

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—S. 2148, H.R. 3474, AND H.R. 3979

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I am told there are three bills at the desk due for a second reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KAINE). The clerk will read the bills by title for the second time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2148) to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes;

A bill (H.R. 3474) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow employers to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of the employer mandate under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act;

A bill (H.R. 3979) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I object to any further proceedings with respect to these three bills.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The bills will be placed on the calendar.

#### RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

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

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed as if in morning business.

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

#### RECOMMENDING GEOFFREY CRAWFORD

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, in Vermont we have been fortunate that for almost two decades Judge William Sessions has served with distinction as a Federal judge for the District of Vermont. In January, Judge Sessions announced that he would take senior status later this year. In response to this news, the Vermont Bar Association, Senator SANDERS, and I, each appointed three members to the Judicial Nominating Commission.

The commission, as one can imagine, received many applications for this district court vacancy. It interviewed and vetted seven finalists, and then rec-

ommended to us the two candidates who garnered unanimous support.

I spent hours interviewing them last week in Vermont, and today I am recommending that the President nominate Geoffrey Crawford, a recently-appointed justice from Vermont's highest court. I talked to him at great length last week and again at length this morning. I am very comfortable in forwarding his name to President Obama, as I now have.

Justice Crawford is an experienced and well-respected jurist. He is known for his modesty and humanity, notwithstanding his elite educational background and intellectual heft. He was a successful plaintiffs' attorney before he was appointed to the Vermont Superior Court in 2002.

Then-Judge Crawford served on the superior court in our State for more than a decade, earning a reputation for his skill in working with juries and handling a wide variety of litigation. Attorneys who have appeared before him, on either side, have found him to be an engaged and careful jurist who treats everyone in the courtroom with respect. I have talked with a number of those lawyers, and they speak of his respect and abilities.

As a lawyer, I wanted to hear this, and although I did not know Justice Crawford before interviewing him for this vacancy, the Vermont legal community repeatedly told me of his intelligence, warmth, and unwavering commitment to the highest calling of public service.

When I met Justice Crawford, I found him to be well deserving of these accolades, and I was impressed by his thoughtfulness and pragmatic approach to the law, as was the chief counsel of the Judiciary Committee, Kristine Lucius, and the state director of my Vermont offices, John Tracy.

I am confident that Justice Crawford will make an excellent Federal district court judge and I hope the President will nominate him soon for the vacancy on Vermont's Federal district court.

#### TRIBUTE TO GENERAL RICHARD CODY

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, it is my honor today to pay tribute to a fellow native of Montpelier, VT, GEN Richard Cody. General Cody is going to be honored next month—and deservedly so—by his alma mater, Montpelier High School.

Following his graduation from Montpelier High School, General Cody attended and graduated from the U.S. Military Academy at West Point. This was the launch of an outstanding U.S. Army career which took him all over our country and world and culminated in his service from 2004 to 2008 as Vice Chief of Staff of the Army. I am really proud to share a hometown with such a distinguished member of our military. I remember how proud Marcelle and I were of General Cody on the day of his retirement ceremony, with full honors, here in Washington.

The Codys and the Leahys go back decades in Montpelier and have always

been friends. General Cody, his siblings, and parents have been among the business and civic leaders in that city for as long as I can remember, and they have always shown the best of true Vermont values. The General brought those values of hard work, patriotism, and especially integrity to his military career, and ended that career as the best example a soldier could have. Even the Secretary of Defense was there for the retirement ceremony to honor him.

I think of this man who would often march from his quarters in Virginia to the Pentagon carrying a military pack just to remind himself of what soldiers on the front line were doing. I have known many in the military—from privates to generals. No one has ranked higher in my esteem than General Dick Cody. He set an example for the whole country.

No salute to a member of the military would be complete without recognizing the family beside the man. Dick's wife, Vicki, and his sons Clint and Tyler, sacrificed much through his service to our country. In fact, Clint and Tyler followed in their father's footsteps, both as members of the Army, and served as helicopter pilots during several combat tours in Iraq and Afghanistan. I am told one flew the same helicopter his father had flown.

In closing, I would like to thank the Montpelier High School Boosters Club, and the citizens of Montpelier, for honoring General Cody. There is no more deserving alumnus, and I am proud to call him a friend.

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

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

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, when the Senate last met, I introduced, together with Senator DURBIN, a resolution regarding our response to Russia's invasion of Ukraine. That resolution, which received unanimous support in the Senate, called for a number of specific steps to punish and isolate Russia for its actions.

Among these steps we called upon President Obama to impose sanctions on officials of the Russian Federation who are most responsible for the invasion of the Crimean region. I am pleased with recent announcements by the White House which demonstrate that the President has begun the process of sanctioning some of these individuals, although I had hoped the numbers sanctioned would be far greater.

I also note that today the President is in the Netherlands discussing with

our European allies and partners the need for further steps. I trust and hope he will be successful in reaching a firm consensus with our allies and friends to define a strong united response to Russian aggression.

Further, I also welcome such provisions in the legislation that is now pending in the Senate, the Support for the Sovereignty, Integrity, Democracy, and Economic Stability of Ukraine Act of 2014, which I trust and hope the Senate will be acting on beginning this evening and perhaps extending into this week.

I would note time is somewhat of the essence. If we are going to send a message to Russia, certainly we don't want to be bogged down in internal delay over nonrelated or only slightly related issues. In fact, that is why Senator DURBIN and I moved our provisions forward before the Senate adjourned for the break, simply to make sure there was a united, bipartisan Senate unanimously approved agreement on 15 measures that would get the message to Vladimir Putin and the Russians that we take this very seriously.

The legislation we will be dealing with also sanctions the Russians responsible for this recent aggression by prohibiting them from coming to the United States and freezing their assets in America. Our European allies have done likewise, and together we have begun to respond to Russia's outrageous behavior.

However, it is my strong belief that much more needs to be done. We and our European allies must recognize the enormity of Putin's crime as he rejects all modern standards of responsible international behavior and tramples on the sanctity of the territorial borders so vital to the stability of the postwar order.

The international response must be more vigorous if we are to prove that Putin's behavior is unacceptable and cannot be repeated. A strong response now is the best way to reassure our allies and friends who are precariously placed on Russia's borders that this outrage must be stopped, reversed, and ended. Conversely, to do little more than prevent a handful of Russian officials traveling abroad will show Putin and his cronies that in the end we actually do not mean what we say.

Again, the international response needs to be, has to be, much more vigorous if we are to prove that we stand together and united, one voice, claiming that the behavior of President Putin is unacceptable and cannot be repeated.

When Senator DURBIN and I introduced our prior resolution on this subject, we signaled our willingness to work with the administration to craft more punishing sanctions, including economic sanctions possibly targeting key sectors of the Russian economy, and I believe many of us here in the Senate on both sides of the aisle want to do more. I have suggested a range of provisions that would reduce Russia's

oil and gas exports—which contribute a very significant amount to their economy and are therefore very dependent—I hope the President is discussing those very measures in Europe with our partners as we speak.

We are all aware that sanctioning key Russian economic activities carries the possibility that our economic interests and those of our European allies could be affected at the same time. While this is reason for us to be thoughtful in terms of how we move forward, it is not a reason for inaction. It should not be the basis for our standing by and watching what is happening and simply saying: Well, this could potentially affect us economically back at home and therefore excuse the actions and probably enable further actions by our Russian adversary in this case.

In the end, unpunished, unconstrained, rampant Russian territorial expansion will threaten us all to a much greater extent. Doing something now could prevent something much worse later. Standing up now could prevent something much more serious in terms of what we might have to do later. Sound policy decisions must reflect full assessments of all eventual consequences, and that includes a clear picture of what the world will look like if illegal, forceful annexation of a neighbor's territory is ignored or met only with a rap on the knuckles.

I continue to believe we can and must do more to isolate Russia. This includes, for example, explicitly expelling Russia from the G8—not temporarily but explicitly expelling them and ending the NATO-Russia Council.

