

Casey	Hirono	Pryor
Coats	Johnson (SD)	Reed
Collins	Kaine	Reid
Coons	King	Risch
Corker	Klobuchar	Rockefeller
Crapo	Landrieu	Sanders
Donnelly	Leahy	Schatz
Durbin	Levin	Schumer
Feinstein	Manchin	Shaheen
Flake	Markey	Udall (CO)
Franken	McCaskill	Udall (NM)
Gillibrand	Menendez	Walsh
Hagan	Merkley	Warner
Harkin	Mikulski	Warren
Hatch	Murkowski	Whitehouse
Heinrich	Murphy	Wyden
Heitkamp	Murray	
Heller	Nelson	

NAYS—32

Barrasso	Grassley	Portman
Blunt	Hoeven	Roberts
Burr	Inhofe	Rubio
Chambliss	Isakson	Scott
Coburn	Johanns	Sessions
Cochran	Johnson (WI)	Shelby
Cornyn	Kirk	Thune
Cruz	Lee	Toomey
Enzi	McCain	Vitter
Fischer	McConnell	Wicker
Graham	Paul	

NOT VOTING—4

Boozman	Stabenow
Moran	Tester

The nomination was confirmed.

NOMINATION OF SUZAN G. LEVINE TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE SWISS CONFEDERATION AND THE PRINCIPALITY OF LIECHTENSTEIN

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the clerk will report the LeVine nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Suzan G. LeVine, of Washington, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Swiss Confederation, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Principality of Liechtenstein.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 2 minutes of debate prior to the vote on the LeVine nomination.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Suzan G. LeVine, of Washington, to be Ambassador of the United States of America to the Swiss Confederation, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Principality of Liechtenstein?

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motions to reconsider are considered made and laid upon the table and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

ENERGY SAVINGS AND INDUSTRIAL COMPETITIVENESS ACT OF 2014—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume legislative session.

The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to engage in a colloquy with the Senator from South Carolina as in morning business.

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

BENGHAZI

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, 19 months ago a terrible thing happened in Benghazi, Libya. Four brave Americans were murdered, and the issue has not only not been resolved but as each of the last 19 months has ensued, the issue of how and under what circumstances this heinous crime was committed continues. The Senator from South Carolina and I, the Senator from New Hampshire, and some others, have vowed we will never give up on this issue until the truth is known and the people who perpetrated it are brought to justice.

We have seen another page turn in this chapter of coverup and obfuscation by this administration by the belated—19 months later—release of the following emails. The first one we will not pay much attention to. This is from Benjamin Rhodes, who is supposed to be the public affairs officer for the National Security Council. In fact, he is obviously the propaganda organ. The goals, as he states them, are to underscore these protests are rooted in an Internet video and not a broader failure of policy.

I tell my colleagues that was not a fact. That was not a fact. There was no evidence these protests were rooted in an Internet video. In fact, the station chief before these talking points were made up sent a message that this is not—not—a spontaneous demonstration.

To show that we will be resolute in bringing people who bring harm to Americans to justice, and standing steadfast through these protests; to reinforce the President's strength and steadiness—that is all about the Presidential campaign. It is not about trying to find out who perpetrated this heinous crime. It is not about trying to respond to the people who committed these acts.

In fact, because of the coverup and the obfuscation and now 19-month delay, not a single person who was responsible for the murder of these four brave Americans has been brought to justice, as the President promised they would be.

Yesterday Mr. Carney said the release of this information had nothing to do with the attack on Benghazi. My friends, I have heard a lot of strange things in my time, but that has to be

the most bizarre statement I have ever heard. This is all about a Presidential campaign. This is all about an effort to convince the American people the President of the United States had everything under control.

The next day, on the Sunday talk shows, Susan Rice said Al Qaeda had been decimated. False; that the embassy was safe and stable and secure. False. And of course the whole issue of blaming an Internet video lasted on and on for a couple of weeks when it was clear the evidence did not indicate that.

I yield to my friend from South Carolina on this issue, and then I will return.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. GRAHAM. I thank my colleague.

To remind the body of what we are talking about, this email was released as a result of a lawsuit, and not voluntarily by the White House. In August of last year, the House of Representatives and the committees of jurisdiction subpoenaed all documents related to Benghazi and basically were stiff-armed.

Senators MCCAIN, AYOTTE, and I have written enough letters to destroy a small forest to the White House with virtually nothing to show for it. A private organization called Judicial Watch sued under the Freedom of Information Act, and an independent judiciary—thank God for that—ordered this White House to disclose this email just days ago. Knowing the email was going to come out, the White House provided it to the Congress a few days ago.

What does that tell us? That tells us they did not want anyone to know about this email. They talk about 25,000 documents they have provided. It doesn't matter the number of documents they provided to the Congress. They could have provided us with the Benghazi phone book. It is the relevance of the documents and the significance of the documents. The reason they did not want anyone—me and anyone else—to know about this email is because it is the smoking gun that shows that people at the White House level—these are people who work at the White House for the administration—were very intent on shaping the story about Benghazi away from what they knew to be the truth.

Here is the problem for the White House. This was 7 weeks before an election. President Obama had said repeatedly: Bin Laden is dead, Al Qaeda is on the run, the war is receding, my foreign policy is working. Many of us were critical of President Obama's foreign policy, particularly in Libya, because after Qadhafi fell, we really did nothing to secure the country.

Senator MCCAIN, myself, and a couple of other Senators—RUBIO—went in 2011 to Libya. We said in an op-ed piece if we don't get rid of these militias, Libya is going to become a safe haven for terrorists.

You have to understand this about the Benghazi consulate. It had been previously attacked in April of 2012.

The British Ambassador had been attacked in June of 2012. The British closed their consulate. The Red Cross closed their office because they had been attacked. And we have email traffic coming from Libya to Washington at the State Department level saying on August 16: We cannot secure the Benghazi consulate from a coordinated terrorist attack, and Al Qaeda flags are flying all over Benghazi.

What they did not want you to know is that the consulate in Benghazi was very unsecure, that everyone else had left the town, and that the numerous requests for security enhancements going back for months had been denied. They didn't want you to know because it would make the American people mad that the facility was so unsecure in such a dangerous area and people in Washington constantly ignored requests for additional security.

Here is what they wanted you to know:

... to convey that the United States is doing everything we can to protect our people and facilities abroad. . . .

That, to me, is the worst of the whole email because they are trying to convey to the American people and the families of the fallen that: These things happened, but we did all we could to protect your family and those who served this Nation.

Nothing could be more untruthful about Benghazi than this statement that they did everything they could to secure the facility.

The question as to whether this email relates to Benghazi was the most offensive thing coming out of the White House in quite a while. No one else died. There was an attack on our Embassy in Cairo with property damage.

What did we think Susan Rice was going to be asked about on Sunday, 16 September? Everybody in the Nation wanted to know how our Ambassador and three other brave Americans died. To suggest they weren't trying to prepare her to talk about the deaths of 4 Americans is insulting to our intelligence, but the document itself tells us it was directed toward explaining Benghazi.

To show that we will be resolute in bringing people who harm Americans to justice . . .

That was part of what they wanted her to convey. No one else was hurt other than in Benghazi. So within the document itself, they are talking about reinforcing the view that we will go after those who harmed Americans. The only people who were harmed—the four people killed—were in Benghazi. So that is just a bald-faced lie. That is insulting our intelligence, and it really is disrespectful to those who died in the line of duty to suggest this email—which they would not give us without a court order—had nothing to do with the death of four Americans.

Mr. MCCAIN. I might add that all of the emails were supposed to be given to the Congress in return for the confirmation of Mr. Brennan as head of the CIA. They didn't do that.

Mr. GRAHAM. The bottom line is the goals set out in this email are to try to convince the American people 7 weeks before an election: We had done everything possible to protect our people and facilities; “to underscore that these protests are rooted in an Internet video, and not a broader failure of policy.”

I am here to tell you—and I dare anybody to show where I am wrong—there is no evidence of a protest outside the compound that led to an eventual attack.

I have talked to the man in charge of security at Benghazi—the only survivor I have been able to talk to. He told me that when the Ambassador went to bed shortly after 9, there was nobody outside the compound. They would not have let him go to bed if there had been protesters, and they would have reported a protest up the chain of command.

Mr. MCCAIN. And the next day the station chief sent a message that there was “not-slash-not spontaneous demonstration.”

Mr. GRAHAM. That was the 15th. So this is in real-time that people are reporting a coordinated terrorist attack. There was no protest. The video had nothing to do with this because there was no protest. And why would they suggest that? They would be far less culpable in the eyes of the American people and myself if, in fact, this was caused by a video we had nothing to do with, a protest we could not see coming. The truth is that this was a coordinated terrorist attack that you could see coming for months, and it was the result of a broader failure of policy. Why didn't they want to admit that? They were 7 weeks out. It undercuts everything they were trying to tell the American people about their foreign policy.

This is the smoking gun that shows they were consciously trying to manipulate the evidence to steer the story away from a coordinated terrorist attack of an unsecured facility and toward the land of an Internet video causing a protest. That, to me, is unacceptable and is clear as the Sun rises in the east, for those who care.

I will end with this and turn it back over to Senator MCCAIN.

After this attack, President Obama said the following:

But everything that—every piece of information we get, as we got it, we laid it out for the American people.

