

suffered from polio. He would take the train to Georgia to go down to Warm Springs to get the therapy of those warm springs, which then was the only mechanism of treating polio.

Today in Georgia, because of the CDC, we have a mechanism of eradicating polio. That is the type of evolution we want to see in health care not just for our country but for the world.

CDC is the best investment of American tax dollars we could possibly make. I support it wholeheartedly, and I thank Senator BROWN for his participation in the colloquy today.

I yield back the remainder of my time 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. UDALL of New Mexico. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. I ask to speak as in morning business.

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

#### SYRIA

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Madam President, like many others, I am deeply disturbed by the current situation in Syria, the appalling atrocities, the tragic loss of life, the reported use of chemical weapons. This deserves the clear condemnation of the international community.

I am also concerned by the push for intervention in this war, by the rush to judgment for the United States to yet again become entangled in a civil war. The President has decided to send arms to the rebels to fight the government of the Bashar al-Asad. The full scope of this intervention is not yet clear, but this path is dangerous and unnecessary.

The Asad regime is cruel and corrupt. We can all agree on that point. Many of the groups fighting against him do not share our values and could be worse. They may pose long-term risks to us and our allies. Asad's enemies may very well be America's enemies. The fact is that we do not know. A number of experts, including our military brass, have sounded alarms warning that the options to intervene in Syria range from bad to worse and could prove damaging to America's strategic interests. By flooding Syria with weapons, we risk arming those who ultimately may seek to do us harm.

We have been down this road before. Recent history tells a cautionary tale. In the 1980s the United States supported a rebel insurgency to repel the Soviet occupation of Afghanistan. Back then as now, many Members of Congress pushed for arming these rebels. The United States supplied weapons, intelligence, and training,

with the goal to defeat the Soviets in Afghanistan.

Our short-term victory had tragic consequences for the future. Radical members of the insurgency formed the Taliban regime, giving safe haven to terrorist training camps, providing material support to Osama bin Laden and his fledgling al-Qaida movement. Through state-sponsored terrorism in Afghanistan, al-Qaida thrived and perpetrated attacks on the USS *Cole* and the World Trade Center on 9/11. The aftermath has been more than a decade of war, with tragic loss of American lives and treasure.

This is history to learn from, not repeat, and yet many who advocated for previously disastrous Middle East interventions are leading the charge to arm groups we know little about and to declare war through air strikes on another Middle Eastern country.

What little we do know about the Syrian rebels is extremely disturbing. The opposition is fractured. Some are sympathetic to the enemies of the United States and our allies, including Israel and Turkey. There are reliable reports that some of the rebels even include Iraqi Sunni insurgents—the same groups who killed many U.S. troops and still target the current Iraqi Army and Government.

We know American law currently considers some of the rebel elements to be terrorist groups. The United States has designated one of the key opposition factions, the Nursa Front, as a terrorist organization for being an al-Qaida-affiliated group.

The Syrian opposition is very unorganized. They lack a chain of command, they are subject to deadly infighting, and if they are able to defeat Asad, they may turn on each other or worse the United States or our allies.

Simply put, once we have introduced arms, neither we nor their fighters may be able to guarantee control over them. Such weapons could end up in the hands of groups and people who do not represent our interests, possibly including terrorists who target the United States, our allies, such as Israel and Turkey, and the Iraqi Army and Government—an Iraq that we spent billions of dollars and thousands of American lives to establish.

Given this reality, those who are pushing for military intervention should answer three basic questions: Can arms be reasonably accounted for and kept out of the hands of terrorists and extremist groups? Can they assure us those arms will not become a threat to our regional allies and friends, including Israel, Turkey, and the Government of Iraq? And if the answer to the two previous questions is no, can they then explain why transferring our weapons to the rebels, whose members may themselves be affiliated with terrorist and extremist groups, is a sensible option for the American people? What national interest does this serve?

I do not believe those questions have been answered. I think the majority of

the American people agree. They do not see the justification of our intervention in this civil war. We need to slow down this clamor for more weapons to Syria and war and take a step back from this plunge into very muddy and dangerous waters.

Stopping radicalism and protecting our allies is of vital importance; however, we come to the ultimate question, one that has not been adequately answered: Will this hasty march to intervene in another Middle East conflict achieve these goals or will it ultimately harm the interests of the United States, leading to yet another bloody, costly, overseas conflict and, ironically, worsening the terrorist threat?

