



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

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

Vol. 160

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 8, 2014

No. 127

## Senate

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

### PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Oh holy God of love, You have made us secure in Your love. Thank You that our right standing with You is based on what You have done and not on our feeble efforts. Set Your stronghold of protection firm against the foes of this land we love, as You use our lawmakers to fulfill Your purposes. Lord, in the midst of distracting problems, give our Senators a vision of what America can become. Make this a nation of justice and plenty where vice shall cease to fester. Prepare us for the role committed to our fallible hands so that our lives will glorify You. We pray in Your merciful Name. Amen.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

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

### RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

### WELCOMING EVERYONE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, it is so good to see the President pro tempore and to be back in this place where we have spent a lot of years of our lives. I am glad to see everybody here ready to go so we can wrap up this double lame duck session.

PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES RELATING TO CONTRIBUTIONS AND EXPENDITURES INTENDED TO AFFECT ELECTIONS—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 471.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows: Motion to proceed to calendar No. 471, S.J. Res. 19, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to contributions and expenditures intended to affect elections.

### SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following my remarks and those of the Republican leader, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 5:30 p.m. this evening. During that period of time until 5:30 p.m. Senators will be permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided and controlled by the two leaders or their designees.

At 5:30 p.m. the Senate will proceed to a rollcall vote and confirmation of a nomination to fill the vacancy in the Eleventh Circuit—Jill Pryor. Following the disposition of the Pryor nomination, there will be a rollcall vote on the nomination of Henry J. Aaron to be a member of the Social Security Advisory Board, followed by three voice votes in relation to Aaron, Cohen, and Chen.

Following disposition of these nominations, the Senate will proceed to a rollcall vote on cloture on the motion to proceed to the constitutional amendment.

Therefore, Senators should expect up to three rollcall votes after 5:30 p.m.

### SENATOR HOLLINGS

The President pro tempore and I served for a long time with the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, Fritz Hollings, who retired. Dealing with the constitutional amendment was his issue, and I can remember seeing this dignified, handsome, very ar-

ticulate Senator talking about its importance. Before he left he spoke on this on many occasions. So it brings back memories—all very positive—about the good work that this man did before he left. By the way, he is still strong and vibrant, 90 years old or thereabouts, still playing tennis and as strong as we knew him when he was here.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—H.R. 5230 AND H.R. 5272

Mr. REID. Mr. President, there are two bills at the desk due for a second reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bills by title for the second time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 5230) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes.

A bill (H.R. 5272) to prohibit certain actions with respect to deferred action for aliens not lawfully present in the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I object to any further proceedings as to both of these bills.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KAINE). The bills will be placed on the calendar.

### MUST PASS LEGISLATION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, as the Senate returns from the State work period, we have a number of vitally important matters that require our attention. I only mention a few of them. There is a lot more than this. The matters coming out of the Judiciary Committee alone would fill this whole page and more, but we have been stopped from doing virtually everything for the last two Congresses, and so we are not getting much done. But I will mention a few of them.

We need to pass appropriations legislation to keep the government from shutting down as it has in the past because of the obstruction of the Republicans. We need to pass the extension of the Internet Tax Freedom Act; we need

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S5349

to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank; we need to pass the Travel Promotion, Enhancement, and Modernization Act, which was overwhelmingly passed by the House a short time ago; and we need to reconsider the issues of college affordability and equal pay for women.

But the bill before us today is Senator UDALL's and Senator BENNET's constitutional amendment. The good Senators from New Mexico and Colorado have joined together on a very important issue and we are going to consider that. The first vote will be tonight.

We have had in this country a flood of very dark money coming into this Nation's political system which is threatening to tear apart the fabric of American democracy. During the 2012 Presidential campaign, outside groups spent about \$1 billion. That is about as much spending as took place in the previous 10 elections combined.

Last year was a Presidential election, so the money this year is focused on the Senate and House races. They will again break all records. This spike in the amount of money being pumped into elections is not surprising, as alarming as it is. Recent decisions rendered by the U.S. Supreme Court in the Citizens United and McCutcheon cases have destroyed our campaign finance laws and have left the American people with the status quo in which radical billionaires are attempting to buy our democracy.

Meanwhile, hard-working families who don't have endless funds to dump into political campaigns are expected to sit on the sidelines and watch as two brothers try to fix every election in America to their liking. And when I say every election—they are involved in elections in the State of Virginia—not for the Senate, but they are involved in that, I am sure, too—but for secretaries of State, and State legislative races in Vermont. All over the country they are spending money as if there is no end to it, and I guess with them there is no end to it.

Hard-working families, though, don't have those endless funds to dump into political campaigns. So they just sit on the sidelines and watch. When I say that Americans are watching the Koch brothers trying to influence November elections, I mean that literally.

Last week it was reported that Charles and David Koch and their political empire have funded 44,000 political ads for television so far during this election cycle—44,000. But that doesn't count money they hide in other organizations such as the Chamber of Commerce and other organizations' ads they helped fund. But we can identify directly Charles and David Koch with 44,000 separate 30-second TV spots.

Putting that in perspective, if for 16 days there was nothing else on television except their 44,000 ads, the 30-second ads would run for 16 consecutive days, 24 hours a day. That is 16 consecutive days, around-the-clock, 30-second

and political ads, and that is just from them. Imagine—16 consecutive days of nonstop political ads, no 24-hour news coverage, no ESPN, no football games, no baseball games, no SportsCenter, no reality television, no anything—just the Koch brothers' paid ads and deceitful messaging all day, everyday for more than 2 weeks. This is the political environment that the Citizens United decision has hatched. It is a society inundated by the wrath of political misgivings and I guess some of the musings of the two billionaire brothers. They are multibillionaires.

While the Kochs and other special interests are using their vast resources to make their voices heard, Americans are being systematically disenfranchised from our democracy. To say that is wrong is a gross understatement. I don't know how else to say it. Our involvement with the government should not be dependent on somebody's checkbook. The American people reject the notion that money gives billionaires, corporations or special interests a greater voice in the government than our own voice, the voice of the voters. The American voter believes, as I do, that the Constitution doesn't give corporations a vote, and it doesn't give them—because of the dollars they have—extra votes.

The only people who don't see it that way are the Republicans here in Congress. They see money as speech. In fact, the Republican leader has said: "In our society spending is speech."

If spending is speech, where does that leave the rest of the American people? Should their role in democracy be diminished because they are paying a mortgage and sending kids to college? Should a family hard hit by a recession—let's say they are out of work—does that mean they shouldn't have any say at the ballot box? Should families hard hit by the recession take a back seat in our government to a couple of billionaires? Right now the answer is yes.

How could everyday American families afford to have their voices heard if spending money is speech? Families cannot compete with billionaires. Rich families can't, poor families can't, working families can't. The only people that would have a vote are these megabillionaires who are trying to buy our country.

They are trying to buy America at every level of government. Why? Because they want to make more money. They control vast amounts of tar sands, oil, gas, coal, chemicals, and on and on. They want to make more money. What they have now is not enough.

So we are faced with a choice: We can keep the status quo or we can change the system and restore the fundamental principle of one American, one vote.

When I was in law school one of the classes I had sent us over to the Supreme Court to listen to an argument—Baker v. Carr. The decision was on one

man, one vote; one woman, one vote. I didn't realize that when I was there listening. Frankly, I didn't really understand a lot of the talk that went on before the Supreme Court, but I came to learn later. I have been in public office now for a few years, and I can remember the first time I ran for the State legislature in Nevada. Clark County, where Las Vegas is, was really growing at the time, but they had not totally reapportioned the State. They had done a little. Clark County is only 1 of 17 counties. They had 9 incumbent assemblymen. So I ran against those 9 incumbent assemblymen. Now the assemblymen run in single districts because reapportionment has taken place because of Baker v. Carr. When I was elected in the legislature one person, one vote did not apply. They hadn't completed that work yet. So I do believe that we should be a society where one vote equals one person.

Corporations should not have a vote and dollar bills should not have a vote. But that is where we are now. We are faced with a choice: Keep the status quo or change it. Senators UDALL of New Mexico and BENNET of Colorado want to change this system. Their constitutional amendment is about restoring freedom of speech for everyone in America. Whether you are a billionaire, a millionaire, upper middle class, middle class, lower middle class, poor, homeless—that is for whom we are fighting. It grants Congress the authority to regulate and limit the raising and spending of money for Federal political campaigns.

Senators UDALL and BENNET's amendment will rein in the massive spending of super PACs, which has grown exponentially since the Supreme Court's misguided decision in Citizens United. It also provides States with the authority to institute campaign spending limits at the State level, which they should have a right to do. This is common sense. It is a solution to an issue that is plaguing our political system. Yet, instead of joining with us to expel the undue influence of special interests from our government, Senate Republicans are doing their best to keep the status quo. What they are going to do, Mr. President—we are going to have a cloture vote tonight to stop debate on this, and they say: Well, great. We will go ahead and support that because we can stall.

They want us to not be able to do anything here. Remember, their whole political mantra is this: We have a Democratic President; we have a Democratic Senate. And they have done their best for the 6 years of the Obama administration to stop everything. That is what they agreed to do—stop everything. They have two goals: not allow the President to be re-elected—they failed there miserably. During the first Congress of his Presidency, we had a lot of Democratic Senators so we were able to get a lot done during that time, but in the last two

they have been experts at stalling everything. That is what they are going to do again today.

But we are going to go ahead and vote on this tonight, and we are going to vote on it again Wednesday. There will be no amendments. It is not a difficult issue. You are either for campaign spending reform or not. So my Republican colleagues can stall for time. We are going to be very patient. We are going to see if there is a single Republican who believes an election in America today should be determined by how much money you have. That is what this vote is all about.

I am going to move this legislation forward regardless of any Republican obstruction because this issue is important. Simply put, this constitutional amendment is what we need to bring back sanity to elections and restore Americans' confidence in our democracy. We must overturn the status quo created by the Supreme Court and instead put in place a system that works for all Americans, not just the richest of the rich.

It is such a shame what this Republican-driven tea party has done in Congress to try to stop everything. Virtually everything is a filibuster. I do not know how much longer the American people are going to put up with it. These are artificial numbers anyway. Should not we be a democracy? We are not because everything in this Senate requires 60 votes. That is not the way of the Founding Fathers. And, of course, a number of the Founding Fathers were from the Presiding Officer's State. None from Nevada; we were not a State. But the Founding Fathers must be turning over in their graves. They must be looking down at this and saying: What in the world are they doing to our country?

We must overturn the status quo. This is what the entire issue boils down to: whether our democracy, as President Lincoln said, is a "government of the people, by the people and for the people." That is what Lincoln said, and we know that is what he meant—or as we have it today: a government of the rich, by the rich, and exclusively for the rich.

Is America for sale? The American people want change. They want their place in government to be protected. The constitutional amendment before the Senate protects working families. It protects Americans. It protects their voice and participation in government because our voice—not the wealth of a few—is the very essence of American democracy.

#### RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

Mr. President, would the Chair announce the business of this afternoon.

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

#### MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be

in a period of morning business until 5:30 p.m., 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.

Who yields time?

The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, what is the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are currently in a period of morning business.

#### CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I know we are going to hold our first vote relevant to S.J. Res. 19 later today, so let me speak about that for a few minutes. It is a constitutional amendment. It is something rare here, but this would restore to Congress and the States the authority to set reasonable limits on contributions and expenditures in our elections. The amendment would also allow Congress and the States to distinguish between natural persons and corporations when shaping legislation regarding the financing of elections.

Both the States and the national government have exercised this power for a long time in a responsible way until a narrow majority of Supreme Court justices ignored history, and, worse than that, they ignored the Court's own precedent. These Court opinions have now eviscerated campaign finance laws, and they have invited corruption into our political system. If we do not respond, we will continue on a path back to the days when only the wealthy few had access to our government. If we do not respond, corruption will flourish and hard-working Americans will lose any remaining faith they have in their elected officials. So I believe it is time to restore some sanity to our campaign finance laws but also to restore the true meaning and intent of the First Amendment.

I came to the Senate in January 1975, in the wake of the Watergate scandal. Americans were voicing concerns about the integrity and honesty of their elected leaders. They were concerned about the corrupting influence of anonymous money flowing into elections. The public's confidence in our democratic institutions was at a low point, so Congress passed the 1976 amendments to the Federal Election Campaign Act. As a freshman Senator—in fact, the junior most Member of the Senate—I was proud to vote for this law.

Decades later Democrats and Republicans again came together in 2002 to pass the McCain-Feingold Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act. It targeted the use of soft money donations and the unlimited spending that could be done anonymously, used to finance attack ads before an election. Just as we did in the wake of Watergate, our bipartisan effort recognized the need to pass important campaign finance reforms to

protect our democracy from corruption and to preserve access to our popular democracy.

But it appears today that many of our elected officials and a narrow majority of the U.S. Supreme Court no longer even acknowledge the corrosive influence of unfettered, anonymous money flowing in to fund our elections. Anonymous money—somebody can try to buy an election, and they do not even have to put their fingerprints on it. They just spend the money. They can say it is the Committee to Bring Honesty and Openness to Government even though it might be funded by a group who wants just the opposite.

Over the last decade a slim majority of the Supreme Court has issued one dreadful campaign finance decision after another. In fact, in 2010, in a 5-to-4 ruling—five Republicans on the Supreme Court—in *Citizens United*, the Court reversed a century of precedent by declaring that corporations have a First Amendment right to spend endlessly to finance and influence elections. In effect, they said corporations were people. I have said this many times before, and sometimes people chuckle, but stop and think about it. This country elected General Eisenhower as President. If you really listen to what the Supreme Court said, we could elect General Electric to be President or General Motors to be President.

In this past year the same five Justices held that aggregate limits on campaign contributions are now somehow a violation of the First Amendment. In other words, if you are running in a local election somewhere where people would normally spend \$300 or \$400, but it is critical because that local board may decide what the tax policy of a big corporation might be in that community, they could say: OK, people running the board are going to spend \$300 or \$400 each. We will just put \$1 million in to elect a different board that will give us a \$10 million tax break.

The Court's radical reinterpretation of the First Amendment contradicts the principles of freedom, equality, and self-government upon which this Nation was founded. The consequence of the Court's opinions is that a small, tiny minority of very wealthy individuals and special interests are drowning out the voices of hard-working Americans and skewing our electoral process. What they are saying is: I have millions of dollars. I have a voice in elections. You? You are just an average hard-working man or woman, and you do not have any voice.

The expressed justification for time-honored campaign finance laws has been a genuine concern about the corrupting influence of money in politics. But despite this well-founded concern, Justice Kennedy's opinion in *Citizens United* nonsensically confined corruption to mean only quid pro quo corruption or bribery. In doing so, these five Justices discarded what our very

Founders understood to be the meaning of corruption. They have also rejected the definition of corruption upon which this Court has historically relied. As recently as 2003 when the Court initially upheld the McCain-Feingold Act before striking much of it down later, the Court stated:

In speaking of 'improper influence' and opportunities for abuse' in addition to 'quid pro quo arrangements,' we [have] recognized a concern not confined to bribery of public officials, but extending to the broader threat from politicians too compliant with the wishes of large contributors.

In fact, I look at the distinguished Presiding Officer—a man who served with such great distinction as Governor of the Commonwealth of Virginia—and I think about the jury verdict handed down last week against another former Republican Governor of the Commonwealth of Virginia, and it reminds us that when elected officials grant political favors in exchange for gifts and money, it certainly threatens the functioning of our democracy. What Justice Kennedy and those who joined with him fail to recognize is that more subtle forms of corruption are also corrosive and undermine public confidence.

Way back in the last century, we changed the Constitution to allow the direct election of Senators. One of the motivating factors was that in one State—at that time the legislatures appointed Senators—in one State, one major corporation in the mining industry so controlled the legislature that it picked who were going to be the Senators. We changed that because we said everybody should have a voice.

States and future Congresses should be able to recognize that corruption extends to the idea that money—particularly unregulated campaign contributions—buys access and influences the political process in disproportionate ways for a wealthy few.

This "pay to play" notion is corrosive to our democracy. The size of your bank account should not determine whether and how the government responds to your needs. The government should be there for all Americans, not just the most wealthy. Vermonters understand this. They have led the way by speaking out forcefully about the devastating impact of these Supreme Court decisions. So we ought to start listening to our constituents. We ought to vote to protect our democracy against corruption. We ought to restore democracy for all Americans.

Some have argued that money is speech so we should not allow the States or Congress to limit any spending in our elections. As Justice Stevens said in his testimony before the Rules Committee, "while money is used to finance speech, money is not speech. Speech is only one of the activities that are financed by campaign contributions and expenditures. Those financial activities should not receive the same constitutional protection as speech itself." This is exactly right.

I have also heard the argument that this proposed amendment would silence nonprofit advocacy groups like the NAACP and the Sierra Club because it allows Congress and the States to distinguish between corporations and actual individuals. Do not believe it. Until Citizens United, prohibitions on corporate and union political spending were the norm at the Federal level and in many states. Those prohibitions never stopped nonprofit groups from engaging in vigorous issue advocacy. Nor would this amendment.

Moreover, I have received a letter of support signed by both the NAACP and the Sierra Club, among many others, that openly advocate for this proposed amendment. If this proposed amendment would have the potential effect of silencing their organizations, why would they support it?

For those who claim the threat of these Supreme Court decisions is not sufficient to warrant a constitutional amendment, let's get the facts straight. Even incremental measures to simply increase the transparency of the flood of money pouring into our elections have been repeatedly filibustered by Republicans. In fact, many of us have tried for years to pass a law to require greater transparency and disclosure of political spending. I have tried to practice what I have preached. I have disclosed every cent ever contributed to me, including one time for one for about 40 or 50 cents. It cost us more to disclose it than what it was, but I wanted people to know exactly who had contributed to my campaign. We tried to have that kind of disclosure.

Republicans have repeatedly filibustered that legislation, known aptly as the DISCLOSE Act. The statutory approach would allow the American people to at least know who is pouring money into the electoral system. It is bad enough that they can pour in an unlimited amount of money, but we ought to at least know who is doing it and why they are doing it.

I hope we will be able to convince enough Republicans to join this effort to overcome the Republican filibuster of a modest transparency bill. But because the Supreme Court based its rulings on a flawed interpretation of the First Amendment, a statutory fix alone will not suffice. Only a constitutional amendment can overturn the Supreme Court's devastating campaign finance decisions.

Our proposal to amend the Constitution simply restores the ability of future lawmakers—Republicans and Democrats—at both the Federal and State levels to rein in the influence that billionaires and corporations now have on our elections. It is necessary to restore the First Amendment so all voices can be heard in the democratic process, whether you are a millionaire or not, and it is vital to ensure that corruption does not flourish.

I hope Senators will join with me on this vote.

I do not see anybody seeking recognition. 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 Alabama.

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

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

#### AMNESTY IN AMERICA

Mr. SESSIONS. President Obama announced Friday that he would not follow through on his promise to utilize Executive orders by the end of the summer to provide amnesty and work authorization for 5 to 6 million illegal immigrants who cannot work lawfully in America because they unlawfully entered the country or have overstayed their visas. That does not indicate he has in any way abandoned his plan to execute such an Executive amnesty.

Indeed, the President directly said he understands that the American people oppose what he is doing—this authorization to work and create a legal status by Executive action. The American people oppose it by more than 2 to 1. So is he going to back off and honor the wishes of the American people? No, not at all—this is the point the American people need to understand.

The President is now brazenly reaffirming in even clearer language that he will carry out his amnesty plan—but only after the election in November. This is an attempt to protect his Democratic Senate candidates. Just a few moments ago, his spokesman, Josh Earnest—Mr. Flack—said it would be wrong to inject this issue into the election.

What I say to Mr. Flack at the White House, whose salary is paid by the American people, is the American people have one chance to have their voice heard. The President is talking about unilateral, illegal action contrary to American law to legalize as many as 5 to 6 million people and we should not inject it into the election. There are Democratic Senators and other Senators who failed to object to that—should they now be protected from being criticized for allowing this to occur? Is that what we have gotten to in our democracy, that the President can make this decision and not involve the American people? They think they should stay out of this. That they should not talk about it in an election. Well, when should we talk about grave issues that are facing America if not during the election cycle?

I think it is time for the Senate, and all Senators, to be heard explicitly. Where do you stand? Do you support the legislation that the House of Representatives has passed that would effectively—as we often do around here—bar the President from spending any

money to execute such an illegal, unauthorized amnesty or not? Are you for it or not?

Well, we know one thing. If it is left up to the Democratic leader in the Senate, it will not be brought up. So it will take a lot of Senators to stand up to Majority Leader REID and President Obama and bring the legislation the House has passed that would bar the expenditure of any money to carry out an unlawful amnesty.

The President cannot give work authorization—as he and his people have said he intends to do—to people unlawfully in America. The law says they are not eligible to work in America, and they are not eligible to be hired in America. The President cannot say, as he has already done for the young people through the DACA program: You are authorized to work. They are now talking about 5 to 6 million more people. One article correctly said there were 10 times as many adults—many of them presumably have entered the country illegally only recently.

I think we have to understand what is going on, and we need to challenge our colleagues to stand up and be counted—counted with regard to the legitimate authority of Congress, which has passed laws of this country that are due to be executed and carried out faithfully by the President of the United States. He is not authorized to just not enforce the law and not utilize the ICE officers and Border Patrol officers and block them from doing their work.

The ICE officers have even sued the Administration, the head of DHS and the ICE director, because they have been blocked from following their oath to enforce the laws of the United States. No wonder this is an important issue. No wonder the American people's interest is rising on this issue, and they have every right to do so.

Well, I am going to explain why this amnesty is unlawful, how it will hurt the American worker, and how it will eviscerate any hope of ever establishing a lawful immigration system in the future if it goes forward. First, let's look at recent events. The President stated at the NATO conference a few days ago that he will give legal status to persons who are unlawfully here by utilizing Executive orders. I say to the American people and to my colleagues that he cannot do that. Those individuals are unlawfully here. He has no power to reverse the laws passed by the Congress of the United States and declare someone lawful who is unlawful. It is a thunderous, dramatic abuse of Presidential power.

He has made it clear previously that his amnesty will include work authorization, and he cannot do that either. It is plainly contrary to law. He has already provided executive amnesty and work permits to those who supposedly came here as young people, although the proof is very uncertain. ICE officers report that they are forced to take someone's word about qualifying for

the amnesty. So they are certainly not very tight about verifying that. His advisers and allies openly boast about how broad this is going to be. They say you must go ahead, Mr. President, and do even more than you are saying you are going to do now under this plan. It is really all because of the opposition of the American people.

By a substantial majority, the American people oppose this action, but the President is intending to do it. According to the news reports, Members of the Senate went to the President and said: Don't do this now, Mr. President. I know you promised to do it before the end of the summer, but don't do it now because that might hurt me in my election. I might have to block votes in the Senate that will stop you from doing this, and I will get criticized for doing it. Please don't do this now. Don't do it now. You can do it after the election, when I have secured my 6-year term. Do it then, Mr. President.