In addition, I am proposing today a specific economic sanction that will harm Russian interests in a serious way and, hopefully, with minimal or no damage to our own. I am introducing an amendment to Ukraine aid bill and I trust it will find broad bipartisan support. The purpose of this amendment is to sanction Russia's Rosoboronexport, the sole state agency for export of Russian weapon systems and defense-related goods. This is a state corporation exclusively entitled to export the entire range of Russian armaments officially allowed for export. It was set up for that purpose. It was set up by President Putin. It is a state-owned enterprise and its business is sending Russian arms around the world—some to very bad actors.

Many of our colleagues here in the Senate know of this arms export agency because of Russia's continuing supply of arms to Assad's regime in Syria. Many here have repeatedly called on the administration to stop all cooperation with Rosoboronexport for that reason. We now have a new, broader reason for ending all cooperation with this export agency of Russia. To take steps to meaningfully obstruct that agency's work and the income it provides the Russian state will become the most effective ways we have of demonstrating our condemnation of Russian action by force of arms.

Let me briefly explain my amendment. It does three things: First, it prohibits the U.S. Government from doing any business with this Russian agency by prohibiting future contracts and canceling past contracts.

It is true the recent National Defense Authorization Act, which I supported, also includes similar language. But that act includes a waiver authority and another work-around provision the Defense Department has been using in order to buy Russian helicopters for Afghanistan. This practice has met with objection. It was objectionable when it began and it became more objectionable as the Russians continued to supply Assad. Now, based on what they have done in Crimea, it should be entirely unacceptable.

Also, I just learned this morning that President Karzai announced his support for the Russian annexation of Crimea and approval of Russian actions, which makes our purchase of Russian weapons for the Karzai regime even more outrageous. After all we have done to support President Karzai and the Afghans with U.S. tax dollars and the lives and injuries to U.S. and coalition soldiers—after all we have done over a decade of time—President Karzai reaches out and publicly supports the Russian action, contrary to ours. Russia is the nation which pillaged Afghanistan for a decade. It is beyond belief that President Karzai can support, along with countries such as Syria and Venezuela—haven't heard from Cuba yet, but probably will—the Russian action when we are there trying to save his hide not only with our tax dollars but with our soldiers' lives.

So my amendment takes away this waiver and would put a complete end to Karzai's business dealings with the Russians. Karzai will have to buy his Russian helicopters with his own money, not ours.

Secondly, I propose this amendment will prohibit contracts with any domestic or foreign company that cooperates with Rosoboronexport in the design, manufacture, or military development of military equipment. Other types of business dealings with the corporation for nonmilitary activities would not be affected. We are going after the military exports, many of which go to some of our sworn enemies.

Third, I propose to authorize the President to deduct from our foreign assistance programs any amount that a foreign state recipient spends on Russian weapons through Rosoboronexport. These deductions would be made from the Economic Support Fund and security assistance accounts but would not affect other aid programs. The President would be authorized to reprogram such funds for use elsewhere subject to congressional notification.

If a USAID recipient is tempted to use some of our money to buy Russian weapons, they need to know we would deduct that amount from our assistance programs. They can buy Russian

weapons on their own dime, not on our dime.

Taken together, I believe these proposals would be a very useful addition to the Ukraine aid act and give it the additional teeth it needs. This amendment would harm the Russian arms industry, the Russian economy, Russian prestige, and Putin's standing in the world. That ought to be our goal. Whether it is my amendment, any other amendment, or whether it is the act we will be debating, it needs to harm the Russian arms industry, the Russian energy portion of the economy, Russian prestige, and Putin's standing in the world.

This amendment will serve as a concrete and immediate response to the illegal invasion perpetrated by the Russian Federation. I urge the majority leader to permit a full debate, an up-or-down vote on my amendment, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

With that, I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HIRONO). The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, I rise today to support the Ukraine assistance package, which will be on the floor for a vote later this evening. I want to thank the leadership of Senator MENENDEZ and all the great work Senator CORKER has put into this bill. I was proud to help put it together, along with Senators JOHNSON, MCCAIN, and many others who were part of our debate in the Foreign Relations Committee.

I come to the floor, as I am sure others have and will over the course of this afternoon, to talk about the vital importance of a big bipartisan vote in favor of this legislation this evening.

Having just come from Ukraine—I was there this last weekend with a number of my colleagues, and it was my second trip to Kiev in the last 3 months—I can tell you they are awaiting a very strong signal of support from the U.S. Congress that will send a message we are going to stand together with our Ukrainian brothers and sisters as they engage in this epic battle for their independence, for their freedom, and for their sovereignty.

I won't belabor the underlying details of the bill, but the three components of the legislation are all equally important to Ukraine. We heard support for all three of these pieces while we were there over this last weekend.

First and foremost, clearly, we have to deliver on our promise of economic aid. There is \$1 billion of loan guarantees in this bill, and it is contingent upon the signing of a new agreement with the IMF, but it will also leverage about \$15 billion in funds from Europe. This is important because even before this crisis precipitated by the Russian invasion of Crimea, Ukraine's economy was incredibly fragile, and this international crisis has done nothing but to further weaken the country.

Ukrainians have a new government—one they have faith in, one they can be-

lieve in—that will finally bring an end to the corruption which has been rife throughout the Ukrainian Government over the past decade. But this new government will be undermined by an economic crisis that will occur, guaranteed, unless the United States steps up and provides this assistance. But we can't do it alone, and so that is why the second component of this bill would allow the United States to agree to a set of IMF reforms that would dramatically increase the amount of funding the IMF has to provide countries in crisis, such as Ukraine.

Every other IMF member has signed on to these reforms except for the United States, and it has been largely due to the intransigence of this body that the United States stands on the sidelines. Some people have categorized the IMF reform component of this bill as superfluous, as a political add-on. That couldn't be further from the truth. When we were meeting with Ukrainian officials in this new government last weekend, they specifically asked that we pass the IMF reforms, because they know the only way they get an assistance package that is in the neighborhood of \$20 billion or \$30 billion is through the IMF. And the IMF will be much more likely able to provide that if the United States steps up and agrees to these reforms.

Lastly, we need to send a strong, clear message to Russia there are consequences for their actions in Crimea. By giving the President the authorization to move forward on a broad range of sanctions, we will show that Putin was wrong when he calculated that a march into Crimea would come at little to no cost to Russia.

I want to talk for a minute about what this really tells us about the status of Russia in the region and in the world. I am sure my other colleagues will come down to talk about the importance of sanctions and how they may change the calculus being made in Russia and Moscow today.

I have watched the media portray the events of the last couple of weeks as some sign of Russian strength. To me, this isn't a sign of Russian strength, this is a sign of Russian weakness.

Putin has designs for reestablishing some sense of the old Soviet empire by reasserting control over what Putin calls the near abroad, which are the former Soviet republics and Soviet satellite states. His dream of reestablishing the Soviet empire fell apart the day President Yanukovich fled Kiev.

Ukraine is the crown jewel of the near abroad. As Putin tried to recreate that empire under the guise of something called the customs union, he knew he couldn't do it without the second biggest country in Europe bordering on Russia—Ukraine. His invasion of Crimea was a panicked reaction to this new reality—a Ukraine now oriented toward the European Union.

So today, I think it is important to understand the position Putin is in. He has made a mess for the international

community to try to clean up through his invasion of Crimea.

Crimea represents 2 million people in a country of 45 million, and 90 percent of Ukraine has a government in Kiev which just signed an association agreement with the European Union. Russia's economy is going to hemorrhage if he continues the occupation of Crimea through a broad-based set of international sanctions. He has become a pariah in the world community.

I agree with my colleague from Indiana: We shouldn't just be talking about removing Russia from the G8; we should take Russia out of the G8 and make it completely clear to them that they don't have a place at the international table along with countries such as the United States, France, Germany, and England if they behave in this way.

The bill we are debating today will give the President and new government in Kiev tools with which to try to address and perhaps end this crisis. But it is important to remember that this is not about reestablishing the Cold War. The world is oriented along paradigms that have nothing to do with who is with the United States and who is with Russia. This panicked invasion of Crimea, while rightly occupying the headlines on a nightly basis, is a display of Russia's weak position in the region and the world after the failure of their puppet government in Kiev to survive.

Lastly, I will talk about the broader history, both looking in the past but also looking to the future, we may miss when we concentrate on an hour-by-hour basis on the crisis at hand.