We should listen to the lessons of history. After over a decade of war overseas, now is not the time to arm an unorganized, unfamiliar, and unpredictable group of rebels. Now is not the time to rush headlong into another Middle Eastern civil war. The winds of war are blowing yet again, and we should be ever vigilant before we venture into another storm.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

#### UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—S. 744

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate resumes consideration of S. 744, which is the immigration bill, on Tuesday, June 18, the time until 12:30 p.m. and the time from 2:15 to 3 p.m. be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees for debate on the pending amendments listed below in the following order: Thune No. 1197, Landrieu No. 1222, Vitter No. 1228, and Tester No. 1198; that there be no second-degree amendments in order prior to the votes; that all the amendments be subject to a 60-affirmative-vote threshold; that there be 2 minutes equally divided between the votes; and that all after the first vote be 10-minute votes.

Madam President, I have spoken with my friend, the ranking member of the Judiciary Committee, the senior Senator from Iowa, because I wanted to add the Heller amendment; however, I understand the Republicans want to pick their own amendments. They do not want me picking them. I understand that, so I haven't included that one in the consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### BORDER SECURITY, ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY, AND IMMIGRATION MODERNIZATION ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 744, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 744) to provide for comprehensive immigration reform and for other purposes.

Pending:

Leahy/Hatch amendment No. 1183, to encourage and facilitate international participation in the performing arts.

Thune amendment No. 1197, to require the completion of the 350 miles of reinforced, double-layered fencing described in section 102(b)(1)(A) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 before registered provisional immigrant status may be granted and to require the completion of 700 miles of such fencing before the status of registered provisional immigrants may be adjusted to permanent resident status.

Landrieu amendment No. 1222, to apply the amendments made by the Child Citizenship Act of 2000 retroactively to all individuals adopted by a citizen of the United States in an international adoption and to repeal the pre-adoption parental visitation requirement for automatic citizenship and to amend section 320 of the Immigration and Nationality Act relating to automatic citizenship for children born outside of the United States who have a United States citizen parent.

Tester amendment No. 1198, to modify the Border Oversight Task Force to include tribal government officials.

Vitter amendment No. 1228, to prohibit the temporary grant of legal status to, or adjustment to citizenship status of, any individual who is unlawfully present in the United States until the Secretary of Homeland Security certifies that the US-VISIT System (a biometric border check-in and check-out system first required by Congress in 1996) has been fully implemented at every land, sea, and airport of entry and Congress passes a joint resolution, under fast track procedures, stating that such integrated entry and exit data system has been sufficiently implemented.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, at every confirmation hearing of every Cabinet position, and probably a lot of other positions as well, a Cabinet nominee is invariably asked a question similar to this: Will you come when you are called to a committee meeting for a hearing, and will you answer inquiries made by members of the committee to certain questions you might be asked? Invariably—and I don't know an exception to this—we get the answer that, yes, they will respond to our communications.

Well, I come to the Senate today to ask why Secretary Napolitano of the Department of Homeland Security hasn't answered inquiries we have made that ought to have been answered by now. And the answers ought to have been made by now because we are dealing with the legislation to which the questions refer.

On April 23, the Judiciary Committee held a hearing to discuss immigration reform and the bill presented by the Gang of 8. Secretary Napolitano was the only witness. The hearing lasted 2 hours and 20 minutes, and most members were able to ask her 5 to 10 minutes' worth of questions. We also submitted questions for the record, which means we submitted questions to her in writing for her to answer. Committee members were given just 24 hours to turn around those questions to present to her. But it has been over

7 weeks—that is more than 49 days—since we submitted those questions to Secretary Napolitano, and we have yet to get answers to those questions.

The questions I asked were genuine and related to the implementation of the bill if it were to be signed into law. I asked questions of the Secretary because she will be responsible for carrying out Congress's intentions. I wanted to know about costs and feasibility, and I asked for data and specifics. So I am concerned I have yet to receive responses.

Keeping information from Congress and the American people is not helpful to ensuring we have the best product coming out of the Senate. Since this bill is right now before the Senate, it is important for Members of this body to have the answers to the questions I am going to describe that I submitted to her.

I will take this opportunity to discuss some of the questions I asked of Secretary Napolitano, although not all of them. Right now I will focus on nine questions I asked about border security because border security is an issue before the Senate as part of this 1,175-page bill. I may discuss other questions later in the week.

Question No. 1 to Secretary Napolitano: You have emphasized that apprehensions at the border are down and in doing so praised the administration's record on border security; however, Customs and Border Protection has just released numbers showing that apprehensions increased 13 percent over the last year. Does the fact that border apprehensions are up mean that the border is becoming less secure?

That was question No. 1 to Secretary Napolitano.