No wonder Senator MCCONNELL referred to that as a cynical act by the President.

This was a dramatic event which occurred over weekend. This executive amnesty would include work permits for millions of people who illegally entered the United States or have overstayed their visas and they are here unlawfully. It is a violation of a sovereign, constitutional law passed by the people's representatives in the Congress. It wipes away the Immigration and Nationality Act's clear rules on who can enter the United States, who can work in the United States, and who can live in the United States. Don't we all agree that our Nation has a right to establish that? Shouldn't those rules and principles be established and followed? We are not against immigration. We have 1 million people come to our country every year legally. They apply, wait their time, and then they have the benefit of citizenship in America. We have one of the most generous immigration policies in the entire world. In addition to permanent immigration flows, we have a huge temporary guest worker program which allows people to come here and take jobs. The President wants to double the number of people who come here and take jobs, but the House has refused to do that.

These rules are the bedrock of any Nation's immigration policy and sovereignty, and in reality the President is actually and truly proposing to wipe away what amounts to the few immigration rules that are in effect. Through executive action, the President is proposing to repeal the lawful protections to which every American worker is entitled. His action would allow millions of illegal immigrants to instantly take precious jobs from struggling and unemployed American workers by the millions in every sector of the economy. These are not just agricultural and seasonal workers.

Under the President's plan, these people who are given work authoriza-

tion would be entitled to take any job. They would be entitled to work at the county commission or the energy company or power company. They would be entitled to work at the manufacturing plants and drive the forklifts and heavy equipment. They would be eligible for good jobs—jobs that are good for America.

This is at a time of high unemployment and falling wages. We are now talking about another 5 million people who will be rewarded with the ability to take the best jobs in America when millions of Americans are struggling and wages are falling and we have the highest percentage of people outside of the workforce in America since the 1970s. We have a higher percentage of people who are working part-time instead of working full-time. There are people who are on welfare. Food stamps have gone up fourfold. We need to get our people working first.

Again, no one that I know of would say that the people who want to come to America and work are evil or bad people. We have a generous immigration plan. We are not saying bad things about them. We are simply saying that if you want to come to America, apply. If you don't qualify, we are sorry. We are not able to accept everybody who would like to come to America. We have rules and regulations to make sure we identify people who are likely to be successful in America and won't be on the welfare rolls and won't demand health care from the government and will be able to pay their fair share of the cost of living in America. That is what any smart Nation does.

I think what people need to know right now is that this unconstitutional action—this planned executive amnesty—has not gone away. It is only a matter of months now that it has been delayed—unless the American people stop it from happening.

The New York Times reported a few days ago on the timing of these actions. They said this:

President Obama will delay taking executive action on immigration until after the midterm elections, bowing to pressure from fellow Democrats who feared that taking action now could doom his party's chances this fall, White House officials said on Saturday.

Well, what does that mean? It was reported in a very neutral way. The New York Times, of course, favors amnesty. But how cynical is that? How cynical is it that the President is now going to take action on a different date than he promised repeatedly, because he is afraid that if he does it now, the American people will have an opportunity to register their opinion come November and members of his party will face election and they are going to be asked, Did they support and vote for this or not? He does not want that to happen.

What is wrong with the American people being able to influence their government? Is the President above that? Has he reached such a high level of popularity he doesn't have to worry

about what the American people say, think, or believe, and that he can advocate and carry out policy based on political deals he has made with big business and special-interest groups and politicians. Even when the American people don't support it and Congress won't pass it, he gets to do it anyway? Is this where we are in America today?

What is particularly disturbing is our Senate Democratic colleagues apparently don't object to the President carrying out unilateral executive amnesty; they only prefer that the President implement it after the election, after their race is over, so they don't have to explain it to the people they represent.

Politico reported one typical Senate Democrat office as saying: "Obama should use his executive authority to make fixes to the immigration system, but after the November elections." After the elections. Don't let it blow back on me. Go ahead, Mr. President, we want you to do this fix, but don't do it now, do it after the election so nobody can hold me to account.

I think the American people are getting tired of this. I think they are wising up. The politicians work for the American people; the American people don't work for the politicians.

We held a vote in the Senate on July 31. I sought to block this action by bringing up a bill similar to a bill the House passed that would bar the President from spending any money to carry out this executive amnesty. Only one Senate Democrat—Senator MANCHIN—voted in support of allowing the bill to come up for a vote. And no one, to my knowledge, on the Democratic side has challenged Senator REID and his blocking of the House-type legislation.

It is a very serious matter that we are engaged in today. It is a very serious matter. The moral underpinnings, the integrity of the immigration law—already seriously damaged by the DACA action President Obama took—will be fatally wounded if he now legalizes 5 million to 6 million people unilaterally. How could we then tell anybody in the future they have to comply with the law?

The President himself said at the NATO conference that if we do his executive amnesty, it will, as he said, encourage legal immigration. Wrong, wrong, wrong. Rewarding millions more who have entered the country illegally—rewarding their illegal acts—is not going to cause more people to follow the law; it is going to be a further weakening of the law. And in the future, how will we be able to tell people who came across the border after that, that they shouldn't be given lawful status, rewarding them for their illegal act? It is that simple.

We are going to have to confront this issue. Congress needs to stand up, affirm the rule of law, do the right thing. We are not against immigration. We are not against immigrants. We don't believe this country ought to be isolationist. But we have a right—and the

American people have a right—to believe their government will create an effective, honorable system of immigration and see that it is enforced fairly and resolutely. That is the moral thing to do. It is the right thing to do. It is what the American people have been demanding for 30 or 40 years, and the politicians have steadfastly refused.

I think it is time for the people's voices to be heard. The American people are right on this issue. They are exactly right. We are failing the future of our country, the lawful system of our country, we are failing the American people, and we are failing American workers who are having a difficult time today finding jobs and seeing their wages decline.

Mr. President, I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

#### SOCIAL SECURITY ADVISORY BOARD NOMINEES

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, today the Senate will vote on three nominees to positions on the Social Security Advisory Board. Two of these nominees—Alan Cohen and Lanhee Chen—are well suited for these positions, and that being the case I totally support their nominations.

However, I plan to vote against the remaining nominee, Dr. Henry Aaron, whom the President ultimately intends to serve as chairman of the board. I wish to take a few minutes today to explain why I have reached this decision.

Over the past decade or so, Dr. Aaron has spent most of his time and efforts focusing on health care issues and advocacy. Indeed, the vast majority of writings he offered in support of his nomination dealt with health care, not Social Security.

When the Finance Committee considered his nomination, I specifically asked Dr. Aaron if he had performed any Social Security analysis over the past decade. He could not produce anything substantive along these lines.

There is nothing wrong with focusing one's energies on health care instead of analyzing Social Security policy. However, given the specific focus of the Social Security Advisory Board, I am concerned about the extent to which Dr. Aaron has considered Social Security issues and analytical advances in the field over the past decade or more. It appears to me that Dr. Aaron's interests and skill set make him better suited for a position in the health care arena rather than advising on the current state of Social Security.

Dr. Aaron has written about Social Security more extensively in the past, but his conclusions were predominantly normative. His most recent Social Security writings too often imply that anyone disagreeing with his conclusions is dead wrong and likely has adverse motives.

In fact, this is a trend that pervades all of Dr. Aaron's writings. Far too

often, in addition to reaching conclusions and making recommendations, Dr. Aaron finds it necessary to condemn potential critics, usually along partisan lines. Of course, I am not one to vote against a nominee simply because I disagree with their policy prescriptions or their analytical techniques. I generally believe in giving reasonable deference to the President on nominations, particularly those involving positions designed to provide advice to the President and his administration.

The Social Security Advisory Board, however, is set up to provide bipartisan advice on Social Security issues to Congress and the Social Security Commissioner, as well as the President. Given all of the challenges facing Social Security, this type of advice is crucial. The board chair must be able to work toward gathering bipartisan consensus and avoid turning the Social Security Advisory Board into another platform for political division and partisan rhetoric. Therefore, it is necessary to consider Dr. Aaron's nomination from the perspective of bipartisanship.

As I said, a nominee for board chair must demonstrate an ability to promote and garner bipartisan consensus. Unfortunately, the evidence does not convince me that Dr. Aaron would be able to set aside his partisan views and manage the board in a bipartisan fashion that aims at consensus in both analysis and conclusions.

Throughout much of his writings, Dr. Aaron has, far more often than not, opted for partisanship over sound policy. This not only makes me question his ability to be bipartisan, it also leads me to question his judgment on policy issues.

For example, he has recently advocated that the President disregard the Constitution and ignore the statutory limit on Federal debt. He has praised the President for ignoring the law by unilaterally deciding not to enforce provisions of the Affordable Care Act, identifying the administration's failure to enforce the law written by Congress and signed by the President himself as an act that, to quote Dr. Aaron, "adroitly performs political jiu jitsu on ObamaCare opponents."

He has written that the Independent Payment Advisory Board—the IPAB—an agency with virtually unchecked power to ration Medicare spending, should be given even broader authority.

He has scolded States that have, fully within their rights, decided against expanding Medicaid as part of the Affordable Care Act rollout. Dr. Aaron used particularly vitriolic words to describe State officials who opted not to expand Medicaid, saying: "Officials in many states have adopted a stance reminiscent of massive resistance, the South's futile effort to block implementation of the Supreme Court's decision banning school segregation."

When I asked Dr. Aaron a question at his confirmation hearing about the caustic nature of some of his comments, he alluded to writings for newspapers and op-eds as avenues in which inclusion of politically charged rhetoric is the “coin of the realm.”

That may very well be the case, but that doesn't mean there is a place for it on the Social Security Advisory Board. I have serious concern about Dr. Aaron's ability to keep such rhetoric in check as he chairs the board that is by statute intended to exhibit impartiality.

Once again, our Social Security system faces a number of fiscal and structural changes and challenges. If we are going to address these challenges, we need serious discussions that will lead to serious solutions, not more partisanship.

Dr. Aaron has not convinced me that he is the one to help lead these types of discussions. For these reasons I intend to vote against this confirmation.

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

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

(The remarks of Mr. CRUZ pertaining to the introduction of S. 2779 are printed in today's RECORD under “Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.”)

Mr. CRUZ. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

#### CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I rise today to support an independent constitutional amendment offered by Senator UDALL of New Mexico which would restore to Congress and the States the authority to rein in the enormous sums of money that are flooding into our political process.

As they built our democracy, the Founders feared the impact of concentration of power. John Adams, a Massachusetts native and the author of our State Constitution, expressed this ideal well. He said:

Power must be opposed to power, force to force, strength to strength, interest to interest, as well as reason to reason, eloquence to eloquence, and passion to passion.

Balance, said Adams, was critical.

But in Washington power is not balanced. Instead, power is concentrated all on one side. Well-financed individuals and corporate interests are lined up to fight for their own privileges and to resist any change that would limit their special deals.

I saw this up close and personal following the 2008 financial crisis when I fought hard for stronger financial regulations, and the biggest banks in this

country spent more than \$1 million a day to weaken reforms. But there are many more examples.

Big corporate interests are smart. They fight every day on Capitol Hill, every day in the agencies, every day in the courts, always with the same goals in mind—to bend the law to benefit themselves. The U.S. Supreme Court is doing all it can to help them.

Three well-respected legal scholars, including Judge Richard Posner of the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals, a widely respected and conservative Reagan appointee, recently examined almost 20,000 Supreme Court cases from the past 65 years. The researchers used multivariate regression analysis to determine how often each Justice voted in favor of corporate interests during that time. Judge Posner and his colleagues concluded that the five conservative Justices currently sitting on the Supreme Court are in the top 10 most procorporate Justices in more than half a century—and Justice Alito and Justice Roberts No. 1 and No. 2.

Perhaps the most egregious example of this procorporate shift is the Citizens United decision. In this new Citizens United era, the Supreme Court has unleashed a flood of secret corporate money into our political system and emboldened a powerful group of millionaires and billionaires who can toss out checks for millions of dollars to influence election outcomes.

Earlier this year the Supreme Court gave them even more room to operate. Congress had long ago put limits on how much money one rich person could contribute to a candidate, a party, or a political action committee in an election. These commonsense limits were intended to preserve the integrity of our democracy and to prevent corruption or even the appearance of corruption, but the Supreme Court struck down those limits.

As Justice Breyer noted in his dissenting opinion, the Court's decision “will allow a single individual to contribute millions of dollars to a political party or to a candidate's campaign.”

The impact of this line of judicial decisions is powerful. In 2012, about 3.7 million typical Americans gave modest donations, \$200 or less, to President Obama and Mitt Romney. These donations altogether added up to about \$313 million. In that same election, 32 Americans gave monster donations to super PACs. Thirty-two people spent slightly more on the 2012 elections than 3.7 million typical Americans who sent in modest dollar donations to their preferred Presidential candidate. When 32 people can outspend 3.7 million citizens, our democracy is in real danger.

This is an extraordinary situation. The Supreme Court overturned a century of precedent, voiding campaign finance restrictions passed by Congress and making it far easier for millionaires, billionaires, and big corporations to flood our elections with massive amounts of money. The Supreme Court is helping them buy elections.

We are here to try to reverse the damage inflicted on our country by these decisions. We are here to fight back against a Supreme Court that says there is no difference between free speech and billions of dollars spent by the privileged few to swing elections and buy off legislators.

We are here to fight back against a Supreme Court that has overturned a century of established law in an effort to block Congress from solving this problem.

I support a constitutional amendment only with great reluctance. Our Constitution sets forth the fundamental structure of our government, the scope of that government's power, and the critical limits on that power. Any change to its text should be measured, should be carefully considered, and should occur only rarely. But there are times when action is required to defend our great democracy against those who would see it perverted into one more rigged game where the rich and the powerful always win.

This is the time to amend the Constitution. I urge my colleagues to support this effort. We were not sent to Congress to run this country for a handful of wealthy individuals and powerful corporations. We were sent here to do our best to make this country work for all our people.

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. DURBIN. 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. DURBIN. Mr. President, I chair the Senate judiciary subcommittee entitled the Subcommittee on the Constitution, Civil Rights and Human Rights. Obviously, the most serious charge of the subcommittee is to consider proposals to amend the Constitution. S.J. Res. 19, the democracy-for-all amendment, was the first amendment considered by the constitution subcommittee since 2009, when I became its chair.

The U.S. Constitution and the wisdom of its Framers has endured for generations. I have established—and so have many of my colleagues—a very high bar for suggestions to amend that Constitution. That is the way it should be. That is why Majority Leader REID, Chairman PATRICK LEAHY of the Senate Judiciary Committee, and I were committed to ensuring this proposal would be thoroughly vetted and that it move through the Senate by regular order.

It is important to recall that until the early 20th century most Americans were not allowed to vote. Even after the franchise was legally expanded, a violent racist campaign prevented many African Americans from voting.

Six constitutional amendments, landmark civil rights legislation, and

Supreme Court decisions helped make the promise of one person and one vote a reality. We must, in our time, in our generation, be constantly vigilant against threats to these victories which were won through the blood, sweat, tears, and even the lives of many Americans. That is why we are engaged in this debate today, because the right to vote is under siege. It is in peril. A well-funded, coordinated effort has made it harder for millions of Americans to vote and at the same time unleashed a tidal wave of special interest and corporate money into elections to drown out the voices of average Americans.

Opponents of our amendment say, oh, they are just trying to repeal the First Amendment. They have it backwards. Our efforts would protect and restore the First Amendment.

The amendment before the Senate would begin to undo the damage done by five activist, conservative Supreme Court Justices who have rewritten and distorted the First Amendment. With decisions like *Citizens United* and *McCutcheon*, these five Justices overturned a century of legal and constitutional precedent to give a privileged clique and corporate titans the power to drown out the voices of ordinary Americans—and that is exactly what is happening.

Big-money donors—and their names are familiar to those who follow the world of politics; the Koch brothers, Sheldon Adelson, and the corporate interests they represent—certainly deserve a seat at the policymaking table. But the size of their bank accounts does not entitle them to buy every seat at the table, control the agenda, and silence their critics. Unfortunately, this is exactly what we are seeing across the Nation being played out, even as I speak, in this current election campaign. Big-money campaign donors and special interests, emboldened by the Supreme Court, have flooded our elections, unfortunately, to a great degree with secret contributions.

Listen to these statistics: Spending by outside groups has tripled since the last midterm election. They spent \$27.6 million in 2010 compared to \$97.7 million so far this year. In 2006, before this awful decision in *Citizens United*, these groups spent \$3.5 million. And now the running total for this year: almost \$100 million from outside special interest groups and well-heeled individuals.

In 2012, super PACs spent more than \$130 million on Federal elections, and 60 percent of all super PAC contributions that year came from an elite class of 159 people. In North Carolina, that elite group had just one member, that State had just one person. Seventy-two percent of all outside spending in 2010 in North Carolina came from one man, Art Pope, a millionaire, conservative, rightwing activist.

As I stand and speak, there is a super PAC on the air attacking me in my home State. As best we can trace it, it is to one individual who so far appar-

ently has spent \$700,000 in negative ads against me on radio and television. Perhaps more will follow. That is the nature of the world we live in.

Members of Congress who run for office, for election and reelection, abide by strict rules on disclosure, money raised, how much is being spent. But when it comes to these individuals, since *Citizens United*, all bets are off.

Although some of the biggest and most frequent spenders are on the Republican side of the aisle, the influx of secret money from super PACs and wealthy donors is happening on the right and on the left. Many have created super PACs on the other side as a defense. Unfortunately, it is a tactic or strategy that has been dictated by the Supreme Court decisions. Sadly, all of this money fight is eroding our democracy and drowning out the voices of everyday citizens.

One year ago, in the Shelby County decision, the same five Justices gutted the Voting Rights Act, civil rights legislation that had protected the constitutional rights of average Americans for 50 years. Emboldened by the Shelby County decision, more Republican-dominated State legislatures followed suit by pursuing legislation to restrict the right to vote. It is no coincidence that these laws have a disproportionate impact on minority, young, and low-income voters.

During his confirmation hearings, Chief Justice John Roberts of the Supreme Court said this of the right to vote. It was “the right preservative of all other rights.” And he pledged to be a neutral umpire, calling balls and strikes when it came to issues such as the right to vote. But because of the judicial activism of Chief Justice Roberts and his four conservative allies, the right to vote of average Americans is now at greater risk than any time since the Jim Crow era.

Two years ago I decided to take my subcommittee for hearings in the States of Ohio and Florida. In both of those States, the Republican-dominated legislatures, inspired by a group known as ALEC that is not a lobbying group but creates so-called model legislation, had dreamed up ways to restrict the opportunity to vote. How did they do this? Some of them called for the presentation of identification cards when you vote. Others said: We will limit the time that you can vote—no early voting. We will restrict the opportunities for people to vote.

My first table of witnesses consisted of a bipartisan gathering of election officials in both Florida and Ohio, States that had passed these restrictive voting laws. I asked the first panel, under oath, a basic question: Tell me about the incidents of voter fraud and voter abuse in your State which led to these changes in the legislature. There were none.

Tell me the number of individuals who had been prosecuted for voter fraud in Ohio and Florida that led to these changes in State legislation.

There were virtually none. One said he could remember maybe one case or two in the course of years.

I think it is pretty clear. These efforts to restrict the right to vote have nothing to do with the integrity of elections. There isn't a single one of us in either political party who condones voter fraud and voter abuse, period. But to restrict the right to vote of millions of Americans in the name of stopping voter fraud that doesn't exist—well, it is time to ask the more basic question: What is the real reason? The real reason is to restrict the right to vote.

It is hard to believe that Republicans in State legislatures, and even some in this Chamber—the party of Abraham Lincoln, for goodness' sake—is party to this effort to restrict the right to vote across America. For goodness' sake, I have been involved in election campaigns which I have won and those which I have not won. I always felt, if it was a fair election, so be it; let the people speak. That is what a democracy is all about. But when you start playing with the rules, when you start saying, well, we are going to try to make it tougher for people to vote—even those who are legally entitled to vote—I frankly think we have crossed a line which we should not ever cross in this country. Fire hoses, growling dogs, and insidious poll taxes have now been replaced with a well-funded campaign denying millions their right to vote and a flood of special interest money drowning out the voices of average Americans.

Is that your vision of America? Is that your vision of this country in the future, where your opportunity to vote is now restricted more and more, even without any indication of voter fraud or voter abuse, when your opportunity to be informed about the candidates and their positions is in fact overwhelmed by those who come in—such as the Koch brothers and those on the left, too—to spend millions of dollars?

I introduced a bill a few years back for public financing and campaigns. There was one valiant Republican who stood, who agreed to cosponsor my bill, and only one: Arlen Specter, a Senator from Pennsylvania, a Republican Senator. What happened to him? I can tell you what happened. The late Arlen Specter was challenged in his Republican primary by one of those on the far right in his party. He couldn't win as he looked at the polls. He switched parties and became a Democrat. I lost my only Republican on public financing when he joined us on this side of the aisle. He lost the Democratic primary, went on and finished his term and passed away. But he was the only Republican with the courage to stand for public financing to change this mess we have.

I can tell you we are reaching a point where mere mortals—individuals who don't happen to be multimillionaires—want nothing to do with this political business. It has become the hobby of

high rollers. The two candidates for the highest offices in my home State now are multimillionaires playing with their own money now, putting millions into their campaigns.

I am not envious of their wealth. I have said it publicly and I will say it again: I am only one Powerball ticket away from matching their wealth. So I am not jealous of them, but it says something about the political process, doesn't it, that someone could put in \$10 or \$12 million of their own money and the Supreme Court can say, well, they are just exercising their right to free speech. Really? I didn't see the word "cash" in the First Amendment. I didn't even see the word "money" in the First Amendment. That is what we are up against.

S.J. Res. 19, which is before us, is a constitutional amendment. It is narrowly tailored and it is a proposal to protect and restore the First Amendment. It empowers Congress and State legislatures, the elected representatives of the American people, to set reasonable, content-neutral—let me underline that—content-neutral limits on the amount of money wealthy individuals and special interest donors can give to candidates. It overturns Citizens United by authorizing Congress and State legislatures—

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

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 5 additional minutes.

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

Mr. DURBIN. I thank the Senator from Texas.

It overturns Citizens United by authorizing Congress and State legislatures to prohibit corporations and unions from spending money from their treasuries to influence elections. Our amendment will ensure that elections are contests for the best ideas, a contest where mere mortals—the group I mentioned earlier—have the same chance to succeed as multimillionaires. That is why our amendment is supported by 60 diverse advocacy organizations and the majority of the American people. Politicians may not get it, but the American people do. They could see what is happening to this bidding war we now call elections. They understand the flood of television.

We have one Senatorial candidate on our side, who she has been subjected to \$15 million in independent expenditures, negative ads in her State. That has been going on for almost 1 year. She is going to weather the storm and be reelected, incidentally. But imagine that \$15 million of special interest groups just showering her with hate and venom for month after weary month. Is that what our political process has come down to?

