continued professionalization of the Ukrainian military;

(11) to condemn economic extortion by the Russian Federation against Ukraine, Moldova, Lithuania, and other countries in the region designed to obstruct closer ties between the European Union and the countries of the Eastern Partnership and to reduce the harmful consequences of such extortion;

(12) to condemn the continuing and longstanding pattern and practice by the Government of the Russian Federation of physical and economic aggression toward neighboring countries;

(13) to enhance and extend our security cooperation with, security assistance to, and military exercises conducted with, states in Central and Eastern Europe, including North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) member countries, NATO aspirants, and appropriate Eastern Partnership countries;

(14) to reaffirm United States defense commitments to its treaty allies under Article V of the North Atlantic Treaty;

(15) that the continued participation of the Russian Federation in the Group of Eight

(G-8) nations should be conditioned on the Government of the Russian Federation respecting the territorial integrity of its neighbors and accepting and adhering to the norms and standards of free, democratic societies as generally practiced by every other member nation of the G-8 nations;

(16) to explore ways for the United States Government to assist the countries of Central and Eastern Europe to diversify their energy sources and achieve energy security; and

(17) to ensure the United States maintains its predominant leadership position and influence within the International Monetary Fund, and to guarantee the International Monetary Fund has the resources and governance structure necessary to support structural reforms in Ukraine and respond to and prevent a potentially serious financial crisis in Ukraine or other foreign economic crises that threatens United States national security.

SEC. 4. PROVISION OF COSTS OF LOAN GUARANTEES FOR UKRAINE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—From the unobligated balance of amounts appropriated or otherwise made available under the heading “ECONOMIC SUPPORT FUND” under the heading “FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT” in title III of the Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2014 (division K of Public Law 113-76) and in Acts making appropriations for the Department of State, foreign operations, and related programs for preceding fiscal years (other than amounts designated pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)(2)(A))), amounts shall be made available for the costs (as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 661a)) of loan guarantees for Ukraine that are hereby authorized to be provided under this Act.

(b) INAPPLICABILITY OF CERTAIN LIMITATIONS.—Amounts made available for the costs of loan guarantees for Ukraine pursuant to subsection (a) shall not be considered “assistance” for the purpose of provisions of law limiting assistance to Ukraine.

SEC. 5. RECOVERY OF ASSETS LINKED TO GOVERNMENTAL CORRUPTION IN UKRAINE.

(a) ASSET RECOVERY.—The Secretary of State, in coordination with the Attorney General and the Secretary of the Treasury, shall assist, on an expedited basis as appropriate, the Government of Ukraine to identify, secure, and recover assets linked to acts of corruption by Viktor Yanukovich, members of his family, or other former or current officials of the Government of Ukraine or their accomplices in any jurisdiction through appropriate programs, including the Kleptocracy Asset Recovery Initiative of the Department of Justice.

(b) COORDINATION.—Any asset recovery efforts undertaken pursuant to subsection (a) shall be coordinated through the relevant bilateral or multilateral entities, including, as appropriate, the Egmont Group of Financial Intelligence Units, the Stolen Asset Recovery Initiative of the World Bank Group and the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, the Camden Asset Recovery Inter-Agency Network, and the Global Focal Point Initiative of the International Criminal Police Organization (INTERPOL).

(c) INVESTIGATIVE ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary of State, in coordination with the Attorney General, shall assist the Government of Ukraine, the European Union, and other appropriate countries, on an expedited basis, with formal and informal investigative assistance and training, as appropriate, to support the identification, seizure, and return to the Government of Ukraine of assets linked to acts of corruption.

(d) PRIORITY ASSIGNED.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall ensure that the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network of the Department of the Treasury assists the Government of Ukraine, the European Union, and other appropriate countries under section 314(a) of the Uniting and Strengthening America by Providing Appropriate Tools Required to Intercept and Obstruct Terrorism Act of 2001 (31 U.S.C. 5311 note).