I am here to tell you that statement has not borne scrutiny. The administration did not live up to this statement.

Here is another statement from Jay Carney:

I can tell you that the President believes that Ambassador Rice has done an excellent job as the United States Ambassador to the

United Nations, and I believe that—and I know that he believes that everyone here working for him has been transparent in the way that we've tried to answer questions about what happened in Benghazi. . . .

If they were trying to be transparent about what was happening in Benghazi, why would they fail to provide the relevant information?

The information that we provided was based on the available assessment at the time.

I am here to tell you, ladies and gentlemen, they have not provided the relevant information. Why? Because the relevant information crumbles the story Susan Rice told on 16 September, crumbles the story of the President himself when weeks later he talked about a protest caused by a video that never happened. The reason they haven't shared this with us is because it exposes the lie of Benghazi.

I will end with this thought. We would not know today about an email on 14 September setting goals for Susan Rice to meet on 16 September to change the whole narrative if it were not for an independent judiciary and a private organization.

This White House has stiffed the Congress. Mostly, the media has been AWOL. But the reason we haven't stopped is because we met the families.

To any Member of the Congress who thinks Benghazi is a Republican conspiracy designed to help LINDSEY GRAHAM or anyone else get elected, why don't you go to the family members and explain to them what happened. Why don't you tell the family members that the government was up front and honest and see if they believe you.

This email that came from a court requiring the White House to disclose is devastating. It is devastating because it shows that 3 days after the attack, their goal was not to inform the American people of what happened but to shape the story to help the President get reelected. I hope and pray that matters to the American people, and I believe it does. And I hope and pray our friends on the Democratic side will start taking a little bit of interest.

I can tell you this about Senator MCCAIN and myself: When President Bush's policies in Iraq were crumbling, we did not have enough troops, and JOHN MCCAIN, to his credit, said that publicly and asked for the resignation of President Bush's Secretary of Defense because of failed policy.

When we discovered the abuses at Guantanamo Bay and Abu Ghraib when it came to detainee policies, both of us said: The system failed. Don't believe it when they tell you this was a few bad apples.

Why did we do that? I have been a military lawyer for 31 years. It means a lot to me to adhere to the conventions we have signed up to.

Senator MCCAIN—if there were ever an American hero in the Senate, it is he. He has lived through a country that practices torture, and he did not want us to go down that road.

When we did those things, we were “great Americans holding the system accountable and doing the country a service.” Now, all of a sudden, we are “just party hacks.”

I am here to say that what drove us then drives us now. When we ask people to serve in faraway places with strange-sounding names and to go out on the tip of the spear, we owe it to them to help them, to give them the best ability to survive. And if something bad happens, we owe their families the truth.

Just as in Iraq, they tried to shape the story in a fashion that did not bear scrutiny. It wasn't a few dead-enders; it was system failure that led to the collapse of Iraq. And thank God we changed tactics and we overcame our problems.

This Benghazi story is about a foreign policy choice called the light footprint that caught up with this administration. It is about an administration that said no to additional security requests because they didn't want to be like Bush. It is a story about an administration that is too stubborn to react to facts on the ground, that kept a consulate open when everybody else closed theirs, unsecured, believing that ignoring the problem would solve the problem.

We have now found evidence of their willingness and desire to change the narrative from a coordinated terrorist attack of an unsecured facility—something they really couldn't control, and they did the best they could 7 weeks before an election.

All I can say is if the shoe were on the other foot and this had been the Bush administration, it would be front-page news everywhere and our colleagues on the other side would be screaming. It is sad that it hasn't been news everywhere. It is sad that my Democratic colleagues in the House in particular have disdain for trying to find out what happened in Benghazi.

Mr. MCCAIN. And the fact is, I would say to my friend, the time has now come for a select committee. The time has now come because these talking points raise more questions than answers. It is time for a bipartisan, bicameral select committee to investigate the entire Benghazi fiasco and tragedy, and it needs to be done soon. The American people and the families of those brave ones who sacrificed their lives deserve nothing less.

My friend Senator GRAHAM mentioned the media. I would like to say thanks.

I would like to say thanks to FOX News. I would like to say thanks to some at CBS. I would like to say thanks to Charles Krauthammer and the handful of people who kept this alive when the “mainstream media” not only wanted to bury it but subjected, of course, as Senator GRAHAM just mentioned, him and me to ridicule.

I wish to go back for a second to this email. In response to questions yester-

day by Mr. Carney, the White House Press spokesperson, if we look at this email and then look at what Mr. Carney said, it is an absolute falsehood. It is a total departure from reality. How does the President's spokesperson tell the American people something that is patently false?

The President's spokesperson, in regard to this email that says to show “these protests are rooted in an Internet video, and not a broader failure of policy”—what was he talking about? He says Rhodes' email “was explicitly not about Benghazi.” Well, then what was it about?

Then he goes on to say:

The fact of the matter is, there were protests in the region.

The talking points cited protests at that facility.

They didn't. The talking points did not cite protests at that facility—i.e., Benghazi.

The connection between protests and video—and the video turned out not to be the case—

It turned out not to be the case because it was never the case and no one ever believed it—

but it was based on the best information that we had.

He had no information that there was a spontaneous demonstration sparked by a video. That was manufactured somewhere. The American people and we need to know where those talking points came from that Susan Rice gave.

He goes on to say:

If you look at that document, that document that we're talking about today was about the overall environment in the Muslim world.

How could he say that and look at this email here? Talking about events in the Muslim world?

And of course he goes on to say, talking about Susan Rice:

She relied on her—for her answers on Benghazi, on the document prepared by the CIA, as did members of Congress.

Mr. Morell, the deputy head of the CIA at that time, said he was astonished to hear that there was reference made on all five Sunday morning shows that there was a hateful video involved.

So Mr. Carney is saying things that are absolutely false. The American people deserve better than that from the President's spokesperson whom they rely on for accurate information. When the bodies came home, and it was a moving event—I was there—the then-Secretary of State told members of the family and told me: We will get these people who were responsible for the hateful video.

That was a number of days later when it was absolutely proven to anyone's satisfaction there was no hateful video, and of course we still don't know what the final version of the talking points was that Susan Rice used on all the morning talk shows, who was the final arbiter of it. We know now that Mr. Rhodes played a very key role in

that, and we need to know who gave her those talking points because they are patently false. If someone gave her those talking points, then why in the world did that person manufacture out of whole cloth information that was told to the American people?

There are a lot of points here, and we can get into some of the details, but the fact is that this is a coverup of a situation which was politically motivated in order to further the Presidential ambitions of the President of the United States. That is what this is all about. That is why comments and instructions were given in this email, because the narrative was: The tide of war is receding, Osama bin Laden is dead.

Secretary Susan Rice said at the time: Al Qaeda is decimated and the Embassy is safe and secure. None of those facts were true. Most importantly, we have five Americans who were killed. It is very clear that should not have happened, would not have happened if proper actions had been taken.

Most important now or just as important now is the fact that for the last 19 months this White House has been engaged in a coverup. It calls for a select committee to examine all of the facts, and as always happens in these kinds of scandals, the coverup is equally or sometimes worse than the actual action itself. The American people deserve to know the truth.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COONS). The Senator from Rhode Island.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Thank you, Mr. President.

I ask unanimous consent to speak as if in morning business for up to 20 minutes.

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

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I am here, as regular viewers of the C-SPAN network know, for the 65th time, every week that the Senate is in session, to ask my colleagues in the Senate to wake up to the realities of climate change that surround us.

Here is what we know: We know the oceans and atmosphere are warming. By the way, that is measurement, not theory. We know sea level is rising. Again, that is measurement, not theory. We know oceans are becoming more acidic—again, a simple measurement. The potential that these changes have to disrupt economic growth and to disrupt global commerce is the subject of my remarks today, and it is those changes that make investors and corporate executives take climate change seriously.

We may not take climate change seriously, but corporate executives do. A world of shifting seasons and extreme heat hurts their bottom line. The world of drought-stricken farms and flooded cities, of raging wildfires and migrating diseases is not good for business. A

recent article from the World Bank conveys the corporate outlook this way:

In corporate boardrooms and the offices of CEOs, climate change is a real and present danger. It threatens to disrupt the water supplies and supply chains of companies as diverse as Coca-Cola and ExxonMobil. Rising sea levels and more intense storms put their infrastructure at risk and the costs will only get worse.

Earlier this month executives from major American companies came to Washington for a roundtable discussion at the Bicameral Task Force on Climate Change, which I lead with Congressman WAXMAN. Each of the companies present had signed the climate declaration of the Business for Innovative Climate and Energy Policy or BICEP. They see a low-carbon economy as a smart way to create new jobs and stimulate economic growth. More than 750 companies, nameplate American corporations such as eBay, Gap, Levi's, Nike, Starbucks, and many others have signed BICEP's climate declaration.

Kevin Rabinovitch is global sustainability director at Virginia-based candy company Mars, Incorporated, makers of the famous M&Ms, among other things. At the roundtable he told us Mars has a goal of eliminating fossil fuel energy use and greenhouse gas emissions companywide by 2040. In fact, just yesterday Mars announced it will build a 200-megawatt wind farm in Texas that will generate enough energy to power all Mars operations in the United States. I applaud this exciting step for Mars and the bold vision it represents.