Having had the opportunity to visit Kiev a few times in the past several months, I have had the opportunity to learn a little bit about the history of the place and of the people. There is a wonderful cathedral in Kiev called the Church of St. Sophia. It is absolutely stunningly beautiful. It was built by Ukraine's greatest leader, Yaroslav the Wise. He presided over an empire which was at the time called Kievan Rus. Kievan Rus was essentially the hub of trading on the Eurasian continent. It took goods from the east and transported them to the west. It took goods from the Scandinavian countries and transported them down to the Mediterranean. Everything ran through the territory of Kievan Rus. It speaks to Ukraine's past but also to its future.

They have been set up with a false choice within the crisis of the last several months: Join the European Union or stay aligned with Russia. But what we know is that Kiev historically has stood at the crossroads—not just east and west but of east and west and north and south. This is Ukraine's past, but it is also going to be Ukraine's future.

While we try to deal today with a Russia run by a leader whose foreign policy seems dictated by a desire to poke a stick in the eye of the United States, I ultimately think viewing the

forest through the trees also means acknowledging that Russia's future ultimately, in a post-Putin era, is about integration with Europe and integration with the West as well. Frankly, this is the direction Russia was heading until Putin took power.

The conversation about how we realize that ultimate paradigm is a conversation for another day. But when Senator MCCAIN and I went to Kiev in December and stood on the stage speaking to a million Ukrainians who had come down to the square to protest the current government, they were there to talk about one concept: dignity. For some it was about Europe, for some it was about corruption, and for some it was about the brutal violence on the square displayed by Yanukovich. For most people, they wanted to restore dignity to their lives, and what dignity really is about in the end is the ability to choose for yourself what your future is. This is why we are here to support Ukraine.

No country—the United States, the Russian Federation, Germany—should dictate to the Ukrainians what their future should be. That is why, in the wake of the invasion, in the wake of years of economic manipulation from Russia, we are going to extend a firm hand to the Ukrainians with an assistance package and a message of economic consequences to Russia.

The world we envision ultimately is one not only where Ukraine gets to go back to its historical routes and draw from east and west but one in which Russia realizes that their economic salvation lies not in setting up some new Cold War but in fully integrating themselves, their economy, and their political institutions not only with countries such as Ukraine, not only with the nations of the EU, but beyond to American shores as well. This is the future.

But that reality will never exist for the young nation of Ukraine unless it survives this moment. And we can send a strong message this evening that this body stands with that future for this young nation of Ukraine by supporting the package before us.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

#### INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

Mrs. FISCHER. Madam President, while I realize Members of this body are very concerned about the situation in the Ukraine today and we are focused on the crisis happening there, I wish to take a few minutes to discuss two bills I have recently introduced that deal with reforms to the Internal Revenue Service.

As the Federal agency tasked with administering the U.S. Tax Code, the IRS has extraordinary influence on the lives of Americans from all walks of life and all points of view. Citizens have the absolute right to expect the IRS to be free from political influence, with taxpayers treated fairly and enforcement carried out in an unbiased

manner. Unfortunately, we have learned our expectations sometimes are very different from reality.

In early 2013 the IRS acknowledged a history of targeting politically active groups as some of these groups sought tax-exempt status. This practice first involved flagging groups concerned about government spending and debt. Ironically, the targeting came at a time when poll after poll indicated that the Federal Government's out-of-control spending and our \$17 trillion debt were top concerns for all Americans, and from my experience, they are the top concerns for Nebraskans as well.

Despite these legitimate concerns and the patriotic desire of Americans to effect change in government, the IRS worked to impede these organizations from full participation in our democratic process. To do so, the IRS dragged its feet and slow-walked applications for tax-exempt status, asking questions that weren't necessary, including questions regarding political beliefs. That is why I recently introduced S. 2043, the Stop IRS Overreach Act. This bill states that the IRS shall not ask any taxpayer any question regarding their religious, political, or social beliefs. This is a pretty straightforward concept, and it is an American concept. It shouldn't matter who you are or what you believe—we should all be treated equally before the law.

Given the recent behavior of the IRS, it appears this legislation is necessary. I believe this measure should enjoy support from both parties. It is worth noting that the legislation passed the House of Representatives on a voice vote.

American taxpayers are also frustrated with the lack of responsiveness from the IRS. Every single year taxpayers and their accountants write the IRS asking for additional information regarding their taxes. Often, the response from the IRS is silence—nothing but silence.

So taxpayers wonder: Did they even get my question? Did they get my letter? Are they going to answer my question?

Silence. No answer.

The IRS currently is not required to respond to taxpayer communication. We all know, though, that the inverse is true—taxpayers are compelled to respond when the IRS requests any information. This is a double standard which is not fair.

My bill, S. 2044, would require the IRS to respond to communication from any taxpayer within 30 days of receiving such communication. This way taxpayers will at least know that the IRS is not asleep at the switch and that they have received their letter.

My bill would also make two other significant changes to the IRS: First, it would require the agency to notify a taxpayer if the agency discloses that person's information to another government entity. Current law doesn't require such disclosure. Next, the legislation would require that when the IRS

begins an audit on any individual taxpayer, the audit and any tax assessed with the audit must be completed within 1 year. The window for these painstaking audits can't be open forever. The uncertainty adversely impacts families, as these audits currently can be held up for years, with the taxpayers never quite sure if the tax is going to be assessed and when it is going to be assessed.

The House approved identical legislation by a voice vote.

These two bills are straightforward. They make simple but important changes to the way the IRS operates. Making these changes will help Americans all across our country. I urge my fellow Senators on both sides of the aisle to support this legislation.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The Senator from Michigan.

#### NATURAL GAS

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, one of the true bright spots in our economy right now has been, and continues to be, manufacturing. Manufacturing jobs have been on the rise. We have over 12 million Americans who are now employed with good-paying jobs in the manufacturing sector. Many of them are in my own great State of Michigan.

This renaissance in the kind of good-paying jobs that built the middle class of this country is being powered in a significant way by American natural gas. More than \$100 billion in investments, in more than 120 different manufacturing projects, is being fueled by abundant, affordable American natural gas. Thanks to American natural gas, the people in our country have a great new opportunity to go to work, have a good-paying job, and support their families.

Our country is truly blessed with this natural resource. It is critical that we continue to put our American natural gas to work so we can create American jobs, which is why I am confused and concerned by those who are rushing to send this American resource overseas without a careful review of the impact this will have on the costs to our manufacturers, our jobs, and our families.

I am not opposed to exporting some of our natural gas as part of a balanced, well-thought-out plan. A rush to approve every export facility request immediately is not wise. It is not wise for our economy or our people when we know that increased natural gas is needed here at home.

People need jobs in America. We have about 10 million people out of work. We have an awful lot of people who need a job. Good-paying jobs in manufacturing

can and will be part of their future if we manage our natural gas resources the right way. It is critical for America that we get this right. We need to export our products, not our jobs, and that is the debate I believe we should be having.

Low-cost natural gas is critical to our Nation's ability to create manufacturing jobs. It is critical. If we start exporting too much of our natural gas without monitoring or evaluating the impact over time, we may be giving up a real advantage we have right now for creating jobs and bringing jobs home from other countries.

What do we hear from a lot of businesses that are making decisions to bring jobs home? They talk about low-energy costs. We don't want to give that up as an advantage for America as we compete in a global economy. Also, if increased exports raise prices to the same level as global oil prices—and obviously some folks would like to see that happen for their own interests—American families will be hit with even higher energy costs at home, and that doesn't make any sense either. Exporting more American natural gas simply doesn't add up.

A study last month by Charles River Associates found that using our own low-cost natural gas to increase American manufacturing is twice as valuable to our economy and creates eight times as many jobs as sending this important American resource overseas. Let me say that again: Using our own low-cost natural gas to increase American manufacturing output is twice as valuable to our American economy and creates eight times as many jobs as exporting this important American resource overseas.

I am particularly dismayed that some people are using the very serious crisis in Ukraine as an excuse to rush through new projects to export our natural gas.

