

(Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1862, a bill to grant the Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the Monuments Men, in recognition of their heroic role in the preservation, protection, and restitution of monuments, works of art, and artifacts of cultural importance during and following World War II.

S. 1923

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1923, a bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to exempt from registration brokers performing services in connection with the transfer of ownership of smaller privately held companies.

S. 1980

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1980, a bill to amend titles XIX and XXI of the Social Security Act to provide for 12-month continuous enrollment under the Medicaid program and Children's Health Insurance Program and to promote quality care.

S. 2026

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2026, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income any prizes or awards won in competition in the Olympic Games or the Paralympic Games.

S. 2037

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) 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. CON. RES. 6

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 6, a concurrent resolution supporting the Local Radio Freedom Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 2752

At the request of Mr. BURR, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) and the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 2752 intended to be proposed to S. 1982, a bill to improve the provision of medical services and benefits to veterans, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2760

At the request of Mr. COBURN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2760 intended to be proposed to S. 1982, a bill to improve the provision of medical services and benefits to veterans, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2762

At the request of Mr. COBURN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin

(Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2762 intended to be proposed to S. 1982, a bill to improve the provision of medical services and benefits to veterans, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. ROBERTS:

S. 2064. A bill to provide for the repeal of certain provisions of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act that have the effect of rationing health care; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to discuss ObamaCare provisions that should be keeping my colleagues and all Americans up at night. Obviously, my views are very different from my colleagues who have just propounded their views on the same subject.

Unfortunately, since the implementation of ObamaCare began, the stories and reports have only confirmed the many warnings that I and many of my colleagues made during the debate. Most of the stories Kansans tell me now involve many hundreds of dollars in increases in monthly premiums or people simply losing their coverage. These are real stories from real Kansans, and they are not lies.

Compounding the problem, this administration has made it a routine practice to do what we call a regulations dump on Friday. This is a deliberate posting of sometimes thousands of pages of regulations during the time when the American public and the press is least likely to be paying attention.

Most recent reports from the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services—what we call CMS—are that millions of small businesses will face increased premium rates under ObamaCare. The President promised to make it easier for small businesses to offer coverage and, lo and behold, it may even become impossible for them to do so.

Then there are the cuts our seniors are about to face to their Medicare plans. We can't forget that the President pilfered—that is a good word, pilfered—\$1 trillion from Medicare to pay for ObamaCare. These cuts have been delayed, but the most recent regulation on Part D and Medicare Advantage will be extremely detrimental to seniors' access to the availability of Medicare plans. And because of this, for once—for once—I wish to speak about a subject where we get ahead of the curve, get in front of the next disaster, and repeal specific provisions of this law that I think will be most harmful to patients.

I have talked before about how this law comes between patients and doctors, but I think we need to bring more attention to the specter of what I call rationing—yes, rationing. In the absence of complete repeal, I urge my colleagues that these provisions must be repealed.

During the health care reform debate, and many times since then, I have spoken at length about rationing. Specifically, I want people to know about what I refer to as the four rations that are included in ObamaCare. Yes, this is a very real threat. And, yes, they will ration care.

Let me start with something called the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services Innovation Center. That is a pretty big, fancy government name. The Center has an enormous budget to match, aimed at finding innovative ways to reform payment and the delivery of health care. That sounds very good, but what this means is that the "innovation center" can now use taxpayer dollars to invest in ways to reduce patient access to care.

Let me say that again. The government can now use taxpayer dollars to invest in ways to reduce patient access to care. It gives the government new powers to cut payments to Medicare beneficiaries with the goal to reduce program expenditures. The reality is they are going to reduce patients' ability to access the care they want and need—all hidden under the cloak of innovation. And that isn't innovation at all. Even if they did give it a fancy title, folks, it is smoke and mirrors. This outfit is already pushing out all of the regulations to implement ObamaCare that are now hurting patients—all the regulations we hear about from our health care providers.

Let me move to the second ration. It grants new authorities to the U.S. Preventive Services Task Force—that is another nice-sounding entity with a long title. This Preventive Services Task Force used to be a body that was scientific and academic, that reviewed treatment, testing, and prevention information, and made recommendations for primary doctors. Nothing is wrong with that. It used to be an academic body that made recommendations, not a body pushing through mandates and regulations. Many would argue that is still what they do today. However, the effect of their recommendations is they are significantly more costly and burdensome. Because of ObamaCare, the task force can now decide what should and, more importantly, should not be covered by health plans. That is not prevention, that is rationing. If the task force doesn't recommend it, then it won't be covered by health plans and patients bear the cost of the procedure. We are seeing this already with things such as prostate exams and mammograms for breast cancer which have been so helpful to so many people—saved their lives.