But Mr. Rabinovitch told the Bicameral Task Force on Climate Change:

... if other companies and governments don't adopt similar science based targets, our efforts will have limited effect on climate change. We cannot do it alone. This is why the business community needs Congress to get off the sidelines, to quit denying rudimentary science and abundant evidence. Improving energy efficiency reduces climate-altering carbon emissions, but it also—these businesses find—reduces operating costs.

Colin Dyer, the president and CEO of Jones Lang LaSalle, Incorporated, the second largest publicly traded commercial real estate brokerage firm in the world said:

Cost savings alone represent a compelling benefit of sustainable design, construction, and management. Jones Lang LaSalle put smart building management technology to work for the consumer goods giant Procter & Gamble.

According to Dyer:

P&G earned back its initial investment in the technology in three months and saw average energy cost savings of 10 percent annually. The program, which is being expanded, also improved building systems reliability, supported the company's broader sustainability programs, and actually increased employee productivity.

Smart executives also understand how much their customers care about this. Rob Olson, vice president and chief financial officer of IKEA, said this:

From talking to our customers, we know that Americans are increasingly concerned about climate change as they experience events like Hurricane Sandy and the drought in California. They want to reduce the amount of energy they use in their home and they care about reducing waste and using less water.

This is not a new message from America's corporate sector. Last year the Bicameral Task Force on Climate Change wrote to over 300 businesses and organizations about carbon pollution and climate change. The response was encouraging. Coca-Cola, headquartered in Georgia, wrote:

We recognize climate change is a critical challenge facing our planet, with potential impacts on biodiversity, water resources, public health and agriculture. Beyond the effects on the communities we serve, we view climate change as a potential business risk, understanding that it could likely have direct and indirect effects on our business.

Walmart, founded and headquartered in Arkansas, wrote this: "We're committed to reducing our carbon footprint and we're working with our suppliers to do the same."

Here is what Walmart said in its 2009 sustainability report:

Climate change may not cause hurricanes, but warmer ocean water can make them more powerful. Climate change may not cause rainfall, but it can increase the frequency and severity of heavy flooding. Climate change may not cause droughts, but it can make droughts longer. Every company has a responsibility to reduce greenhouse gases as quickly as it can. Currently, we are investing in renewable energy, increasing efficiency in our buildings and trucks, working with suppliers to take carbon out of products and supporting legislation in the U.S. to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

Serious business leaders are looking for serious answers to the looming economic crisis of climate change. An article last month in the Harvard Business Review entitled "How to Survive Climate Change and Still Run a Thriving Business" outlines recommendations for companies looking to strengthen their supply chains and better understand their consumers.

Serious business leaders are also fed up with the denial apparatus that is run by the big carbon polluters. Major utilities PG&E, the Public Service Company of New Mexico, and Exelon all quit the U.S. Chamber of Commerce after a chamber official called for putting climate science on trial similar to the Scopes Monkey Trial of 1925. Large tech companies such as Apple and Yahoo also left the chamber.

One of the companies that came in to the Bicameral Task Force was North Carolina-based VF Corporation. You may not have heard of VF Corporation, but you have sure heard of their major brands. They make Lee, Wrangler, Nautica, North Face, and many other name brands. Letitia Webster is their director of global corporate sustainability, and they have a global perspective on climate change. Their customers around the world are concerned about climate change, particularly their younger customers, and VF wants

to meet those customers' expectations for good citizenship. VF also needs cotton for all their clothing and they are worried about climate disruption to the cotton supply chain. "Research tells us that continued climate change will make it more and more difficult for farmers to manage cotton crops and for companies to manage their supply chains."

VF also provides very high performance clothing and equipment to high-performance outdoor athletes who train and compete in places where climate changes are already evident. Those athletes see the same changes as the 100 winter Olympic competitors from 10 countries who signed a letter of warning about climate change. Letitia Webster mentioned in particular the Khumbu Icefall which has closed Mount Everest to climbers for the first time. She is not the only one.

John All, a climber, scientist, and professor of geography at Western Kentucky University told the Atlantic magazine:

I am at Everest Base Camp right now and things are dire because of climate change. . . . The ice is melting at unprecedented rates and [that] greatly increases the risk to climbers. You could say [that] climate change closed Mt. Everest this year.

Tim Rippel is a climbing guide, and he blogged from Everest's base camp:

As a professional member of the Canadian Avalanche Association, I have my educated concerns. The mountain has been deteriorating rapidly the past three years due [to] global warming and the breakdown in the Khumbu Icefall is dramatic.

Ms. Webster warned of the costs of inaction, saying, "It's too expensive not to take action." This is a North Carolina company, and I hope its message gets through to elected officials who represent North Carolina.

Senator HAGAN has already spoken passionately about the need to act on climate change. She gets it, but her colleagues on the other side of the aisle remain silent.

I visited North Carolina over the recess as part of a tour of the effects of climate change along the southeast coast. I flew out to where sea level rise is gnawing away at North Carolina's Outer Banks.

I visited the marine science facility at Pivers Island, where scientists from Duke University, the University of North Carolina, North Carolina State, East Carolina University, and of course NOAA, are studying aspects of sea level rise in North Carolina and the effects of ocean acidification on microbes that form the basis of the food web.

These are some of the world's leading scientists. They all know that these changes are driven by carbon pollution. There is no doubt. Unless North Carolina's elected officials think that their own universities are part of the big hoax some of our colleagues talk about, they had better pay attention to what is happening on the North Carolina coast.

I met with the North Carolina Coastal Federation at their coastal education center in Wilmington, NC. It

was a bipartisan group joined together in concern over the exposure of their coastal communities to the rising seas. The “North Carolina Sea-Level Rise Assessment Report” prepared in 2010 by the North Carolina Coastal Resources Commission’s Science Panel on Coastal Hazards says:

The most likely scenario for 2100 AD is a rise of 0.4 meters to 1.4 meters (15 inches to 55 inches) above present.

By the way, that is what they call bathtub measures. That doesn’t take into account what 55 inches of extra sea will do when it is heaped against the shore by a storm surge from a big tropical storm or hurricane.

I hope their congressional delegation in Congress is listening.

The biggest power producer in North Carolina is Charlotte-based Duke Energy. Duke worked through the U.S. Climate Action Partnership for climate change legislation. Duke actually pulled out of the National Association of Manufacturers because of that organization’s denial of climate change. Duke’s then-chief executive officer Jim Rogers said:

We are not renewing our membership in the NAM because in tough times, we want to invest in associations that are pulling in the same direction we are.

He said that NAM, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and Republicans “ought to roll up their sleeves and get to work on a climate bill. . . .” Duke Energy might want to also consider whether North Carolina politicians are pulling in the same direction.

This is not complicated. Load up carbon dioxide concentrations in the atmosphere and you load up heat in the atmosphere. We have known that since Abraham Lincoln was President. This is not a new discovery. Load up the heat, and the oceans warm up. That is not some theory either. You can measure it—with thermometers. When liquid warms, it expands, unless my colleagues want to repeal the law of thermal expansion. As the ocean expands and ice melts, up goes the sea level. It is up 6 inches at the tide gauge in Wilmington, NC, since 1954.

If my colleagues want to deny the 6-inch increase in the tide gauge in Wilmington, NC, let me explain to them what the North Carolina assessment says about how you measure sea level rise:

[Sea-level rise] can be directly measured in a straightforward way. The longest record of direct measurement of sea level comes from tide gauges. A tide gauge is a device built to measure water level variations due to tides and weather, and to eliminate effects due to waves. A tide gauge can be as simple as a long ruler nailed to a post on a dock. More sophisticated instruments, like those used by NOAA, are usually placed in a stilling well, or a pipe, that protects a float connected to a recording device from waves. As tides rise and fall, the float’s motion is recorded.

It is not complicated. Good luck denying that. When you fly over the North Carolina coast, you see lots of investment along the seashore. There

are lots of houses, lots of hotels, condominiums, restaurants—an entire seafloor economy that the larger North Carolina economy very much depends on.

What are my colleagues from North Carolina going to tell them about climate change: Don’t worry. It is not real? Good luck with that. They are already measuring the sea level rise.

Those small businesses in North Carolina want to protect their storefronts from sea level rise just as VF Corporation wants to protect its cotton supply from drought. These North Carolina companies get the economic threat that climate change presents.

The frustrating thing here is that we can strengthen our economies and businesses by tackling the problem of climate change and sea level rise head-on, and we can leave things better, not worse, for the generations that will follow us—perhaps the simplest obligation that we hold, and one, by the way, at which we are presently failing. But if we are going to stop failing at that obligation and tackle this problem head-on, we have to wake up to reality. We have to put aside, once and for all, the toxic polluter-paid politics that infect Washington.

The denial campaign that is run by these polluters is as poisonous to our democracy as carbon pollution is to our atmosphere and oceans. America is suffering as a result of Congress being tangled in a web of lies and surrounded by a barricade of special interests. We have to break through that. It is a matter of truth, it is a matter of honor, and it is a matter of being effective at these real problems.

I yield the floor and thank the Presiding Officer, and I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 2265

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, it is often said that foreign aid from America is to project American power and what America believes in. Unfortunately, over decades, the only thing consistent about foreign aid is that the money continues to flow regardless of the behavior of the recipients. This is extraordinary, and we have seen this decade after decade.

Studies will often show that 75 percent of foreign aid throughout many continents is simply stolen, taken in graft. The Mubarak family in Egypt is an example.