Last week I met with members of the Ukrainian community in Detroit. They are deeply concerned about what is happening. This is personal for them. They have family and friends in Ukraine. This crisis should not be used by those in the oil and gas industry to rush through actions that may be good for them in the long run. It certainly will not be good for some people in the short run. Anything that is approved now will take way too long before it has any impact in Ukraine. Raising prices may be good for some in the long run, but it will not be good for American manufacturers. It is not good if the whole idea is to create American jobs here at home, and it is not good for middle-class families.

I want to be very clear: I am extremely concerned about what is happening in Ukraine. We must stand with the people of Ukraine and our allies in Europe against the outrageous actions of Russia and President Putin. This crisis is very serious and requires a serious response by the Senate. I know colleagues on both sides of the aisle

care deeply about this issue. I hope and I assume we will pass a package to help Ukraine as soon as possible.

Again, this crisis should not be used as an excuse to shortcut the permit process or the thoughtful evaluation that I know the Department of Energy is committed to doing to make sure we get this right. This crisis should not be used to rush through new natural gas export facilities that may undercut our effort to create good-paying jobs here at home.

The Department of Energy has already agreed to permit six liquefied natural gas LNG export facilities that will export over 9 billion cubic feet of LNG every day—and that is not counting the other 30 applications that have been approved for export to countries we have free trade agreements with. I am not suggesting that should not have been done; I have not opposed that. But we better be careful on how we move forward and how we evaluate the impact on our economy.

As we all know, LNG export facilities take years to build. We could approve permits for 100 new LNG facilities tomorrow, and unfortunately it would do nothing to address the crisis in Ukraine and potential supply disruptions to our other important allies in Western Europe.

Here is what I am most concerned about: We all know that gas prices are decided by the global marketplace. Prices are high in Asia right now. We don't have the existing infrastructure to get natural gas to Ukraine. The gas in the export facilities that are rushed through are very likely to go to Asia—very likely to go to China.

Should American natural gas be used to lower prices and create jobs in China or in other parts of Asia or should we be using low-cost natural gas to create jobs right here at home? I hope we can all agree on the answer to that question.

Rushing through more natural gas export facilities, unfortunately, would not help Ukraine. However, it could have a negative effect on our own economy in the long run. Increasing exports would reduce our supply here at home and raise consumer prices, and we all know how devastating that would be for our families. Higher prices for natural gas means it will cost more to cook your dinner, heat your home, and power your small business.

The recent propane shortages and dramatic price spikes we saw in States across the country should raise a red flag for everybody. We simply cannot afford to export too much natural gas too fast without truly understanding the impact on our own jobs and families. Plus, sending so much of our natural gas abroad will neutralize the competitive advantage we have right now for cheap and abundant fuel. We have an advantage right now, and we need to keep that advantage.

My concern is that we would be giving the big oil companies a boost because there would be higher prices for

natural gas which would keep oil as a viable alternative because there would not be the advantage of natural gas anymore if we go to the global marketplace and all the prices go up.

In the end, the people of Ukraine and our allies who need our help would not be receiving it. Our own manufacturers, businesses, and families would not be receiving it. Instead, it would be going to the oil companies.

Shame on us if we squander the opportunities that low-cost, abundant natural gas resources offer our country. I believe we need to be smart in how we manage our resources.

Again, I am not opposed to exports. It is a question of a balance. It is a question of thinking it through in a thoughtful way and having an American plan where we are balancing out part exports, part keeping natural gas here at home, and making sure our manufacturers have the edge in a global economy because they have lower cost energy. We need to make sure we are bringing jobs back from overseas because of lower cost energy. We need to make sure our families have low-cost fuel and other energy assistance.

We need to be smart at this point in time about our resources. We have the opportunity, I believe, to find the right balance that allows us to both benefit from some exports and benefit from the resources by creating jobs here at home. Our manufacturers are families, the middle class of this country, the folks trying to hold on, folks trying to get into the middle class who know manufacturing jobs are a part of the way of doing that. They are counting on us. Our economy is counting on the fact that we will be smart about the way we make decisions about our natural resources. Right now with natural gas we have the opportunity not only for the States that have it to do well by exploration and extraction but by leveraging that as we look at the opportunities for manufacturing; leveraging our own resources, which we are told will give us eight times more in benefit in terms of jobs than just having our natural resources in America exported around the globe and the prices floating up to the higher prices of oil.

I thank the Chair. We are going to have a lot of discussion and debate on this issue going forward. I look forward to that. I think this is an opportunity for us to have an American plan on manufacturing, with American low-cost energy, to be able to jump-start our economy moving forward.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McCAIN. Madam President, I have a parliamentary inquiry: What is the business before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is considering the motion to proceed to S. 2124, the Ukraine aid bill.

Mr. McCAIN. I thank the Presiding Officer.

I urge my colleagues to not only vote for this particular measure but also to

vote to pass as soon as possible the bill before the Senate that was reported out by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, by a vote of 14 to 4, before we went into recess. Obviously, it is intended to be an opening response—a beginning response—to the Russian aggression in Ukraine; specifically now occupying and absorbing Crimea into Russia, an act of aggression the likes of which has not been seen in a long time.

In addition, now additional pressures are being put on the Ukrainian Government as we speak, such as raising the price of gas, canceling Ukraine special price discounts. Also, oil deliveries are slow, border crossings for the delivery of trade have been closed, and the dirty tricks go on from the old KGB colonel Vladimir Putin.

This act is relatively mild. It will provide loan guarantees which are badly needed. Now the Ukrainian economy is under even greater pressure and greater difficulty, given the actions taken by Vladimir Putin, and it would stabilize the Ukrainian economy. It is just a beginning, but it is a strong signal of support by the United States for this fledgling Ukrainian democracy.

The IMF reforms are considered somewhat controversial by some of my colleagues, but the IMF reforms are not the reason this legislation is before us. The reason the legislation is before us is because Vladimir Putin has now absorbed Crimea into Russia. I predicted that when the Ukrainian Government became a government of the people and threw out Yanukovich, Putin would do exactly that because of his view of the need to have Sevastopol, the base on the Black Sea, in order to have access to the Mediterranean, without which his visions and view of the Russian empire would be threatened.

Right now the President of the United States is in Europe. I hope he is leading in Europe rather than just consulting in Europe. By the way, a comment by the President—I still don't quite get it—that there would not be a military excursion in Ukraine—I have never heard that word used in regard to military action. But the most important thing, in my view, is to pass this legislation as soon as possible. We can fight about other less important issues later on. We need to send a strong signal to the people of Ukraine who are watching us as we speak and as we vote today, as to whether we are going to come to their assistance and at least take some small measures to punish Vladimir Putin. If we get hung up for another week or another who knows how many hours because of our failure to act, in my view, it sends exactly the wrong signals.

I also speak again in the strongest terms that we need to send military assistance to this country. We need to help them defend themselves. Russian troops are amassed on the border of Eastern Ukraine as we speak. I don't know whether Vladimir Putin will go

into Eastern Ukraine. I did predict he would go into Crimea. Now I believe he is watching carefully for the reaction of the West, led by the United States of America, as to how we are going to assist Ukraine, how we are going to prevent or at least make the cost of further encroachment into Ukrainian territory a very expensive one.

We have military assistance programs with a myriad of nations, and we should be giving them the weapons they need to defend themselves. I am talking about defensive weaponry. It is shameful for us not to do so.

I see my colleague from Illinois with whom I was privileged and proud to travel to Ukraine, a man who understands these issues as well or better than anyone in this body and one who represents thousands and thousands and thousands of Ukrainian Americans whom I know he has met with and who are deeply concerned.

Mr. DURBIN. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MCCAIN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I wish to say through the Chair it was an honor to join my colleague Senator MCCAIN in a whirlwind trip to Ukraine: 48 hours, maybe 6 extra to spare; 2 full days of working, meeting every leader at every level of government there and sensing their concern over the pending so-called referendum on Crimea and what Russia will do next. The Senator from Arizona and I stand together in a bipartisan fashion, urging the passage of this resolution as quickly as possible.

I just left the phone—the reason I came to the floor, I say to the Senator from Arizona, I was on the phone with the Ambassador of Ukraine and we were talking about the situation there, and I said: Senator MCCAIN is on the floor and I would like to go down and say a word.

He said the people of Ukraine are watching what we are doing. They are watching what Congress and the United States are going to do.

