

I can only turn to words such as that because I have never walked in those shoes, of being part of a family who lost someone in Iraq or Afghanistan or in any conflict. So tonight we pay tribute to those Pennsylvanians who gave so much to their country, and their families as well have given so much to their country.

I am honored to be joined by my colleague Senator TOOMEY, who will begin to read the names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I thank my colleague Senator CASEY for organizing this brief tribute that is so much deserved by the servicemembers we are going to be acknowledging in a few minutes.

I would like to begin by extending my deepest condolences to the families, friends, loved ones of these true Pennsylvania heroes and the lives that they led and the cause for which they died. Those men represent all that is great about this great country.

Some enlisted right after graduating from high school. During those very tough and grueling days and weeks in basic training, I suspect they never heard of the places in Afghanistan where they would make this sacrifice.

These Pennsylvanians, of course, join a long list of soldiers, sailors, airmen, and Coast Guard members who have given their lives for this country, to include those who gave their lives in World War II, the Korean war, the Vietnam war, of course the ongoing war against violent radical Islamists all around the world.

It is no accident that Pennsylvania has suffered so heavily in this conflict, as it has in every other conflict in our Nation's history. I think it is because in the towns across Pennsylvania, towns and cities such as Tafford and Mohnton, there are certain values that are deeply rooted in those communities: importance of family, importance of faith, the importance of serving this Nation. There is a deep conviction that freedom is worth defending, and a belief that a cause worth fighting for is not just someone else's responsibility. These are the values that have helped shape these service members, their families, their churches, their houses of worship, and their communities. These values are exemplified in the lives of our fallen who will forever be honored by our great Commonwealth for their service to this country.

I will begin reading the names of the men who made the supreme sacrifice for freedom last year in this conflict, and Senator CASEY will complete the list:

CWO Matthew Paul Ruffner, U.S. Army, Tafford; CWO Jarett Michael Yoder, U.S. Army, Mohnton; SSG Marek Soja, U.S. Army, Philadelphia.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I thank my colleague for starting the list. I

will read the remaining names. I should correct myself. I said five at the beginning. I had the count wrong. It is actually six individuals:

SSG Thomas Baysore, Jr., United States Army, Milton, PA; SGT Patrick Hawkins, U.S. Army, Carlisle, PA; SSG Patrick Quinn, U.S. Army, Quarryville, PA.

As I conclude the list of Pennsylvanians who were killed in action over the past year, I want to say again we honor them. We pay tribute to them. By this brief commemoration we remember them. We remember them and we also remember the families they left behind. To quote Lincoln a second time, he once wrote to a family, "I pray that our Heavenly Father may assuage of your bereavement, and leave you only the cherished memory of the loved and lost, and the solemn pride that must be yours to have laid so costly a sacrifice upon the altar of freedom."

None of us could say it better than Abraham Lincoln did. But we offer that prayer tonight to the families. So to the families of our fallen heroes, from these and from other conflicts, please know that they and you are in our thoughts and prayers.

Again, I thank Senator TOOMEY.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### MILITARY RETIREMENT RESTORATION ACT

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I am very proud to follow my colleague from New Hampshire and thank her for her leadership in offering the Military Retirement Restoration Act, which I am very pleased to support as an amendment to the unemployment insurance extension bill.

For all the reasons I have stated, and others have expressed even more powerfully than I, this bill makes sense. We must extend unemployment benefits for the long-term jobless. The merits of this bill are absolutely indisputable and undeniable. This bill offers a critically important opportunity, and we ought to seize it to correct and fix a defect in the budget agreement that was reached by the very excellent work of our colleague Senator MURRAY and Congressman RYAN, and that was passed overwhelmingly by a bipartisan majority in this body.

It was an agreement that advanced and enhanced economic certainty. It had many advantages, but it also was far from perfect. Its flaws included a cut in military retiree benefits. These benefits were cut by provisions to that

agreement that was approved by this body, with many reservations and regrets, and now we ought to seize this opportunity to correct that defect as this measure offers us through an amendment.

We can pay for it. It can be budget neutral, if we simply close a certain egregious corporate tax loophole as Senator SHAHEEN has suggested. I want to emphasize again what Senator SHAHEEN said so well. We can think of a lot of different ways to pay for the \$6.5 billion that is necessary to correct these cuts in military retiree benefits. What is beyond question is the need to fix this flaw. It is a flaw that not only diminishes in monetary terms the benefits these retirees need and deserve, it also dishonors the service and sacrifice they have made. What better opportunity than now, as we deal with the extension of unemployment benefits in a measure that deserves overwhelming support just as the budget deal received, to correct this flaw.