The point I would like to make today is if we are going to project what America stands for, if we want our money to go to people who are supporting activities that America is for, we should write that into the law. We have made attempts at this in the past.

Several years ago Senator LEAHY attached an amendment to foreign aid that says that countries need to be evolving towards democracy or showing an ability to go forward towards democracy. The problem is that every time we have restrictions on foreign aid, they are evaded. We always give an out. The President always has an out.

This week in Egypt, 683 people were condemned to death in one trial. Yet your money still flows to Egypt without interruption.

We have another contingency that says: If a country has a military takeover—if you have an election and then you have a military junta or a military takeover of the government—our aid should end. It didn’t happen in Egypt when there was a military takeover.

The only consistency about foreign aid is that it flows to all countries regardless of behavior. It is the opposite of what many of the proponents say. Many of the proponents say that we do this so we can modulate behavior and try to improve and make things better around the world. Yet they steadfastly oppose restrictions on foreign aid.

I have a bill that I am going to ask—in a few minutes—for the Senate to unanimously approve. This is a bill that should be an easy lift for most Senators. This is a bill to support our ally Israel and to say to the Palestinian Authority that if you wish to continue to take American money—and many people don’t realize this, but the American taxpayer gives hundreds of millions of dollars every year to the Palestinian Authority, and we supposedly have restrictions, but there is always an out. Guess what. They always get their money regardless of behavior.

What have I have been saying is, let’s have some restrictions. If we are going to give money to the Palestinian Authority, shouldn’t they agree to recognize the State of Israel? Shouldn’t that be part of what goes on with this?

We now have a problem—and the reason this has become a more pertinent issue and something that has come to the forefront—because Hamas, a terrorist group in Gaza, is now aligning them with Fatah, the people who run the Palestinian Authority.

My question is: Are we now going to send money to a unity government? Part of the charter of Hamas is not only not to recognize Israel, but they are actually for the destruction of Israel.

This is what I would ask Americans and those who will object to the bill—because there will be an objection to my bill: How can you object to something that calls for the recognition of Israel as a state? How can you object to this and how can you continue to allow the flow of money to a group that calls for the destruction of Israel? They will say: Well, we have contingencies for that or we will stop it if they become part of or control the West Bank.

When I was in Israel a year ago, I asked everybody that question. I met

with the Prime Minister of Israel, the President of Israel, the King of Jordan, and with the leader of the West Bank, Abbas. I met with all of these people and asked them: Can there be a separate peace? Can there be peace with the West Bank and peace with Gaza—a separate peace?

They all said: No, it has to be one peace.

I said to the Israeli side: If they are unified, will you negotiate with Hamas?

They said: No. They lob missiles at us. They are at war with us. They don't recognize our right to exist as a state. Not only that, they openly advocate for the destruction of Israel.

Realize that in the objection you will hear today, you will hear an objection that despite arguments to the contrary we will allow money to go to a unity government that will include Hamas.

I am simply asking that if we are going to send good money after bad—frankly, it is money we don't have. We have \$1 trillion in debt. We have bridges falling down in our own country, and your government is sending hundreds of millions of dollars to the Palestinian Authority—which is now going to be unified with Hamas, without restrictions or with restrictions that have a hole so big you can drive a truck through them. This always happens.

Every contingency and every limitation on foreign aid that you think would be practical and reasonable always has an exception for the President to overcome. The President always does it so the only thing consistent about foreign aid is that money continues to flow.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we pass my bill, S. 2265, Stand With Israel. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be discharged from further consideration of S. 2265 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration. I further ask that the bill be read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Reserving the right to object to Senator PAUL's request to discharge S. 2265 in the committee, this legislation Senator PAUL has been referring to has not been considered by the committee. It was just introduced in the last day or so, I think.

As chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and on behalf of the Republican ranking member, Senator CORKER, who had to depart to return to Tennessee but otherwise would have joined me in making remarks, I come to the floor to express our opposition to an effort to circumvent the normal legislative process and deprive the members of our committee of the opportunity to decide whether to take up this legislation. The authorization to provide or cut U.S. assistance to the

Palestinian Authority is clearly within the purview of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and it should have its members decide if it is appropriate, and it should be fully and openly considered by the committee.

This bill is a blunt-force instrument that would risk the collapse of the Palestinian economy in the West Bank. That is not in Israel's interests and it is not in our interests either. The bill would shift the burden of dealing with a failed state on its borders to Israel. That is certainly not my goal, and I hope it is not the goal of Senator PAUL either. Our goal should be to get back to a process and a negotiation toward a two-state solution that will allow Israel to live in peace and security.

We need to allow the parties—and particularly Mr. Abbas—the time to steer back toward a productive path to peace. To be clear, his time is limited. I am in agreement with Senator PAUL that President Abbas must ultimately choose between a future that envisions two States living side by side in peace and security or a destructive unity pact with a terrorist organization whose stated objective is to make sure there is no two-State solution.

A unity government—not a unity announcement but a unity government—between Fatah and Hamas has consequences that are clear under existing U.S. law. If Mr. Abbas definitely opens the door to Hamas exercising influence in the Palestinian Authority, I will encourage my colleagues to stand with me in exercising the existing legal authority to halt assistance to a government that includes parties that reject Israel's right to exist as a Jewish state and continues to support terrorism.

For those reasons, I must object to the Senator's request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Vermont.

DIFFERENCES OF OPINION

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, there has been a lot of criticism waged at the majority leader of the Senate, HARRY REID, for his discussion about the Koch brothers. That criticism of Senator REID is unfortunate. I think what Senator REID is trying to do is educate the American people about the disastrous Citizens United Supreme Court decision and what it has done by allowing billionaire families, such as the Koch brothers and Sheldon Adelson and others, to pump hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars into the political process in order to elect candidates in the House, in the Senate, and in the White House, who are working overtime against the best interests of the middle class and working families of this country and, at the same time, are working to provide even more tax breaks to millionaires and billionaires and large profitable corporations.

I think it is important, when we talk about the Koch brothers, not to make this discussion personal. It is not a personal discussion. It is a discussion about what the most powerful political

family in this country believes. If they are spending hundreds of millions of dollars—and this is a family worth \$80 billion, and they may end up spending, in fact, billions of dollars on campaigns—what is it they want? What do they believe? What do folks such as Sheldon Adelson believe, when they invite potential Republican candidates for President to come to Las Vegas for what has been called the Adelson primary, where he will listen to them and decide who he might support and spend hundreds of millions of dollars on in a Presidential campaign?

So I think it is important we know what the Koch brothers believe. Here is the best information I have. In 1980, as it turns out, David Koch, one of the two brothers, ran for Vice President of the United States on the Libertarian Party platform. What is interesting to me is to what degree the platform he ran on—which in 1980 got him 1 percent of the vote on the Libertarian ticket—to what degree that extremist set of positions has now become mainstream Republican today.

I want to take a few minutes to quote exactly what was in that 1980 platform so the American people can recognize to what degree ideas that at one point were considered extremist are now mainstream Republican. This is what was in the 1980 Libertarian Party platform upon which David Koch ran for Vice President:

We urge the repeal of federal campaign finance laws, and the immediate abolition of the despotic Federal Election Commission.

What that means is the Koch brothers, and increasingly the Republican Party, now believe there should be no campaign finance laws, that Citizens United did not go far enough, and that the Koch brothers should be able to spend millions of dollars by giving that money directly to individual candidates. That is what the Koch brothers said in 1980. That is what many Republicans believe today.

Let me state an exact quote from the platform:

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

There are many Republicans today who not only want to see cuts in Social Security but who ultimately want to privatize Social Security who believe it is unconstitutional for the U.S. Government to be involved in retirement benefits for seniors.

Libertarian Party platform, 1980:

We oppose—

Listen to this one. This is really quite incredible:

We oppose all personal and corporate income taxation, including capital gains taxes. We support the eventual repeal of all taxation.

Repeal of all taxation? That is the government. Basically, what they are saying, very boldly, straightforwardly—we have to respect their honesty—is they don't believe in government.

I have not heard any of my Republican colleagues say they want to abolish all taxation. That is not what they say and that is not what they believe. But on the other hand, it is important to note that the Ryan budget, just passed in mid-April in the House, provides a \$5 trillion tax break over a 10-year period, mainly by cutting the top individual and corporate income tax rates significantly. In other words, at a time when the wealthiest people are doing phenomenally well at the same time as the middle class disappears and more and more people live in poverty, what my Republican colleagues believe is we should give more tax breaks to millionaires and billionaires.

The Koch brothers' position in 1980 was that they support—Libertarian Party platform:

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

What does that mean?

Yesterday, we had a vote on the floor of the Senate which said that a \$7.25 an hour minimum wage is a poverty wage; that people who are working 40 hours a week and are making \$7.25 an hour are living in poverty; that they cannot bring up and raise families on those wages; and that if we raise the minimum wage to \$10.10 an hour, we could increase the salaries of approximately 28 million Americans. On that vote to overcome a Republican filibuster, one Republican voted with members of the Democratic caucus, and we lost that vote.

What is interesting, it is not simply that almost every Republican voted against raising the minimum wage; what is more significant is that many Republicans believe we should abolish the concept of the minimum wage.