Opponents of our amendment argue that any limit whatsoever on election spending violates the First Amendment. Just as there is no constitutional right to buy an election, free-

dom of speech doesn't give anyone the right to violate or overwhelm the constitutional rights of others. Apparently five conservative Supreme Court Justices believe the wealthy and elite have a greater right to free speech because they have more money.

Our opponents also argue that corporations are people. Give me a break. Corporations are granted the advantages of perpetual life, property ownership, and limited liability to enhance their efficiency as an economic entity, according to Justice Rehnquist in one of his opinions, but he went on to say in the same opinion, "Those properties so beneficial in the economic sphere pose special dangers in the political sphere."

That was Justice Rehnquist speaking about giving powers to corporations which exceed the obvious. While some First Amendment protections have rightfully been extended beyond everyday Americans to corporations, Citizens United went way too far. Living, breathing Americans face challenges these legally created entities will never face. Corporations never get married, they don't raise kids, they don't care for sick relatives, and they cannot vote in elections or run for office. Corporations have the right to be heard, for sure, but the right to control an election with their bank account? There is something wrong with that decision.

Our amendment restores the basic longstanding principle that corporations shouldn't be able to wield their enormous economic power to sway Federal elections. Our amendment restores and protects the First Amendment for all Americans. I encourage my colleagues to vote for S.J. Res. 19, and I expect a strictly partisan vote. I am sorry if that happens, but I expect it.

When we brought up the issue of disclosure, to disclose who was giving to campaigns, we couldn't get the Republicans to give us support. Just disclose who is giving the money. Nope. Keep it secret. That was their position. Now they not only want to keep it secret; they want to make sure those who are abusing the process by sending in huge sums of money on behalf of corporations and individuals are going to be protected. They may protect the special interests, but they will do it at the expense of average Americans who are losing their faith—losing their faith in this process and in the institutions it creates.

Restore that faith. Support S.J. Res. 19. Let's amend the Constitution and make Citizens United a vestige of a wrong-headed decision by the Supreme Court.

I yield the floor.

I again thank my colleague from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I am glad I got to catch a few of the tail-end remarks of my colleague from Illinois. I didn't realize what this debate was truly all about, but he made that clear.

This is all about public financing of elections, according to him, because anybody contributing any of their hard-earned money to support a candidate whom they happen to believe in or someone espousing or advocating for the principles they believe in—there is something inherently wrong with that according to the distinguished majority whip, the Senator from Illinois, because to him the only answer is let's take your money and use that to finance an election perhaps to benefit a candidate who doesn't agree with anything you believe in. Is that what this is all about, public financing of elections?

He said something else I don't think I ever heard anybody have the audacity to say before. He said voter fraud doesn't exist. I am sure in Chicago they have had a few instances of voter fraud. We have unfortunately had some in Texas, some that resulted in the nomination of Lyndon Johnson to be Democratic nominee for President of the United States in box 13 in Duvall County, TX, and there have been a number of other instances investigated and found cases of voter fraud that have been found to exist.

What is the problem with issuing or requiring somebody to have a photo ID to vote? In Texas to get a voter ID, for which the Attorney General has sued the State of Texas, saying somehow it is discriminatory to require somebody to have a voter ID to prove they are who they say they are so they can then cast their vote, even though it takes a photo ID to get into the Department of Justice—you cannot go see Eric Holder or anybody at the Department of Justice unless you have a photo ID. Oh, by the way, you cannot buy tobacco products, you cannot buy alcohol, you cannot fly on an airplane without a photo ID, and if for some reason you don't have one in the State of Texas, well, you get one for free. How does that possibly burden the right to vote?

It is no surprise that 70 percent of the respondents in most of the polling I have seen—Independents, Democrats, and Republicans alike—say they think voter ID is a good idea, because what does it do? It protects the integrity of the ballots for people who are qualified to vote and doesn't permit illegal votes to dilute those votes.

We spent the last several weeks back home meeting with our constituents. I know some people like to call it recess. I know it doesn't feel like recess, at least not in the elementary school sense of the word, because most of the time this is a period during which we get to travel our States and interact with our constituents and do something we need to do more of, which is to listen to what they have to say and what their concerns are, and I did that in Texas.

My constituents did not say the most important thing we can do is pass a constitutional amendment gutting the First Amendment, the right to free speech. That didn't come up one time.

What did come up were their concerns about the economy, about the access to health care, about immigration, about the challenges imposed by radical Islamic terrorists and the Russian strongman Vladimir Putin. All of those came up. Not a single time did my constituents say: We want you to go back to Washington, DC, and vote to gut the First Amendment right to free speech. At this time of high unemployment and stagnant wages, with the labor participation rate at historic lows—that is, the percentage of people actually in the workforce looking for jobs is at a historic low—and millions of Americans concerned about losing their health insurance or facing higher deductibles or premiums, with a crisis on the southwest border which has not gone away with this wave of unaccompanied minor children coming across from Central America, with terrorists on the march in the Middle East, with Russian military forces continuing a full-blown invasion of Ukraine, despite all that, the majority leader in his wisdom has decided to bring up this amendment because he thinks the most urgent order of business is to replace the current First Amendment which has stood the test of time for lo all these many years since our country's founding and replace it with one that empowers incumbent politicians to control who has access to the resources in order to get their message out.

Now everyone is entitled to their priorities, but it is painfully clear the majority leader's priorities have everything to do with November 4, the coming midterm elections, so it is all politics all the time, no matter what. I am embarrassed, frankly, to confront my constituents when they say: What are you going to be doing when you return to Washington, DC? Are you going to be dealing with jobs or the energy sector—which is a very bright spot in our economy—or what are we going to do to make sure the millennials—the young adults—can actually find jobs so they can pay down their college loans and so they can get to work? What are you going to do to keep the promises the President made on health care; that if you like what you have you can keep it, the premiums for a family of four are going to go down by \$2,500, and you can keep your doctor if you like your doctor—what are you going to do to make sure those promises are kept?

Instead of dealing with all of those very important issues, it is embarrassing for me to tell my constituents that, look, the majority leader is the one who controls the agenda in this Senate. He is the traffic cop, and an individual Senator—and certainly not one in the minority—doesn't have any ability to control the agenda of the U.S. Senate.

So this is all Senator REID's choice as the majority leader, and he claims this proposed constitutional amendment is all about getting so-called dark money out of the political system. In reality, if that was all this was about, we might

have a good debate and a vote. But in reality what he is concerned about is opposition—political support that is going to make it more likely that Republicans regain the majority of the Senate and Democrats become a member of the minority. That is what is motivating this vote. In reality what this amendment would do would be to undermine some of our most cherished, most fundamental, and most important liberties.

If this proposed amendment ever becomes law, State and Federal lawmakers would suddenly have vast new powers to regulate or even criminalize political speech. So to state the blindingly obvious, the Founding Fathers proposed and readopted the First Amendment precisely because they saw how dangerous it was to let politicians restrict the exercise of free speech. The Founders understood that without the First Amendment we could end up with a never-ending cycle of elected officials shrinking the boundaries of permissible speech. A political system such as that would be totally incompatible with the principles and values of a free society. Yet that is exactly the type of political system we would have if this constitutional amendment being proposed ever were to take effect.

I heard the majority whip saying this isn't about political speech, this is just about the money, but that argument quickly falls apart.

For starters, my colleagues amendment would allow Congress to restrict freedom of assembly and freedom of petition as well, both of which are essential to safeguarding political speech. While the amendment might not give Congress the power to curtail freedom of the press per se, it would give Congress the power to curtail political speech by individuals and activists, which begs the question: Why should the political speech of newspapers and magazines be any different from the political speech of you and me? Why should theirs be carved out and unrestricted in terms of the financial resources that could advance those points of view in newspapers and magazines? Yet our ability to communicate about the things we care about the most would be restricted by limiting the amount of money we could spend to advocate those points of view.

After all, when newspapers publish editorials about public policy, they are trying to persuade politicians and other elected officials to adopt a given position, and that is an important part of our system.

I ask unanimous consent for an additional 3 minutes.

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

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CORNYN. Newspapers are trying to persuade voters all the time to elect a given candidate because they endorse those candidates.

I remember when I ran for my first public office as a district judge in Bexar County, San Antonio, TX, one of

the most important things I sought was the endorsement of the editorial board of the local newspaper. I knew that even if nobody knew anything else about me, if the newspaper editorial board thought I was a credible candidate, that might help in my election.

Neither Federal nor State lawmakers should have the power to decide what type of political speech is permissible. Free speech is free speech. The solution to speech is more speech, not less speech.

For 225 years the First Amendment has served as the guarantor of American democracy. It was designed to protect all speech, not just speech we happen to agree with or that supports our particular point of view. A recent Supreme Court decision put it this way: "There is no more basic right to our democracy than the right to participate in electing political leaders."

Unfortunately, this amendment would undermine that right, and it would roll back perhaps the most elemental freedom of our founding document by creating a system in which vital, indispensable liberty would be contingent on the ever-shifting tides of partisan politics. These efforts should not only be not supported, they should be repudiated firmly, loudly, and unapologetically, nothing less than the very bedrock of American democracy is at stake.

As I close, I wish to add that the Founders wisely put the process by which the Constitution can be amended in our Constitution. Two-thirds of the House and two-thirds of the Senate must vote for a constitutional resolution and then it goes to the States where three-quarters of the States must ratify this constitutional amendment. I can tell you that there is no doubt in my mind that this would ever happen with this amendment.

Why is the majority leader bringing this up now, less than 60 days before the midterm elections? Perhaps it is to motivate his own political base in the hope that will mitigate some of the losses in the November 4 election. But it certainly cannot be without any hope or pipedream that it would ever become the law of the land, and for the reasons I have stated it should not.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. President, I say to my good friend the Senator from Texas that there are very important reasons for bringing up this issue now, and it is because of the elections that are going on. He makes it sound as though this is some kind of a political process. What is going on in our elections right now—and here are the nine top Senate races in the country. The blue on this chart indicates partial or nondisclosed money. This is the dark money. Nobody knows where this money is coming from. It could be billionaires or large corporations. It could be almost anyone with a secret agenda.

As an example, more than half the money in this race in Arkansas is dark money. In Georgia we can see that almost all of the money is in this category of partial or nondisclosure. In Kentucky and North Carolina almost half the money is in the category of partial or nondisclosed money, and there is a significant amount of partial or nondisclosed in the other nine States. This issue has to do with what is happening right now in our elections.

Just 6 months ago I went over to the Supreme Court and listened to the McCutcheon argument and the ruling—well, I went over there longer than 6 months ago. They made the ruling about 6 months ago. That ruling said one individual can give \$3.6 million, and that is what this is about. We are trying to get to the bottom of what is happening in our elections and how our elections are being taken away from us and how they are being influenced in terms of dark money. This is a very good time to have this debate.

I will also say to my friend from Texas, this is a bipartisan amendment. This amendment started back in 1983 with Ted Stevens, a Republican. Ernest Hollings could not be more of a bipartisan figure in the Senate, and he picked it up. From 1983 to today, we have had 11 Republicans either vote for the amendment or a similar amendment or beyond the amendment. This is not anything that should be partisan. This dark money and the impact it is having is something the American people are very worried about. I will come back to this chart in a minute.

This is a crucial period in our history. Americans will go to the polls and vote. It is our heritage, it is something to celebrate, and it is something to protect. The integrity of our elections is crucial, but our campaign finance system is under siege, drowning in cash and record amounts of money. Much of the money is from outside groups and much of it is hidden. Our elections should not be for sale to the highest bidder. Money has poisoned our political system. The American people have lost faith in us as they have watched this merry-go-round and constant money chasing from special interests and very little has been getting done.

Folks want Congress to get to work and work together so we can find real solutions to real problems and spend our time raising hopes instead of raising cash. That is why Senator BENNET and I have introduced our constitutional amendment and that is what I wish to talk about today.

Total spending on Federal elections was over \$6 billion in 2012. That is double what was spent in 2000, just 12 years before. That is a lot of money. Where does it come from? Most of it comes from a tiny fraction of the population, and there are billionaires and special interests writing checks—often in dark corners with a lot of the dark money, as I talked about at the beginning of

my speech. Nobody knows who is behind that dark money, and that dark money is in our elections in a big way.

There are basically two questions: How did we get into this mess and how do we fix it? First, we need to look at the history, which is important to understand because folks can change the subject, but they cannot change the facts and the facts are very clear. Our campaign finance system is being destroyed by misguided Supreme Court decisions, one after another with narrow 5-to-4 decisions, giving a hammer to big money and chipping away at our democracy.

Normally the tradition in the Supreme Court has been that of Justices deciding on issues with a vote of 9 to 0 or 8 to 1 after trying to work things out, but these are narrow 5-to-4 decisions which are dividing the country and dividing the Court.

We can go all the way back to a Supreme Court decision back in 1976 in a case called *Buckley v. Valeo*, when the Court said money and free speech are the same thing. Four years ago in a case that involved *Citizens United*, the Court said corporations are persons and they can spend all they want.

Basically the Supreme Court put a for sale sign on elections. These elections and decisions opened the door and allowed a flood of money. They ignored political reality and drowned out the voices of ordinary Americans.

Most recently the McCutcheon decision knocked down aggregate contribution limits. What we are talking about in that case is that one person can dole out \$3.6 million directly to candidates and parties in all 50 States. Let's put that in perspective for the average American working full time and making minimum wage. He or she would have to work 239 years to make that much money. Because of the McCutcheon decision, one person can dole out \$3.6 million directly to candidates and parties in all 50 States. It would take the average American, working full time and making minimum wage, 239 years to make that much money. Look at the imbalance and inequality there.

Supreme Court Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg said in a recent interview in the *National Law Journal*:

I think the biggest mistake this Court made is in campaign finance. . . . It should be increasingly clear how [money] is corrupting our system.

Justice Ginsburg is right. It is clear to most Americans, which is why opponents of reform either change the subject or muddy the water, which I will get into in a minute. But the point must be made that the five conservative Justices on the Supreme Court are not done. If left unchecked, the hammering will continue and the destruction will go on.

Chief Justice Roberts made a troubling statement in the McCutcheon decision. He said preventing bribery is the only basis, the only justification for Congress to pass campaign finance laws.

What does this mean? It means more bad decisions from the Court, the floodgates stay open, and the money keeps pouring in. Short of prohibiting out and out bribery, Congress is powerless to act and the American people must step aside. Billionaires will stay at the front of the line. All of this, folks, defies common sense.

Senator MCCAIN said after the ruling on McCutcheon: "There will be scandals involving corrupt political officials and unlimited, anonymous campaign contributions that will force the system to be reformed once again."

I am afraid my friend is right. There will be scandals. We are setting the stage for scandals. Just look at the millions of dollars of undisclosed money pouring into our elections.

How can there be reform? The Court has tied the hands of Congress. Until the Constitution is amended, we cannot enact real reforms—reforms such as McCain-Feingold. The Court will just strike them down. We are headed back to the pre-Watergate era.

In 2012 outside groups spent \$450 million to influence Senate and House races. In 2008, before *Citizens United*, they spent \$43 million. That is a tenfold increase. There is an obvious trend and it is deeply troubling. Much of that money is hidden.

According to a recent report by the Brennan Center, over half the money spent in this year's top nine Senate races is not fully disclosed. So in 2 months we will know the outcome of these elections, but we won't know who paid for them.

This chart is a great indication. We have the top-most contested Senate races, and here in the red we have full disclosure of the money. So the red shows us what people know and that they know who the contributors are, but the blue, which is more than half if we average it through all of the elections, represents partial or absolute nondisclosure.

This clearly shows we have a broken system. There are only two ways to fix it. The Court can reverse itself—that is unlikely—or we can amend the Constitution, making clear in the Constitution that people have the right to regulate campaign finance. Until then, we will fall short of real reform. That is why a constitutional amendment is essential—because the time has come to give power back to the elected representatives of the people.

Opponents say this is just an election year stunt, but, again, this ignores history. Our amendment is similar to other bipartisan amendments introduced in nearly every Congress since 1983 when Ted Stevens—a Republican—was the lead sponsor. Many prominent Republicans cosponsored and voted for these amendments over the course of three decades, people such as John Danforth, Strom Thurmond, Nancy Kassebaum, Arlen Specter, JOHN MCCAIN, and THAD COCHRAN. This was always a bipartisan effort. And this was before *Citizens United*, before

McCutcheon, when things went from bad to worse.

It is not a radical idea. In fact, it is pretty simple. It would give back power to Congress to regulate campaign finance at the Federal level and to States at the State level. That is it, period. We do not dictate specific reforms. We can debate the specifics, and we should, but Congress has a duty and a right to enact sensible campaign finance reform.

The American people support reform because they know a basic truth: No matter how hard some may try to obscure it, when the Court says money is free speech, there is a great risk that special interests can drown out the voices of everyone else because we know we don't get something for nothing. Folks writing those checks want something in return. Whether they are Democratic billionaires or Republican billionaires, they want value for their money, which usually means less compromise and which usually means less compromise and more gridlock.

Opponents of reform are in full throttle by ignoring history and torturing logic. But let's be clear. Here is the bottom line: They oppose any limits, they oppose any restrictions on how big the checks are or even saying which billionaires are writing them. It is hard to defend that. Instead, they change the subject and talk about threats to free speech, which goes something like this: If Congress can regulate campaign finance spending, then it can also regulate free speech. I think this is a straw man argument not supported by history, logic, or the law. It isn't persuasive, and it is basically a scare tactic.

Congress has a long history of regulating campaign finance, often in the wake of scandal. Since 1867 Congress has been in the business of regulating campaign finance by banning solicitation of campaign funds from naval yard government employees. We have had the Pendleton Act, the Tillman Act, the Federal Corrupt Practices Act of 1925, the Hatch Act, the Federal Campaign Election Act of 1974, and the Bipartisan Campaign Act of 2002.

First scandal and then reform—that is the unfortunate pattern. Every generation has faced that challenge for ethical government, for standing up to the power of big money, and the Congress has acted. It has not banned books, suppressed preachers, or stopped printing presses. Reform has been modest, reasonable, and responsive, sensible enough to pass both Houses of Congress and get the signature of the President. We have to answer to our constituents, unlike Supreme Court Justices.

Further, our amendment does not give Congress free rein. There is still a reasonableness requirement in the Court's interpretation of any constitutional amendment. If Congress did pass extreme laws, the Court could still overturn them as unreasonable. The First Amendment is in full effect. So in

the classic example, we protect free speech, but we cannot yell "fire" in a crowded theater. "Reasonable" is not a complicated idea—except maybe here in Washington or to billionaires who demand their way or the highway.

Opponents also argue that our amendment protects incumbents. This, again, misses the point. If anything, the current system favors incumbents. Raising \$10 million, \$15 million, or \$20 million for a Senate seat is a tall order—one many qualified candidates will decline. If a person is elected, it is just the beginning of this endless campaign cycle to compete, to keep up, to raise more money. Every Member in this body can speak to the hours on the phone dialing for dollars when our time could be better spent meeting the real needs of our constituents and serving the folks who sent us here in the first place.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. I ask unanimous consent for 1 more minute to sum up.

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

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. President, this is not about free speech, and the American people know it. It is about the wealthiest interests trying to buy elections in secret, with no limits, period. That is it.

Let me finally say that I have had a great group of Senators working with me on this amendment over the years. One of them we are going to hear from right now—Senator BERNIE SANDERS from Vermont. All of us—Senator LEAHY, Senator DURBIN on the Judiciary Committee—have worked and refined this amendment to do everything we can to make sure that it is responsive to the American people and that it will make us responsive to the American people in terms of having a good, solid electoral system other than the one the Supreme Court is leading us down the path with.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, let me begin by thanking Senator TOM UDALL for his extraordinary work over the years in calling attention to this disastrous Supreme Court decision called *Citizens United* which is doing so much to undermine the foundations of American democracy. It has been a pleasure working with him, and we will continue to fight.

My colleagues may not know it by reading the newspapers or watching TV, but this week we are going to be having a debate on what I consider to be the most important domestic issue facing the United States of America; that is, whether this great country retains its democratic foundations—one person, one vote—or whether we move into an oligarchic form of society where a small handful of billionaires is able to control not only the economic life of our Nation but the political life as well.

Whether one is a Democrat, whether one is a Republican, or whether one is—as the Presiding Officer and I are—an Independent, the overwhelming majority of the American people do not believe free speech has anything to do with billionaires being able to buy elections.

The Washington Post reported earlier this week that one family, the Koch brothers—a family worth \$80 billion—has already put on the air some 44,000 ads, and this campaign has 2 months left to it—44,000 ads. America is supposed to be about debates on issues. It is not supposed to be a process where a billionaire can come into a small State such as Maine or Vermont and plop \$50 million down or \$20 million down to elect candidates whose sole job in life is to represent the wealthy and the powerful.

Men and women have put their lives on the line and died to defend American democracy—the right for all of us to be involved in the political process, not to create a situation where a handful of superwealthy families can elect the candidates they want.

I think some people, when they hear about *Citizens United*, say: Well, it is kind of an esoteric issue; it is not really relevant to my life.

Those who believe that are dead wrong. If people are concerned about the collapse of the middle class; if people are concerned about the fact that more people today are living in poverty than at any time in American history; if people are concerned about the fact that we have more wealth and income inequality in America today than any other major country on Earth; if people are concerned that we are the only major country on Earth without national health care, guaranteeing health care to all people; if people are concerned about the crisis of global warming and many other issues, people have to be interested in the issue of *Citizens United* and how we elect Members of the House and Senate and Governors, and so forth and so on, because ultimately what this is about is whether the wealthy can determine the agenda of the House and the Senate, whether they can say to candidates: Here it is—we are going to put \$50 million into your campaign, and all you have to do is support us on A, B, C, D, and E. You have to make sure the rich get more tax breaks—despite the fact that the wealthy are doing phenomenally well. You have to make sure we cut food stamps or education or we eliminate the Environmental Protection Agency. That is why we are giving you the money we are giving you.

People do not spend hundreds of millions of dollars on campaigns for fun, for the hell of it; they are spending money because they have an agenda. And the billionaire agenda is not the agenda of the American people.

I wish to read for a moment exact language from the 1980 Libertarian Party, whose Vice Presidential campaign and major funder was one David

Koch—one of the two Koch brothers. What I am going to read to my colleagues today is what I believe remains their agenda today because I see no evidence that it has changed.

When we turn on the TV and we see an ad coming from one of the Koch brothers' organizations, know what they stand for.

"We favor the abolishment of Medicare and Medicaid programs."

That doesn't mean cutting them; that means ending them.

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

That does not mean they are opposed to raising the minimum wage, which many of us want to do; they want to do away with Social Security entirely—not cut Social Security but do away with it.

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

What that means in English is that while we are trying to raise the minimum wage, they want to abolish the concept of the minimum wage. So in high-unemployment areas, an employer can pay a worker \$3 an hour or \$4 an hour.