There has been a lot of misinformation and confusion about exactly what the Murray-Ryan agreement did to military retirement benefits, and there is a need to address in the longer term the system that provides for retiree benefits, to make it serve better the interests of our retirees, our veterans, our patriots who have given so much to our Nation. But right now, in these next few days, beyond any kind of question or doubt, is the need to correct this defect and to follow through on the understanding that many of us had, including myself, that in fact we would correct this defect.

I supported the budget agreement with the understanding, as Chairman LEVIN of Michigan made clear, the Senate would work this year, as soon as possible, to stop the 1-percent reduction in the cost of living adjustments for military retirees until the age of 62 that would take effect in December of 2015. December, 2015 of that year is a long way off. There may be other opportunities to correct this flaw—the reduction in retiree benefits—but let's do it now. Let's not delay in restoring the benefits that these retirees need and deserve.

So I urge my colleagues to join in this effort, paying for this change by making sure companies managed and controlled in the United States can't avoid U.S. taxes simply by claiming foreign status. Many of us have long advocated closing this loophole. It seems to me a reasonable approach, far better than taking away the child tax credit for poor migrant families.

Ultimately, the pay-for issue, the offset question, should be resolved, and I believe it will be, if not in this act then in the Omnibus appropriations bill we will address next and then make sure we keep faith. We must assure that we will keep faith with these retirees who have given and served so much.

As Senator SHAHEEN has said, most Americans would agree this kind of tax avoidance is unfair, and we ought to

close this tax loophole rather than reducing military retiree benefits. What all Americans would agree with is that we should keep faith and leave no veteran behind, making sure this amendment is voted on and approved and given legal force and effect so we correct and fix the flaw in the budget agreement that has disallowed and dishonored the obligation we owe these retirees.

I thank the Presiding Officer, and I yield the floor.

#### REMEMBERING DICK CLARK

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, on December 5, the world lost one of the greatest leaders of our era, and of any era, when Nelson Mandela died at the age of 95. His capacity for forgiveness was rivaled only by his courage. His actions serve as an example for the entire world. Having led South Africa out of its darkest period of history, Mandela focused on achieving national reconciliation to transition his government from minority rule and apartheid, to a multicultural democracy. He was successful in this endeavor because he believed in the importance of bringing people together, breaking down the barriers that defined, and imprisoned, many South Africans. For Nelson Mandela, the opportunity to lead meant the possibility of painting South African society on a blank canvas. It meant the possibility of creating a unified and free South Africa, rather than perpetuating a fractured mosaic defined by inequality.

We are fortunate to have leaders among us who share many of Nelson Mandela's qualities of leadership and a focus on human rights. Having served for nearly four decades in the Senate, I have had the privilege to serve with some of them. Dick Clark, a Senator from Iowa who was in the Senate when I was first elected, is one such individual, and his story is connected to Nelson Mandela's legacy. I not only served with Senator Clark but I travelled with him to Vermont and elsewhere. His sense of commitment and his conscience set a Senate standard that is rarely matched.

He was a fierce opponent of apartheid, and a recent POLITICO article recalls Dick Clark's efforts to raise awareness in Congress on the importance of the issue, and to push legislation that would distance the United States from the South African government's activities in the region. His efforts eventually contributed to his electoral loss at the end of his term, but that did not keep him from pursuing his goals. I am pleased that during this important period of reflection, Dick Clark's contributions continue to be recognized.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the recent POLITICO article, A Nelson Mandela backstory: Iowa's Dick Clark, be printed in the RECORD.

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

[POLITICO, Dec. 26, 2013]  
A NELSON MANDELA BACKSTORY: IOWA'S DICK CLARK  
(By David Rogers)

Dick Clark was Mandela when Mandela wasn't cool.

A one-term Democratic senator from Iowa and for years afterward a leader of congressional discussions on apartheid, Clark is now 85 and long gone from the public scene. But the ups and downs of his career are an intriguing back story—and counterpart—to the outpouring of praise for Nelson Mandela, the black liberation leader and former president of South Africa who died Dec. 5.

It wasn't always that way in Washington. Indeed, Mandela turned 60 in South Africa's Robben Island prison in the summer of 1978 even as Clark—chairman of the African Affairs panel on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee—was fighting for his own re-election in Iowa.

It was a time when Republican challenger Roger Jepsen felt free to taunt the Democrat as “the senator from Africa.” Tensions were such that the State Department called in a South African Embassy official in May for making disparaging remarks about Clark in Iowa. And after Clark lost, South Africa's ousted information secretary, Eschel Rhoodie, said his government invested \$250,000 to defeat Clark, who had become a thorn in the side of the white regime.

Jepsen denied any knowledge of South Africa's alleged role. Nor does Clark accuse him of such. But 35 years after, Clark has no doubt that the apartheid government led by Prime Minister B. J. Vorster wanted him out—and had a hand in his defeat.