Many of us know Senator TOM COBURN of Oklahoma to be an honest and straightforward guy. He tells it the way he sees it. This morning on the "Morning Joe" television show, this is what Senator COBURN said, and I quote from the transcript:

I don't believe you ought to interfere in the market. If there's to be a minimum wage—my theory is I don't believe there ought to be a national minimum wage. That's my position.

In other words, what Senator COBURN is saying today and, in fact, what many Republicans agree with him about, is we should abolish the concept of the minimum wage—something the Koch brothers were talking about 34 years ago.

What are the implications of that if we do as Senator COBURN suggested and just let the market work and don't have government interfere by establishing a minimum wage American workers should receive? What it means, quite simply, when we let the free market work, is that if people are in a high unemployment area and there are many workers competing for few jobs, an employer will say to a potential employee: I am prepared to hire you, good news, and I am going to pay \$4.

The worker says: I can't live on \$4 an hour. That is a starvation wage.

The employer says: That is OK, because I have 20 other workers who are prepared to accept that wage.

That is what happens when we abolish the concept of the minimum wage.

Many of us—and I think the vast majority of the American people—have a very different vision of where our country should go. We don't believe we should be abolishing the minimum wage. We don't believe we should be cutting or privatizing Social Security or transforming Medicare into a voucher program or making horrendous cuts to Medicaid.

What, in fact, the American people want is the Federal Government to start standing up for working families rather than millionaires and billionaires. In poll after poll, what the American people have said is they want us to invest in rebuilding our crumbling infrastructure and create millions of decent-paying jobs. That is what the American people want. They do not want tax breaks for billionaires but the creation of millions of jobs for rebuilding our crumbling infrastructure.

The American people, despite what Senator COBURN and others may believe, want us to raise the minimum wage. Poll after poll suggests the American people want us to raise the minimum wage to at least \$10.10 an hour.

The American people do not want us to cut Social Security. In fact, more and more Americans want us to expand Social Security, to make sure when elderly people reach retirement age, they can live and retire with dignity.

I think there has perhaps never been a time in the modern history of this country where the political lines have been drawn as clearly as they are right now. If you listen to the Koch brothers, if you read the Republican Ryan budget in the House, their positions are quite clear: Tax breaks for millionaires and billionaires and significant cuts in the programs that are life and death for the middle-class and working families of this country.

That is not what the American people want, and it is time we began to listen to the American people. It is time we took on those people, those billionaires who are spending huge amounts of money electing candidates who represent their interests. And it is time we listen to the working families of this country, who are struggling to survive.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARKEY). The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. ROBERTS. I thank the Presiding Officer.

Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of my friend from Vermont, who I know is in a hurry to leave the premises, as most Senators have already done. Perhaps he could relax and go out and have a Coke. Bad pun.

(The remarks of Mr. ROBERTS pertaining to the introduction of S. 2282

are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

IMMIGRATION REFORM

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I rise today to point out to my colleagues that more than 300 days have passed since we in the Senate passed bipartisan legislation that would secure our borders, hold employers accountable for hiring illegal workers, grow our economy, and provide a chance for people currently here illegally to get right with the law and earn legal status. But the House has failed to do anything to fix our broken immigration system—more than 300 days after we in the Senate passed bipartisan legislation.

To be clear, the problem is not that there is a difference of opinion between a House bill and a Senate bill on immigration that cannot be reconciled. The problem is that House Republicans have completely abdicated their responsibility to address important issues, such as fixing our broken immigration system.

Again, the problem is not that the House has passed laws that the Senate disagrees with. The problem is that the House will not put any immigration bills up for a vote, no matter what is in those bills. Now, why is that?

It is not because our immigration system is not broken. There is no Member of Congress who will stand and say: Our immigration system is great. Leave it alone. What is all the fuss about?

No one is happy with the present system. Finding a Member of Congress anywhere who will say we do not need to reform our broken immigration system is impossible.

The reason the House has done nothing on immigration is because House Republicans have handed the gavel of leadership on immigration to far-right extremists such as Congressman STEVE KING.

Congressman KING is not a mainstream Republican on this issue. You cannot even call him a conservative on this issue. He is an extreme outlier on the issue of immigration reform.

Every time any Republican has raised the possibility of action on immigration reform in the House, STEVE KING is there, in his own words, "manning the watchtowers 24/7" to make sure nothing can be passed to fix our broken immigration system.

When Republicans such as ERIC CANTOR, hardly a flaming liberal, talked early in 2013 about introducing a bill called the KIDS Act which would allow minors brought here through no fault of their own to earn legal status if they served in the military or obtained a college degree, KING said, "For every child who's a valedictorian, there's another 100 out there who weigh 130 pounds and they've got calves the size of cantaloupes because they're hauling

75 pounds of marijuana across the desert.”

The rhetoric of STEVE KING is beyond the pale. I am certain that the majority of Republicans in the House have their stomachs churn when they see STEVEN KING spew that kind of rhetoric. But rather than stand up to him, they give him the keys to the kingdom of immigration reform. Just look at what happened after KING protested. There was no KIDS Act introduced. Go look for the text of the KIDS Act on line. It does not exist. There is no bill. Not only was the KIDS Act never introduced, but House Republicans actually voted, nearly unanimously, to resume deporting minor children who had committed no crimes.

Another Republican, JEFF DENHAM, a Republican from California, who is also an Air Force reservist, recently proposed to let young people who came here illegally earn status by enlisting in the military. They love America so they would enlist in the military and risk their lives for this country. Here is what DENHAM said—paraphrasing him. He said: I know many of us do not want to vote on immigration. But we can at least tweak the Defense authorization bill to allow young people who were brought here illegally as minors through no fault of their own to serve in the military when they love this country and this is the only country they know.

To be clear, this measure is far short of comprehensive legislation that is needed to fix our broken system. This slight tweak is not even a drop of water in the Grand Canyon. Even for the small microscopic measure known as the ENLIST Act, STEVE KING responded, saying, “Don’t do it.” And the Republicans did not.

Here is what KING said:

As soon as they raise their hand and say I’m unlawfully present in the U.S., we are not going to take your oath into the military, but we’re going to take your deposition and we have a bus for you to Tijuana.

What happened when KING said this? He won. The ENLIST Act was stricken from the Defense authorization bill. So not only are Republicans catering to the views of KING and others on the far, far, extreme right on immigration by refusing to vote on any immigration reform, they actively promote anti-immigrant viewpoints by having passed a bill called the ENFORCE Act. You see, STEVE KING and his little group of far-right Members of Congress on immigration want to sue the Federal Government to require them to deport minor children, parents of U.S. citizens, and agricultural workers, rather than use all of its resources to focus on immigrants who are criminals, terrorists, and recent border crossers.

But Members of Congress, as most everyone knows, do not have standing to sue the Federal Government, because under our Constitution, Congressmen are not allowed to sue every time they disagree with a decision of the executive branch. Instead of think-

ing it was probably a good idea to focus our immigration enforcement resources on criminals, terrorists, and border crossers, once again STEVE KING said: Jump. And the Republican mainstream in the House said: How high? Republicans overwhelmingly voted to give KING and others the ability to sue the Federal Government every single time a decision on immigration enforcement is made with which they disagree.

There are Republican colleagues in the House who do not have the views of STEVE KING. We know that. They can offer other excuses they want for failing to do anything on immigration. For instance, they tried to blame the President. They say the President is to blame because he will not enforce the law. The record shows that he does enforce the law. In fact, many of the more liberal people, many of the immigration groups, are angry with him because they think he is enforcing the law too much.

But let’s say you believe he is not enforcing the law. So we have said to them: Good. Pass a bill now and say it does not take effect, all of the enforcement and any of the rest of it, until 2017. We will have a new President. If Republicans cannot agree to pass a bill that goes into effect after the President’s term, then we know that mistrust of the President is nothing but a straw man.

They say they really want to pass immigration legislation in their heart, but they are only one Member and it is not up to them. They can even have their leadership blame other Republicans for not holding a vote. But Bill Parcells, who used to coach for both the New York Giants and New York Jets, was famous for saying, “You are what your record shows you are.”

What does the record show? The record on Republican immigration reform is clear. STEVE KING, a far-right, way-out-of-the-mainstream outlier, does not just spew hatred, he calls the shots. They listen to him. The Republican Party, the party of Abraham Lincoln and Theodore Roosevelt and Dwight Eisenhower and Ronald Reagan and George Bush, all of whom had much different views on immigration than STEVE KING, is following STEVE KING on immigration.

Let me say, they are following STEVE KING over the cliff. Because not only are they hurting America, but because they are so afraid to buck this extremist—and he is extreme on immigration—they are going to make it certain that they will lose the 2016 Presidential election, that they will make sure that the Senate remains Democratic in 2016 and that the House turns Democratic.

It is amazing. The Republican record on immigration reform is clear. STEVE KING has three wins. The rest of the Republican Party and the rest of America is winless. Good for him. Terrible for us. Since House Republicans will not stand up to STEVE KING, KING is in the driver’s seat on immigration re-

form. As long as he sits there, things will continue to be stuck in a rut.

America is growing weary of Republicans talking a good game on immigration while high-tech businesses cannot get the labor they need to grow and create American jobs. We are growing weary of all the talk while crops go unpicked because farmers cannot find labor. We are growing weary while Republicans talk and immigrants continue to come into our country illegally.