Obviously, is the border more secure or isn't the border more secure? That was the whole basis of the debate over the last week in this body.

Question No. 2 to Secretary Napolitano: The bill only calls for establishing an entry-exit system for air and seaports before implementing the path to citizenship. Aside from cost, what impediments are there to instituting the system at land ports?

Question No. 3: The bill requires your department to establish a strategy to identify where fencing should be deployed along the southern border. During the hearing, you indicated the administration believes that sufficient fencing is in place and that you would prefer not to increase fencing along the southern border. So my question: Do you anticipate that your study will call for any additional physical fencing?

Now that seems to me to be a pretty important question at this time when border security is very basic to whether there will be any legalization. We have not received an answer yet.

Question No. 4: During the hearing we discussed the fact that the northern border was not part of the trigger and did not need to be secured before green cards are distributed. You said the

northern border is a different border but that it is a part of the discussion. Can you elaborate? Can you describe how the northern border is "different"? Please provide a list of "other than Canadians" who have crossed the northern border illegally in the last 10 years, including their country of origin.

Question No. 5. Section 1102 of S. 744 requires the Secretary to increase the number of CBP officers by 3,500; however, it does not specify how many of those agents will be used to secure the physical border versus customs enforcement and other mission requirements. How do you envision this section being implemented and how would the Department make decisions with regard to determining how many agents are hired to secure the physical borders?

Talking about border security, that seems to me to be a legitimate question that ought to have been answered by the Secretary a long time before we even started debate on this bill but surely before we get done with it.

The sixth question: Section 1104 provides funding for only the Tucson sector of the southwest border region. Does the administration support only resources to this sector? Are there other sectors that should be included? If so, please provide details.

Seventh question: Section 1105 relates solely to the State of Arizona. Should this provision be expanded to all of the southwest border States?

Question No. 8: Section 1107 provides for a grant program in which individuals who reside or work in the border region and are "at greater risk of border violence due to the lack of cellular service" can apply to purchase phones with access to 911 and equipped with GPS. Does the administration believe the Southwest border region is safe and secure, rendering this grant program unnecessary?

Question No. 9, and my last question I will discuss tonight, does the administration have any views on section 1111 on the use of force, including the requirement that the Department collaborate with the Assistant Attorney General for the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice?

Those are the nine questions that I think are very pertinent to just the part of the bill we spent the last week debating and we are going to spend a few more days debating. Is the border secure? That is very basic to everything else that goes on in this piece of legislation.

As I said, the questions I have asked the Secretary are meant to ensure that we pass the best bill possible. We ought to know how she will carry out the bill if it is signed into law. I hope she will provide answers to these and the other questions I submitted on April 24.

I yield the floor.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, on June 12 and 13, 2013, I filed two amendments, Nos. 1258 and 1282, to S. 744, the Border Security, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Modernization Act. The name of Senator HIRONO

was inadvertently omitted as a cosponsor of both amendments. I have asked that Senator HIRONO be added as a cosponsor to amendment No. 1258 and amendment No. 1282.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

#### REMEMBERING FRANK R. LAUTENBERG

Mr. CASEY. Madam President. I am honored to join my fellow Senators as we remember our friend and colleague Senator Frank Lautenberg. A dedicated public servant, Frank proudly represented New Jersey almost continuously from 1982 until his death.

Long before reaching the Senate, Frank Lautenberg had proven himself a patriot. Following his high school graduation, Frank enlisted in the Army and served his country in Europe as a member of the Army Signal Corps during the Second World War. A member of the "Greatest Generation" and the last World War II veteran to serve in the Senate, Frank was a true public servant.

Motivated by the desire to give back to the country that provided him with so much, Frank's work in the Senate improved the lives of all Americans and left a lasting impact on our Nation. Through his legislative efforts, Senator Lautenberg helped to safeguard our Nation's transportation infrastructure, increase access to quality healthcare, and ensure that the brave men and women who serve our country today will have access to the same benefits and opportunities that Frank frequently credited with his success.

Frank's strong moral character often made him a leader on some of the most pressing issues of the day, and his efforts will undoubtedly leave a lasting legacy. Having cast more than 9,000 votes on the floor—more than any previous Senator from New Jersey—Frank played an influential role in shaping important policies, directing funding, and helping people in need.

On a personal note, I will always recall what a privilege it was to travel to Israel and Turkey with Frank in 2009 as part of a Congressional delegation. I admired his strong support of Israel and he will certainly be remembered as a tireless friend and advocate.