This is also from the Koch brothers' platform: "We oppose all government welfare, relief projects, and aid to the poor programs. All of these government programs are privacy-invading, paternalistic, demeaning, and inefficient. The proper source of help for such persons is the voluntary efforts of private groups and individuals."

That means goodbye to good jobs, nutrition programs, Federal aid to education, and goodbye to unemployment insurance.

This is not a conservative agenda. This is not a small-government agenda. This is an extremist agenda designed to eliminate virtually every piece of legislation passed by Congress in the last 80 years which protects the middle class, working families, low-income people, seniors, and the system. That is their agenda.

I am not saying every Republican adheres to every aspect of this agenda, but these guys are pouring hundreds of millions of dollars into the political process for a reason, and that reason is to make the wealthiest people in this country even wealthier while they do away with all legislation that protects working families.

Citizens United is one of the worst decisions in the history of the U.S. Supreme Court. I hope every Member of the Senate votes this week to start the process for a constitutional amendment to overturn Citizens United.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

#### REMEMBERING TRUETT CATHY

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, today the State of Georgia lost a great citizen and America lost a great patriot.

Truett Cathy, 93 years old, the founder of Chick-fil-A restaurants, passed away this morning. One of the great entrepreneurs of all time, Truett Cathy started a restaurant called the Dwarf House in College Park, GA, years and years ago. He turned it into the Chick-fil-A restaurant, which now has over 1,800 restaurants in 40 States and the District of Columbia. It is a family-owned business. It is not a public corporation. It is a business that is built on the principles that Truett Cathy believed in and believed in to this day. Truett Cathy's stores are never open on Sunday. He is a devout Christian and believes Sunday is a day of rest. So he operates 6 out of the 7 days. Everybody who competes with Truett Cathy operates for 7 days. But everybody who competes with Truett Cathy finishes second in gross sales, second in quality, and second in the line.

Truett Cathy was an extra-special man whose life has been a great tribute to all the right things in life that all of us believe in.

Truett Cathy also gave back to his community probably more than any other person I know of. He founded WinShape Homes, WinShape to build boys, WinShape to take children who could not find a foster parent, put them in a home and turned their life around. He was a prolific writer of book after book after book about his belief in life. His greatest book is one I gave to each Member of the Senate about 5 years ago: "It's Better to Build Boys than Mend Men." Because he knew the citizens of our country would be better if we had good foundations from the beginning. So he tried to make sure all those who were less fortunate, who did not have the advantages he or others had, had a chance to grow up in a home with a warm and nurturing environment, a Christian environment, an environment that was dedicated to the principles of this country, and freedom and democracy.

Atlanta and Georgia will miss Truett Cathy. He is irreplaceable. It is said that nobody is irreplaceable. Truett Cathy is. But the legacy and the legend he built and his restaurants will go on as a flagship for everything that is right about free enterprise and about the United States of America.

On this day on the floor of the Senate, to his family and to his legion of friends and to all he stood for and stands for, I mourn the loss of Truett Cathy, a great American and a great citizen.

I urge everybody, when they get the chance, to read the story of his life, because it is the story of the American way of life. It is the story of principles you are committed to, vision you hope for, taking a risk to try and create a reward, and giving back to the community when you earn the money from that reward, to see to it you leave this world a better place than you found it.

For America and Georgia today, Truett Cathy has left us. He has gone to a much better place. But he has left

our city, our State, and our country a better place than what he found. May God bless the life of Truett Cathy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

(The remarks of Mr. NELSON pertaining to the introduction of S.J. Res. 42 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

#### CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

Mr. ROBERTS. This evening the Senate will vote on whether it should proceed to the consideration of a constitutional amendment that would, of all things, alter the Bill of Rights. Specifically, it seeks to amend the First Amendment to permit this Congress to regulate the speech and political activity of American citizens.

As written, the First Amendment does not permit regulation of the sort the majority wishes to impose, so they have decided to rewrite it. This is incredible and a sad demonstration of the lengths to which this majority is willing to go in its quest to retain power.

It is particularly sad when you realize that in just over 2 weeks we will be celebrating the anniversary of the Senate action that made ratification of the First Amendment possible. It was on September 25, 1789, that this body passed the first 10 amendments to the Constitution of the United States. That was 225 years ago. The ratification process was completed when Virginia became the 11th State to approve the amendments on December 15, 1791.

Since then, for over two centuries, the First Amendment has guaranteed all Americans will have the right to express themselves and participate in the political process without fear of government reprisal. While other nations have struggled to build and sustain democracy, the liberties guaranteed by our Constitution have given us a stability that allowed the United States of America to grow, to prosper, and to become a beacon of freedom around the globe.

Our Founders knew that the free expression of ideas was essential to the life and health of our democracy. Many other nations have yet to learn this lesson and still punish and imprison their citizens for daring to speak out and challenge those in power.

That does not happen here because of the system our Founders gave us. It does not happen because of the First Amendment. These things should be obvious. We might even call them self-evident. One would think that even in these polarized times we would have a consensus or could have a consensus on the wisdom of the Founders on this point.

You would think that Senators on both sides of the aisle would recognize and agree that the First Amendment, which has preserved our liberty, must itself be preserved.

I am very sorry to say that if you thought that, you would be wrong. I am very sorry to say that as we stand here today in September 2014 those on the other side of the aisle now want to reverse the decision this body made that September 225 years ago. Forty-nine Members of the majority have chosen to cosponsor S.J. Res. 19, an amendment to the Bill of Rights.

I am pleased to say that not a single one of my Republican colleagues has joined them, but I am saddened that so many of those across the aisle have taken the extraordinary step of supporting it.

I think the reason is clear. They want to silence their opponents. The First Amendment does not allow them to do so, so they are going to try and change it.

The First Amendment begins with "Congress shall make no law"—for a reason. Our Founders knew a great deal about human nature. They knew that those in power would be inclined to retain it and unless constrained would use their power to punish those who would seek to challenge them or remove them from office.

The First Amendment denies us that power. It explicitly prohibits this Congress from passing laws that restrict the speech of the American people.

Now the majority wants to remove that prohibition. They want to grant themselves the power to control speech, to silence their opposition.

We will hear from the other side that there is nothing to worry about, that all they wish to do is impose reasonable regulations.

Of course, the point of the First Amendment is to prevent this Congress from making determinations about what speech is reasonable—and, therefore, permitted—and what is unreasonable and, therefore, prohibited. We don't need to speculate about what the majority will deem reasonable and what it will deem unreasonable.

As I described at a recent Rules Committee hearing on the DISCLOSE Act, prior consideration of that legislation has shown us what the majority regards as reasonable. The DISCLOSE Act is the majority's most recent version of their now biannual attempt to create a new regulatory structure to deter speech. It is precisely the kind of legislation we can expect to see more of if the majority grants itself the power to regulate speech through the amendment we are debating today.

So with past as prologue, let us recall what happened when the DISCLOSE Act was considered by the House in 2010. Not surprisingly, the restrictions and obligations it imposed were applied to groups disfavored by the majority at that time. A number of corporations were simply prohibited from speaking. Government contractors and TARP recipients were prohibited from making independent expenditures.

During floor consideration an amendment was added also to prohibit speech by companies that explore and produce

oil and gas on the Outer Continental Shelf. The bill was on the floor soon after the Deepwater Horizon spill, so this was an easy target.

Not surprisingly, the majority thought it was perfectly reasonable to prevent any of these companies from speaking but did not think it was necessary to extend those restrictions to the unions that might represent the workforce in these companies. Republican amendments to extend the restrictions to those unions were rejected. The majority did not find them reasonable, apparently.

In some cases groups were excluded from the disclosure obligation solely because the votes were not there to include them. That is what happens once the Congress starts imposing speech restrictions—restrictions get applied to whoever doesn't have enough votes in the Congress to prevent them. Imposing speech regulations based on the whims of whatever party happens to be in the majority in the Congress at a given time is not reasonable, but it is exactly what happens once we start down this path and the majority has not deviated from it.

The Rules Committee hearing revealed the DISCLOSE Act continues to exempt groups sympathetic to the majority from the obligations it would impose on others.

It may be a natural impulse to wish those who are criticizing us would stop—everybody understands that—but the First Amendment does not allow us to make it stop. We should not have the power to silence our critics and we should never have it.

I know many Members on the other side of the aisle are upset about the ads that are attacking them and their agenda. I know they want those ads to stop. Well, we don't get to choose who gets to speak.

The proponents of this amendment and the critics of the Citizens United decision are clearly exercised by the prospects of corporate speech. It is obvious they fear how such speech might influence public policy debate in this country and their own electoral prospects. They have decided these voices should not be heard and must be suppressed.

They claim to be motivated only by a desire to promote the health of this democracy. They claim they just want all voices to be heard and want to make sure powerful corporations do not drown out the voices of others.

This claim is belied by one simple fact that there are and always have been powerful and wealthy corporations that have exerted enormous influence over our politics in this country and in our culture even. But the majority has not had a problem with them. I am speaking, of course, of media corporations. They were never limited by the electioneering restrictions imposed on other corporations. The Citizens United decision simply leveled the playing field and ended that nonsensical distinction.

That logical and constitutional result alarms the majority, though, because they fear that other corporations may not be as sympathetic to them as media corporations have been. They therefore regard it as perfectly reasonable to allow media corporations to say whatever they want, while at the same time regarding it as intolerable that other corporations be permitted to do the same.

While the amendment they propose would allow them to prohibit speech by any corporation—including the media—we can expect their allies will continue to enjoy the right to free expression. Their opponents, however, will be targeted. Those whose views align with the majority should draw no comfort from this fact though. Majorities do change. The whole point of the First Amendment is to ensure that the people's right to speak is not dependent on the whims of whatever majority happens to be in power at a given time in the Senate.

People have a right to express themselves and that right is not limited to whatever this body might deem to be reasonable.

We have a free marketplace of ideas. We do not entrust this Congress with the power to decide what ideas will get expressed or how much they will be expressed. Again, we don't entrust this Congress with the power to decide what ideas will get expressed or how much they will be expressed.

The majority proposes this amendment because they want that power, but they should never have it, and neither should any future majority. We have already seen from the rule change they imposed unilaterally only a few months ago that this majority is willing to jettison longstanding traditions and practices for short-term political gain. This mentality has already done serious and possibly irreparable damage to this body, but apparently destruction of the Senate rules will not suffice. Now the Constitution itself must yield. The interests of the majority are paramount and everything—even our most basic principles—must be sacrificed on the altar of the majority.

Well, thankfully, the rules for ratification cannot be discarded as easily as the rules of this body. To ensure against precisely what the majority wishes to do—to alter the Constitution for their own benefit—the Founders made it very hard to amend. Two-thirds of each House of Congress must agree to an amendment. Then three-quarters of the States must ratify it. That is just not going to happen.

But the fact that they will not succeed does not mean that we should not take their threat seriously. To even begin down this path shows a remarkable contempt for our political traditions and founding documents. It reveals the desperation of the majority and at the same time it reveals the wisdom of our Founders. In seeking to amend the First Amendment to protect

themselves, the majority reminds us again how lucky we are to live in a country with a Constitution that prevents such abuses.

I am profoundly grateful for the wisdom of the Founders and proud to stand here today to defend the First Amendment that they gave us.

I will oppose this amendment today, tomorrow, and forever, and I ask my colleagues to do the same.

I suggest the absence of a quorum, and I ask unanimous consent that the time be charged equally to both parties.

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

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### EXPRESSING THE CONDOLENCES OF THE SENATE TO THE FAMILIES OF JAMES FOLEY AND STEVEN SOTLOFF

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, these last few weeks have been very trying for America. In August, as the result of the cowardly and barbaric acts of the terrorist group ISIS, America lost two courageous and inspiring journalists, James Foley and Steven Sotloff.

Along with my colleagues Senators AYOTTE, NELSON, and RUBIO, and Chairman MENENDEZ, I am submitting a resolution to honor the lives of James Foley, who was born and raised in New Hampshire, and Steven Sotloff, a Florida native but a graduate of Kimball Union Academy in Meriden, NH.

Our resolution mourns James and Steven, two outstanding journalists who pursued their profession under the most difficult and dangerous conditions in order to tell the stories that needed to be told of the struggles that people on the ground were facing in the middle of difficult conflicts. We will never forget the bravery of James and Steven and their dedication to the ideals of freedom they so embodied.

Our resolution strongly condemns the terrorist group ISIS, a group that has committed unspeakable atrocities against humanity and attempted to justify them through a perverted interpretation of Islam. ISIS fighters have targeted Iraqi Christians, killing many and forcing others to flee their ancient homeland, they have massacred Muslims who do not subscribe to their depraved ideology, they have threatened genocide against the ancient Yazidi population of Iraq, and they have targeted other religious and ethnic minority groups. They have threatened to conduct terrorist attacks internationally, including here in the United States. And of course ISIS brutally murdered these two American journalists, Jim Foley and Steven Sotloff.

Let us be clear. We must hold ISIS accountable for their despicable acts.

We must vigorously pursue those responsible and bring them to justice, and we must not let the deaths of these two Americans go unanswered. The terrorists who murdered Jim Foley are deeply mistaken if they think their barbaric acts will lessen Americans' resolve and pave the way for ISIS to continue terrorizing. We will bring an end to those who stand against everything these men stood for.

I hope the entire Senate—Republicans, Democrats, and Independents—will stand together to adopt this resolution. Let us show the world our Nation is united in its commemoration of the lives of James Foley and Steven Sotloff, and in our condemnation of the barbaric group that took these Americans from us.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### PRYOR NOMINATION

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, in about 19 minutes the Senate will exercise one of its constitutional responsibilities of advice and consent to President Obama on the appointment of Jill A. Pryor to be a U.S. Circuit Judge for the Eleventh Circuit of Georgia. I urge all of my colleagues to vote favorably for Ms. Pryor, a lawyer from the city of Atlanta and the State of Georgia, a great nominee and a great appointee.

As I make this recommendation, I want the Chamber to know loudly and clearly that I praise the President and his staff—particularly Kathy Ruemmler—for the job they did in coordinating with Senator CHAMBLISS and myself in seeking advice and consent to come up with a series of appointees to the district and circuit courts of Georgia.

Jill Pryor is an outstanding lawyer and an outstanding attorney. She is a graduate of William & Mary and Yale University, and was editor of the Yale Law Review.

An outstanding jurist and an outstanding person, she has practiced and specialized in business law, representing plaintiffs and defendants—not in the same case, I might add—in the areas of business torts, corporate governance, and shareholder disputes, class actions, trade secrets, fraud, intellectual property fraud, and the Georgia and Federal RICO statutes.

She is an outstanding member of the firm of Bondurant, Mixson & Elmore, and clerked for an Eleventh Circuit judge when she got out of Yale University Law School. She is an outstanding individual of impeccable credentials, impeccable integrity, and will be a

great credit to the Federal bench of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit.

I commend her to each of my colleagues here today with my highest recommendation, and I again thank the President of the United States and his staff for their cooperation in nominating a superior judge to the Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and I ask unanimous consent that the time be equally divided.

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

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

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

#### CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, with all the problems facing the country and the world, the majority has decided the time has come to cut back on the Bill of Rights to be amended for the first time in our history.

We hear from the other side repeatedly that they revere the Constitution. But they want to restrict the core of free speech. That is speech that allows a self-governing people to choose in elections the people who will represent them. This proposed amendment would enshrine in our Constitution the ability of elected officials to criminally punish those who would dare to criticize them more than the elected officials think is reasonable.

Today Americans are free to spend unlimited money on behalf of candidates and political issues and messages of their choice. The amendment being proposed would put those who would engage in political speech on notice that they may be prosecuted for being active citizens in our democracy. That threat of criminal prosecution would not just chill speech, it would freeze political speech. This proposed amendment would be the biggest threat to free speech that Congress would have enacted since the Alien and Sedition Acts of 1798.

The First Amendment creates a marketplace of ideas. When people disagree on political speech, competing voices respond to each other and the public then decides. When speech is free, people are not shut up with the threat of jail if the government thinks they speak too much.

Since the 1970s, the Supreme Court has ruled repeatedly that because effective speech can only occur through the expenditure of money, government cannot restrict campaign expenditures by candidates or anybody else. The Court has recognized that effective campaign speech requires that individuals have the right to form groups that

might actually spend money on campaign speech.

The proposed amendment is very radical. It would not overturn just 1 or 2 but it would overturn 12 Supreme Court decisions. That was the testimony before the Judiciary Committee of the country's foremost First Amendment lawyer, Floyd Abrams.

The other side may think the Senate can simply filibuster the motion to proceed and then move on to some other political vote they may want to have us take. Proposals to amend our fundamental charter of liberty, the Bill of Rights, should be treated more seriously. We should have debate on this important amendment. The majority should be made to answer for why they want to silence their critics under threat of criminal prosecution.

I look forward to supporting the vote to move to that debate, and I now yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

#### PRYOR NOMINATION

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the nomination of Jill Pryor to serve as circuit judge for the Eleventh Judicial Circuit.

Ms. Pryor's educational pedigree is beyond reproach. She worked to put herself through college at William & Mary, graduating phi beta kappa. She then went on to Yale Law School where she was the senior editor in chief of the Yale Law Journal. After finishing law school she clerked for Judge Edmundson on the Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals in Atlanta, the very court for which she is today being considered.

Once she finished her clerkship, she decided to stay in Atlanta in private practice, where she has been practicing for the last 25 years. During that time she has played a pivotal role in some of the largest, most complex cases in the history of our legal system and in our great State of Georgia. But like any other well-rounded attorney, Ms. Pryor has taken time to give back outside the courtroom. She is currently on the State Bar of Georgia Board of Governors, and she is also on the Board of Governors of the Georgia Legal Services Program. She is the former chair of the appellate practice section of the State bar, and she is a past president of the Georgia Association for Women Lawyers.

The Eleventh Circuit will be well served by the addition of Ms. Pryor, and as I said in July before the Senate unanimously confirmed Judge Julie Carnes to this very same court, this is a vacancy that needs to be filled and needs to be filled quickly. Ms. Pryor certainly has the judicial as well as educational background to serve on the Eleventh Circuit. She has done extensive work inside the courtroom as well as at the appellate level, and she is well qualified to now go to the Eleventh Circuit.

I am pleased to speak on behalf of this highly qualified nominee, and I urge my colleagues to vote in support of Jill Pryor to the Eleventh Circuit judicial court.

Thank you very much. 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. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

#### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

#### NOMINATION OF JILL A. PRYOR TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Jill A. Pryor, of Georgia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eleventh Circuit.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today we will finally vote on the confirmation of Jill Pryor of Georgia to fill a judicial emergency vacancy on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the 11th Circuit. Her nomination has been pending in the Senate since February 2012—more than two and one-half years, which is longer than any other currently pending judicial nominee. She received the American Bar Association's highest rating of unanimously well qualified and has the support of both of her Republican home State Senators—Senator CHAMBLISS and Senator ISAKSON. Rather than vote to confirm her before the August recess, some Senate Republicans continued their senseless obstruction to keep the Senate from fulfilling its constitutional duty of advice and consent by filibustering her nomination for the sake of delay.

Despite this unyielding partisan strategy, the Senate has made great strides to fill vacancies on courts around the Nation. This year the Senate has confirmed 61 nominees to the circuit and district courts and in doing so, it has hit an historic milestone for diversity on the Federal appeals courts. More women and people of color are serving on the Federal appellate bench than ever before. Today I am happy that we will add to this laudable record with yet another well-qualified nominee.

From the outset, President Obama has understood that our Federal courts

should reflect the diverse communities that it serves. He has nominated more women and more lawyers of color than any previous President in American history. Since the first day of the Obama administration, former Senate staffer Christopher Kang has worked with home State Senators to implement President Obama's goal of finding judicial nominees who not only embody the necessary integrity, intellect, and commitment to the rule of law, but who are also drawn from diverse backgrounds. I urge my fellow Senators to vote to confirm Jill Pryor of Georgia and to agree to votes on the remaining district court judges on the calendar without delay.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Jill A. Pryor, of Georgia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eleventh Circuit?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) is necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) and the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI).

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

The result was announced—yeas 97, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 257 Ex.]

#### YEAS—97

Alexander	Graham	Murray
Ayotte	Grassley	Nelson
Baldwin	Hagan	Paul
Barrasso	Harkin	Portman
Begich	Hatch	Pryor
Bennet	Heinrich	Reed
Blumenthal	Heitkamp	Reid
Booker	Heller	Risch
Boozman	Hirono	Roberts
Boxer	Hoeven	Rockefeller
Brown	Inhofe	Rubio
Burr	Isakson	Sanders
Cantwell	Johanns	Schatz
Cardin	Johnson (SD)	Schumer
Carper	Johnson (WI)	Scott
Casey	Kaine	Sessions
Chambliss	King	Shaheen
Coats	Kirk	Shelby
Coburn	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Cochran	Landrieu	Tester
Collins	Leahy	Thune
Coons	Lee	Toomey
Corker	Levin	Udall (CO)
Cornyn	Manchin	Udall (NM)
Crapo	Markey	Vitter
Cruz	McCain	Walsh
Donnelly	McCaskill	Warner
Durbin	McConnell	Warren
Enzi	Menendez	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Merkley	Wicker
Fischer	Mikulski	Wyden
Flake	Moran	
Franken	Murphy	

#### NOT VOTING—3

Blunt	Gillibrand	Murkowski
-------	------------	-----------

The nomination was confirmed.

# NOMINATION OF HENRY J. AARON TO BE A MEMBER OF THE SO- CIAL SECURITY ADVISORY BOARD

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the first nomination.

The bill clerk reported the nomination of Henry J. Aaron, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Social Security Advisory Board for a term expiring September 30, 2014.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is now 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote on confirmation.

The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, at an important time for the Social Security program, the Senate now votes on three nominations to the Social Security Advisory Board which the Congress established to provide critical input and perspective on the Social Security Program. All three of these nominees are very well qualified, and they are strong and independent thinkers.

The first is Dr. Henry Aaron. Dr. Aaron is one of America's foremost experts on Social Security. His many publications and contributions to the program make him an invaluable asset. I strongly urge Senators to support his confirmation on this bipartisan board.

The second is one of the Senate's own, Dr. Alan Cohen, a veteran economist of the Finance Committee staff. He will be an excellent board member.

The third is Dr. Lanhee Chen. Dr. Chen has a particularly commendable academic record.

I yield the additional time to Senator CARDIN, who has great expertise on Social Security.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I support all three of these nominations, but I want to talk a moment about Dr. Henry Aaron. I have had a chance to work over my legislative career with Dr. Aaron. I do not know of a person who is more qualified to serve on this board. He has been involved with Social Security his entire professional life dating back to 1979 when he chaired the Advisory Council on Social Security, which is a bipartisan group that works on Social Security.

He is an individual who will work across party lines in order to deal with the short-term and long-term needs of Social Security. He is currently the Bruce and Virginia MacLaury senior fellow in economic studies at Brookings, a fellow faculty member at the University of Maryland, Stanford University. He is very well qualified.