There are some differences between us. There are some differences between the parties. There comes a moment—and there always has, at least in the past—where we decide we are going to stand together as a nation, particularly when it comes to issues of foreign policy. This resolution doesn't address every issue the Senator from Arizona has raised, but it certainly addresses some key issues on which the Senator and I both agree. We both voted for this in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and we both want to see this move. The sooner the better.

I wish to salute my colleague, the Senator from Arizona, for returning to the Maidan, that area in Kiev where 103 Ukrainians lost their lives demonstrating against the former government and asking for change. Our experience together, visiting that country with a delegation of eight Senators, I hope sent a strong message: There is bipartisan support for Ukraine and we

will not tolerate Putin's aggression at the expense of innocent people.

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to engage in a colloquy with the Senator from Illinois.

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

Mr. MCCAIN. I ask my friend: Isn't it true the people of Ukraine are watching in a way that is hard for them to understand—before an empty Chamber. But, more importantly, whether we act and act quickly, that signal to them as they face this additional Russian aggression, maybe not military aggression but already borders have been closed, the price of their energy has been raised—in other words, Putin is putting more and more pressure on them. They look to us. Isn't it a fact they will not quite understand if we go another several days because of some additional issue that does not affect whether we are coming to their assistance, I ask my friend.

Mr. DURBIN. Through the Chair, I couldn't agree more. I think it is significant that when the new Prime Minister of Ukraine was scheduling his first trip outside of the country, where did he come? Here, Washington, DC. With whom did he meet? The President and the leaders. We sat together with him in a room downstairs—the Senate Foreign Relations Committee room. He came here because he wanted to bring the message to us of what he feared would happen if Putin's aggression went forward, and he wanted us to bring the message to the world that the United States stood by him. How can we possibly explain to these people who are worried about the existence and survival of their Nation that we got tied up in some political squabble between the House and the Senate and the two political parties? It is important for us to move and move quickly.

The Senator from Arizona understands this as well or better than most. Many of us have come from countries which were once under the yoke of the Soviets and we remember full well what it took to finally get independence and democracy. Today, Vladimir Putin is fighting to save a failing Soviet franchise, and where he can't win the hearts and minds of neighboring nations, he instead uses masked gunmen, troops, barbed wire, and energy extortion. That is how he works. He is not winning this battle, but he is saying to the world: The only way I can keep my "friends" in line is with pressure. So the United States, and I hope other civilized nations, will join us in saying that is unacceptable.

I thank the Senator and I agree with him. Now is the time to act in the Senate.

Mr. MCCAIN. I note the presence of the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee whom I wish to thank for his rapid leadership in getting this legislation approved by an overwhelming majority of the committee on a bipartisan basis. I know he is waiting to speak.

I have just one more comment for my friend from Illinois. I understand he just met with Ukrainian Americans in Chicago, in his home State of Illinois. Isn't it true they don't quite understand why we have not acted more rapidly in the face of naked aggression—which is incredible acquisition of territory which the Russian Government guaranteed as part of Ukraine when Ukraine gave up its nuclear inventory, which happened to be the third largest in the world. I see the chairman waiting, so I will not ask any more questions, except to urge my colleagues let's have an overwhelming vote to move to this legislation and get it done as quickly as possible.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, first let me thank my two colleagues, both distinguished members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator MCCAIN and Senator DURBIN. Their work and their leadership on this issue has created the type of bipartisan spirit that I think is incredibly important in general but certainly in foreign relations. They both added greatly to the legislation that came out of committee with a strong bipartisan vote that we are considering on the floor.

Last week some of my colleagues in this Chamber were sanctioned by Vladimir Putin for standing up for the Ukrainian people, standing up for freedom, standing up for their democratic aspirations, standing up for the sovereignty of Ukraine. As I said in Brussels at the German Marshall Fund this weekend, if I have been sanctioned for those reasons, then I say, by all means, Mr. Putin, sanction me.

I urge all of my colleagues to be supportive of the legislation. They may be sanctioned at the end of the day, but that is really what standing for Ukraine is all about at this critical moment and what it means beyond.

When we look around the world, we realize that every so often we face a critical juncture at a time of great upheaval and change. With the backsliding of Russian leadership to a pre-1991 posture, we are at such a juncture. Vladimir Putin seems to view the pre-1991 Soviet Union's expansionist authoritarianism as a present-day goal and the last two decades, which saw the formation of new and independent states, as a departure from Peter the Great's expansionist aspirations.

From Ukraine, to Georgia, to the Middle East, we are seeing a new Russian leadership bent on using its military authority, its economic resources, and diplomacy to serve its parochial interests at any cost—despite violations of its own legal commitments and those it has made to the international community.

Russia's flatout extortion of Ukraine, supported by former corrupt leaders of Ukraine, forced the political explosion which Russia then exploited.

In Syria, President Putin is actively propping up President Bashar al-Assad

and perpetuating the world's worst humanitarian disaster.

In Iran, the ink of the Joint Plan of Action signed in Geneva last November was barely dry when reports surfaced that Tehran and Moscow were negotiating an oil-for-goods swap worth \$1.5 billion a month, and that they planned to build a new nuclear plant—all steps that only aid Iran in its pursuit of nuclear weapons, while diminishing the sanctions that forced that country to the negotiating table in the first place.

It is no surprise that Putin and his cronies have already threatened to derail Syria and Iran talks if their countries do not step back from punishing Russia for its annexation of Ukraine.

In Geneva, as the P5+1 talks with Iran continue, we can only hope that the crisis in Ukraine will not have a ripple effect in Russia's position or participation.

But, in my view, Mr. Putin has miscalculated. He has reignited a dangerous pre-1991 Soviet-style game of Russian roulette with the international community, and we cannot blink.

He must understand that we will never accept his violation of international law in Ukraine. That is why we passed this legislation in committee—an aid package for Ukraine that provides loans for economic stabilization, supports planning for upcoming democratic elections, aids in the recovery of stolen assets, and expands security cooperation between the two countries, and it holds Moscow accountable for its aggressive stance against Ukraine.

First, this legislation provides for Ukrainian loan guarantees, consistent with the \$1 billion announced by the administration in recent days. It mirrors the House legislation.

Second, it ensures that the Obama administration can assist the Ukrainian Government to identify, secure, and recover assets linked to the acts of corruption by Viktor Yanukovich, members of his family, or other former or current Ukrainian Government officials.

Third, it authorizes \$50 million for democracy, governance, and civil society assistance and \$100 million for enhanced security cooperation for Ukraine and other states in Central and Eastern Europe.

Fourth, it mandates sanctions, complementing the President's recent Executive order, against Ukrainians and Russians alike responsible for violence and serious human rights abuses against antigovernment protesters—and those responsible for undermining the peace, security, stability, sovereignty or territorial integrity of Ukraine—as well as imposing sanctions on Russian individuals complicit in or responsible for significant corruption in Ukraine.

Fifth, it allows the administration to broadly sanction corrupt Russian officials and go after Putin's allies and cronies who are engaged in massive

corruption to the detriment of the Russian people.

Finally, it provides needed reforms to the United States' participation in the International Monetary Fund, which would allow the United States to leverage significant support from the IMF for Ukraine today and for similar unforeseen crises that are going to come in the future.

It is the IMF that is leading the effort to stabilize Ukraine's fragile economy, an essential task if there is to be any chance of reaching a peaceful political solution to the standoff with Russia.

Congressional ratification of the 2010 IMF reforms would increase IMF emergency funding to Ukraine by up to 60 percent, and it would provide an additional \$6 billion for longer-term support, setting an important marker for other donors such as the EU and the World Bank.

Failure to approve the reforms, on the other hand, would undermine both the IMF and the international standing of the United States.

Some countries are happy to see U.S. global influence diminish. Failing to approve the reforms weakens the United States and emboldens our competitors.

The IMF is strengthened at no cost to U.S. finances or influence. The United States retains its Executive Board seat and sole veto power at no net cost, since the \$63 billion increase in U.S. quota is fully offset by an equivalent decrease to a separate emergency facility. Other countries, however, put in new money, increasing IMF lending power.

The fact is, it is a pure win for the United States. We will pay for the \$315 million budget impact of the bill with real cuts and from funds that were underperforming or no longer needed. Given that the IMF helps to stabilize countries, often precluding future need for military action, the relatively minor cost will pay back many times over.