The third rationer is the Patient Centered Outcomes Research Institute. Yes, that is another mouthful. This is the outfit that was given millions and millions of dollars to do comparative effectiveness research. I am not opposed to research. I don't know anyone in this body who is opposed to research, especially when it is used to inform the conversation between doctors

and their patients. But there is a reason this was formerly called cost-effective research. There is a very fine line between providing information to doctors and patients to determine the best course of care and using that information to decide whether the care or treatment is worth paying for. I have long been concerned that instead this research will be abused to arbitrarily deny patients access to potentially lifesaving treatments or services. That simply should not happen. The research should only be used for the doctor and the patient to make the best health care decision.

Finally, the fourth rationer—my personal nemesis—the Independent Payment Advisory Board—IPAD. This is a board made up of 15 unelected bureaucrats who will decide what gets to stay and what gets to go in Medicare coverage. They will decide which treatments and services will be covered and which will not, with no accountability whatsoever.

When proposed, supporters of the health care law told me: We are too close to our constituents. It is too difficult to make the hard decisions.

Then they said: Let's have somebody else do it.

That was during the debate with regard to IPAD.

I couldn't believe it. I believe we are elected to make the hard decisions and take care of the hard votes, and I believe that is the way Kansans want it, and I think that is the way virtually everybody in every other State wants it. This board diminishes our constitutional responsibility.

Even worse is the fine print of the Independent Payment Advisory Board, or IPAD. If Kansans or any Americans determine they do not like the direction the board is taking and they call my office and, down the road, any other office of any other distinguished Senator to ask me to do something about it—which is what you get when you go back home on any regulation today: what are you going to do about it?—it will take 60 votes in the Senate to overturn their decision—60.

On the surface this sounds OK until you realize that the President doubtless will never support Congress overturning the recommendation of this board made up of his bureaucrats. So he will veto it, and overriding a veto, obviously, takes a two-thirds vote. That is 66 votes to overturn a decision by the payment board.

My colleagues have been changing the rules around here because they think 60 votes is too high a threshold. What are the chances of reaching 66? But wait. There is even more. If the Secretary appoints a board unable to make recommendations for cuts to Medicare—tough decisions, albeit—then she gets the authority to make the decision of what to cut, one person.

This President has already cut \$½ trillion from Medicare to pay for ObamaCare and gave himself the ability to go after even more Medicare dol-

lars and have no accountability. This, my friends, is frightening; it is ridiculous; it is irresponsible; but it is not new.

I have been talking about the four rationers for a long time and what it means to patients, especially senior patients.

What upsets me, scares me, as I watch all the other warnings and broken promises come true, is what is going to happen to Kansans and all the folks back home when the warnings about the four rationers come true.

We need to protect the all-important doctor-patient relationship, which the four rationers put at risk. That is why today I come to the floor to introduce the Four Rationers Repeal Act of 2014.

For once, look beyond the current troubles we are experiencing. We have to get ahead of the curve. This legislation repeals the Independent Payment Advisory Board; it repeals the euphemistically but misleadingly named Innovation Center; it repeals the changes made to the Preventive Services Task Force; and it makes sure any—any—comparative effectiveness research, called CER, is used by the doctor and patient, not coverage providers or CMS, to determine the best care for patients.

This legislation is relatively simple. It should be supported by all of my colleagues to address some of the egregious changes from ObamaCare that are about to happen just around the bend. It is time to get ahead of the curve this time, prevent it.

I really believe that in order to protect this all-important doctor-patient relationship, we need to repeal and, most importantly, replace ObamaCare with the real reforms that work for Kansans and all Americans.

However, in the meantime we can also start taking it down, piece by piece, which is what my Four Rationers Repeal Act does. I urge my colleagues to support this proposal. For once, let's get ahead of the curve.

By Mr. INHOFE (for himself and Mr. LEVIN):

S. 2065. A bill to create incentives for the development of alternative fuel vehicles; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, today I join with Senator INHOFE to introduce a bill to incentivize the production and use of alternative fuel vehicles, including natural gas vehicles, NGVs, and plug-in-electric hybrids. Encouraging the production of alternative fuel vehicles will help to diversify our fuel mix, while reducing our reliance on imported oil and also reducing carbon emissions. In the U.S. alone, NGVs offset the use of nearly 360 million gallons of gasoline in 2011. We hope our bill will help increase that number.

The moment is right to capitalize on the abundance of domestically sourced natural gas. Already, American manufacturers have benefited from the availability of domestically produced

natural gas, reducing the cost of US-based production and contributing to the return of manufacturing to the United States. If we can expand the use of natural gas to fuel our vehicles, then American consumers can also benefit from this cleaner and cheaper domestic fuel.