I know personally of his commitment to work with all Members of the Senate.

I urge my colleagues to support all three of these nominees.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I yield the floor and urge their confirmation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Henry J. Aaron, of the District of Columbia, to

be a member of the Social Security Advisory Board for a term expiring September 30, 2014?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) is necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) and the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI).

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

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 43, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 258 Ex.]

## YEAS—54

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

## NAYS—43

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

## NOT VOTING—3

Blunt	Gillibrand	Murkowski
-------	------------	-----------

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, have we finished all of our work on the last vote?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The last vote has concluded.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we are now going to have three voice votes on nominations. There will be one more rollcall vote tonight. That is it.

# NOMINATION OF HENRY J. AARON TO BE A MEMBER OF THE SO- CIAL SECURITY ADVISORY BOARD

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the second nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Henry J. Aaron, of the District of Co-

lumbia, to be a Member of the Social Security Advisory Board for a term expiring September 30, 2020.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is now 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote on the Aaron nomination.

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

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

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Henry J. Aaron, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the Social Security Advisory Board for a term expiring September 30, 2020?

The nomination was confirmed.

# NOMINATION OF ALAN L. COHEN TO BE A MEMBER OF THE SO- CIAL SECURITY ADVISORY BOARD

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the Cohen nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Alan L. Cohen, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Social Security Advisory Board for a term expiring September 30, 2016.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is now 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote on the Cohen nomination.

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

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

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Alan L. Cohen, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Social Security Advisory Board for a term expiring September 30, 2016?

The nomination was confirmed.

# NOMINATION OF LANHEE J. CHEN TO BE A MEMBER OF THE SO- CIAL SECURITY ADVISORY BOARD

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the Chen nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Lanhee J. Chen, of California, to be a Member of the Social Security Advisory Board for a term expiring September 30, 2018.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is now 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote on the Chen nomination.

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

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

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Lanhee J. Chen, of California, to be a Member of the Social Security Advisory Board for a term expiring September 30, 2018?

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, with respect to those nominations confirmed, the motions to reconsider are considered made

and laid upon the table and the President shall be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will resume legislative session.

### CLOTURE MOTION

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to calendar No. 471, S.J. Res. 19, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to contributions and expenditures intended to affect elections.

Harry Reid, Patrick J. Leahy, Tom Udall, Debbie Stabenow, Christopher Murphy, Christopher A. Coons, Charles E. Schumer, John D. Rockefeller, IV, Maria Cantwell, Patty Murray, Dianne Feinstein, Bill Nelson, Tom Harkin, Richard J. Durbin, Sheldon Whitehouse, Al Franken, Amy Klobuchar.

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

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to S.J. Res. 19, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to contributions and expenditures intended to affect elections, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) is necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) and the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI).

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 79, nays 18, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 259 Leg.]

#### YEAS—79

Alexander	Corker	Johnson (SD)
Ayotte	Cornyn	Kaine
Baldwin	Donnelly	King
Begich	Durbin	Kirk
Bennet	Feinstein	Klobuchar
Blumenthal	Fischer	Landrieu
Booker	Flake	Leahy
Boozman	Franken	Levin
Boxer	Graham	Manchin
Brown	Grassley	Markey
Burr	Hagan	McCain
Cantwell	Harkin	McCaskill
Cardin	Hatch	McConnell
Carper	Heinrich	Menendez
Casey	Heitkamp	Merkley
Coats	Heller	Mikulski
Cochran	Hirono	Moran
Collins	Hooven	Murphy
Coons	Johanns	Murray

Nelson	Schumer	Walsh
Pryor	Sessions	Warner
Reed	Shaheen	Warren
Reid	Stabenow	Whitehouse
Rockefeller	Tester	Wicker
Rubio	Udall (CO)	Wyden
Sanders	Udall (NM)	
Schatz	Vitter	

#### NAYS—18

Barrasso	Inhofe	Risch
Chambliss	Isakson	Roberts
Coburn	Johnson (WI)	Scott
Crapo	Lee	Shelby
Cruz	Paul	Thune
Enzi	Portman	Toomey

#### NOT VOTING—3

Blunt	Gillibrand	Murkowski
-------	------------	-----------

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas are 79, the nays are 18. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

### PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES RELATING TO CONTRIBUTIONS AND EXPENDITURES INTENDED TO AFFECT ELECTIONS—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be able to speak as in morning business for 15 minutes.

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

(The remarks of Mr. INHOFE pertaining to the introduction of S.J. Res. 43 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

#### NDAA

Mr. INHOFE. There is another issue I wish to talk about, and I have talked to our leader, Chairman LEVIN, on the Armed Services Committee. There are several members of the Armed Services Committee, including the chair, on the floor.

I think we wanted a vote on what happened last year. Last year we did not pass an NDAA—keep in mind we passed an NDAA every year for 52 years. Perhaps, in my narrow view, I think it is the most significant bill we address every year.

Now we have this year's NDAA that we passed on May 22. It passed our committee 25 to 1. It had the overwhelming support of Democrats and Republicans to go ahead and have an NDAA bill. Chairman LEVIN and I have come to the floor and begged our colleagues to send down amendments if they want. We have several amendments now, a couple hundred amendments. We are looking those over. We are going to try to see what can go into a managers' amendment, and maybe we can come up with something. I am hoping we can do it before the election, to come up with a bill that will consider the amendments. If we were able to say to the Democrats and Republicans in this vote that we would restrict it to "X" number of amendments, 3, 5, 6

amendments on each side, then I believe our leader would allow this to come to the floor so we could have an NDAA vote.

I have a number; 140 amendments have already been filed. The staff has been working over the August recess to put together a managers' package that is going to consider varieties of all these 140 amendments, but we need more. What I don't want to happen is in the last minute everyone comes up and says: Wait a minute. I have amendments and I want to have them included. Now is the time to do it.

We have thousands of men and women serving today in harm's way, risking their lives for us, for our Nation, and they are dealing with the most complex and volatile global security environments I have ever seen in my life. We rely on them to do their job to keep our Nation safe and they should rely on us to do the same.

Let's remember what happened last year. Last year we didn't do it and we came up to the year-end, and it wasn't until then we decided we were not going to be able to do it in the legitimate way that we have been doing for 52 years. And so I happened to be the ranking member of the minority, and of course we have Chairman LEVIN and we had the two on the House side. The big four got together in a room, took all the amendments that had been considered, weeded through them, satisfied most of the people, and in 3 hours we designed a bill, brought it out to the floor and passed it on the 26th of December. Now we have gone beyond that. We have gone to December 31.

We have kids out there risking their lives without hazard pay, without reenlistment bonuses. It costs some \$15 million to train a fighter in the air to the standards of an F-22, and the reenlistment bonus would be about \$200,000. So the economics are there. Assuming we had gone beyond that point, it would have been an absolute disaster.

So I am pleading with all of our Members on the Republican side and on the Democratic side to do what is necessary to bring their amendments down to the floor.

The President recently submitted an OCO request for \$59 billion to fund operations in Afghanistan and around the world. The request includes a new \$4 billion counterterrorism partnership fund and \$1 billion for the European re-assurance funds. Many questions remain about these funds. I have questions about it. I haven't talked to one member of our Senate Armed Services Committee who knows the details of this request.

We are the ones who should be doing this. These are measures we can include in the NDAA, and I am going to ask and plead with our fellow Members on the Democratic and Republican side to get your amendments in and let's go ahead and let us take a number of amendments on each side so we can have the ability to do it the way it should be done.

The only alternative is to do what we did last year, and that doesn't include anyone except four people in the House and Senate.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### RECOGNIZING THE MARSHFIELD HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, true to their Vermont roots, the citizens of Marshfield, VT, are bringing to fruition a new vision for the Marshfield Historical Society, an organization dedicated to preserving—and sharing—the long history of this 44-square mile town in the foothills of Vermont, just outside our State capital of Montpelier.

In the late 17th century, the land that came to be known as Marshfield was home to the Abenaki. Then, just as now, its inhabitants enjoyed the Winooski River to fish and the surrounding hills to hunt. Marshfield is a community that upholds tradition and passes stories from generation to generation. The land is clearly different than it was centuries ago, but these customs can make it difficult to notice the sometimes subtle changes Marshfield has borne. Creating a public space to commemorate the town's past is the mission of the Marshfield Historical Society.

On September 12, with the support of the Vermont Historical Society, the Marshfield Historical Society will host its grand opening, a reopening of sorts. In concert with the support of the local Selectboard, the Jaquith Public Library, a generous anonymous donor, the perseverance of a dedicated core of volunteers, and, of course, the residents of Marshfield, the history of this small but vibrant town will now be accessible to the public. Local artifacts and memorabilia, cloistered for years, will be publicly accessible in the Old Schoolhouse Common. The Marshfield Historical Society is returning to the residents of Marshfield their own history.

The Marshfield Historical Society owes much to the memory of Hap Hayward, a longtime resident, who was an original inspiration for the establishment of a local historical society. The society's new site, organized content,

and new exhibits will surely attract visitors and locals. Some of their most noteworthy collections include a rare copy of Militia Law of the State of Vermont from 1843, as well as an extensive collection of postcards of Marshfield buildings and landscapes. These artifacts belong to the residents of Marshfield, and to all Vermonters. As a longtime supporter of the historic preservation of our communities, our downtowns and our local histories, I am eager to visit the new historical society.

I congratulate the people of Marshfield on successfully undertaking this impressive effort to protect their history for generations to come.

#### REMEMBERING JAMES FOLEY

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I would like to honor James Foley, a proud son of New Hampshire, whose life was guided by love—love for the humanity he devoted his life to documenting, love for his family members who worked tirelessly to secure his release, and love for God who brought him strength and comfort, even in the darkest moments.

The entire Nation was saddened to hear the news about Jim. It was with a heavy heart that I joined the Foley family and a crowd of nearly 1,000 on August 24 at Our Lady of the Holy Rosary parish in Rochester, NH, to memorialize Jim and reflect upon how he chose to live his life.

As we here pause to remember Jim, we cannot allow those responsible for his death to fill us with sorrow and despair. Though the sense of loss remains, through Jim's life we may hope to rediscover a sense of optimism and goodness—the same feelings that motivated him as a journalist to search for humanity in the world's darkest and most dangerous places.

When I think of Jim, I will remember his fierce passion for his work and for the people whose stories he lived to tell. I will remember the interminable spirit of his parents, Diane and John. And I will remember how New Hampshire, and Americans across the country, came together to support the Foleys.

Jim Foley's life began in Wolfeboro, a small New Hampshire town on the shores of Lake Winnepesaukee. He graduated in 1992 from Kingswood Regional High School, where classmates remember him as light-hearted, but also caring and eager to see the world. As the oldest of Diane and John Foley's five children, James developed a strong sense of responsibility for others.

Jim was known in his family for running late because wherever he went he ran into friends and colleagues who wanted to stop and catch up with him. Jim's uncommon kindness earned him the trust and friendship of people across the United States and the world.

Jim's compassion for others and his desire to learn their stories is what motivated his life's work. According to

his parents, Jim's exposure to the poverty of inner-city Milwaukee while attending Marquette University led him to realize that people are often shaped by events and circumstances out of their control, and that it was within his power to tell their stories.

He carried this mission with him throughout his life and used it as a basis for his work in conflict zones.

After graduating from Marquette, Jim started down the path that would turn him into the successful journalist he became. He first taught history for 3 years at middle school in Phoenix, AZ, a world away from his upbringing in the Lakes Region of New Hampshire.

Eager to learn how best to turn his experiences into compelling stories, he went on to complete master's degrees in writing and journalism at the University of Massachusetts-Amherst and Northwestern University. Classmates of Jim's at Northwestern recall that when one of his professors assigned him to cover a neighborhood in the Lower West Side of Chicago, Jim decided to move there, a telling decision for a future frontline journalist.

Jim later gained experience in conflict reporting while covering U.S. military operations as an embedded reporter in Iraq and Afghanistan, but he worried that being removed from the local population detracted from his reporting to people back home.

When a wave of popular revolutions swept the Middle East and North Africa in the spring of 2011, Jim knew that he needed to bear witness to this incredible phenomenon from the perspective of those living through it.

Jim left for Libya, where he provided critical stories on the Libyan civil war until he was captured and imprisoned for 44 days by pro-Gadhafi forces.

Others who were detained with Jim tell stories of his unending selflessness toward his fellow prisoners—how he shared food, blankets and an endless stream of jokes to help everyone cope with a difficult and scary situation.

Furthermore, when Jim returned to the U.S. after his release, he was frequently asked to tell the story of his capture and detention. Instead of focusing on his own experience, Jim used the publicity to raise money for the family of a colleague who had been killed in the attack that led to Jim's capture. It was Jim's nature to care more about others than he did about his own personal successes or accolades.

In his reporting from Libya, Jim discovered that his passion was in helping the world relate to those in the middle of unimaginable conflict, and he would soon return to the region, this time to Syria, where Bashar al-Assad was escalating his brutal tactics of repression to maintain control of the country.

It was in the Syrian chaos that observers began to talk about rise of a group of militant Islamists calling themselves the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria, the same group that would later hold Jim hostage for 637 days

alongside a handful of other innocent journalists and aid workers.

Thanks to a message Jim passed to his family through a fellow prisoner who was released, we know that his close relationship with God and his family provided him with strength in captivity.

In the letter, he thanked his family and friends for their thoughts and prayers, and recounted treasured memories from time spent together. Most strikingly, he spent most of his words offering encouragement and support to those he loved. Even in the most trying circumstances, Jim Foley refused to abandon his core concern for others over himself.

We will always remember Jim for his compassion and devotion to the lives and stories of others, even in the most difficult conditions.

We are all proud to call James Foley our fellow American.

#### TRIBUTE TO JOHN ARNOLD

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I wish to recognize and congratulate John Arnold and recognize the 47th anniversary of Portable Practical Educational Preparation. This is a noteworthy milestone, an opportunity to recognize them for their remarkable history and the important results they continue to achieve.

The story of Portable Practical Educational Preparation begins with John Arnold and his vision of what could be done to address the problems being faced by the poor and those who came to America in search of a better life. His response was to roll up his sleeves and get to work. He knew an education would be the key these individuals would need to create a better life for themselves and their families. Over the past 47 years the success he began in that and so many other efforts has been nothing short of extraordinary.

The work that began in Arizona proved to be just the beginning. John has since reached out to those in need across the country and around the world. When Hurricane Katrina devastated so many of our Southern States, he was there to help provide those whose lives were forever changed with a reason to hope for a better future because he cared enough to help. His other projects have reached out to people in Africa to provide them with the resources they needed to improve their lives, their communities, and their countries.

As has been said before, John Arnold leads the best way—by example. By so doing, he has provided us with a chance to see what can be done if we are sufficiently motivated and determined to take on the greatest challenge of them all—changing the world—and creative and enthusiastic enough to make it happen.

I want to offer my congratulations to John and all those who have worked with him over the years. He has made so many things happen, and we are all

looking forward to seeing what he will take up in the years to come.

#### NEW HARMONY, INDIANA BICENTENNIAL

Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the outstanding citizens of New Harmony, IN as they celebrate their town's 200th anniversary and to recognize the many contributions of New Harmony's citizens to the great State of Indiana and our Nation as a whole.

New Harmony was founded in 1814 by the Harmonie Society, led by Georg Johann Rapp. Just 5 short years after purchasing land along the Wabash River, the settlers had developed the area into a productive and prosperous community. In 1825, the community was sold to Robert Owen and his financial associate William Maclure. With the continued developments of Owen, a Welsh industrialist, and Maclure, who some consider "the father of American geology," New Harmony became a magnet for intellectual and academic innovators of the 19th century. The town had been called "the Athens of the West" because of the many scholars and scientists that called New Harmony home, such as the renowned American entomologist Thomas Say, French educator Marie Duclos Frategeot, and Dutch naturalist Gerard Troost.

Throughout its history, New Harmony has demonstrated a constant spirit of innovation, especially in the educational and scientific fields. New Harmony was the home of the early kindergarten movement in America, as well an early example of what is now called a technical school. Robert Owen's son, David Dale Owen, led the early geological surveys of the Midwest, and another son, Robert Dale Owen, was a U.S. Representative from New Harmony, who wrote the bill to establish the Smithsonian Institution and chaired the Building Committee. Robert Dale Owen was also an abolitionist who was influential in shaping President Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation.

New Harmony has long sustained its spirit of cultural innovation. In 1979, world-renowned architect Richard Meier designed the Athenaeum of New Harmony. Since its construction, the Athenaeum has been recognized with the prestigious Progressive Architecture Award and the American Institute of Architects' Twenty-Five Year Award.

I wish to congratulate the council members of New Harmony, Joe Straw, Don Gibbs, Linda Warrum, Karen Walker, and Andrew Wilson; the entire Bicentennial Commission and its co-chairs, Connie Weinzapfel and Raymond McConnell; as well as the citizens of New Harmony for their ongoing support and contributions to their community and the State of Indiana.

Today, New Harmony remains a bastion of the hard work, dedication, and

innovation that are such an integral part of the Hoosier spirit that makes Indiana the great State it is today. On behalf of the citizens of Indiana, I congratulate each and every member of the New Harmony community on the town's 200th Anniversary. I wish them continued success and growth for many more years to come.

#### 2014 GREEN RIBBON SCHOOLS

Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. President, today, I wish to applaud the Saint Thomas Aquinas School of Indianapolis and Carmel High School of Carmel, IN for being recognized as 2014 Green Ribbon Schools by the U.S. Department of Education.

Established in 2011, the Green Ribbon School program is the Federal Government's first comprehensive green school initiative. Since its inception, the program has offered the opportunity for schools in every State to gain recognition for educational and environmental accomplishments. Recognition as a Green Ribbon institution is based on a school's ability to reduce environmental impact, improve the health of students and staff, and provide environmental education. Both of these exceptional Hoosier schools have made great strides in these areas.

In 2003, Saint Thomas Aquinas School constructed a National Wildlife Federation-certified schoolyard where students can learn about the environmental sciences as they grow vegetables for a local food pantry. In addition, Saint Thomas Aquinas School has also greatly reduced its carbon footprint through the installation of new energy efficient windows and low-flush toilets, the implementation of an extensive recycling program, and the encouragement of walking and biking to school. As a result, Saint Thomas Aquinas has reduced its solid waste by nearly 30 percent and carbon-emissions by nearly 19 percent.

Similarly, Carmel High School has made its campus and the surrounding community environmentally friendly. Carmel has embraced energy saving technology such as energy efficient bulbs and LED lighting and has moved to a fuel efficient bus fleet. After two decades of implementing these impressive measures, Carmel High School has reduced its energy consumption by 72 percent, its greenhouse gas emissions by nearly 50 percent and its water consumption by 55 percent. The school also established Carmel Green Teen, a board that dispenses microloans for student projects that work towards pollution reduction, conservation, and energy savings.

I would like to thank Principal Cara Swinefurth of Saint Thomas Aquinas School and Principal John Williams of Carmel High School, their entire staffs, and their students for the hard work and dedication it undoubtedly took to receive this prestigious award.

On behalf of the citizens of Indiana, I congratulate both the Carmel High

School and Saint Thomas Aquinas communities, and I wish them continued success in the future.

#### ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

##### RAYMOND, NEW HAMPSHIRE

• Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to the town of Raymond, NH, which is celebrating the 250th anniversary of its founding this month. I am proud to recognize this historic milestone.

Located in Rockingham County along the Lamprey River in southeast New Hampshire, the geographic area that Raymond now occupies was originally a parish of Chester called Freetown by its early settlers who came from nearby Exeter. Later, in 1764, the town was incorporated by colonial Governor Benning Wentworth and was officially named Raymond.

Since its incorporation in 1764, the population in Raymond has grown to approximately 10,000 residents, whose dedication to preserving the town's unique character and historical charm is a testament to their patriotism and pride. Raymond is also a hub for commerce with a vibrant downtown.

Raymond's town common serves as a central gathering place for the community and helps makes this town a quintessential New England treasure. Each year Raymond's residents come together for the annual Christmas parade and tree lighting, the Fourth of July parade, Veterans Day, and other special events. The town is also home to several historic sites, including the Raymond Congregational Church, which was established in 1874, the Dudley-Tucker Library, and the old Raymond Railroad Depot, which now houses the Raymond Historical Society.

The theme for Raymond's 250th anniversary celebration is "My Town, Your Town, Our Town." These words reflect the deep pride and spirit of citizenship that have defined Raymond over the course of the past 250 years—and which will continue to guide the town's future. Among the many activities planned as part of Raymond's 250th celebration is a parade that will bring together local residents, community organizations, businesses, veterans, and students. I am truly honored to be joining residents of Raymond for this special and historic event.

On behalf of the people of New Hampshire, I am delighted to congratulate the citizens of Raymond on this important occasion in the town's history and commend them for their many contributions to our State and their spirit of community—which will endure for the next 250 years and beyond.●

##### TRIBUTE TO MICHAEL SIELICKI

• Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, I wish to recognize the exceptional public service of my good friend Police Chief

Michael Sielicki. Mike Sielicki has worked as a New Hampshire law enforcement officer for more than 26 years, retiring as the chief of police of the Kensington Police Department.

After serving in the U.S. Army with the 82nd Airborne Division from 1979 to 1983, then as a combat engineer in Germany from 1983 to 1986, Chief Sielicki returned to New Hampshire to serve in the New Hampshire criminal justice system. He first joined the Hillsborough County Department of Corrections in 1986 and then the Coos County Department of Corrections in 1987. Mike Sielicki began his law enforcement career with the Colebrook Police Department in 1987 and attended the New Hampshire Police Academy in 1989. Through his hard work and dedication, he rose through the ranks and became the chief of the Colebrook Police Department in 1993, serving in that capacity until 1999, when he accepted the chief's position in Hancock, where he worked from 1999 to 2003. In 2003, he was appointed the chief of police of the Rindge Police Department, where he served until accepting the chief's position in Kensington in 2012.

In a career that has spanned three decades, Mike has established a reputation as a knowledgeable, respected and compassionate public safety professional and engaged community member. He established the Colebrook Police Athletic League in 1994. Chief Sielicki became a foster parent and subsequently served as the president of the New Hampshire Foster Parent Association from 1999 to 2004. He led the Law Enforcement Torch Run for NH Special Olympics from 2008 to 2011.

During my tenure as New Hampshire's attorney general, it was my privilege to work directly with Chief Sielicki on many important law enforcement initiatives. Mike earned the respect and admiration of his peers and has been a thoughtful, effective leader in efforts to improve the criminal justice system and public safety in New Hampshire. Active in the New Hampshire Association of Chiefs of Police, Chief Sielicki rose through the executive board chairs and served as its president from 2013 to 2014, a term he just completed. A courageous and respected leader, Mike often spoke out on important public policy issues, such as opposing the legalization of marijuana, and the expansion of gambling.