This is not a partisan issue. Presidents Reagan, Clinton, and both Presidents Bush backed legislation to increase IMF resources, and President Reagan called the IMF "the linchpin of the international financial system."

These efforts combined send a message to the world that the annexation of Crimea will not stand.

Let me close by saying we are at a dangerous moment in history, with global consequences, and the world is watching.

If the West does not act, what will China say when it is looking at its territorial desires in the South China Sea? What will Iran say when we are negotiating in Vienna about nuclear weapons? What will others in the world say—North Korea, whose march to nuclear weapons on a greater scale is still in play?

All of them will be looking at what we in the West do or do not do, in making a decision about Russia's brazen

move into Ukraine. They will be watching to see how far they can go, how much they can do. They will be asking: What can I get away with?

The fact is, as a matter of principle, Ukrainian sovereignty cannot be violated for simply looking westward and embracing ideals rooted in freedom. These ideals must always remain first and foremost in our strategic response to international events.

When I was in Brussels last week at NATO and the German Marshall Fund, I said: The broader question that faces us is this: Can a united transatlantic vision and our collective commitment to bold actions in this century match the vision and commitment of those who created the international institutions which brought peace and prosperity to millions in the last century?

I believe that—if we live, lead, and govern, guided by shared values and united by our common concerns—we can lead the world through this transformational moment in history and prevent further Russian aggression from taking us back prior to what was that 1991 world.

That is the choice before us. I urge my colleagues to strongly support the cloture motion so that we can work toward a statement that will do exactly that.

Mr. MCCAIN. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MENENDEZ. I will be happy to yield to the distinguished Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. I think it is very clear that Vladimir Putin has amassed forces on the border of Russia and eastern Ukraine, and right now he is calculating as to whether to move there or even into Moldova, where the Transnistrian region is now occupied and has been by Russian troops. Also, there is pressure on the Baltic countries that is being exerted as we speak, a lot of it in defense of "Russian-speaking people." If we do not send this message now, with this package, in a bipartisan and strong manner, Vladimir Putin will be encouraged to enact further acts of aggression against Crimea and in the region.

I would ask my colleague if he does not agree with that assessment.

Mr. MENENDEZ. I think the Senator is spot-on. Right now, Putin is looking at whether or not he proceeds in Eastern Ukraine. He is looking at Transnistria and Moldova. He is calculating and he is calculating: What are the costs? What will the United States and the European Union do?

From my perspective, President Putin only understands strength, and that strength is either in a military context—which, of course, no one is speaking about at this moment—or an economic one. That is why this package is so incredibly important—because it takes every single dimension that the distinguished Senator helped us in the committee on. It aids Ukraine up front for the loan guarantee. It sanctions—and the Senator was very engaged in several elements of that—elements of the Russian hierarchy for

engaging in corrupting the country, Ukraine, and at the same time for invading its territorial integrity. It prepares assistance for that election which is supposed to take place in May that is critical to be fair, open, and transparent and, at the same time, provides for the greater resources through the IMF.

So all of these elements are critical. It also includes a very clear statement about greater defense cooperation, which is also critically important.

So these are all the elements of sending a strong message, as Putin is calculating: What will be the cost? If the cost is not high enough, he may very well proceed into Eastern Ukraine or to those parts of Moldova. That is an action that we can ill-afford and the action that others will look at across the world, as I mentioned, that they will calculate: The West is not willing to take the actions necessary to stop my designs.

If that is the case, then I think we are in a world of hurt across the globe.

Mr. MCCAIN. I thank the chairman for his eloquent statement.

I yield the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The assistant 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. 329, S. 2124, a bill to support sovereignty and democracy in Ukraine, and for other purposes.

Harry Reid, Robert Menendez, Debbie Stabenow, Barbara Boxer, Patty Murray, Richard Blumenthal, Jeff Merkley, Carl Levin, Joe Donnelly, Christopher A. Coons, Jack Reed, Maria Cantwell, Barbara A. Mikulski, Tom Harkin, Tim Kaine, Jeanne Shaheen, Jon Tester.

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. 2124, a bill to support sovereignty and democracy in Ukraine, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL), the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU), and the Senator from Mis-

souri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK).

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 78, nays 17, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 79 Leg.]

#### YEAS—78

Alexander	Graham	Murkowski
Ayotte	Grassley	Murphy
Baldwin	Hagan	Murray
Begich	Harkin	Nelson
Bennet	Hatch	Portman
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Pryor
Blunt	Heitkamp	Reed
Booker	Hirono	Reid
Boxer	Hoeben	Rockefeller
Brown	Inhofe	Rubio
Burr	Isakson	Sanders
Cardin	Johanns	Schatz
Carper	Johnson (SD)	Schumer
Casey	Johnson (WI)	Shaheen
Coats	Kaine	Stabenow
Collins	King	Tester
Coons	Klobuchar	Thune
Corker	Leahy	Toomey
Cornyn	Levin	Udall (CO)
Donnelly	Manchin	Udall (NM)
Durbin	Markey	Vitter
Feinstein	McCain	Walsh
Fischer	McConnell	Warner
Flake	Menendez	Warren
Franken	Merkley	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Mikulski	Wyden

#### NAYS—17

Barrasso	Enzi	Roberts
Boozman	Heller	Scott
Coburn	Lee	Sessions
Cochran	Moran	Shelby
Crapo	Paul	Wicker
Cruz	Risch	

#### NOT VOTING—5

Cantwell	Kirk	McCaskill
Chambliss	Landrieu	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote the yeas are 78, the nays are 17. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

The Senator from Washington.

#### OSO LANDSLIDE

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I am sure all our colleagues have seen the news over the past few days from my home State of Washington where we are suffering from a devastating natural disaster.

For those who haven't seen the coverage, on Saturday the town of Oso, WA—a very small, tightly knit community on the Stillaguamish River—was hit by a massive landslide. It has cut off the town of Darrington just a few miles up State Road 530, and houses over a square mile have been swept away.

We know already we have lost eight people. This morning we learned there are more than 100 people still missing, and right now in my home State of Washington there are dozens of families who do not know if their loved ones are still alive. These are moms and dads, they are sons and daughters, they are neighbors and friends who in the blink of an eye saw water and earth

wipe away their homes and their entire community, and now many of them don't know if their loved ones survived.

I was in Arlington, WA, yesterday, where the search and rescue operations are being coordinated. It is just down the road from where the slide hit, and I want to talk for a few minutes this evening on the Senate floor about this tragedy.

Oso and Darrington are very small towns like a lot of others in this country. The population of Oso is 180 people. These are the types of places where everyone knows everyone, where they stop to say hello, and where everyone lends a helping hand. It is impossible to describe the scope of this devastation. There isn't a single person who hasn't been impacted in some way by this tragedy. There also isn't a single person anywhere who isn't doing everything they can to help. I saw neighbors who were there providing food, providing shelter, offers of all kinds of hope, help, hugs, and prayers. First responders are risking their lives every minute, braving very dangerous conditions to look for survivors. People across my State are offering help and donations, anything they can to assist these communities that are experiencing the unthinkable. We have grocery stores offering food to the families who need it and to the rescue workers. The Red Cross is there on the ground. Tribal leaders from the local community are coming to offer what they can.

I wanted my colleagues to know that this weekend I saw some of the worst devastation I have ever witnessed in my home State. At the same time I also saw firefighters who hadn't slept. They refused to stop as they searched for survivors. I saw families refusing to give up hope, and I saw communities that need our entire State and our entire country to stand with them now.

Even though Oso and Darrington are 2,300 miles away from the Nation's Capital, our hearts and prayers are with the families in those communities tonight. In the coming weeks and months—and even years if that is what it takes—all of us need to stand with the people of Oso and Darrington and Arlington and provide the Federal resources they are going to desperately need in this recovery and rebuilding operation. I want them to know they will have the thoughts and prayers of everyone in this country going out to the real Washington as they see this through.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

#### SMITH AND MCHUGH NOMINATIONS

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I rise this evening to speak in support of two nominees for Federal judgeships from Pennsylvania. I believe my colleague Senator CASEY is going to have a message he will share with us momentarily.