SEC. 6. DEMOCRACY, CIVIL SOCIETY, GOVERNANCE, AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR UKRAINE AND OTHER STATES IN CENTRAL AND EASTERN EUROPE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State shall, subject to the availability of appropriations, directly or through nongovernmental organizations—

(1) improve democratic governance, transparency, accountability, rule of law, and anti-corruption efforts in Ukraine;

(2) support efforts by the Government of Ukraine to foster greater unity among the people and regions of the country;

(3) support the people and Government of Ukraine in preparing to conduct and contest free and fair elections, including through domestic and international election monitoring;

(4) assist in diversifying Ukraine's economy, trade, and energy supplies, including at the national, regional, and local levels;

(5) strengthen democratic institutions and political and civil society organizations in Ukraine;

(6) expand free and unfettered access to independent media of all kinds in Ukraine and assist with the protection of journalists and civil society activists who have been targeted for free speech activities;

(7) support political and economic reform initiatives by Eastern Partnership countries; and

(8) support the efforts of the Government of Ukraine, civil society, and international organizations to enhance the economic and political empowerment of women in Ukraine and to prevent and address violence against women and girls in Ukraine, and support the inclusion of women in Ukraine in any negotiations to restore Ukraine's security, independence, sovereignty, or territorial or economic integrity.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of State \$50,000,000 for fiscal year 2015 to carry out the activities set forth in subsection (a). Amounts appropriated for the activities set forth in subsection (a) shall be used pursuant to the authorization and requirements contained in this section. Additional amounts may be authorized to be appropriated under other provisions of law.

(c) STRATEGY REQUIREMENT.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a strategy to carry out the activities set forth in subsection (a).

(d) NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Funds appropriated or otherwise made available pursuant to subsection (b) may not be obligated until 15 days after the date on which the President has provided notice of intent to obligate such funds to the appropriate congressional committees.

(2) WAIVER.—The President may waive the notification requirement under paragraph (1) if the President determines that failure to do so would pose a substantial risk to human health or welfare, in which case notification shall be provided as early as practicable, but in no event later than three days after taking the action to which such notification requirement was applicable in the context of the circumstances necessitating such waiver.

SEC. 7. ENHANCED SECURITY COOPERATION WITH UKRAINE AND OTHER COUNTRIES IN CENTRAL AND EASTERN EUROPE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The President shall, subject to the availability of appropriations—

(1) enhance security cooperation efforts and relationships amongst countries in Central and Eastern Europe and among the United States, the European Union, and countries in Central and Eastern Europe;

(2) provide additional security assistance, including defense articles and defense services (as those terms are defined in section 47 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2794)) and military training, to countries in Central and Eastern Europe, including Ukraine; and

(3) support greater reform, professionalism, and capacity-building efforts within the military, intelligence, and security services in Central and Eastern Europe, including Ukraine.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the President a total of \$100,000,000 for fiscal years 2015 through 2017 to carry out this section. Amounts appropriated for the activities set forth in subsection (a) shall be used pursuant to the authorization and requirements contained in this section. Additional amounts may be authorized to be appropriated under other provisions of law.

(c) STRATEGY REQUIREMENT.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a strategy to carry out the activities set forth in subsection (a).

(d) NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Funds appropriated or otherwise made available pursuant to subsection (b) may not be obligated until 15 days after the date on which the President has provided notice of intent to obligate such funds to the appropriate congressional committees and the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

(2) WAIVER.—The President may waive the notification requirement under paragraph (1) if the President determines that failure to do so would pose a substantial risk to human health or welfare, in which case notification shall be provided as early as practicable, but in no event later than three days after taking the action to which such notification requirement was applicable in the context of the circumstances necessitating such waiver.

SEC. 8. SANCTIONS ON PERSONS RESPONSIBLE FOR VIOLENCE OR UNDERMINING THE PEACE, SECURITY, STABILITY, SOVEREIGNTY, OR TERRITORIAL INTEGRITY OF UKRAINE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The President shall impose the sanctions described in subsection (b) with respect to—

(1) any person, including a current or former official of the Government of Ukraine or a person acting on behalf of that Government, that the President determines has perpetrated, or is responsible for ordering, controlling, or otherwise directing, significant acts of violence or gross human rights abuses in Ukraine against persons associated with the antigovernment protests in Ukraine that began on November 21, 2013;

(2) any person that the President determines has perpetrated, or is responsible for ordering, controlling, or otherwise directing, significant acts that are intended to undermine the peace, security, stability, sovereignty, or territorial integrity of Ukraine, including acts of economic extortion;