As Chief Sielicki celebrates his retirement, I want to commend him on a job well done and ask my colleagues to join me in wishing him, his wife Kim, and their family well in all future endeavors.●

##### REMEMBERING COMMAND SERGEANT MAJOR HOWARD A. MCRAE

• Mr. BEGICH. Mr. President, it is my pleasure to memorialize a decorated veteran from the Alaska community of Haines, CSM Howard A. McRae. Born in 1929, he wanted to see more of the

world, so, with his buddy Dave Berry, he made his way to Seattle. In that short distance, the two young men found themselves broke, so they joined the U.S. Army, where they received training in electronics. That was 1948.

For Howard it was a turning point. Described by a family member as "a little disheveled," the Army changed his life. He was now on his way to a 23-year military career, including 11 in the Green Berets.

Howard got his wish to see more of the world, although perhaps not as originally intended. Assignments took him to Korea, Japan, Laos, Cambodia, Thailand, and Vietnam. He did four tours of duty in Korea and three in Vietnam.

Described as courageous and disciplined, Howard McRae received many citations and medals for his bravery, his dedication to duty, and his leadership. Among them: an Army Commendation Medal with three Bronze Oak Leaf Clusters to include a "V" for valor; a Korean Service Medal with four Bronze Service Stars; a Vietnam Service Medal with three Bronze Service Stars, a United Nations Service Medal given by the U.N. for participation in the Korean war; and an Army Commendation Medal and Oak Leaf Cluster for meritorious service as chief instructor of the Advance Training Committee and as sergeant major and director of instruction at Fort Bragg, NC.

Exemplifying the military's own respect for Command Sergeant Major McRae, he was among the 44 Special Services soldiers chosen to stand guard over President John F. Kennedy's body as he lay in State in the White House. McRae had said that this was his proudest moment.

In his later military career, McRae was command sergeant major of the Special Forces School and the High Altitude Low Opening Military School, parachute at Fort Bragg, NC. As the highest ranking noncommissioned officer at the post, he was in charge of oversight for those who taught tactical training skills. Truly, he was a leader among leaders.

Unfortunately, and likely due to the effects of agent orange connected to his service in Vietnam, Command Sergeant Major McRae was medically retired in 1971. With wife Sarah Elizabeth, whom he met at Fort Bragg, he returned to Haines. There, he continued in service but this time through the city and borough of Haines, where he served in the borough assessor's office. In 1976 he and Sarah moved to Juneau, where he served as a budget analyst for the Alaska Department of Education.

Every inch a soldier, McRae raised his blended family of 8 children and 34 grandchildren to serve. His son Guy served in the Army, as did grandsons Steven and Joshua. Grandson Thomas joined the Marines and, given his grandfather's indomitable spirit, survived serious injuries in Afghanistan.

Sadly, we lost Command Sergeant Major McRae in 1987, but given his service through the military, his community, and State, it is only fitting that his home community of Haines has placed his name in partnership with another great Alaskan leader, Walter Soboleff, on a veteran's home. The Soboleff-McRae Veterans Village and Wellness Center will forever serve as a reminder of the exemplary service of this man gave to his country. We are eternally grateful.●

#### RECOGNIZING KRAFT FOODS

● Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, Kraft Foods has a long history in Springfield, MO, and is observing two anniversaries this year. Kraft started production of processed cheese in 1939 on the second floor of a building on West Mill Street. After 15 years, Kraft made the decision to expand and build a "modern new plant" on property on the outskirts of town off Bennett Street east of Glenstone. This plant is now home to more than 800 employees who enjoy good-paying jobs. The 780,000-square-foot plant turns out hundreds of millions of pounds of product annually, including Kraft American Singles, Kraft Macaroni & Cheese in boxes and microwaveable cups, and Kraft natural cheeses. The dozens of different products made at Kraft Foods-Springfield are distributed throughout the South, the Midwest, and the mountain States.

The current Springfield plant was expanded again in 1976, adding 219,000 square feet of modernized production space for new lines of pasta products; shredded cheese joined the product mix, and a 100,000-square-foot warehouse was completed in 2000. Kraft-Springfield receives raw products by the train car load every day, and a fleet of trucks sends the finished products to the marketplace. In 2010, working with the city of Springfield, bonds were issued to allow Kraft to expand, which included an \$18 million pasta press, drying equipment, and a natural cheese project. Another \$20 million funded new technology for Kraft Singles, and a third project funded improvements to the EZ Mac cup line.

Critical to the success of the Kraft-Springfield operation is the offsite warehouse in the Springfield Underground. Opened more than 50 years ago when below-surface storage was untested, offsite space today boasts reduced energy costs and performance sustainability. At 36 degrees Fahrenheit, the Kraft Foods space in the underground stores cheeses, Oscar Mayer meats, and Jell-O puddings. Kraft officials believe that the facility uses about 65 percent less electricity than a comparable surface warehouse. It is another part of the emphasis Kraft places on its environmental stewardship. The Kraft facility achieved the Ozarks GreenScore Gold Level in 2013—the highest level of environmental achievement—and the Ozarks GreenScore Gold Level in 2011.

Kraft employees and the company also give back to the community through product donations, employee time and fundraising to support the Ozarks Food Harvest, Boys & Girls Clubs of Springfield, United Way Day of Caring, and Park Board Dairy Days, among numerous other organizations.

I remember touring the plant during our Congressional Agriculture Tour in 2000 and later at the Underground. It was a remarkable facility then and is even more advanced now. The commitment Kraft Foods has made to Springfield is reflected in the commitment Springfield has made to Kraft. On this 60th anniversary of the plant and Kraft's 75th year in Springfield, I hope this unique public-private partnership survives for many generations to come.●

#### JACKIE ROBINSON WEST LITTLE LEAGUE CHAMPIONS

● Mr. KIRK. Mr. President, I wish to recognize Chicago's very own Jackie Robinson West Little League team, who are the reigning 2014 Little League World Series U.S. Champions. Jackie Robinson West is the first team from Chicago to reach the Little League World Series in more than 40 years. They have brought immense pride to our city, and I commend them on their incredible achievement.

From Chicago's South Side, the Jackie Robinson West team consists of 13 players aged 11–13 years old. The last Little League team from Chicago to make it nearly this far was in 1967, and we were long overdue for another run at the championship. These 13 players worked together for countless hours to bring their A-game to the field. During their season, they outscored their opponents by a score of 212 to 28! Their teamwork, dedication to their teammates and coaches, and perseverance to become champions is nothing short of an inspiration to myself and our entire country.

Jackie Robinson West showed us all what true dedication, tireless effort and teamwork can achieve. They represented our Nation with great pride and sportsmanship on and off the field, and I am proud of each and every one of these young men for what they have achieved and for the sense of pride and accomplishment that they have brought to our city. They are an inspiration to young men and women across Chicago and throughout the Nation.

I want to personally congratulate DJ Butler, Lawrence Noble, Jaheim Benton, Ed Howard, Cameron Bufford, Brandon Green, Darion Radcliff, Marquis Jackson, Joshua Houston, Eddie King, Prentiss Luster, Pierce Jones, Trey Hondras, their coach Darold Butler, director Bill Haley, and assistant coaches Jerry Houston and Jason Little on their historic win. I am exceedingly proud of their accomplishments and wish them best of luck in this upcoming school year.●

#### REMEMBERING JOSEPH CALNAN

● Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, today I honor Mayor Joseph Calnan, of Anaconda, MT. It is with pride that I recognize his dedication and service to those Montanans who most needed a helping hand.

Joseph Calnan believed in the value of hard work. He spent 30 years working for the Butte Anaconda Pacific Railroad. Each night he returned home for dinner with his wife and seven children before heading out to his second job at a local store. The only interruption in his long career was the 4 years he spent working as the mayor of Anaconda.

Mayor "Joe" Calnan took office in 1963 and immediately began fighting for a better Anaconda. He worked to beautify Anaconda's Common, taking it from a weedy field to the lush, tree-filled park it is today. Joe fought to open land for business development at a time when one in five Americans was living below the poverty line. He knew the importance of creating jobs so hardworking folks would have a chance to provide for their families. His own children still remember him saying time and again, "We have plenty of picnic tables in Anaconda. But without jobs, there won't be food to put on those tables."

As he worked on the local level, Joe also kept an eye on national politics. On August 20 1964, President Lyndon B. Johnson signed the Economic Opportunity Act into law, creating the Job Corps. Job Corps allows young people from low income families to get the training they needed to enter the workforce, free of charge. Joe began his campaign to bring a Job Corps center to Anaconda immediately.

First, Joe wrote to Sergeant Shriver, Special Assistant to the President, to request the establishment of a Job Corps center at the Forest Creek Picnic Area just west of Anaconda. He received an encouraging reply, and traveled to Washington to meet with Senators Mike Mansfield and Lee Metcalf and Representative Arnold Olsen to finalize his proposal. When the first three Job Corps students arrived in Anaconda in 1966, they got off the bus to find Joe waiting there for them in his personal car. Through a partnership with the Forest Service, the Job Corps program thrived at the Anaconda Job Corps Civilian Conservation Center.

The Anaconda Job Corps Civilian Conservation Center has graduated over 14,000 students since it opened its door, over 160 students are currently enrolled, and most importantly, 86 percent of enrolled students get jobs.

On August 20, Job Corps celebrated its 50th anniversary. At the Anaconda Center, the Forest Service dedicated its newly completed dining hall to Mayor Calnan in honor of his hard work to bring the Job Corps to his town. While Joe has passed away, his children, grandchildren, and great grandchildren were there to celebrate

the event. Job Corps students had created the metal sign dedicating the dining hall, the same sort of hard-working young people that Joe spent so much time helping during his time as mayor. They put it best. The sign reads simply, "Joseph F. Calnan Thank You for Your Vision."●

#### HONORING TERESA LAWRENCE

● Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I wish today to honor Teresa Lawrence, CEO of Delta Personnel and the 2014 recipient of the Excelencia Award for Small Business Leadership by the Hispanic Chamber of Commerce of Louisiana.

Teresa was born in Cuba and came to the United States in 1973 to escape tyranny. She came here with her mother, brother, and grandmother. Tragically, her father was unable to join the family in leaving Cuba and was killed 4 years later.

Teresa's mother, along with her grandmother, instilled in her a strong work ethic. She began working at the age of 14 by bagging groceries, and eventually worked her way up to the position of advertising account executive. She attended college for 2 years until her mother was injured and needed her help. Teresa then took a full time job at a large architectural firm to help support the family. She said this position helped sharpen her skills and expand her vocabulary.

In 1988, Teresa married David Lawrence, whose family owned and operated a staffing agency, Delta Temporaries. That same year, the business was struggling and her father-in-law was diagnosed with Parkinson's disease, so David and Teresa quit their jobs and began running the company. With no formal training in the staffing profession, they spent years trying to run the business, get out of debt, and just survive.

In 2000, Teresa became the sole owner of Delta Personnel. Just when she felt she had really turned things around, the community was devastated by Hurricane Katrina, which brought immeasurable changes not only to her business, but also to southeast Louisiana. Through a lot of hard work, Teresa and her staff were able to re-open the business in Baton Rouge before eventually being able to locate the business back home in Metairie.

Teresa is known as a great leader who places an emphasis on empowering her staff to make decisions needed to help their business grow and thrive. She participated in and graduated from the Goldman Sachs 10,000 Small Businesses program in New Orleans in March of 2012. Since joining 10,000 Small Businesses, her company has more than doubled their sales from \$2.3 million with expectations to exceed \$5 million this year. Teresa says the great reward is that she and her staff have placed more than 950 people in jobs across the Gulf Coast.

I am pleased to join with the Hispanic Chamber of Commerce of Louisiana in honoring Teresa Lawrence.●

#### NORTHWEST YOUTH CORPS ANNIVERSARY

● Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, this weekend, the Northwest Youth Corps celebrated its 30th year of providing young people with opportunities to learn and lead. For three decades, Northwest Youth Corps has educated youth and young adults and instilled in them a strong sense of leadership, community, and environmental stewardship.

Northwest Youth Corps, NYC, founder Art Pope created NYC in 1984. Mr. Pope's inspiration for the NYC stemmed from the 1930s-era Civilian Conservation Corps, CCC, which provided work to the unemployed during the Great Depression. Mr. Pope was inspired by the hands-on, education-based model of the CCC and wanted to extend the vision of hard work and service to modern youth. The NYC philosophy encourages youth to pursue individual achievement, develop a solid work ethic and leadership skills, all while benefitting their communities and the environment.

Thirty years ago, NYC extended this vision to its first class of 52 students. Today, NYC serves more than 1,000 teens per year across 5 States. NYC offers a wide variety of programs for youth and teens from 12 to 19 years old. Youth enrolled in NYC summer programs learn conservation values in a hands-on learning environment. Summer programs range from teaching youth how to build trails and enhance natural habitats to 6-week camping programs where teens learn reforestation techniques. At the summer program graduation last year, I saw firsthand the sense of accomplishment and pride NYC students feel upon completing 6 weeks of conservation efforts in our State's beautiful forests.

In 1997, NYC drew from the success of its summer programs and established a full-year high school. Over the past 17 years, the OutDoor High School has grown into a fully-accredited, tuition-free, private high school with a strong focus on applied learning and environmental stewardship.

NYC's hands-on conservation education programs have enriched the lives of more than 16,000 students over the past 30 years, and have touched countless communities and ecosystems across the west. It is my pleasure to recognize Northwest Youth Corps 30th anniversary. I look forward to NYC's continued contribution to the community for many, many more years.●

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Sen-

ate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations and a withdrawal which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

#### MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bills were read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 5230. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5272. An act to prohibit certain actions with respect to deferred action for aliens not lawfully present in the United States, and for other purposes.

#### MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

S. 2779. A bill to amend section 349 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to deem specified activities in support of terrorism as renunciation of United States nationality.

#### 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-6722. A communication from the President of the United States to the President Pro Tempore of the United States Senate, transmitting, consistent with the War Powers Act, a report relative to the authorization of targeted airstrikes and humanitarian assistance in Iraq, received during adjournment of the Senate on August 11, 2014; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-6723. A communication from the President of the United States to the President Pro Tempore of the United States Senate, transmitting, consistent with the War Powers Act, a report relative to the authorization of targeted air strikes in Iraq, received during adjournment of the Senate on August 18, 2014; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-6724. A communication from the President of the United States to the President Pro Tempore of the United States Senate, transmitting, consistent with the War Powers Act, a report relative to the authorization of targeted airstrikes in Iraq, received during adjournment of the Senate on September 2, 2014; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-6725. A communication from the President of the United States to the President Pro Tempore of the United States Senate, transmitting, consistent with the War Powers Act, a report relative to the deployment of certain U.S. forces to Iraq; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-6726. A communication from the President of the United States to the President Pro Tempore of the United States Senate, transmitting, consistent with the War Powers Act, a report relative to the authorization of targeted airstrikes in Iraq; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-6727. A communication from the Deputy Assistant to the President and Executive Secretary and Chief of Staff of the National Security Council, transmitting, pursuant to

law, a report relative to the War Powers Act; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-6728. A communication from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Importation of Fresh Blueberries From Morocco Into the Continental United States" ((RIN0579-AD81) (Docket No. APHIS-2013-0016)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 1, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-6729. A communication from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approved Tests for Bovine Tuberculosis in Cervids" (Docket No. APHIS-2014-0027) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 1, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-6730. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Notice, Comment, and Appeal Procedures for National Forest System Projects and Activities and Project-Level Predecisional Administrative Review Process" (RIN0596-AD18) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 1, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-6731. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Law Enforcement Support Activities" (RIN0596-AB61) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 1, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-6732. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Non-discrimination in Programs or Activities Conducted by the United States Department of Agriculture" (RIN0503-AA52) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-6733. A communication from the Director of Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Foreign Commercial Satellite Services" ((RIN0750-AI32) (DFARS Case 2014-D010)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 31, 2014; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-6734. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Robert E. Milstead, Jr., United States Marine Corps, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-6735. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of an officer authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of rear admiral and an officer authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of rear admiral (lower half) in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-6736. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of eight (8) officers authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of brigadier general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-6737. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition, Technology and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Department of Defense's facility repair and recapitalization goals; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-6738. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to an alternative plan for monthly basic pay increases for members of the uniformed services for 2015; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-6739. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the continuation of the national emergency that was declared in Executive Order 13396 on February 7, 2006, with respect to Cote d'Ivoire; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-6740. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Office of the Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Removal of Emergency Homeowners' Loan Program Regulations" (RIN2502-AJ24) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 14, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-6741. A communication from the Chairman and President of the Export-Import Bank, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to transactions involving U.S. exports to China; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-6742. A communication from the Acting Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Debris Removal: Eligibility of Force Account Labor Straight-Time Costs under the Public Assistance Program for Hurricane Sandy" ((RIN1660-AA75) (44 CFR Part 206) (Docket No. FEMA-2012-0004)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 2, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-6743. A communication from the Acting Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Suspension of Community Eligibility" ((44 CFR Part 64) (Docket No. FEMA-2014-0002)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 2, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-6744. A communication from the Acting Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Suspension of Community Eligibility" ((44 CFR Part 64) (Docket No. FEMA-2014-0002)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 2, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-6745. A communication from the Acting Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Final Flood Elevation Determinations" ((44 CFR Part 67) (Docket No. FEMA-2014-0002)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 13, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-6746. A communication from the Acting Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Manage-

ment Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Final Flood Elevation Determinations" ((44 CFR Part 67) (Docket No. FEMA-2014-0002)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 13, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-6747. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Final Flood Elevation Determinations" ((44 CFR Part 67) (Docket No. FEMA-2014-0002)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 13, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-6748. A communication from the Acting Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Suspension of Community Eligibility" ((44 CFR Part 64) (Docket No. FEMA-2014-0002)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 13, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-6749. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Office of Housing-Federal Housing Commissioner, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Housing Administration (FHA) Multifamily Mortgage Insurance; Capturing Excess Bond Proceeds" (RIN2502-AJ16) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 13, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-6750. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the continuation of a national emergency declared in Executive Order 13222 with respect to the lapse of the Export Administration Act of 1979; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-6751. A communication from the Regulatory Specialist of the Legislative and Regulatory Activities Division, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Regulatory Capital Rules: Advanced Approaches Risk-Based Capital Rule, Revisions to the Definition of Eligible Guarantee" (RIN1557-AD83) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 13, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-6752. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revisions to Defense Priorities and Allocations System Regulations" (RIN0694-AE81) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 15, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-6753. A communication from the Director of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Regulatory Capital Rules: Advanced Approaches Risk-Based Capital Rule, Revisions to the Definition of Eligible Guarantee" (RIN3064-AE13) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 14, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-6754. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Wassenaar Arrangement 2013 Plenary Agreements Implementation: Commerce Control List, Definitions, and Reports; and Extension of Fly-by-Wire Technology and Software Controls" (RIN0694-AG05) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 31, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-6755. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Technical Amendments to the Export Administration Regulations: Update of Export Control Classification Number 0Y521 Series Supplement—Biosensor Systems and Related Software and Technology" (RIN0694-AG23) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 31, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-6756. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Addition of Certain Persons to the Entity List" (RIN0694-AG22) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 31, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-6757. A communication from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a notification of the President's intent to exempt all military personnel accounts from sequester for fiscal year 2015, if sequester is necessary; to the Committee on the Budget.

EC-6758. A communication from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to discretionary appropriations legislation; to the Committee on the Budget.

EC-6759. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the designation as an emergency requirement all funding so designated by the Congress in the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Resolution, 2014, pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, for the following account: "Department of Defense-Procurement-Procurement, Defense-Wide"; to the Committee on the Budget.

EC-6760. A communication from the Director, National Park Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the detailed boundaries for the Virgin Wild and Scenic River in Utah; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-6761. A communication from the Director, Office of Surface Mining, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Texas Regulatory Program" ((SATS No. TX-066-FOR) (Docket No. OSM-2014-0001)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 1, 2014; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-6762. A communication from the Acting General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Generator Relay Loadability and Revised Transmission Relay Loadability Reliability Standards" (RIN1902-AE81) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2014; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-6763. A communication from the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, National Park Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Special Regulations, Areas of the National Park System, Wrangell-St. Elias National Park and Preserve; Off-Road Vehicles" (RIN1024-AE14) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 13, 2014; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of August 5, 2014, the following reports of committees were submitted on August 26, 2014:

By Mr. CARPER, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 2113. A bill to provide taxpayers with an annual report disclosing the cost and performance of Government programs and areas of duplication among them, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113-243).

By Mr. CARPER, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs:

Report to accompany S. 2117. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to change the default investment fund under the Thrift Savings Plan, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113-244).

By Mr. CARPER, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, with amendments:

S. 2640. A bill to amend title 44, United States Code, to require information on contributors to Presidential library fundraising organizations, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113-245).

By Mr. TESTER, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, with an amendment and an amendment to the title:

S. 1447. A bill to make technical corrections to certain Native American water rights settlements in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113-246).

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1468. A bill to require the Secretary of Commerce to establish the Network for Manufacturing Innovation and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113-247).

By Mr. CARPER, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1691. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to improve the security of the United States border and to provide for reforms and rates of pay for border patrol agents (Rept. No. 113-248).

By Mr. CARPER, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, without amendment:

S. 2323. A bill to amend chapter 21 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that fathers of certain permanently disabled or deceased veterans shall be included with mothers of such veterans as preference eligibles for treatment in the civil service (Rept. No. 113-249).

By Mr. TESTER, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, without amendment:

H.R. 4002. A bill to revoke the charter of incorporation of the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma at the request of that tribe, and for other purposes.

By Mr. TESTER, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 919. A bill to amend the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act to provide further self-governance by Indian tribes, and for other purposes.

S. 1474. A bill to encourage the State of Alaska to enter into intergovernmental agreements with Indian tribes in the State relating to the enforcement of certain State laws by Indian tribes, to improve the quality of life in rural Alaska, to reduce alcohol and drug abuse, and for other purposes.

S. 1574. A bill to amend the Indian Employment, Training and Related Services Demonstration Act of 1992 to facilitate the ability of Indian tribes to integrate the employment, training, and related services from diverse Federal sources, and for other purposes.

S. 1622. A bill to establish the Alyce Spotted Bear and Walter Soboleff Commission on Native Children, and for other purposes.

S. 1948. A bill to promote the academic achievement of American Indian, Alaska Native, and Native Hawaiian children with the establishment of a Native American language grant program.

By Mr. TESTER, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, with amendments:

S. 2041. A bill to repeal the Act of May 31, 1918, and for other purposes.

By Mr. TESTER, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, with an amendment:

S. 2188. A bill to amend the Act of June 18, 1934, to reaffirm the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to take land into trust for Indian tribes.

By Mr. TESTER, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute and an amendment to the title:

S. 2299. A bill to amend the Native American Programs Act of 1974 to reauthorize a provision to ensure the survival and continuing vitality of Native American languages.