First, I wish to be very clear that I am very enthusiastically in support of both Judge Ed Smith and Mr. Gerald

McHugh, the two nominees, both of whom are likely to get a vote this week. If confirmed, they will serve as U.S. district judges for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

I thank Chairman LEAHY and Ranking Member GRASSLEY for their work in ushering these candidates through the committee process.

I thank Leader REID and Leader MCCONNELL for their role in ensuring these nominees would have a chance to have a vote on the Senate floor.

Most of all, I thank my colleague Senator CASEY. Senator CASEY and I have been working hard to fill a number of vacancies on the Federal bench in Pennsylvania since I got to the Senate. He predates my arrival here, so he has been at this longer than I have, but since I have arrived we have had a terrific working relationship. We have had eight terrific men and women confirmed to the Federal bench across Pennsylvania. Hopefully, these two gentlemen will join them and we will be up to 10.

We have developed a rigorous process by which the many candidates who apply for these vacancies are thoroughly vetted, and I am very pleased that we have been able to make this ongoing process work. Pennsylvanians expect us to work together across party lines—a Democratic Senator and a Republican Senator—to simply find the best candidates. I have to say that I think we are doing exactly that with respect to our judicial nominees, and there could be no better examples than Judge Smith and Gerald McHugh.

Ed Smith was approved by the Judiciary Committee by a voice vote on January 16. He is very well respected. I have known Judge Smith for nearly 20 years. There is no question that he has the requisite skills, the knowledge, the background, and the acumen. He will be a great Federal judge. We know this because of what he has already accomplished in his career. He serves as a captain in the U.S. Navy, in the JAG Corps. He has been a commanding officer at the Navy Reserve Naval Justice School. He served as a military trial judge in the Navy Reserve. He was deployed to Iraq in 2007 and 2008 to serve as a rule of law advisor to the Iraqis, and he received a Bronze Star for his service.

Currently, Ed Smith is a judge on the Northampton County Court of Common Pleas. He has been a partner in the law firm of DeRaymond & Smith, and he is a cum laude graduate from Dickinson Law School.

Importantly, Judge Smith has agreed that if he is confirmed, he will sit in the Easton Courthouse in the First District. That is a courthouse which has not had a district court judge since 2004. The people of Northampton County deserve to have that courthouse filled, and Judge Smith is an outstanding candidate to do it.

I am also delighted to support Gerald McHugh. Gerald McHugh is a highly accomplished attorney, of very keen

intellect, with a great commitment to public service. He is currently a partner in the Raynes McCarty firm. His work has mostly been in civil litigation, in medical malpractice, in litigation regarding unsafe products, aviation disasters, and in civil rights. He has been a shareholder in the firm of Litvin, Blumberg, Matusow & Young.

He began his career clerking for District Court Judge Luongo in the Eastern District. He is a cum laude graduate from the University of Pennsylvania Law School.

Gerald McHugh is not only a skilled lawyer, but he has been very active in his community. He has been giving back to the greater Philadelphia area for a long time. He is on the boards of many charitable and civic organizations. He is the president of the Pennsylvania Legal Aid Network and has been since 2004. He cofounded the Hospitality House of Philadelphia to help ex-offenders, and he does pro bono work to improve neighborhoods and prevent crime in West Philadelphia.

Both of these candidates have the crucial qualities necessary to make outstanding judges, and they have manifested that throughout their very distinguished careers. They have the intelligence, they have the integrity, they have the commitment to public service, and they have respect for the limited role the judiciary has under our constitutional system. So I am pleased to rise to speak on behalf of these two highly accomplished nominees, and I urge my colleagues to support their confirmation later this week.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I would like to commend and salute the work done by Senator TOOMEY and his staff, working with ours, as well as the leaders he mentioned, beginning with Majority Leader REID and Chairman LEAHY.

Like Senator TOOMEY, I am grateful to have the opportunity to talk about both of these nominees for the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania: Edward George Smith, who serves now as a judge, as well as Gerald Austin McHugh, Jr. I have known Gerald Austin McHugh, Jr., a lot longer, and I will speak about him first. I know him as Jerry.

If there is one thing I could say about Jerry McHugh, it is he is a lawyer's lawyer. He is the kind of lawyer other lawyers go to for advice, for guidance, and sometimes for education. He has been a great leader in the bar, but also someone who has been a strong advocate for those who need a voice, often serving as a lawyer for those who wouldn't have an advocate absent his involvement in a case.

Jerry McHugh is a Philadelphia native. He was educated at St. Joe's University in Philadelphia where he received a degree in theology, graduating summa cum laude with the highest

honors. He also graduated from the University of Pennsylvania Law School, and he graduated from Penn law school with honors as well.

He began his practice at the law firm of Litvin Blumberg Matusow & Young in the early 1980s. Prior to his career as a lawyer, he served two judges as a law clerk: first, Judge Spaeth, Superior Court of Pennsylvania, the second highest court in the State right next to the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania. He then served Judge Alfred L. Luongo, U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania. He then went into practice in the Litvin firm, and later the Raynes McCarty law firm in Philadelphia, PA, starting in 2004.

I will highlight a few memberships which I think bear upon his work as a lawyer and the work he will do as a judge. He has been a member of the Pennsylvania Trial Lawyers and a board member of the Legal Aid Network in Philadelphia. He served the bar association in a number of capacities, including Volunteers for the Indigent Program, helping those who may not have a voice.

Jerry focused his practice on complex civil litigation, including a variety of matters. I think it is noteworthy that the Pennsylvania Supreme Court three times appointed him to chair the Pennsylvania Interest on Lawyers Trust Accounts Program, a program which is very important so that when the fund is needed to help resolve a case which involves a lawyer, the fund is there. It has to be administered and overseen by folks who have the highest integrity.

I know Jerry McHugh as someone who has a wide range of experience as a lawyer, an advocate, an active citizen, someone who would bring to the court a passion for justice and a sense of outrage in the face of injustice. I can't say enough about his experience and his preparation for this very important assignment he would have upon confirmation to be a judge in the Eastern District of Pennsylvania. I am grateful for his willingness to serve.

In addition, Judge Edward George Smith, as Senator TOOMEY noted, has a great career and a varied set of experiences, serving now as a judge in the Court of Common Pleas in Northampton County since January of 2002. He was elected to that position and then retained, which is the ultimate validation of someone's services on the bench in the Court of Common Pleas in Pennsylvania.

Prior, as Senator TOOMEY noted, Judge Smith served the United States in the Navy Judge Advocate General's Corps as a captain, from 1984 until the present time. He also served in the DeRaymond & Smith law firm for about 11 years. In that time period he served as solicitor for a number of entities in the region.

Edward Smith has also demonstrated his commitment to his community. He is a former president of the Boys and Girls Club of Easton, PA, former president of the Kiwanis Club of Palmer

Township, former emergency medical technician in Forks Township.

His 27-year military career is substantial. In addition to serving in the Navy and achieving the rank of captain, he served our country in Iraq. Just a few of his commendations are the Bronze Star medal, Meritorious Service medal, and the Navy and Marine Corps Commendation medal.

Whether by way of life experience as well as legal experience or whether his experience as a judge, Judge Smith is prepared to be a judge again on a different court—in this case, the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

When we make decisions about whom to nominate for either the district court or the appellate court, we always want to consider a range of characteristics, experiences, and qualifications. First and foremost, we look to people who have unquestioned integrity. We look to them as people who have a varied experience, whether in the law as a judge or in other life experiences as well. We also look to people who can do the job—not just by way of their integrity and ability but also those who have the judicial temperament, the approach to litigants, to treat them with fairness and to arrive at a measure of justice.

On those qualifications and characteristics, as well as others, both of these nominees possess them in abundance. I am grateful for Senator TOOMEY's work with us to get this done to have two judges to be confirmed, and we are looking forward to doing that later this week.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

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

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

#### 1964 ALASKA EARTHQUAKE

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Thank you, Mr. President.