STEVE KING is calling the shots of the entire House Republicans on immigration. That is a shame. That is a disgrace. That is a singular lack of courage that we see in our dear colleagues across the way on the Republican side of the aisle. KING is not satisfied. He is warning that his colleagues have to man the watchtowers 24/7 to make sure nothing happens to fix our broken immigration system.

Where are the people in the Republican Party in the House of Representatives with the courage to stand up to STEVE KING and the far right? They know he is wrong. We know they know he is wrong. Where are the people in the Republican Party to stand up to STEVE KING and say: Enough is enough. We will not let our party or our country be hijacked by extremists whose xenophobia causes them to prefer maintaining our broken immigration system over achieving a tough, fair, and practical long-term solution.

If Republicans continue to kowtow to STEVE KING and the hard right on immigration, they will consign themselves to being the minority party for more than a decade or they can show some courage and say the STEVE KINGS in the world can say whatever they want, but they have no place in the modern Republican Party. They can move their party into the light by passing a bill that secures borders, holds employers accountable, grows our economy, reduces our debt, and heals broken families. The choice is theirs.

Speaker BOEHNER has occasionally said he wants to pass reform. Where are the rank-and-file Republicans who know STEVE KING is wrong to encourage Speaker BOEHNER? Where are they? I hope that for our sakes, the majority of Republicans in the House Republican caucus make the right choice.

But I will tell them this: For the country, no matter what choice they make, the ultimate outcome is undeniable. Immigration reform will pass this year with bipartisan support and a bipartisan imprint or it will pass in future years with only Democratic support and Democratic imprints, because Democrats will control the Congress and the White House. The right thing will ultimately be done. But hopefully Winston Churchill will not be right in saying that it will only be done after everything else is tried.

Republicans in the House, stand up to STEVE KING. You know he is wrong. You know you cringe when he says

what he says. Do not let him dictate policy.

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.

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

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

Mr. REED. The Republican-led filibuster of the minimum wage bill—which would raise the Federal minimum wage from \$7.75 per hour to \$10.10 per hour—means that an estimated 27.8 million Americans, including 91,000 Rhode Islanders, will not get a raise. It also means, according to estimates from the Economic Policy Institute, that our economy will miss out on a GDP boost of \$22 billion by 2016, which would have supported over 84,000 additional full-time jobs.

Those 27.8 million workers who would have received a raise would have spent it at local businesses, helping their local communities and spurring economic growth. Typically, minimum wage workers are those who, when they receive an increase in their paychecks, go out and buy things that are necessary. They are the ones who really provide the kind of local stimulus we need to grow the economy.

The Federal minimum wage has not been increased since 2009. Today an individual who works 40 hours per week 52 weeks a year at the Federal minimum wage earns \$15,080 per year, and that is nearly \$5,000 below the Federal poverty level for a family of three and almost \$9,000 below the poverty level for a family of four. That means we have hard-working Americans putting in full-time work every week for the entire year and yet still living in poverty. That is not fair to these families who are just looking for a fair shot.

People who work hard for a living shouldn't have to live in poverty. That was not the case in the sixties when the minimum wage was such that it would lift you out of poverty, and that is what we have to do today.

When Congress last passed legislation to raise the minimum wage in 2007, it was a bipartisan undertaking, and 44 Republican Senators joined Democrats to send President Bush a bill that raised the minimum wage to its current level. That bipartisan effort should be emulated today in this Senate. In fact, one could argue that the needs are more pressing; that American workers have fallen further behind; and that the same logic that compelled President Bush to sign this bill and a bipartisan Congress to send it to him is even more compelling today.

Our constituents sent us here to work together to grow the economy and create jobs. It is disappointing that this bill to provide millions of hard-working Americans a raise—a raise

they deserve through their own efforts—has been filibustered.

I hope my colleagues on the other side would find a way to work with us on this issue and come together to strengthen our economic recovery. I was particularly gratified, working with my colleagues on emergency unemployment insurance, that we did get bipartisan support to pass sensible and fiscally responsible legislation. Unfortunately, now it is in the House and it is not moving there. I hope it does.

But we have to do more of that, focus on what will actually help Americans individually and collectively move and grow our economy. We have worked together on emergency unemployment insurance and other issues, such as immigration reform. We can work together on this issue, and we must.

Again, I am at this point very disappointed that same bipartisan effort has not been translated into action by the House of Representatives when it comes to restoring emergency unemployment insurance. Speaker BOEHNER could call up our bill, which is fully paid for and which will affect, at this point, about 2.6 million Americans—and their families, so it is many more Americans who will benefit—and under the rules of the House could quickly have a vote within probably 24 hours. I am convinced and so is my colleague Senator HELLER of Nevada, who is my chief cosponsor, that bill would pass in the House today on a bipartisan basis. We have had Republican Representatives who have written to the Speaker and said: Bring it up for a vote. That would help. It would help not only 2.6 million Americans—and that grows each day—but it would also help our economy.

So, again, in a similar vein, we need bipartisan action on raising the minimum wage in the Senate, emulating the bipartisan action we took with respect to emergency unemployment insurance, and then we need that same bipartisanship in the House of Representatives to move these measures to the President for his signature.

Raising the minimum wage and restoring jobless benefits are the right things to do for the American people and for the American economy. I hope these policies, which traditionally have enjoyed strong bipartisan support, will eventually prevail in both the Senate and the House and be signed into law by the President of the United States.

Once again, I think it is important to emphasize that the last time we raised the minimum wage, it was a bipartisan effort signed by a Republican President. This is not an issue or should not be an issue of political ideology or political posturing. This should be an issue of what helps the American worker make his or her way through a very difficult economy. Viewed in that logic, it is clear to me that we should pass this legislation, not filibuster it, and that the House should pass quickly the emergency unemployment insurance compensation bill.

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.

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

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

The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

Mr. HOEVEN. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. HOEVEN pertaining to the introduction of S. 2280 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. HOEVEN. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Ms. HEITKAMP). The Senator from Connecticut.

HEALTH CARE

Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, I wish to tell the story of a 57-year-old man from Boyertown, PA. His name is Dean Angstadt.

Dean is a self-employed, self-sufficient logger. He is the kind of guy, similar to a lot of Americans out there, who has sort of grown up to believe he could do everything for himself; that he didn't need a lot of help from people around him in order to make a living, in order to provide for his family, in order to keep himself healthy.

He has been uninsured since 2009, and he had some particular thoughts about the Affordable Care Act. He knew he didn't want anything to do with ObamaCare.

In 2011 Dean had a pacemaker and a defibrillator implanted to help his ailing heart pump more efficiently. Not long after he got these two implants, the 6-foot, 285-pound guy was back out in the woods, but last summer his health worsened again. It was taking him about 10 minutes just to catch his breath after he felled a tree, and by the fall he was winded just traveling the 50 feet between his house and his truck. He said:

I knew that I was really sick. I figured the doctors were going to have to operate, so I tried to work as long as I could to save money for the surgery. But it got to the point where I couldn't work.

So he called his friend Bob who is a 55-year-old retired firefighter and nurse, and talked about the fact that he was having trouble. Bob said: Why don't you check out the Affordable Care Act? But every time he made that suggestion, Dean refused. Dean said:

We argued about it for months. I didn't trust this ObamaCare. One of the big reasons is it sounded too good to be true.

January came, and Dean's health continued to get worse. His doctor made it clear he urgently needed valve replacement surgery, and he was facing a choice: He either had to find a way to get health care or he was going to die. That was his choice, find a way to pay for health care or perish.

Luckily, his friend Bob finally convinced Dean to come over and at least

take a look at the Affordable Care plans available to Dean. So he came over to his house, and in less than an hour the two of them had finished the application. One day later Dean signed up for the Highmark Blue Cross Silver PPO plan and paid his first monthly premium of \$26.11.

All of a sudden, I'm getting notification from Highmark, and I got my card, and it was actually all legitimate. I could have done backflips if I were in better shape.

His plan kicked in on March 1, just in time to get the surgery he couldn't have afforded otherwise, that he couldn't have put off any longer. On March 31, after his surgery, he said without that surgery:

I probably would have ended up falling over dead. Not only did it save my life, it's going to give me a better quality of life.

For me, this isn't about politics. I'm trying to help other people who are like me, stubborn and bullheaded, who refused to even look. From my own experience, the ACA is everything it's supposed to be and, in fact, better than it's made out to be.

Dean's story is one of 8 million stories that can be told all across the country. Eight million people have enrolled in private health care plans under the Affordable Care Act. Why? Because there is a simple premise embedded at the foundation of the Affordable Care Act; that is, that you shouldn't get sick—in Dean's case, you shouldn't face death—simply because you don't have the money to afford surgery.

Dean was working. Dean was a logger, a salt-of-the-Earth kind of guy who was playing by the rules, obeying the law, had a job, but he just didn't have the money to afford that expensive surgery. He gets to live and he gets access to health care because of the Affordable Care Act—not because of a government handout but because of our collective decision to give Dean a discount on private health care, 1 of 8 million people all across the country.

That is just the number of people who have been insured on these private exchanges. Three million young people under the age of 26 have been able to stay on their parents' plans because the Affordable Care Act allows for that to occur. New numbers this week suggest more than 4.8 million people have enrolled in Medicaid and CHIP plans between October 2013 and March of 2014. Another approximately 1 million individuals gained coverage through an early expansion of Medicaid that happened in States before January 1, 2014.