Michigan has become a leading innovator in advanced alternative fuel vehicles and is revolutionizing our transportation sector. As automakers in Michigan and elsewhere manufacture NGVs they face the dilemma often encountered when introducing an alternative fueled vehicle: what will come first, the NGV infrastructure or the vehicle itself? This is the classic chicken and egg question. Ethanol, Diesel and electric vehicles all faced this challenge when first introduced. Our bill will allow Michigan to continue to innovate and harness the power and benefits that domestically sourced alternative fuels have to offer this country.

The benefits of expanding the number of natural gas and alternative fuel vehicles on our roads are numerous. Up to 90 percent of the natural gas used in the United States comes from the United States. We need to tap into this domestic resource for our transportation needs and take an aggressive approach to reducing our dependence on foreign oil. Consumers should also have more choice and flexibility when it comes to fueling their vehicles. This bill allows for that. At the moment natural gas is about half the price of gasoline. Consumers should be able to benefit from these reduced prices. Furthermore, vehicles running on natural gas have 20-30 percent less CO₂ tailpipe emissions than gasoline fueled vehicles. Because natural gas burns cleaner, it increases the life of the car. It has no lead or benzene or other chemicals that break down auto parts or dilute lubricants.

These are all desirable reasons to encourage more NGV production. The use of natural gas vehicles is expanding among private fleets used by airports and transit agencies where refueling infrastructure is available. However, the chicken and egg dilemma is slowing the adoption of both dedicated and bi-fuel natural gas vehicles among light-duty passenger vehicles.

Our legislation would incentivize both production and consumer demand for alternative fuel vehicles such as natural gas vehicles and plug-in electric hybrids by expanding regulatory incentives. It would also provide consumers with an added incentive to drive natural gas vehicles by giving them access to high occupancy vehicle, HOV, lanes. Giving consumers an additional benefit such as HOV access could help increase demand for these vehicles and the fueling stations that are necessary to support them.

The President outlined in his State of the Union his goal to achieve energy independence through the use of alternative fuels. He specifically mentioned natural gas as the bridge fuel that can

grow our economy, create jobs for the middle class, and reduce carbon pollution. I am pleased to introduce legislation today that takes a step toward meeting that goal.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 364—EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE INTERNAL REBUILDING, RESETTLEMENT, AND RECONCILIATION WITHIN SRI LANKA THAT ARE NECESSARY TO ENSURE A LASTING PEACE

Mr. INHOFE (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. CRAPO, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. ENZI) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations :

S. RES. 364

Whereas May 19, 2014, marks the five-year anniversary of the end of the 26 year civil war between the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE) and the Government of Sri Lanka;

Whereas the people of Sri Lanka suffered greatly as a result of this conflict, the impact and aftermath of which has been felt by all, especially by women, children, and families;

Whereas the Government of Sri Lanka established a "Lessons Learnt and Reconciliation Commission" (LLRC) to report whether any person, group, or institution directly or indirectly bears responsibility for incidents that occurred between February 2002 and May 2009 and to recommend measures to prevent the recurrence of such incidents in the future and promote further national unity and reconciliation among all communities;

Whereas the LLRC report was presented to the Sri Lankan Parliament on December 16, 2011, and officially translated into Sinhala and Tamil on August 16, 2012;

Whereas the LLRC report acknowledges important events and grievances that have contributed to decades of political violence and war in Sri Lanka and makes constructive recommendations on a wide range of issues, including the need to credibly investigate widespread allegations of extrajudicial killings; enforced disappearances; intentional targeting of civilians and noncombatants; demilitarizing the north and the country as a whole; reaching a political settlement with minority communities on the meaningful decentralization of power; and promoting and protecting the right to freedom of expression for all through the enactment of a right to information law and additional rule of law reforms;

Whereas the Government of Sri Lanka developed the National Plan of Action to implement the recommendations of the LLRC and has made significant progress within limited time in the implementation of the National Plan of Action, notably in the areas of demining, rehabilitation of ex-combatants, resettlement of displaced persons, improvements of infrastructure and social services in the North and East, as well as investigations into complaints regarding persons who have disappeared during the war;

Whereas there have been reports of attacks on places of worship and restrictions on the media in several places in Sri Lanka;

Whereas the Government of Sri Lanka expressed its commitment to address the needs

of all ethnic groups and has recognized the necessity of a political settlement and reconciliation for a peaceful and just society, which is a long-term process that will need to be driven by the people of Sri Lanka themselves;

Whereas the September 21, 2013, elections in Sri Lanka for the Northern, Central, and North Western Provincial Councils were an important step in fulfilling this commitment;

Whereas these elections were made possible through a sustained effort by the Government of Sri Lanka to restore infrastructure in the North and put in place a system for the conduct of the elections;