(3) any official of the Government of the Russian Federation, or a close associate or family member of such an official, that the President determines is responsible for,

complicit in, or responsible for ordering, controlling, or otherwise directing, acts of significant corruption in Ukraine, including the expropriation of private or public assets for personal gain, corruption related to government contracts or the extraction of natural resources, bribery, or the facilitation or transfer of the proceeds of corruption to foreign jurisdictions; and

(4) any individual that the President determines materially assisted, sponsored, or provided financial, material, or technological support for, or goods or services in support of, the commission of acts described in paragraph (1), (2), or (3).

(b) SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The sanctions described in this subsection are the following:

(A) ASSET BLOCKING.—The exercise of all powers granted to the President by the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) to the extent necessary to block and prohibit all transactions in all property and interests in property of a person determined by the President to be subject to subsection (a) if such property and interests in property are in the United States, come within the United States, or are or come within the possession or control of a United States person.

(B) EXCLUSION FROM THE UNITED STATES AND REVOCATION OF VISA OR OTHER DOCUMENTATION.—In the case of an alien determined by the President to be subject to subsection (a), denial of a visa to, and exclusion from the United States of, the alien, and revocation in accordance with section 221(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1201(i)), of any visa or other documentation of the alien.

(2) PENALTIES.—A person that violates, attempts to violate, conspires to violate, or causes a violation of paragraph (1)(A) or any regulation, license, or order issued to carry out paragraph (1)(A) shall be subject to the penalties set forth in subsections (b) and (c) of section 206 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1705) to the same extent as a person that commits an unlawful act described in subsection (a) of that section.

(3) EXCEPTION RELATING TO THE IMPORTATION OF GOODS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The requirement to block and prohibit all transactions in all property and interests in property under paragraph (1)(A) shall not include the authority to impose sanctions on the importation of goods.

(B) GOOD DEFINED.—In this paragraph, the term “good” has the meaning given that term in section 16 of the Export Administration Act of 1979 (50 U.S.C. App. 2415) (as continued in effect pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.)).

(4) EXCEPTION TO COMPLY WITH UNITED NATIONS HEADQUARTERS AGREEMENT.—Sanctions under paragraph (1)(B) shall not apply to an alien if admitting the alien into the United States is necessary to permit the United States to comply with the Agreement regarding the Headquarters of the United Nations, signed at Lake Success June 26, 1947, and entered into force November 21, 1947, between the United Nations and the United States, or other applicable international obligations.

(c) WAIVER.—The President may waive the application of sanctions under subsection (b) with respect to a person if the President—

(1) determines that such a waiver is in the national security interests of the United States; and

(2) on or before the date on which the waiver takes effect, submits to the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Af-

fairs and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives a notice of and a justification for the waiver.

(d) REGULATORY AUTHORITY.—The President shall issue such regulations, licenses, and orders as are necessary to carry out this section.

SEC. 9. SANCTIONS ON PERSONS IN THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION COMPLICIT IN OR RESPONSIBLE FOR SIGNIFICANT CORRUPTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The President is authorized and encouraged to impose the sanctions described in subsection (b) with respect to—

(1) any official of the Government of the Russian Federation, or a close associate or family member of such an official, that the President determines is responsible for, or complicit in, or responsible for ordering, controlling, or otherwise directing, acts of significant corruption in the Russian Federation, including the expropriation of private or public assets for personal gain, corruption related to government contracts or the extraction of natural resources, bribery, or the facilitation or transfer of the proceeds of corruption to foreign jurisdictions; and

(2) any individual who has materially assisted, sponsored, or provided financial, material, or technological support for, or goods or services in support of, an act described in paragraph (1).

(b) SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The sanctions described in this subsection are the following:

(A) ASSET BLOCKING.—The exercise of all powers granted to the President by the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) to the extent necessary to block and prohibit all transactions in all property and interests in property of a person determined by the President to be subject to subsection (a) if such property and interests in property are in the United States, come within the United States, or are or come within the possession or control of a United States person.