By Mr. TESTER, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 2442. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to take certain land and mineral rights on the reservation of the Northern Cheyenne Tribe of Montana and other culturally important land into trust for the benefit of the Northern Cheyenne Tribe, and for other purposes.

By Mr. TESTER, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, with amendments:

S. 2465. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to take into trust 4 parcels of Federal land for the benefit of certain Indian Pueblos in the State of New Mexico.

By Mr. TESTER, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 2479. A bill to provide for a land conveyance in the State of Nevada.

S. 2480. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Federal land to Elko County, Nevada, and to take land into trust for certain Indian tribes, and for other purposes.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. CARPER, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, without amendment:

S. 2665. A bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to provide eligibility for broadcasting facilities to receive certain disaster assistance, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113-250).

By Mr. HARKIN, from the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 2511. A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to clarify the definition of substantial cessation of operations.

## 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. ROCKEFELLER (for himself and Mr. THUNE):

S. 2777. A bill to establish the Surface Transportation Board as an independent establishment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. CRUZ, and Mr. NELSON):

S. 2778. A bill to require the Secretary of State to offer rewards totaling up to \$10,000,000 for information on the kidnapping and murder of James Foley and Steven Sotloff; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY):

S. 2779. A bill to amend section 349 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to deem specified activities in support of terrorism as renunciation of United States nationality; read the first time.

By Mr. NELSON:

S.J. Res. 42. A joint resolution to authorize the use of United States Armed Forces against the Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. INHOFE:

S.J. Res. 43. A joint resolution to authorize the use of force against the organization called the Islamic State in order to defend the American people and assist the Iraqi Government in expelling the Islamic State from their territory; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

## ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 434

At the request of Mr. WALSH, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 434, a bill to authorize and implement the water rights compact among the Blackfeet Tribe of the Blackfeet Indian Reservation and the State of Montana, and for other purposes.

S. 734

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 734, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to repeal the requirement for reduction of survivor annuities under the Survivor Benefit Plan by veterans' dependency and indemnity compensation.

S. 759

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. JOHANNIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 759, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income tax for amounts paid by a spouse of a member of the

Armed Forces for a new State license or certification required by reason of a permanent change in the duty station of such member to another State.

S. 822

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 822, a bill to protect crime victims' rights, to eliminate the substantial backlog of DNA samples collected from crime scenes and convicted offenders, to improve and expand the DNA testing capacity of Federal, State, and local crime laboratories, to increase research and development of new DNA testing technologies, to develop new training programs regarding the collection and use of DNA evidence, to provide post conviction testing of DNA evidence to exonerate the innocent, to improve the performance of counsel in State capital cases, and for other purposes.

S. 897

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 897, a bill to prevent the doubling of the interest rate for Federal subsidized student loans for the 2013–2014 academic year by providing funds for such loans through the Federal Reserve System, to ensure that such loans are available at interest rates that are equivalent to the interest rates at which the Federal Government provides loans to banks through the discount window operated by the Federal Reserve System, and for other purposes.

S. 942

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

S. 948

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 948, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage and payment for complex rehabilitation technology items under the Medicare program.

S. 1008

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1008, a bill to prohibit the Secretary of Homeland Security from implementing proposed policy changes that would permit passengers to carry small, non-locking knives on aircraft.

S. 1463

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1463, a bill to amend the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 to prohibit impor-

tation, exportation, transportation, sale, receipt, acquisition, and purchase in interstate or foreign commerce, or in a manner substantially affecting interstate or foreign commerce, of any live animal of any prohibited wildlife species.

S. 1533

At the request of Mr. LEVIN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1533, a bill to end offshore tax abuses, to preserve our national defense and protect American families and businesses from devastating cuts, and for other purposes.

S. 1556

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1556, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to modify authorities relating to the collective bargaining of employees in the Veterans Health Administration.

S. 1562

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1562, a bill to reauthorize the Older Americans Act of 1965, and for other purposes.

S. 1688

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1688, a bill to award the Congressional Gold Medal to the members of the Office of Strategic Services (OSS), collectively, in recognition of their superior service and major contributions during World War II.

S. 1691

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1691, a bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to improve the security of the United States border and to provide for reforms and rates of pay for border patrol agents.

S. 1811

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

S. 1828

At the request of Mr. DONNELLY, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) 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. 2037

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. HAGAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2037, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to remove the 96-hour physician certification requirement for inpatient critical access hospital services.

S. 2042

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2042, a bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to reauthorize the National Estuary Program, and for other purposes.

S. 2100

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2100, a bill to promote the use of clean cookstoves and fuels to save lives, improve livelihoods, empower women, and protect the environment by creating a thriving global market for clean and efficient household cooking solutions.

S. 2207

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 2207, a bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to require all political committees to notify the Federal Election Commission within 48 hours of receiving cumulative contributions of \$1,000 or more from any contributor during a calendar year, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. KING, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2207, *supra*.

S. 2231

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2231, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide an individual with a mental health assessment before the individual enlists in the Armed Forces or is commissioned as an officer in the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

S. 2377

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. McCONNELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2377, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude certain compensation received by public safety officers and their dependents from gross income.

S. 2481

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. HAGAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2481, a bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide authority for sole source contracts for certain small business concerns owned and controlled by women, and for other purposes.

S. 2501

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2501, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to make improvements to the Medicare hospital readmissions reduction program.

S. 2508

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S.

2508, a bill to establish a comprehensive United States Government policy to assist countries in sub-Saharan Africa to improve access to and the affordability, reliability, and sustainability of power, and for other purposes.

S. 2529

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2529, a bill to amend and reauthorize the controlled substance monitoring program under section 3990 of the Public Health Service Act.

S. 2530

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2530, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the importation or exportation of mussels of certain genus, and for other purposes.

S. 2545

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2545, a bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to revoke bonuses paid to employees involved in electronic wait list manipulations, and for other purposes.

S. 2570

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2570, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to recognize Indian tribal governments for purposes of determining under the adoption credit whether a child has special needs.

S. 2621

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) and the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) were added as cosponsors of S. 2621, a bill to amend the Migratory Bird Hunting and Conservation Stamp Act to increase the price of Migratory Bird Hunting and Conservation Stamps to fund the acquisition of conservation easements for migratory birds, and for other purposes.

S. 2692

At the request of Mrs. MCCASKILL, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) were added as cosponsors of S. 2692, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 and the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act to combat campus sexual violence, and for other purposes.

S. 2693

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. HAGAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2693, a bill to reauthorize the women's business center program of the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes.

S. 2694

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut

(Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2694, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to extend the application of the Medicare payment rate floor to primary care services furnished under Medicaid and to apply the rate floor to additional providers of primary care services.

S. 2701

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2701, a bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to address certain inconsistencies between the self-attested information provided by an applicant in enrolling in a health plan on an Exchange and being determined eligible for premium tax credits and cost-sharing reductions or in being determined to be eligible for enrollment in a State Medicaid plan or a State child health plan under the State Children's Health Insurance Program and the data received through the Federal Data Services Hub or from other data sources.

S. 2702

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2702, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require the social security number of the student and the employer identification number of the educational institution for purposes of education tax credits.

S. 2704

At the request of Mr. LEVIN, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2704, a bill to prohibit the award of Federal Government contracts to inverted domestic corporations, and for other purposes.

S. 2710

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2710, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt private foundations from the tax on excess business holdings in the case of certain philanthropic enterprises which are independently supervised, and for other purposes.

S. 2714

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 2714, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the centennial of World War I.

S. 2732

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the names of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) were added as cosponsors of S. 2732, a bill to increase from \$10,000,000,000 to \$50,000,000,000 the threshold figure at which regulated depository institutions are subject to direct examination and reporting requirements of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, and for other purposes.

S. 2737

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2737, a bill to ensure that transportation and infrastructure projects carried out using Federal financial assistance are constructed with steel, iron, and manufactured goods that are produced in the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 2742

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2742, a bill to provide for public notice and input prior to the closure, consolidation, or public access limitation of field or hearing offices of the Social Security Administration, and for other purposes.

S. 2757

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2757, a bill to invest in innovation through research and development, to improve the competitiveness of the United States, and for other purposes.

S. CON. RES. 38

At the request of Ms. MIKULSKI, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 38, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that Warren Weinstein should be returned home to his family.

S. RES. 410

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 410, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the anniversary of the Armenian Genocide.

S. RES. 530

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 530, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate on the current situation in Iraq and the urgent need to protect religious minorities from persecution from the Sunni Islamist insurgent and terrorist group the Islamic State, formerly known as the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL), as it expands its control over areas in northwestern Iraq.

S. RES. 536

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. HAGAN), the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK), the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator

from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY), the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO), the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. UDALL), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 536, a resolution designating September 2014 as "National Ovarian Cancer Awareness Month".

#### STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY):

S. 2779. A bill to amend section 349 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to deem specified activities in support of terrorism as renunciation of United States nationality; read the first time.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I rise to address an issue of grave importance to the national security of the United States; that is, the threat from the radical Sunni terrorist organization known as the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria or simply as the Islamic State.

Now it claims to control territory in a grotesque parody of a nation state. ISIS is a study in oppression and brutality that is conducting ethnic cleansing against religious minorities in the region; that is, targeting and persecuting Christians and that is attempting to subject the local population to the strictest forms of Sharia law. ISIS has grotesquely murdered U.S. civilians and indeed journalists on the public stage. It should come as no surprise that the people of the United States are deeply concerned about this development. We are concerned about the inability of our government to anticipate this gathering threat. We are concerned about the brutal acts of oppression against the weak and the helpless.

We are concerned about ISIS's seizure of financial and military assets that have fueled their murderous rampage. Above all, we are concerned about the threat ISIS poses, not only to our close allies in the region but also to our citizens and even here in our homeland.

There has been a lot of talk in recent days about developing a strategy to combat ISIS. I would like to propose a couple of commonsense steps that we should take immediately to combat this scourge.

First, the time has come—it is beyond time—for us to secure our borders. Representing the State of Texas, which has a border nearly 2,000 miles long, I know firsthand how insecure the border is right now. This week of all weeks, with the anniversary of the September 11 attacks upon us, we can have no illusions that terrorists will not try to make good on their specific threats to attack America. As long as our border is not secure, we are making

it far too easy for the terrorists to carry through on those promises.

Rumored ISIS activities on the southern border should unite us all in the resolve to make border security a top priority rather than an afterthought or rather than something to be held hostage for political negotiations in the Congress. Second, we should take commonsense steps to make fighting for or supporting ISIS an affirmative renunciation of American citizenship. We know there are over 100 Americans who have joined ISIS who have taken up arms alongside the jihadists, along with thousands of others from the European Union.

We also know they are trying to return to their countries of origin to carry out terrorist attacks there. We know this because on May 24 an ISIS member returned to Belgium where he attacked innocent visitors at a Jewish museum, slaughtering four people. It was reported today he had been plotting an even larger attack on Paris on Bastille Day.

In addition, on August 11 of this year, an accused ISIS sympathizer, Donald Ray Morgan, was arrested at JFK Airport trying to reenter the United States. So we know this threat is real. That is why I have today filed legislation, the Expatriate Terrorist Act of 2014, which would amend the existing statutes governing renunciation of U.S. citizenship to designate fighting for a hostile foreign government or foreign terrorist organization as an affirmative renunciation of citizenship.

By fighting for ISIS, U.S. citizens have expressed their desire to become citizens of the Islamic state. That cannot and will not peacefully coexist with remaining American citizens, the desire to become a citizen of a terrorist organization that has expressed a desire to wage war on the American people, has demonstrated a brutal capacity to do so, murdering American civilians on the global stage and promising to bring that jihad home to America.

We should not be facilitating their efforts by allowing fighters fighting alongside ISIS to come back to America with American passports and walk freely in our cities to carry out unspeakable acts of terror. It is my hope the legislation I am introducing today will earn support on both sides of the aisle, that we will see this body come together and say: While there are many partisan issues that divide us, when it comes to protecting U.S. citizens from acts of terror, we are all as one. That is my fervent hope.

The third thing we should do is we should do everything possible to make ISIS understand there are serious ramifications for threatening to attack the United States, for murdering American citizens. While damaging ISIS's financial assets is certainly a part of this action, because of the very nature of ISIS, the response must be principally military.

All Americans are weary of the long and costly wars in the last decade. We

are tired of sending our sons and daughters potentially to die in distant lands. No one wants to see an extended engagement in Iraq, but at the same time I do not believe the American people are one bit reluctant to defend our national security, to defend the lives of fellow Americans. The American people can see the grim threat represented by ISIS and the need for decisive action.

We should concentrate on a coordinated and overwhelming air campaign that has the clear military objective of destroying the capability of ISIS to carry out terror attacks on the United States. We must remain focused on this clear military objective if we hope to be successful. We cannot engage in photo op foreign policy or press release foreign policy of dropping a bomb here, shooting a missile there, and not have a strategy that is dictated by clear and direct military objectives in furtherance of U.S. national security interests.

We should be perfectly clear as well that any action we take against ISIS is in no way contingent on resolving the civil war in Syria. That conflict is a humanitarian tragedy, pitting a brutal dictator against radical Islamic terrorists. The sad reality is there are no good options for the United States in this fight. We may have had less radical options 3 years ago, but those are not currently available.

The Obama administration had proposed arming rebel forces that contained terrorist factions associated with ISIS. Previously, we were told the rebels fighting alongside ISIS were our friends and Assad and Iran were our enemies. Now, in the face of ISIS, we are hearing Assad may be our friend, Iran may be our friend, and ISIS is now our enemy. This makes no sense. Indeed, it is a dangerous cycle reminiscent of George Orwell's "1984." Orwell wrote:

At this moment, for example, in 1984. . . Oceania was at war with Eurasia and in alliance with Eastasia. . . . Actually . . . it was only four years since Oceania had been at war with Eastasia and in alliance with Eurasia. But . . . [officially the change of partners had never happened. Oceania was at war with Eurasia; therefore Oceania had always been at war with Eurasia. The enemy of the moment always represented absolute evil, and it followed that any past or future agreement with him was impossible. . . .

This administration seems to have no sense of past or future. All of those familiar with the terribly human carnage inflicted by the civil war in Syria pray for its end. But the goal of our action against ISIS should not be to end it by supporting Assad. The enemy of my enemy is not always my friend. Sometimes the goal is the destruction of the enemy who poses an imminent threat to our national security, not the enabler of yet another enemy of America.

It should also be clear that any action we take against ISIS should in no way be contingent on political reconciliation between Sunnis and Shiites in Baghdad. This administration has often become distracted by the hope to

achieve this reconciliation, but the sad truth is the Sunnis and Shiites have been engaged in a sectarian civil war since 632 A.D. It is the height of hubris, it is the height of ignorance to suggest the American President can come and resolve a 1,500-year-old religious civil war and have both sides throw down their arms and embrace each other as brothers. That should not be our objective, although we of course always hope for reconciliation and peace. We should not be so naive as to make defending our national security contingent on resolving millennia-old sectarian religious civil wars. Doing so, seeking to promote a utopia, seeking to transform Iraq into Switzerland is nothing less than a fool's errand.

Likewise, it should be perfectly clear that any action we take to stop ISIS from attacking and murdering Americans is in no way contingent on consensus from the so-called international community. America is blessed to have many good friends and allies in the region and beyond who understand the threat of ISIS and are eager to do what they can to combat it. We welcome their support. But in order that this action be done right, it must be led by the United States, unfettered by other nations' rules of engagement that might impede our effective action.

Achieving some preordained number of countries in a coalition is not a strategy. For as has often been remarked: In the most effective efforts, the mission determines the coalition, not the other way around. It is heartening to hear the voices from my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, raising the alarm of the threat posed by ISIS. President Obama has signaled his intention of addressing the issue later this week.

It is well past time for him to do so. His recent statements from his admission on August 28 that "we don't have a strategy yet" to his suggestion on September 3 that "our best bet is to try to 'shrink' ISIS's sphere of influence until they are a manageable problem," those comments are not encouraging. The objective is not to make ISIS manageable. The objective is to protect the national security interests of the United States and to destroy terrorists who have declared jihad on our Nation.

Neither are the two things we already know that the President will propose in his new "game plan"—namely, that he will not be requesting authorization from Congress for military action against ISIS and that his model is the counterterrorism policies pursued by his administration the past 5 years. Neither of these is encouraging. I ask the President to reconsider both of these points.

While ISIS is obviously part of the scourge of radical Islamic terrorism that has bedeviled the West for decades, it equally obviously represents a new and particularly virulent strain. The President is reportedly considering an action that could last as long as 3

years and may require a range of actions. If this is indeed the case, then it is incumbent on him to come to Congress and lay out his strategy so that we and the American people are clear on it.

I would note that the Presiding Officer has been particularly vocal and clear defending the constitutional authority of Congress to declare war. I would note as well that it is beneficial for the effort for the President to come to Congress, because in doing so it will force the President to do what has been lacking for so long, which is lay out a specific and clear military objective: What is it we are trying to accomplish that is tethered directly to the U.S. national security interests of America?

The Constitution is clear. It is Congress and Congress only that has the constitutional authority to declare war. Any President, as Commander in Chief, has constitutional authority to respond to an imminent crisis, to respond to a clear and present danger. But in this instance, the President is not suggesting it. He is suggesting engaged military action, and it is, therefore, inconsistent with the Constitution for him to attempt to pursue that action without recognizing the constitutional authority of this body.

It is my hope that he will do so, and it is my hope we will have a substantive and meaningful debate about the military objective we should be united in achieving, which is, namely, destroying ISIS and preventing them from committing acts of terror and murdering innocent Americans.

Given the need to consider such action against a new actor such as ISIS, it also must be admitted that the Obama administration's counterterrorism policy has not been a success. They have labeled the 2009 attack on Fort Hood in my home State of Texas as an act of "workplace violence" even though the terrorist attacker Nidal Hasan recently asked to become a citizen of the Islamic State.

They also missed connecting the dots that would have uncovered the radicalization of the Tsarnaev brothers that resulted in the attack on the Boston Marathon. It should be noted that Tamerlan Tsarnaev, the elder brother, worshipped at the same Cambridge, MA, mosque where the ISIS head of propaganda worshipped. This jihad can reach back and directly take the lives of Americans citizens at home.

The administration has failed to respond effectively to the attack on our facilities in Benghazi on September 11, 2012, in which four Americans were murdered, including the first ambassador killed in the line of duty since 1979, an event that inaugurated Libya's spiral into terrorist anarchy that continues unchecked to this day. They completely missed the gathering threat of ISIS to the point that the President himself was under the misapprehension that the group was the terrorist equivalent of the junior varsity only a few months ago.

We cannot afford to return to these destructive policies, given the acute threat posed by ISIS. It is my hope that this body will stand together as one in bipartisan unity to secure the borders and to change our laws to pass the legislation I am introducing today to make clear that any American who takes up arms with ISIS has, in doing so, constructively renounced his or her American citizenship so that the Congress, with one voice, can protect Americans at home. This requires clear, decisive, unified action, and it is my hope that all of us will come together supporting such action and that the President will submit to the authority of Congress seeking authorization to protect America against ISIS and to engage in a concentrated, directed military campaign to take them out.

By Mr. NELSON:

S.J. Res. 42. A joint resolution to authorize the use of United States Armed Forces against the Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I have introduced today a Senate joint resolution. This is a resolution that will express the authorization for the use of the U.S. Armed Forces against the Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant. It is a resolution that has been necessitated by legal scholars.

Since the President has used his existing authorization for the use of military force in Iraq, most recently against ISIS—ISIL/ISIS; it is the same thing. The Levant is that area broadly from about Baghdad all the way to the Mediterranean. That is ISIL. ISIS, I-S-I-S, is the Islamic State in Iraq and Syria. Of course, we know that this organization that is calling itself an Islamic caliphate knows no jurisdictional boundaries. It has taken large swaths of territory in Syria as well as Iraq. When the President successfully employed the use of air power, both manned and unmanned, against ISIS targets as they were marching toward Erbil, the capital of Kurdistan, and then likewise as they were marching toward the Mosul dam, the President used his authority in Iraq and also his authority as Commander in Chief to protect Americans.

There are Americans in Erbil. There are Americans in Baghdad. There are Americans in other places in Iraq. The protection of the dam in Mosul was to protect those Americans downriver, because if the dam were blown, that would have flooded all downriver and it would have flooded Baghdad.

Legal scholars disagree with me that the President has the authority under the Constitution as Commander in Chief to go after ISIS in Syria. I describe ISIS as a snake. If the head of the snake is in Syria, which it is—a lot of their organization, a lot of their leadership is there—then we ought to go after the snake where the head is and decapitate the snake. In doing

that, we are going to have to go into Syria.

I believe the President has the authority to do this under the Constitution anyway, but there are some who disagree. So rather than quibble about legalities, I have introduced this legislation. There is no pride of authorship. The Senate is obviously going to debate this. I believe if you are seeing the polls from today, where 90 percent of the people of this country are concerned about ISIS, and some huge number want us to go on and attack ISIS in other places than where we are attacking now, then I think it is obvious the United States is going to have to continue this attack on ISIS.

I want to compliment the President. Often, as I have talked about this issue, people have come—or members of the press—and said: Well, the President has dillydallied and so forth. I do not think he has at all. I think the President indeed has employed a very successful strategy of going after ISIS in Iraq—in fact, stopped their march on Erbil, in fact, stopped their march on the Mosul dam, and is going after them in other locations in coordination with the Peshmerga of the Kurds, as well as the Iraqi Army.

Indeed, the President started on August 25 the surveillance flights over Syria so that we can collect the intelligence that is necessary to prepare to go after them in Syria. But the President has done something more. He has started to put together a coalition, realizing that the American people have no appetite for American boots on the ground in Syria—to put together a coalition so that maybe the Free Syrian Army, maybe other members of the Arab League, maybe some other members of NATO would participate.

But the way we drew this resolution, it talks about there would not be a recurring military presence and the employing of an American army on the ground. It leaves the flexibility that clearly there will be American boots on the ground, just as there already have been when we sent our special operations forces in there to try to rescue the two American journalists who subsequently met such a brutal and uncivil end in their beheading. So American boots have been there. We might need special operations kinds of missions in the future. We might need forward air observers actually on the ground to direct air strikes. So there is flexibility in this resolution.

I want to say if there is anybody with any doubt about the intent of ISIS, they have made it so clear, not only taking the lives of these journalists, the second one of which was from my State of Florida, but in their statements of what they intend to do, setting up an Islamic caliphate. The leader, al-Baghdadi, even calls himself the caliph or religious leader.

But they have also said they will not stop until the black flag of ISIS is hanging and flying over the White House. Their intent is pretty clear. We

are going to have to deal with them, not only in Iraq as we are now, but elsewhere. It is going to be sooner or later. It is not going to be a 1-day or 2-day operation. As the President has already indicated, this is going to be a long-term kind of operation. The fact is, the United States is the one that has to lead the coalition.