Put that all together: Eight million people on exchanges, 3 million young people covered through their parents' plan, 5.8 million people on Medicaid. That is 16 million, 17 million people in this country who have health care who didn't have it before.

In my State the numbers are even more remarkable. We had a goal of signing up about 100,000 people, and we went out there and did everything we could to get the word out about the Affordable Care Act. We didn't sign up 100,000 people; we signed up 200,000 peo-

ple. To be exact, we signed up 208,301 people in Connecticut. On the last day alone, on March 31, 5,900 people signed up in Connecticut. Connecticut is a small State. We only have a handful of 1 million people who live in our entire State, and we increased those who have insurance by 200,000 in a State of only a few million. That is probably why—the fact that in States such as Connecticut 200,000 people now have insurance, 15 million-plus across the country have insurance—the polling is starting to fundamentally change. A Washington Post poll from a few weeks ago showed that for the first time a majority of Americans support the Affordable Care Act. A new poll in battleground congressional districts shows that 52 percent of respondents want to implement and fix the Affordable Care Act, which is about 10 percent more than those people who want to repeal and replace the bill. That 52 percent number has increased beyond what the poll showed last December. The 42 percent number of those who want to repeal and replace is much less than the number from last December. People are starting to figure out that all the Republican spin and rhetoric about the Affordable Care Act is just that, spin and rhetoric, and the reality is that 15 million people have access to health care. The stories such as Dean's can be multiplied all over the country in every corner of this great Nation.

But here is the even better news: We are not only enrolling more people but we are saving money. We are enrolling people and saving money. Medicare spending growth is down. Medicare per capita spending is growing at historically low rates. In April, for the fifth straight year, CBO reduced its projections for Medicare spending over the next 10 years. This time they reduced it by another \$106 billion.

This is what we always said was the problem with the American health care system. We always said we don't insure enough people. We still leave 30 million people without access to health care and we spend twice as much money as our other competitor first-world nations—less people insured, much greater cost. We all came down to the floor, the Senate and the House, and said the Affordable Care Act will tackle both problems, and now a few months into the full implementation of the law that is exactly what is happening.

It is actually costing less than we thought. The projections are that the Affordable Care Act is going to reduce the deficit by \$1.7 trillion over the next two decades. Let me say that again. The Affordable Care Act will reduce the deficit by \$1.7 trillion, meaning if you repeal the Affordable Care Act, as so many still want to do—as the House has tried to do 50 different times—you would increase the deficit by \$1.7 trillion and the overall cost of the program is 15 percent less than what the initial projections were.

Insurers are starting to weigh in as well. The second biggest U.S. health in-

surer, WellPoint, increased its profit forecast after the ACA enrollment numbers boosted their quarterly results. Their chief executive officer said:

The risk pool and the product selection seem to be coming in the manner that we hoped it would. It's very encouraging right now.

UnitedHealthcare, which had a pretty small footprint in these exchanges, has now changed its bias to increase the participation in exchanges in 2015 because it said it saw a positive response from consumers who enrolled in the plans they did offer in limited States in greater than expected numbers. Fifteen million people, including eight million people on private insurance plans, enrolled, saving money for taxpayers and for insurance companies. That is the real story of the Affordable Care Act.

Let me finish by sharing with you a couple more stories from Connecticut, and I am going to share them through the eyes of the enrollers because enrollers and assisters are the heroes of these last several months.

There was an embarrassing rollout of the Affordable Care Act in the fall of last year, a Web site that should have been working on day one that wasn't. But the fact is that thousands of people all across this country working in community health centers and emergency rooms, at nonprofits, decided to make this thing work in red States and in blue States and went out and enrolled in record numbers, shattering expectations for people on affordable health care. I had a few of these assisters together in Connecticut. They started telling me stories and I will finish with two of them.

Michael, who is an assister in Danielson, CT, tells this story, and he said: I recall a husband and wife who came into our health center and didn't have health insurance mainly because they indicated their employer's insurance plan was way too expensive. As I went along asking questions during the application the husband mostly complained about ObamaCare. He kept saying our government is making it so no one can afford insurance and that he and his wife heard that insurance plans were still too high, even after going through the exchange. After completing the application and showing them the plans that were offered, they were totally surprised by the minimal cost of the premiums as well as the deductible rates. I also helped them understand how certain plans were structured and what services the deductible applied to. They left that day choosing a plan that was right for them. Needless to say, they went home from our meeting feeling more confident about their choice, more educated about health insurance and less resentful of the Affordable Care Act.

Sean, who is an assister from Norwich, tells this story: I met one middle-aged man. He hadn't had insurance for over 5 years because all the plans were so high and unaffordable and he was

over the income for the State Medicaid insurance program. He had a few prescriptions and had to pay out-of-pocket around \$150 to \$200 every month. We successfully completed an ACA application and selected an Anthem Blue Cross and Blue Shield plan with tax credits. The plan's monthly premium was only a fraction of what he would have paid every month for prescriptions and medical care, and the prescription drug copay was only about \$10. This man was ecstatic, and he said he would have to go home to figure out a way to spend all of the money that he would save every month with his new plan.

There are stories similar to his and Dean's all over the country, 8 million of them just when it comes to the people who have signed up for private health care, but for the rest of us who have health care, the news is good as well: \$1.7 trillion off of the deficit, a program that is costing 15 percent less than we had expected, an overall Medicare inflation rate for taxpayers that is coming down, and for many of us the ability to sleep a little bit better at night because we know that the most affluent, most powerful country in the world has committed itself to the idea that somebody like Dean—a logger, going out and working the land—doesn't have to die simply because he doesn't have the money to pay for surgery. In so many ways the Affordable Care Act is working.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

CAMPAIGN SPENDING

Mr. KING. Madam President, there is an ominous tide rising in this country. It is not water. It is not oil. It is not any kind of substance. It is dollars. It is cash. It is a tide of dark money that is flowing in and threatens to dominate our political system.

Yesterday we had a very interesting hearing in the Rules Committee on the subject of disclosure and the rise of outside money in campaigns. We have developed a kind of parallel universe of campaign financing, where the candidates, you and I and other Members of this body, work hard to raise money from supporters so we can fund our campaigns. By the way, all of that money that is raised has to be under certain limits. There are limitations. There are disclosure requirements. If you get a contribution, it has to be disclosed who paid it and what do they do for a living and what is their address. All of that is public.

Yet on the other side is this parallel universe, as I mentioned, where a multimillionaire can come into your State or my State or anybody's State and put in an enormous amount of money, essentially unregulated and often totally anonymous. I think this is a danger to our country. I started the hearing off yesterday by saying I fear for my country. I fear for our democracy.

There are several basic points I wish to make. This isn't an evolutionary

change. This isn't, OK, we are spending a few more dollars this year than we did last year and it is a little more of the same and it is no big deal. This is what is happening: This is nonparty outside spending starting back in the early nineties, and we see what happened in 2012. Now we don't have the numbers in 2012. Of course, 2012 was a Presidential year. What we see is it started to go up, the Presidential year in 2004, and then down. It goes up in 2008 in the Presidential year, down—but not so much—and then way up in 2012, and this gives the context of what is happening. This isn't evolutionary change; this is revolutionary change. This is a fundamental change.

I asked one of our witnesses yesterday at the hearing: Is this a very significant, great change that is going on? He said: Senator, it is an explosion.

It is an explosion. Here is what it looks like. This is nonparty spending, cycle to date, and the day was the day before yesterday. In other words, it is the outside party spending, the so-called independent expenditures comparing apples to apples as of April 29 of each year.

So here again, 2004 Presidential year, then it drops way down in 2006 midterms, again jumps up in 2008, down in 2010, big jump for 2012. But look where we are as of this date in 2014. Look at the comparison between this and the last midterm year. It is almost 10 times as much. This is a threat that is growing and it is going to overwhelm us.

Some of my colleagues have said we are bound for a scandal. Indeed, that is what has driven campaign finance reform throughout our history. The first major campaign finance reform was in 1907. It resulted from the Presidential campaigns in the late 1890s and the turn of the century, where Mark Hanna, a political operative, called the major corporations of America and said: You will give us this—and that is how the money was raised for those campaigns. We then passed the first campaign finance law under the leadership of Teddy Roosevelt in 1907 because he saw a scandal coming.

So this is nonparty outside spending. This is both disclosed and undisclosed, but look at this. This is spending by nondisclosure groups, cycle to date. Look where we are. This is the money that nobody knows where it comes from. If we start back in here, 2012, this is a Presidential year to date and here we are in 2014. It is an explosion, and nobody knows where that money is coming from. It is secret money.

What we have is the development of organizations and institutions engaged in what I call identity laundering. I am not going to attempt to explain this chart, but this is a chart that traces in 2012 one set of funds. It is about \$400 million from three large organizations that go through all of these different entities and the whole purpose is to keep the names of the donors secret. So the public doesn't know who is trying

to influence their vote. This isn't insignificant money. Fifty million dollars this line represents to something called the American Future Fund. They create these entities—and there is also the wonderful nomenclature here—there are even entities entitled “undesigned” or “disregarded”—and the whole purpose of this is to hide the identity of the people who are supporting it.