Clark's liberal record and support of the Panama Canal Treaty, which narrowly cleared the Senate in the spring of 1978, also hurt his chances in Iowa. But the fatal blow was a fierce wave of late-breaking ground attacks from anti-abortion forces—something even conservative writers like Robert Novak had not anticipated in a published column weeks before.

“Abortion was the issue, and how much effect this apparent \$250,000 had to do with promoting it more, I have no way of evaluating it,” Clark said in a recent interview at his home in Washington. “No question that they did it. They said they did, and I think they did.”

Clark had made himself a target for South Africa with his high-profile chairmanship of the Africa subcommittee. In Washington as well, he was not without critics who accused him of being too puritanical, too quick to fault U.S. policy. But like no senator before him, Clark used the panel to raise the visibility of human rights issues in the southern regions of the continent. The roster of prior Africa subcommittee chairs reads like a Who's Who of national Democrats: John Kennedy in the late 1950s; Tennessee Sen. Albert Gore, father of the future vice president; future Senate Majority Leader Mike Mansfield; and former Vice President Hubert Humphrey after his return to the Senate. But all stayed for just one Congress before moving on. Clark stuck, challenging Cold War policies that he believed hurt the larger struggle against apartheid that Mandela symbolized.

“He was the icebreaker here,” says his friend Rep. George Miller (D-Cal.). “He was out breaking ice on Africa issues for the country and certainly for the Senate.” What's more, after losing his Senate seat, Clark didn't stop. Instead, he found a new classroom via the Aspen Institute, where the former professor began what amounted to his own graduate program in 1983 to educate members of Congress about different policy issues.

Russia had been Clark's early academic interest and was as well in his first years at Aspen. But Africa tugged and he set out “to try to get a get a cadre of Congress who would know about South Africa and what was going on in South Africa.”

These typically were nearly weeklong seminars—held at choice locales overseas to lure members of Congress but also to provide neutral ground for the warring parties inside South Africa.

Bermuda, for example, served as a meeting place in 1989. The island allowed officials from the South African government to shuttle in and out before the arrival of outlawed representatives for Mandela's African National Congress, which was operating then from outside South Africa.

“All of them were there, making their pitches,” Clark said. And once Mandela was released from prison in 1990, the venue shifted to South Africa itself. “We got Mandela, who had just gotten out of jail not long before, to come,” Clark recalls of an April 1991 session in Cape Town—a seminar that also included F. W. de Klerk, South Africa's white president.

Most striking here was Clark's impact on Republicans—the party that helped to throw him out of the Senate.

“He is a wonder,” says former Sen. Alan Simpson (R-Wyo.). “I had been told he was a lefty, the stereotype, but he just drew out people. He never showed bitterness toward the right or promoting one side.”

Just as “Mandela made a difference, Dick Clark made a difference in awareness” at home in Congress, Simpson adds.

Former Rep. John Porter (R-Ill.) remembers an Aspen meeting in Cape Town at which Clark surprised the participants on the last day by sending them out to walk through the neighborhoods of a black township to meet with families. “Dick Clark would do things like that,” Porter said.

“This was before all the big changes in South Africa when we were debating sanctions,” said former Sen. John Danforth (R-Mo.). “He was just so dedicated to it and knew all the players.” In fact, Clark says he knew very little about Africa before coming to the Senate after the 1972 elections. But when a seat opened up on Foreign Relations in 1975, he grabbed it and fell into the Africa post—just ahead of his classmate Sen. JOSEPH BIDEN (D-Del.), the future vice president. Timing is everything in Congress and it was Clark's good fortune in this case. The legendary but very controlling Foreign Relations Committee Chairman J. William Fulbright (D-Ark.) had just left the Senate at the end of 1974 and this allowed subcommittee chairs like Clark to act more on their own.

“Fulbright's attitude was the subcommittees couldn't do anything. Everything ought to be done by the full committee,” Clark said. “I was next to last on seniority. When it got down to me, the only thing left was Africa about which I knew very little. Some would say none. So I just figured: Here's a chance to learn something and I spent a lot of time doing hearings and learning about Africa.”

He also traveled—venturing into southern, sub-Saharan Africa which was then unfamiliar to many on the Senate committee.

“Humphrey told me that he got as far south as Ethiopia,” Clark said. “It was new territory and interesting and of course we were putting a lot of covert money in Africa, as were the Russians.” In the summer of 1975, Clark and two aides left Washington for what was to be a trip to just Tanzania, Zambia and Zaire. But that itinerary quickly expanded to include the two former Portuguese colonies, Mozambique and Angola.

The Angola detour was pivotal and included face-to-face meetings with Central Intelligence Agency personnel on the ground as