(B) EXCLUSION FROM THE UNITED STATES AND REVOCATION OF VISA OR OTHER DOCUMENTATION.—In the case of an alien determined by the President to be subject to subsection (a), denial of a visa to, and exclusion from the United States of, the alien, and revocation in accordance with section 221(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1201(i)), of any visa or other documentation of the alien.

(2) PENALTIES.—A person that violates, attempts to violate, conspires to violate, or causes a violation of paragraph (1)(A) or any regulation, license, or order issued to carry out paragraph (1)(A) shall be subject to the penalties set forth in subsections (b) and (c) of section 206 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1705) to the same extent as a person that commits an unlawful act described in subsection (a) of that section.

(3) EXCEPTION RELATING TO THE IMPORTATION OF GOODS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The authority to block and prohibit all transactions in all property and interests in property under paragraph (1)(A) shall not include the authority to impose sanctions on the importation of goods.

(B) GOOD DEFINED.—In this paragraph, the term “good” has the meaning given that term in section 16 of the Export Administration Act of 1979 (50 U.S.C. App. 2415) (as continued in effect pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.)).

(4) EXCEPTION TO COMPLY WITH UNITED NATIONS HEADQUARTERS AGREEMENT.—Sanctions under paragraph (1)(B) shall not apply to an alien if admitting the alien into the United States is necessary to permit the United States to comply with the Agreement re-

garding the Headquarters of the United Nations, signed at Lake Success June 26, 1947, and entered into force November 21, 1947, between the United Nations and the United States, or other applicable international obligations.

(c) WAIVER.—The President may waive the application of sanctions under subsection (b) with respect to a person if the President—

(1) determines that such a waiver is in the national security interests of the United States; and

(2) on or before the date on which the waiver takes effect, submits to the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives a notice of and a justification for the waiver.

(d) REGULATORY AUTHORITY.—The President shall issue such regulations, licenses, and orders as are necessary to carry out this section.

SEC. 10. ANNUAL REPORT ON MILITARY AND SECURITY DEVELOPMENTS INVOLVING THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than June 1, 2015, and June 1 of each year thereafter through 2020, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the specified congressional committees a report, in both classified and unclassified form, on the current and future military power of the Russian Federation (in this section referred to as “Russia”). The report shall address the current and probable future course of military-technological development of the Russian military, the tenets and probable development of the security strategy and military strategy of the Government of Russia, and military organizations and operational concepts, for the 20-year period following submission of such report.

(b) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.—The report required under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) An assessment of the security situation in regions neighboring Russia.

(2) The goals and factors shaping the security strategy and military strategy of the Government of Russia.

(3) Trends in Russian security and military behavior that would be designed to achieve, or that are consistent with, the goals described in paragraph (2).

(4) An assessment of the global and regional security objectives of the Government of Russia, including objectives that would affect the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the Middle East, or the People's Republic of China.

(5) A detailed assessment of the sizes, locations, and capabilities of the nuclear, special operations, land, sea, and air forces of the Government of Russia.

(6) Developments in Russian military doctrine and training.

(7) An assessment of the proliferation activities of the Government of Russia and Russian entities, as a supplier of materials, technologies, or expertise relating to nuclear weapons or other weapons of mass destruction or missile systems.

(8) Developments in the asymmetric capabilities of the Government of Russia, including its strategy and efforts to develop and deploy cyberwarfare and electronic warfare capabilities, details on the number of malicious cyber incidents originating from Russia against Department of Defense infrastructure, and associated activities originating or suspected of originating from Russia.

(9) The strategy and capabilities of space and counterspace programs in Russia, including trends, global and regional activities, the involvement of military and civilian organizations, including state-owned enterprises, academic institutions, and commercial entities, and efforts to develop, acquire, or gain access to advanced technologies that would enhance Russian military capabilities.

(10) Developments in Russia's nuclear program, including the size and state of Russia's stockpile, its nuclear strategy and associated doctrines, its civil and military production capacities, and projections of its future arsenals.

(11) A description of the anti-access and area denial capabilities of the Government of Russia.

(12) A description of Russia's command, control, communications, computers, intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance modernization program and its applications for Russia's precision guided weapons.

(13) In consultation with the Secretary of Energy and the Secretary of State, developments regarding United States-Russian engagement and cooperation on security matters.

(14) Other military and security developments involving Russia that the Secretary of Defense considers relevant to United States national security.