To get this right out front and center of what we need to do, I have introduced, and it is printed as a part of the RECORD, this resolution to give the legal authorization from the Congress for the President to strike ISIS in Syria and to do as the President has said, to bring to a successful conclusion, to stop this horrendous uncivil, extraordinary kind of inhumane behavior that is being illustrated by these folks.

By Mr. INHOFE:

S.J. Res. 43. A joint resolution to authorize the use of force against the organization called the Islamic State in order to defend the American people and assist the Iraqi Government in expelling the Islamic State from their territory; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, when you look at what is happening with ISIS, we have gone through all kinds of terrorist activities. We all know we are in a crisis right now. I am inclined to agree—and I don't always agree—with Secretary Hagel, but on the day when he said that "ISIS is an imminent threat to every interest we have, whether it is in Iraq or anywhere else," this is a big deal.

As America sat back and looked and observed and saw the beheading of two Americans, a lot of people said that was an act of war. I found out recently that as of yesterday—and it will be announced in the next few days that there is a poll that has been conducted, that if we take all the problems that are out there that people have been talking about for a long period of time, including the borders and all the other issues, nothing is even close to ISIS.

I think it was very interesting that on August 28, just a few days ago, the President made the statement, "We don't have a strategy yet" to deal with ISIS in Syria. If there is not a strategy now, there has to be a strategy.

I am introducing an AUMF resolution for action against ISIS. An AUMF is Authorization for Use of Military Force. This is something that perhaps the President has anyway—we don't know that—but we have to take away the doubt that is out there. Something has to be done. I know the President is going to make a speech—I guess it is on Wednesday—and he may come out with a specific strategy. If he doesn't, he has had all the time in the world he needs to do it, and he hasn't done it. My AUMF is specific to ISIS. There are other AUMF's dealing with Al Qaeda and other things, but to me that just confuses the issue. This has now become the No. 1 issue in America, and

there is no tolerance to continue doing nothing, as we have been doing. We need to make sure the President has the authority, and this requires the President, within 15 days and then with 90-day updates, to submit in writing to Congress a comprehensive strategy to defeat the global threat posed by ISIS.

Keep in mind, it seems as if this President is inclined, anytime there is a problem out there, let's drop a bomb here and let's do something over there. That is not a strategy. I stated 1 year ago, on this same day, that the President cannot continue to operate without a clear-cut strategy.

So the congressional authorization for the President is to use all necessary and appropriate force to protect Americans in defending national security in the United States against a threat posed by ISIS and any successor terrorist organization. It allows the President to use all tools available and necessary to defeat ISIS, with flexibility to adjust efforts as the terrorist organization evolves. So this is not just limited to any boundaries. As you know, there are no boundaries with ISIS. It is not just Syria, it is not just Iraq. This is something that is spread all over. It is huge, and it is a threat unlike anything we have seen in our country before.

So I am asking my good friends—I have already talked to several friends on the Democratic side and the Republican side—to join me, and I think hopefully we will be able to do it.

It is estimated that 12,000 foreign fighters have joined ISIS, about 2,500 of which hold Western passports to give them easy access. What is going to happen is they will come back and be trained terrorists. I think that is a major issue that I want to at least have announced.

I have introduced this resolution. It is out there right now and we are going to be asking for support.

#### AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

**SA 3783.** Mr. PORTMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the resolution S. Res. 530, expressing the sense of the Senate on the current situation in Iraq and the urgent need to protect religious minorities from persecution from the Sunni Islamist insurgent and terrorist group the Islamic State, formerly known as the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL), as it expands its control over areas in northwestern Iraq; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

**SA 3784.** Mr. PORTMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the resolution S. Res. 530, supra; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

**SA 3785.** Mr. PORTMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the resolution S. Res. 530, supra; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

**SA 3786.** Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 19, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to contributions and

expenditures intended to affect elections; which was ordered to lie on the table.

#### TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

**SA 3783.** Mr. PORTMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the resolution S. Res. 530, expressing the sense of the Senate on the current situation in Iraq and the urgent need to protect religious minorities from persecution from the Sunni Islamist insurgent and terrorist group the Islamic State, formerly known as the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL), as it expands its control over areas in northwestern Iraq; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations; as follows:

Strike the preamble and insert the following:

Whereas Iraq is currently embroiled in a surge of violence arising from an ISIL-led offensive that began in Anbar province and has spread to key locations such as Mosul, Tikrit, and Samarra and continues to engulf the region in violence and instability;

Whereas, on June 29, 2014, ISIL leader Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi renamed the group the Islamic State and pronounced himself Caliph of a new Islamic caliphate encompassing the areas under his control, and Mr. al-Baghdadi has a stated mission of spreading the Islamic State and caliphate across the region through violence against Shiites, non-Muslims, and unsupportive Sunnis;

Whereas Iraq's population is approximately 31,300,000 people, with 97 percent identifying themselves as Muslim and the approximately 3 percent of religious minorities groups comprising of Christians, Yezidis, Sabean-Mandaeans, Bahais, Shabaks, Kakais, and Jews;

Whereas the Iraqi Christian population is estimated to be between 400,000 and 850,000, with two-thirds being Chaldean, one-fifth Assyrian, and the remainder consisting of Syrians, Protestants, Armenians, and Anglicans;

Whereas the Iraqi constitution provides for religious freedom by stating that "no law may be enacted that contradicts the principles of democracy," "no law may be enacted that contradicts the rights and basic freedoms stipulated in this Constitution," and "[this Constitution] guarantees the full religious rights to freedom of religious belief and practice of all individuals such as Christians, Yazidis, and Mandaean Sabaeans";

Whereas the fall of Mosul in particular has sparked enough anxiety among the Christian population that, for the first time in 1,600 years, there was no Mass in that city;

Whereas over 50 percent of Iraq's Christian population has fled since the fall of Saddam Hussein, and the government under Prime Minister Nouri al-Maliki did not uphold its commitment to protect the rights of religious minorities;

Whereas the United States Government has provided over \$73,000,000 of cumulative assistance to Iraq's minority populations since 2003 through economic development, humanitarian services, and capacity development;

Whereas 84,902 Iraqis have resettled to the United States between 2007 and 2013 and over 300,000 Chaldean and Assyrians currently reside throughout the country, particularly in Michigan, California, Arizona, Illinois, and Ohio; and

Whereas President Barack Obama recently declared on Religious Freedom Day, "Foremost among the rights Americans hold sacred is the freedom to worship as we choose

... we also remember that religious liberty is not just an American right; it is a universal human right to be protected here at home and across the globe. This freedom is an essential part of human dignity, and without it our world cannot know lasting peace." Now, therefore, be it

**SA 3784.** Mr. PORTMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the resolution S. Res. 530, expressing the sense of the Senate on the current situation in Iraq and the urgent need to protect religious minorities from persecution from the Sunni Islamist insurgent and terrorist group the Islamic State, formerly known as the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL), as it expands its control over areas in northwestern Iraq; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations; as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following: "That the Senate—

(1) reaffirms its commitment to promoting and to protecting religious freedom around the world;

(2) calls on the Department of State to work with the Government of Iraq, the Kurdistan Regional Government, neighboring countries, the diaspora community in the United States, and other key stakeholders to address the urgent plight of those Iraqi minority groups seeking safety and protection from persecution in Iraq;

(3) respectfully requests the Government of Iraq to prioritize the issue of protecting religious minorities and take concrete action to enact and enforce laws protecting religious freedom; and

(4) urges the President to ensure the timely processing of visas for Iraq's minority groups fleeing religious persecution, in accordance with existing United States immigration law and national security screening procedures.

**SA 3785.** Mr. PORTMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the resolution S. Res. 530, expressing the sense of the Senate on the current situation in Iraq and the urgent need to protect religious minorities from persecution from the Sunni Islamist insurgent and terrorist group the Islamic State, formerly known as the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL), as it expands its control over areas in northwestern Iraq; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations; as follows:

Amend the title so as to read: "A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate on the current situation in Iraq and the urgent need to protect religious minorities from persecution from the terrorist group the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL)."

**SA 3786.** Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 19, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to contributions and expenditures intended to affect elections; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This resolution may be cited as the "No Exemption for Washington from Obamacare Act".

## SEC. 2. HEALTH INSURANCE COVERAGE FOR CERTAIN CONGRESSIONAL STAFF AND MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH.

Section 1312(d)(3)(D) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 18032(d)(3)(D)) is amended—

(1) by striking the subparagraph heading and inserting the following:

“(D) MEMBERS OF CONGRESS, CONGRESSIONAL STAFF, AND POLITICAL APPOINTEES IN THE EXCHANGE.”;

(2) in clause (i), in the matter preceding subclause (I)—

(A) by striking “and congressional staff with” and inserting “, congressional staff, the President, the Vice President, and political appointees with”; and

(B) by striking “or congressional staff shall” and inserting “, congressional staff, the President, the Vice President, or a political appointee shall”;

(3) in clause (ii)—

(A) in subclause (II), by inserting after “Congress,” the following: “of a committee of Congress, or of a leadership office of Congress,”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(III) POLITICAL APPOINTEE.—In this subparagraph, the term ‘political appointee’ means any individual who—

“(aa) is employed in a position described under sections 5312 through 5316 of title 5, United States Code, (relating to the Executive Schedule);

“(bb) is a limited term appointee, limited emergency appointee, or noncareer appointee in the Senior Executive Service, as defined under paragraphs (5), (6), and (7), respectively, of section 3132(a) of title 5, United States Code;

“(cc) is employed in a position in the executive branch of the Government of a confidential or policy-determining character under schedule C of subpart C of part 213 of title 5 of the Code of Federal Regulations; or

“(dd) is employed in or under the Executive Office of the President in a position that is excluded from the competitive service by reason of its confidential, policy-determining, policy-making, or policy-advocating character.”; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(iii) GOVERNMENT CONTRIBUTION.—No Government contribution under section 8906 of title 5, United States Code, shall be provided on behalf of an individual who is a Member of Congress, a congressional staff member, the President, the Vice President, or a political appointee for coverage under this paragraph.

“(iv) LIMITATION ON AMOUNT OF TAX CREDIT OR COST-SHARING.—An individual enrolling in health insurance coverage pursuant to this paragraph shall not be eligible to receive a tax credit under section 36B of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 or reduced cost sharing under section 1402 of this Act in an amount that exceeds the total amount for which a similarly situated individual (who is not so enrolled) would be entitled to receive under such sections.

“(v) LIMITATION ON DISCRETION FOR DESIGNATION OF STAFF.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a Member of Congress shall not have discretion in determinations with respect to which employees employed by the office of such Member are eligible to enroll for coverage through an Exchange.”.

## NOTICE OF HEARING

### COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mrs. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public,

that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources will hold a business meeting on Thursday, September 11, 2014, at 10 a.m., in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to consider the nomination of Elizabeth Sherwood-Randall to be Deputy Secretary of Energy.

For further information, please contact Sam Fowler at (202) 224-7571, or Sallie Derr at (202) 224-6836.

## PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Amanda Figueroa, a Defense fellow serving on our office staff, and Bale Dalton, also a Defense assistant, be granted privileges of the floor for the remainder of the 113th Congress.

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

## MEASURE DISCHARGED AND INDEFINITELY POSTPONED—S.J. RES. 39

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the Foreign Relations Committee be discharged from further consideration of S.J. Res. 39; also, as part of that unanimous consent request, I ask that the joint resolution be indefinitely postponed.

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

## MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 2779

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I am told S. 2779 is due 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. 2779) to amend section 349 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to deem specified activities in support of terrorism as renunciation of United States nationality.

Mr. REID. I object to any further proceedings with regard to this matter at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The bill will be read for a second time on the next legislative day.

## ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 9, 2014

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until tomorrow morning, September 9, at 10 a.m.; 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, there be a period of morning business for 1 hour with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each, with the Republicans controlling the first 30 minutes and the

majority controlling the next 30 minutes; that following morning business, the Senate resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S.J. Res. 19 postcloture; further, that the Senate recess from 12:30 p.m. to 2:15 p.m.; finally, that the time during any period of morning business, adjournment or recess count postcloture.

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

## ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. REID. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:27 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, September 9, 2014, at 10 a.m.

## NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

### DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

RONALD ALAN PEARLMAN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE OVERSIGHT BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 14, 2015, VICE NANCY KILLEFER, TERM EXPIRED.

### OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION

DEVEN J. PAREKH, OF NEW YORK, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 17, 2016, VICE KATHERINE M. GEHL, RESIGNED.

TODD A. FISHER, OF NEW YORK, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 17, 2016, VICE JAMES A. TORREY, TERM EXPIRED.

### DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

CARLOS A. MONJE, JR., OF LOUISIANA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION, VICE POLLY TROTTEMBERG, RESIGNED.

### FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

COLETTE DODSON HONORABLE, OF ARKANSAS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE TERM EXPIRING JUNE 30, 2017, VICE JOHN ROBERT NORRIS, RESIGNED.

### TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

VIRGINIA TYLER LODGE, OF TENNESSEE, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY FOR A TERM EXPIRING MAY 18, 2019, VICE WILLIAM B. SANSON, TERM EXPIRED.

RONALD ANDERSON WALTER, OF TENNESSEE, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY FOR A TERM EXPIRING MAY 18, 2019, VICE BARBARA SHORT HASKEW, TERM EXPIRED.

### DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

SETH B. CARPENTER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, VICE MATTHEW S. RUTHERFORD.

### DEPARTMENT OF STATE

SHEILA GWALTNEY, OF CALIFORNIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE KYRGYZ REPUBLIC.

JENNIFER ANN HAVERKAMP, OF INDIANA, TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE FOR OCEANS AND INTERNATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL AND SCIENTIFIC AFFAIRS, VICE KERRI-ANN JONES, RESIGNED.

PETER MICHAEL MCKINLEY, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF AFGHANISTAN.

NANCY BIKOFF PETTIT, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF LATVIA.

### PEACE CORPS

CARLOS J. TORRES, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF THE PEACE CORPS, VICE CAROLYN HESSLER RADELET, RESIGNED.

### DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

RUSSELL C. DEYO, OF NEW JERSEY, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY FOR MANAGEMENT, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY, VICE RAFAEL BORRAS, RESIGNED.

SARAH R. SALDANA, OF TEXAS, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF HOMELAND SECURITY, VICE JOHN MORTON, RESIGNED.

#### EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

MICHAEL P. BOITICELLI, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL POLICY, VICE R. GIL KERLIKOWSKA, RESIGNED.

DANIEL HENRY MARTI, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ENFORCEMENT COORDINATOR, EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, VICE VICTORIA ANGELICA ESPINEL, RESIGNED.

#### SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

GILBERTO DE JESUS, OF MARYLAND, TO BE CHIEF COUNSEL FOR ADVOCACY, SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, VICE WINSLOW LORENZO SARGEANT.

#### IN THE COAST GUARD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 14, U.S.C., SECTION 271(E):

##### *To be rear admiral (lower half)*

CAPT. STEVEN J. ANDERSEN  
CAPT. PAT DEQUATTRO  
CAPT. WILLIAM G. KELLY  
CAPT. JOHN P. NADEAU  
CAPT. JOANNA M. NUNAN  
CAPT. KEITH M. SMITH  
CAPT. DAVID G. THROOP

#### IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

##### *To be lieutenant general*

L.T. GEN. TOD D. WOLTERS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

##### *To be major general*

BRIG. GEN. VERALINN JAMIESON

THE FOLLOWING AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

##### *To be brigadier general*

COL. DENNIS D. GRUNSTAD II

#### IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

##### *To be lieutenant general*

MAJ. GEN. JOHN W. NICHOLSON, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

##### *To be major general*

BRIG. GEN. PAUL M. BENENATI

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

##### *To be major general*

BRIG. GEN. MICHAEL A. CALHOUN

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

##### *To be major general*

BRIG. GEN. BRET D. DAUGHERTY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

##### *To be brigadier general*

COLONEL RAUL E. ESCRIBANO  
COLONEL TIMOTHY J. MCATEER  
COLONEL JEFFREY L. MILHORN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

##### *To be colonel*

HERBERT J. BROCK IV  
THOMAS W. HANLEY  
GREGORY S. PHIPPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

##### *To be lieutenant colonel*

SYED AHMED  
KEVIN S. AKERS  
SHAWN M. ALDERMAN

MUSTAFA M. ALIKHAN  
ASNA A. AMIN  
ZACHARY M. ARTHURS  
CRAIG H. BARSTOW  
DANIEL A. BELLIN  
MATTHEW A. BORGMAN  
JOANNA G. BRANSTETTER  
ELIZABETH L. BRENT  
JAMIE D. BULKENHOOVER  
MARK D. BUZZELLI  
JOSEPH G. CHEATHAM  
ERIC CHIN  
SUNGHUN CHO  
PAUL CLARK  
DANIEL V. CORDARO  
DAVID A.T. CORTESE  
DANIEL CUADRADO  
AMANDA S. CUDDA  
SCOTT P. CUDDA  
RACHEL A. CUENCA  
NEIL B. DAVIDS  
DAVID C. DEBLASIO  
CHAD A. DEROSA  
JAY M. DINTAMAN  
BRAD M. DOLINSKY  
DUANE DUKE  
ELIZABETH H. DUQUE  
LEE A. EVANS  
BYRON J. FALER  
EDWIN A. FARNELL IV  
COLLIN J. FISCHER  
ERIN FLAHERTY  
SHANNON K. FLOODNICHOLS  
ERIC C. GARGES  
JEFFREY R. GIULIANI  
TRISA A. GIULIANI  
DAVID L. GREENBURG  
CHRISTINA D. HAHN  
JASMINE J. HAN  
UEL D. HANSEN  
SCOTT HARRINGTON  
FENELOPE J. HARRIS  
DOROTA J. HAWKSWORTH  
MELVIN D. HELGESON  
EREK K. HELSETH  
PETER M. HENNING  
MARY K. HINKLE  
COURTNEY A. HOLLAND  
KEVIN G. HUEMAN  
EDWARD A. HULTEN  
CHESTER C. JEAN  
CHRISTOPHER S. JOHNSON  
WILLIAM J. JORDAN  
CHARMAINE F. KAULA  
DAVID S. KAUVAR  
JOSEPH F. KELLY  
KEVIN M. KELLY  
AARON D. KIRKPATRICK  
PETER KREISHMAN  
ADRIAN T.G. KRESS  
ANJALI N. KUNZ  
ANTON P. LACAP  
JEFFREY N. LACKEY  
JEFFREY T. LACZEK  
JEFFREY B. LANIER  
CYNTHIA L. LAUER  
ABIGAIL J. LEE  
SUKHYUNG LEE  
LUCAS R. LEONARD  
CHRISTINA LONG  
JOSEPH M. LURIA  
DUSTIN MACDONALD  
MICHAEL A. MAHLON  
ASHLEY MARANICH  
SCOTT A. MARSHALL, JR.  
THERESA M. MCKAY  
NEIL MCMULLIN  
GEORGE J. MEYERS IV  
PAUL M. MICHAUD  
ETHAN A. MILES  
CAELA MILLER  
LUKE M. MILLER  
FOUAD J. MOAWAD  
RYAN T. MOORE  
JASON M. NAKAMURA  
SHAHIN NASSIRKHANI  
EMUEJEVOKE J. OKOH  
JUSTIN D. ORR  
DAVID OWSHALIMPUR  
JAMES O. OYEKAN  
MATTHEW PFLIPSEN  
MATTHEW A. POSNER  
JENNIFER PUGLIESE  
ERIC W. RAWIE  
JOHN R. REAUME  
THEODORE T. REDMAN  
MEAGAN M. RIZZO  
JUSTIN ROBBINS  
ROSEMARIE RODRIGUEZ  
KATHLEEN M. SAMSEY  
SHAWN C. SHAFFER  
EVA SMETANA  
DAVID R. STAGLIANO  
JUSTIN J. STEWART  
BERNDA L. STRYJEWSKI  
GERALD W. SURRETT  
MICHAEL F. SZCZEPANSKI  
MICHAEL F. TRAVER  
JACOB L. TURNQUIST  
PAUL S. URIBE  
CHRISTINE M. VACCARO  
MICHELLE S. VAL  
TIMOTHY D. WAGNER  
JAMES Y.L. WANG  
ERIC D. WEBER  
TIMOTHY S. WELCH

RYAN A. WITHROW  
ROSS A. WITTERS  
SCOTT E. YOUNG  
BRADLEY ZAGOL  
AMY ZINGALIS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY DENTAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

##### *To be lieutenant colonel*

BRADLEY AEBI  
JAMES P. ARNOLD  
TRAVIS J. AUSTIN  
CHAD BANGERTER  
CHUN Y. CHAN  
HUI F. CHIU  
MICHAEL FORAN  
KEITRA T. GEORGE  
JOHN K. GOERTEMILLER  
THOMAS R. GUNNELL  
KELLY J. JOHNSON  
DANIEL D. KERSTEN  
SOOMO LEE  
WILLIAM A. MACNAUGHTON  
MICHAEL R. MANSELL  
DAVID D. NELSON  
LISA NORBY  
KEVIN PARKER  
JERROD L. SANDERS  
JILL E. SANDERS  
NALORN N. SENGAMPHAN  
DANIEL C. SHIN  
DAVID TUCKER  
AZURE L. UTLEY  
RUSSELL M. WEAVER  
KEVYN WETZEL

#### IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUAL FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

##### *To be lieutenant commander*

GREGORY E. OXFORD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUAL FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

##### *To be lieutenant commander*

BENJAMIN I. ABNEY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

##### *To be commander*

JOEL N. PETERSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

##### *To be captain*

GREGORY C. CATHCART  
JAMES M. EDWARDS  
YOLANDA L. A. GILLEN  
STEPHEN M. LEE  
CHRISTOPHER MERRIS  
WILLIAM J. MUHM  
MICHAEL W. SNEATH  
MICHAEL D. WILLIAMS

#### THE JUDICIARY

JEANNE E. DAVIDSON, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF INTERNATIONAL TRADE, VICE DONALD C. POGUE, RETIRED.

HAYWOOD STIRLING GILLIAM, JR., OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, VICE CLAUDIA WILKEN, RETIRING.

## CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate September 8, 2014:

#### THE JUDICIARY

JILL A. PRYOR, OF GEORGIA, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT.

#### SOCIAL SECURITY ADVISORY BOARD

ALAN L. COHEN, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ADVISORY BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 30, 2016.

LANHEE J. CHEN, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ADVISORY BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 30, 2018.

HENRY J. AARON, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ADVISORY BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 30, 2014.

HENRY J. AARON, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ADVISORY BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 30, 2020.

## WITHDRAWAL

Executive Message transmitted by the President to the Senate on September 8, 2014 withdrawing from further Senate consideration the following nomination:

ANNETTE TADDEO-GOLDSTEIN, OF FLORIDA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE INTER-AMERICAN FOUNDATION FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 20, 2018, VICE JOHN P. SALAZAR, TERM EXPIRED, WHICH WAS SENT TO THE SENATE ON FEBRUARY 27, 2014.