Whereas the elections allowed the people of the North of Sri Lanka to exercise their political rights that had been withheld from them for more than 20 years by the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE) and resulted in a clear victory for the provincial wing of the Tamil National Alliance;

Whereas Sri Lanka is enjoying rapid economic growth as an important hub for shipping transport, technology, and tourism in the South Asia region;

Whereas Sri Lanka is of great strategic importance to the United States, due to its location, deep-water ports, and proximity to the world's busiest shipping lanes, an importance noticed and pursued by other significant powers; and

Whereas Sri Lanka seeks to be a key United States partner in the fight against terrorism and Indian Ocean piracy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) calls upon the President to develop a comprehensive and well balanced policy towards Sri Lanka that reflects United States interests, including respect for human rights, democracy, and the rule of law, as well as economic and security interests;

(2) calls on the United States Government and the international community to assist the Government of Sri Lanka, with due regard to its sovereignty, stability, and security, in establishing domestic mechanisms to deal with any grievances arising from actions committed by both sides during and after the civil war in Sri Lanka;

(3) encourages the Government of Sri Lanka to put in place a truth and reconciliation commission similar to the one adopted by South Africa to help heal the wounds of war, taking into account the unique characteristics of the conflict and its aftermath; and

(4) urges the Government of Sri Lanka to improve religious and media freedoms and to bring to justice those responsible for attacks on journalists and newspaper offices as well as places of worship, regardless of religion.

SENATE RESOLUTION 365—DEPLORING THE VIOLENT REPRESSION OF PEACEFUL DEMONSTRATORS IN VENEZUELA, CALLING FOR FULL ACCOUNTABILITY FOR HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS TAKING PLACE IN VENEZUELA, AND SUPPORTING THE RIGHT OF THE VENEZUELAN PEOPLE TO THE FREE AND PEACEFUL EXERCISE OF REPRESENTATIVE DEMOCRACY

Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. CRUZ, and Mr. NELSON) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.:

S. RES. 365

Whereas the Government of Venezuela's chronic mismanagement of its economy has produced inflation that exceeds 50 percent annually, currency shortages, economic distortions, and the routine absence of basic goods and foodstuffs;

Whereas the Government of Venezuela's failure to guarantee minimal standards of public security for its citizens has led the country to become one of the most violent in the world, with the per capita homicide rate in the city of Caracas exceeding 115 per 100,000 people;

Whereas the Government of Venezuela has taken continued steps to remove checks and balances on the executive, politicize the judiciary, undermine the independence of the legislature through use of executive decree powers, persecute and prosecute its political opponents, curtail freedom of the press, and limit the free expression of its citizens;

Whereas, on January 23, 2014, National Representative Maria Corina Machado and Mr. Leopoldo López, leader of the political party "Popular Will", among others, called on the Venezuelan people to gather in street assemblies and debate a popular, democratic and constitutional "way out" of Venezuela's crisis of governability;

Whereas, since February 4, 2014, the people of Venezuela—responding to ongoing economic hardship, high levels of crime and violence, and the lack of basic political rights and individual freedoms—have turned out in demonstrations in Caracas and throughout the country to protest the Government of Venezuela's inability to ensure the political and economic well-being of its citizens;

Whereas the government of Nicolas Maduro responded to the mass demonstrations by ordering the arrest without evidence of senior opposition leaders, including Mr. Leopoldo Lopez, Carlos Vecchio, and Antonio Rivero, and by violently repressing peaceful demonstrators with the help of the Venezuelan National Guard and groups of armed, government-affiliated civilians, known as "collectives";

Whereas, on February 18, 2014, opposition leader Leopoldo Lopez turned himself in to authorities in Venezuela, was arrested, and charged unjustly with criminal incitement, conspiracy, arson, and intent to damage property;

Whereas the Maduro government has sought to censor information about the demonstrations and the government's violent crackdown by blocking online images and threatening the few remaining uncensored domestic media outlets;

Whereas President Maduro threatened to expel the United States news network CNN from Venezuela and has taken off the air the Colombian news channel NTN 24, which transmits in Venezuela, after news outlets reported on the nation-wide protests;

Whereas the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights released a statement on February 14, 2014, which "expresses its concern over the serious incidents of violence that have taken place in the context of protest demonstrations in Venezuela, as well as other complaints concerning acts of censorship against media outlets, attacks on organizations that defend human rights, and acts of alleged political persecution"; and

Whereas, as of February 27, 2014, there have been 13 people killed, over 100 injured, and dozens have been unjustly detained due to pro-democracy demonstrations throughout Venezuela: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) reaffirms United States support for the people of Venezuela in their pursuit of the free exercise of representative democracy as guaranteed by the Venezuelan constitution