In closing, I am reminded of a quotation from President Kennedy. Senator Frank Lautenberg truly was "someone who looks ahead and not behind, someone who welcomes new ideas without rigid reactions, someone who cares about the welfare of the people—their health, their housing, their schools, their jobs, their civil rights and their civil liberties." We will miss

him in this Chamber but our country and our children have a brighter future because of his dedicated service.

#### ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

##### CORNISH, NEW HAMPSHIRE

• Ms. AYOTTE. Madam President, today I wish to recognize and honor the town of Cornish, NH as it celebrates the 250th anniversary of its founding.

Established in 1763 and incorporated in 1765 by Colonial Gov. Benning Wentworth, Cornish was named for Sir Samuel Cornish, a distinguished vice-admiral of the Royal Navy.

This area, located in Sullivan County, was once known as Mast Camp because it was the shipping point for the tall masts floated down the river by the English for use by the Royal Navy. Forestry and agriculture continue to be important components of Cornish's economy and lifestyle.

Cornish is known as a summer resort for artists and writers. In 1885, sculptor Augustus Saint-Gaudens sought a summer studio away from the heat of New York City and found himself in Cornish. Maxfield Parrish and other artists soon followed Saint-Gaudens, transforming the area into a popular artists' colony. In 1964, Saint-Gaudens' home and studio were named a national historic site. Famous authors Winston Churchill and J.D. Salinger wrote at homes in Cornish.

Cornish is home to four covered bridges, all of which are on the National Register of Historic Places. The Cornish-Windsor Covered Bridge built in 1866 is the longest two-span covered bridge in the world. The Cornish-Windsor Covered Bridge has been designated a National Civil Engineering Landmark by the American Society of Civil Engineers and still carries daily automobile traffic.

Whether it is the Cornish Fair or a summer concert at Saint-Gaudens National Historic Site, Cornish has contributed so much to the rich heritage of New Hampshire during its first 250 years. I am pleased to join the citizens across New Hampshire in celebrating this special milestone for the people of Cornish, whose accomplishments, love of country, and spirit of independence have enriched our State.●

##### RECOGNIZING QUEST AIRCRAFT

• Mr. RISCH. Madam President, a cornerstone of the American dream has always been the belief that those individuals with a good idea and a strong work ethic can become successful. In these tough economic times, it is inspiring to hear the stories of small businesses that have risen above the challenges they have faced and are making their dreams come true. That is why during National Small Business Week, I rise today to honor Quest Aircraft located in Sandpoint, ID.

Quest Aircraft was founded in 2001 by Tom Hamilton and David Voetmann.

These men saw the need for development of a plane that could be used for humanitarian work in remote areas of the world. Tom and David brought on Bruce R. Kennedy to chair Quest's board of trustees. Bruce was a man who had a noteworthy aviation career, holding the positions of chairman, chief executive officer, and president of Alaska Airlines. Bruce helped bring Tom Hamilton's and David Voetmann's vision to fruition, chairing Quest's board of trustees until his tragic death in 2007. That same year, Quest started its first production run of the KODIAK airplane.

The KODIAK airplane is a rugged short takeoff and landing, STOL, turboprop aircraft that requires only 1,000 feet of runway, making it ideally suited for the demanding nature of global humanitarian work. The KODIAK is currently in use around the world. While principally marketed for humanitarian missions, purchasers of the KODIAK include the U.S. Park Service, foreign governments, and private citizens.

Despite the impact the global recession has had on the airplane industry, Quest Aircraft has persevered and expanded their company in recent years. Quest Aircraft has expanded from a staff of 14 in 2001 to currently employing nearly 200 people. Shortly after the first year of business, Quest Aircraft moved into its 27,000-square-foot facility at the Sandpoint, ID, Municipal Airport. By May 2007, the KODIAK received FAA type certification and began global deliveries that year. Keeping in line with the mission put forward by the founders of Quest Aircraft, approximately every 10th plane produced is subsidized by the profits the company brings in. This aircraft is then donated to a participating not-for-profit humanitarian organization. This is testament to the good that can be spread from a success story such as this, and serves as an inspiration to many who wish to find the successful intersection of humanitarian work and financial success.

Small businesses like Quest Aircraft are on the cutting edge of technology and innovation. These businesses are often at the forefront of groundbreaking advances that provide much-needed solutions to the marketplace. Small businesses are the economic engines of our economy and critical to the national economic recovery. I have faith in the many small businesses that spring up in Idaho and around the United States today, and success stories such as Quest Aircraft should serve as inspiration for the future generation of innovators and entrepreneurs.●

##### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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