In Alaska there is a great deal of attention focused this week on the Great Alaska Earthquake of 1964. March 27 marked the 50th anniversary of this amazing physical event, the second largest earthquake that has ever been recorded, an episode Alaskans have been talking about for the past 50 years and will be talking about for the next 50. I rise this afternoon not to speak about that anniversary but to speak of a 25-year anniversary that while not caused by Mother Nature had a devastating impact on Alaska and the surrounding waters of our State. I would like to speak very briefly about where we are 25 years after the Exxon Valdez ran aground on Bligh Reef.

The Exxon Valdez was a 987-foot tanker. It was carrying 53 million gal-

lons of crude oil. It struck Bligh Reef in Prince William Sound at 12:04 a.m., on March 24, 1989, and within literally hours it had released approximately 11 million gallons of crude oil into the water.

As most know, the Alaskan coastline isn't just a nice thin straight beach; it is hundreds and hundreds of coves and islands and miles of shoreline. That oil spread over approximately 1,000 miles of shoreline across our coast. It is absolutely a fact that this environmental disaster is something that has left an impression on Alaskans not unlike what we experienced 25 years prior to that with another one of Mother Nature's devastations, the Great Friday earthquake in 1964.

It is important when we have milestones, when we have anniversaries or times where we pause to think about what has happened before, that we not only think about the tragedy at the time but we think about how we have moved forward from that time, hopefully learning from those incidents that trigger such strong memories.

So many Alaskans have stories of how they worked to help clean up the oil spill in the aftermath of the Exxon Valdez, whether it was fishermen who had been displaced—they were no longer going out and fishing; instead they charged their vessels to be part of the massive cleanup effort that was underway. The stories that are out there throughout our State and from folks around the country are as poignant and touching 25 years later as they were at the time, because as the environment was impacted, the lives of Alaskans were clearly impacted.

I like to think I spend a good amount of time in the small fishing community of Cordova—a community that was dramatically impacted by the Exxon Valdez spill—visiting with fishermen and fishing families decades after the fact and hearing their stories not only of the loss they incurred because they were not able to go out and fish, they were not able to meet their boat mortgages, but the other stresses the community experienced because of this disaster, whether it was personal bankruptcies, whether it was divorce, whether it was social issues because people just couldn't deal with the fact that their landscape and their livelihoods had been changed. It was a very trying and traumatic time. I think those scars take decades to heal.

My hope is that, as Alaskans, we come together and learn from these tragedies and events so we can move forward. We are pretty resilient people. The people who have been so dramatically impacted are proof and evidence of that.

What else have we seen as we have tried to learn from that tragedy? I think it is fair to say that at the time—back in 1989 when the Exxon Valdez ran aground—there was perhaps, as some would call it, a complacency. Perhaps we were just not monitoring operations as we should have,

but we had an industry that had been operating quite safely—absolutely safely—for decades without incident. When you lose that vigilance, things can happen, and things happened with the Exxon Valdez.

Since that time, we have learned that you have to have a level of preparedness as you operate in areas such as the Prince William Sound, you have to have a level of preparedness that meets the challenge you face. At the time the tanker ran aground, the spill response equipment that was there and had been planned for was not readily available. We didn't have sufficient boom available in the event of a disaster. We didn't have the fleet that could go out and assist in the disaster.

Now, 25 years later, Alyeska has 189 skimmers, 49 miles of boom and on-water storage capacity of almost 38 million gallons. We have put in place a requirement that North Slope oil must be transported in double-hull tankers. You cannot bring a tanker in to carry North Slope crude unless it is double-hulled. It doesn't matter what the weather is, we require a level of escort—a two-tug escort—out of the Prince William Sound. It can be a flat, calm summer day or a foul winter day, but every tanker going out is escorted by two tugs. We also have radar monitors that are in place that truly allow for a greater level of oversight and scrutiny.

What we have done in response to the spill is, I think, something that is worthy of note. Clearly, it is something that Other Nations look to as the example of preparedness. We have our Prince William Sound Regional Citizens Advisory Council in place. They are truly active and engaged, not only with the community, but with the fishing fleets.

We have learned that the company Alyeska—the management company for the transportation of Alaska's North Slope oil—conducts two major oil spill drills every year to make sure that there is a level of preparedness. We have about 400 local fishing boat owners that are trained to deploy and maintain the boom. They come together with drills to make sure we never have anything like we saw with the Exxon Valdez again.

I think it is fair to say that 25 years after the spill, we are continuing to monitor not only the land and water but our fisheries. I recognize we still have a herring fishery that has not yet recovered. We still have a bird population—the guillemot—which has not recovered.

Twenty-five years is a long time. When you have a disaster, as we had, it does leave an impact. My goal, mission, and effort as a legislator is to make certain we do not have a level of complacency where we close our eyes and fail in our efforts for preparedness again.

I think what we have demonstrated in Alaska since the spill is, as I say, admirable in recognizing that we had

failed in a level of prevention, but we also recognized we could learn from that tragedy and move forward, and we did.

I wanted to take a couple of minutes this afternoon and acknowledge that there are still many Alaskans who woke up this morning not thinking about the weather or getting their kids to school, but with a very strong reminder of where they were 25 years ago and how the events of that day changed people's lives. Again, the goal here is to never have a tragedy of that scale and scope again.

With that, I thank the Chair, 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 for up to 10 minutes each.

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

#### REMEMBERING RICHARD CLINE

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to Richard Francis Cline, a member of "The Greatest Generation." Mr. Cline, who passed away last September at the age of 89, will be honored today by interment at Arlington National Cemetery. Mr. Cline was a dedicated father and patriot who, like so many of his generation, left friends, family, and the comfort of home to take up arms in defense of his Nation.

A native of Chicago, and North Carolinian later in his life, Mr. Cline and his eight siblings knew hardship early in life, coming of age during the Great Depression. To help support his family he worked at several jobs as a boy and as a young man. He began working by selling popcorn at Wrigley Stadium at the age of 9 and learned, out of necessity, the merit of a strong work ethic that would follow him for the rest of his life.

After graduating from high school, he joined the U.S. Army at the age of 18. He served his country in General Patton's famous 3rd Army Corps, where he was a member of the 15th Medical Supply Division that operated in England as well as France and Belgium during the Battle of the Bulge. He witnessed the horrors of war and served his country to provide not only for his family, but also for the freedom of all Americans.

While stationed in a small town in Belgium, he met his future wife, Jeanine. She returned with him to America

and they continued their lives together following the war. They were married for 64 years, and together they raised 4 children who saw their father not only as their parent, but as their friend.

Once Mr. Cline returned home, he started what would become a 44-year career with the Continental Can Corporation. Those who knew him would tell you that he expected nothing he did not earn, and worked hard to achieve the American dream he fought so hard to protect. He gave earnestly to his community in many ways throughout his life, often making wooden toys for children who might not otherwise have had any presents at Christmas. Richard Francis Cline embodied the spirit of the "greatest generation" and made many who knew him proud to call him both a fellow American and a friend.

I am honored to have been able to call Mr. Cline a constituent. His interment at Arlington National Cemetery is recognition of his loyal service to this great Nation. I offer my condolences to his family and those who knew Mr. Richard Cline, for we have lost a remarkable man and role model.

#### ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

##### REMEMBERING JUAN GONZALEZ AND BRIAN LAW

• Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the memory of two dedicated public servants, California Highway Patrol officers Juan Gonzalez and Brian Law. Officer Gonzalez and Officer Law were tragically killed in the line of duty while responding to an automobile accident in Kingsburg, CA.

A graduate of Tulare Union High School and California State University, Fresno, Juan Gonzalez joined the California Highway Patrol in 2008, the culmination of years of hard work and the realization of a goal that he had held since he was 5 years old. He worked for 2 years in San Jose before transferring to the Fresno area in 2010.

A Marine and Air Force reservist, Brian Law also graduated from the California Highway Patrol Academy in 2008 and worked in Alameda County for the CHP for 5 years before transferring to Fresno last year.

Officer Gonzalez and Officer Law first met as cadets at the California Highway Patrol Academy, where they became good friends. In 2013, they teamed up as partners in the CHP's Fresno office.

Those who knew Officer Gonzalez fondly remember him as a trusted colleague and friend who was committed to his career and family. His determined spirit, unique laugh, and camaraderie will be missed.

Officer Law was an avid sports fan with an engaging personality whose willingness to help others and passion for law enforcement helped him to become a respected member of the California Highway Patrol. Above all else,