(c) SPECIFIED CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term “specified congressional committees” means—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Armed Services, the Select Committee on Intelligence, and the majority leader and minority leader of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Armed Services, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and the Speaker and minority leader of the House of Representatives.

SA 2868. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2124, to support sovereignty and democracy in Ukraine, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Insert after section 11 the following new section:

SEC. 12. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING CYBER ATTACKS AND DEFENSE.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) a direct Russian cyber attack or cyber violation against NATO or United States operations that causes significant disruption or destruction, or against Ukraine's critical infrastructure, would be considered a violation of peace agreements; and

(2) the United States Government should establish effective cyber deterrence policies and pursue the establishment of objectives to defend Europe against Russian short- and medium-range ballistic missiles.

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 business meeting has been scheduled before the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. The business meeting will be held on Thursday, March 27, 2014, at 9:45 a.m., in room, SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Building.

The purpose of the business meeting is to resume consideration of the fol-

lowing nominations: Rhea S. Suh, to be the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks; and Janice M. Schneider, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Interior, Land and Minerals Management.

The Committee previously met to consider the two nominations on February 13, 2014, but the meeting was adjourned in the absence of a quorum.

In addition, the Committee will be asked to approve new subcommittee assignments, appointing Senator WYDEN to subcommittee assignments previously held by Senator LANDRIEU.

Because of the limited time available for the business meeting, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, those wishing to submit written testimony for the hearing record should send it to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, United States Senate, 304 Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC 20510-6150, or by email to Sam_Fowler@energy.senate.gov.

For further information, please contact Sam Fowler at (202) 224-7571 or Sallie Den at (202) 224-6836.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 25, 2014, at 9:30 a.m.

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

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 25, 2014, at 10 a.m., in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled “Importing Energy, Exporting Jobs. Can it be Reversed?”

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

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. DURBIN. 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 March 25, 2014, at 2:30 p.m. in room 430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled “Teacher Preparation: Ensuring a Quality Teacher in Every Classroom.”

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

COMMITTEE ON EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT, INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS, AND THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Emergency Management, Intergovernmental Relations, and the District of Columbia of the

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 25, 2014, at 2:30 p.m. to conduct a hearing entitled, “Transparency and Training: Preparing our First Responders for Emerging Threats and Hazards.”

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMERGING THREATS AND CAPABILITIES

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities of the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 25, 2014, at 2:15 p.m.

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

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 25, 2014, at 2:30 p.m.

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

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator MURRAY's Budget Committee's legal extern, Elizabeth Mendoza, be granted floor privileges beginning March 26 and ending April 30, 2014.

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

RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED TODAY

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration en bloc of the following resolutions which were submitted earlier today: S. Res. 396, S. Res. 397, and S. Res. 398.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolutions en bloc.

S. RES. 398

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs has received a request from a State regulatory agency seeking access to records that the subcommittee obtained during its recent investigation into offshore tax evasion and the effort to collect unpaid taxes on billions in hidden offshore accounts.

This resolution would authorize the chairman and ranking minority member of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, acting jointly, to provide records, obtained by the Subcommittee in the course of its investigation, in response to this request and requests from other government entities and officials with a legitimate need for the records.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be agreed to, the preambles be

agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table en bloc, with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolutions were agreed to.

The preambles were agreed to.

(The resolutions, with their preambles, are printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

MEASURE READ THE FIRST
TIME—S. 2157

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I understand S. 2157, introduced earlier today by Senator WYDEN, 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 legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2157) to amend titles XVII and XIX of the Social Security Act to repeal the Medicare sustainable growth rate and to improve Medicare and Medicaid payments, and for other purposes.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. I now ask for its second reading and object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The bill will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, MARCH
26, 2014

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m. Wednesday, March 26, 2014; that following the prayer and the 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 11 a.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each and the time equally divided and controlled by the two leaders or their des-

igneers, with Republicans controlling the first half and the majority controlling the final half; and that following morning business, the Senate proceed to executive session under the previous order.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. There will be four rollcall votes at 11 a.m. tomorrow and another series at 2:30 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M.
TOMORROW

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:16 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, March 26, 2014, at 10 a.m.