I don't think that is consistent with the First Amendment. It is not consistent with our political traditions. It is not consistent with the whole idea of conveying information. If somebody wants to come and buy ads in Pennsylvania or North Dakota or New York or California, that is fine. They have a right to do that, at least under the current Supreme Court rulings, but they also ought to tell us who they are. That is part of the information the voters should have in assessing the validity of the message that is being delivered to them.

In Maine you cannot go to a town meeting with a bag over your head. If you are going to make a speech, if you are going to take your position on an issue, you tell who you are, and people can assess the validity of your views based upon in part who they know you are, what your interest is, what your stake is in this process, and we are denying the people of America the opportunity to know that.

It is important to realize in this whole area of campaign finance, which is unbelievably complicated, that the Supreme Court has significantly narrowed our ability in Congress or in the States to regulate campaign finance. They have essentially said that money is speech and that it can't be limited—at least in the aggregate, that is the McCutcheon decision. Under the Citizens United decision, the corporations are also people and have a right to free speech and can spend as much money as they want.

When you go back and read those key opinions—Citizens United and McCutcheon, which was just decided about a month ago—the Supreme Court said: We are going to strike down these limitations because they are limitations on free speech, but the basic reason we feel comfortable doing so is because the public still has disclosure and they will know who is talking, and that is our bulwark against abuse and corrosion of our system.

The problem with that reasoning is the bulwark doesn't exist, and clever campaign operatives have created this elaborate system which is designed to disguise who the contributors are, and that is the problem with our system.

The problem right now is that one party may think they are advantaged by the current system, but 2 years from now that advantage could disappear. Indeed, data we received just before our hearing indicates that 2 years ago 88 percent of the outside money was conservative. Indeed, this year—so far in 2012—it is closer to being balanced. It

is 60–40 conservative over more liberal messages. I submit that once it gets to be 50–50, everybody on both sides of the aisle will say that maybe we need to do something about it. I am suggesting we do something about it sooner rather than later.

The Supreme Court has invited us to do something about disclosure. I think it is the tool we know we have. There is discussion about a constitutional amendment, which is fine, and I am a supporter. That is a long-term solution. That could take 4, 5, 6 years, assuming the support could be achieved in the Congress and in the States. In the meantime, disclosure is something we could do next week, and it is something we should do. We owe it to the American people to allow them to know who it is that is trying to influence their vote.

Occasionally, there is an argument that people who make these kinds of contributions will be subjected to some kind of intimidation—crank phone calls, threats, and those kinds of things. Well, Justice Scalia—the Supreme Court Justice whom I used to know in law school—recently said: “Requiring people to stand up in public for their political acts fosters civic courage, without which democracy is doomed.”

If people are willing to spend millions of dollars attacking someone else’s character, integrity, and career, they ought to at least be willing to stand up and say: Here am I. I am making these statements.

They should not be allowed to hide behind something created by an army of accountants and lawyers to disguise their identity. I think this is something—and based upon the hearing we had yesterday and the work we did in preparing for it—we really need to attend to.

When I first got into this subject last year, I thought it was bad. Well, what I have learned over the last several months is that it is a lot worse than I thought. It is happening fast. It is a tidal wave, and it is going to engulf our system. Why do we care? Because it is corrosive and it undermines the confidence citizens have in us as their political leaders.

In the 1970s and 1980s, people had a perception that money was corrupting around here, even if it wasn’t. But, boy, when we start to have unidentified, outside dark money and nobody knows where it is coming from, what could be more calculating to undermine public confidence in their leadership than a system like that? It is corrosive. It undermines the trust of our people. It is wrong, and I think it is something we should attend to. It is something we can do. We know we can do it constitutionally. We had an 8-to-1 majority vote. McCutcheon and Citizens United invited us to do this. I think we should be able to find a bipartisan solution to this subject because it will benefit this whole country, and I think it will be a great benefit to the institution of de-

mocracy itself. This is not what the Framers envisioned, and we have it within our power to do something about it so we can improve this situation and the flow of information—including the source of that information—to the people of America.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

UKRAINE

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I take this time on the floor as the Chair of the U.S. Helsinki Commission. The Helsinki Commission is the operating arm of the U.S. participation in the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, the OSCE. It has been in the press recently because of the circumstances in Ukraine, which is what I am going to talk about.

First, I will remind my colleagues that the United States, along with all the countries of Europe and Canada, formed the commission on security and cooperation in Europe in 1975. It was founded on the principle that in order to have a stable country, you need to deal not just with the direct security needs—the military needs—of a country and not just with its economic and environmental agenda, but you also need to deal with its human rights and its good governance, and all three of these are related.

Commitments were made by all the signatories to the OSCE about respecting the jurisdictions of the member states and dealing with the rights of your neighbors and dealing with the rights of your own citizens. The Soviet Union was a member of the OSCE, and now all of the countries of the former Soviet Union are members, including Russia and the countries of central Asia.

I am increasingly alarmed at the deterioration of the situation in Eastern Ukraine, particularly in the Donetsk region, where Moscow-controlled pro-Russian separatists have seized 19 buildings and 14 cities and towns.

Late last week seven members of the German-led OSCE Vienna Document inspection team, charged with observing unusual military activities, along with five of their Ukrainian escorts, were kidnapped by pro-Russian militants. One observer has been freed, and the rest continue to be held hostage. Russia, an OSCE member, has not lifted a finger to secure their release. There is no doubt in my mind that if Mr. Putin gave the word, this hostage situation would cease to exist.

This hostage-taking of unarmed international monitors must continue to be condemned in the strongest possible terms, and everything possible must be done to secure their release.

In addition to the OSCE observers, 40 people—journalists, activists, police officers, and politicians—are reportedly being held captive in makeshift jails in Slovyansk.

Meanwhile, the violence in Eastern Ukraine continues. On Monday, several

thousand peaceful protesters marching in favor of Ukraine’s unity were attacked by pro-Russian thugs wielding clubs and whips, resulting in 15 seriously injured. That same day, Gennady Kernes, the mayor of Ukraine’s second largest city, Kharkiv, was shot, underwent emergency surgery, and remains in serious condition. He is now in Israel for further medical treatment.

Furthermore, I am deeply dismayed at other flagrant violations of human rights by pro-Russian militants in Eastern Ukraine and in Russia’s annexed Crimea. These include attacks and threats against minority groups, particularly Jews and Roma as well as Crimean Tatars and ethnic Ukrainians in Crimea. Supporters of a united Ukraine have been targeted as well, including a local politician and university student whose tortured bodies were found dumped in a river near Slovyansk.

The joint statement on Ukraine signed in Geneva on April 17 by the EU, the United States, Russia, and Ukraine calls on all sides to lay down their arms, vacate buildings, and begin the process of dialogue and de-escalation. That was signed just 2 weeks ago. That agreement provided a basis for de-escalation. Yet, over the course of the last days and weeks, we have not seen the Russians follow through on urging separatists to stand down in Eastern Ukraine. What have we seen? Kyiv, on the one hand, is taking concrete steps and making good-faith efforts to live up to the Geneva agreement, including vacating buildings and offering dialogue. Russia has done nothing. Instead of working to de-escalate the conflict, it is doing the opposite—fueling escalation. Russia continues to violate the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Ukraine and flagrantly flaunts its commitments under the Geneva agreement.

The Geneva agreement also calls upon the parties to refrain from any violence, intimidation, or provocative actions and condemns and rejects all expressions of extremism, racism, religious intolerance, including anti-Semitism. Clearly, both the spirit and the letter of this agreement have been breached by Russia.

In recent days we have seen troubling manifestations against ethnic and religious minority communities. The distribution of flyers in Donetsk calling for Jews to register their religion and property is a chilling reminder of an especially dark period in European history. While the perpetrators of this onerous action have not been determined, one thing is clear: Moscow, which controls the pro-Russian separatists in Eastern Ukraine, is using anti-Semitism as an ingredient in its anti-Ukrainian campaign. Perhaps even worse, among the Russian special forces and agitators operating in Ukraine are members of the neo-Nazi and other anti-Semitic groups.

Jewish communities in parts of Eastern Ukraine are not the only ones that have reason to be worried. In

Slovyansk, armed separatists have invaded Romani homes and beaten and robbed men, women, and children. Ukrainian speakers—including Ukrainian-speaking journalists—have reportedly experienced intimidation in the largely Russian-speaking Donetsk area.

At the same time in Crimea, which Russia forcibly annexed, Crimean Tatars continue to be threatened with deportation and attacked for speaking their own language in their ancestral homeland. Moreover, the longtime leader of the Crimean Tatar community and former Soviet political prisoner Mustafa Dzhemilev has been banned from returning to Crimea.

It is important to underscore that Crimea is the ancestral home of the Crimean Tatars, who in 1944 were forcibly and brutally evicted by Stalin to central Asia and only allowed to return to their home in the early 1990s.

Additionally, the separatist Crimean authorities have gone after the Ukrainian community, announcing that Ukrainian literature and history will no longer be offered in Crimean schools.

These attacks and threats underscore the importance of the OSCE Special Monitoring Mission and other OSCE institutions in Ukraine in assessing the situation on the ground and helping to de-escalate tensions. They need to be permitted to operate unhindered—and most certainly not held hostage—in Eastern Ukraine and to be allowed access into Crimea, which Russia continues to block.

The actions against pro-Ukrainian activists and minorities are the direct result of Russia's unfounded and illegal aggression against Ukraine—first in Crimea and then in Eastern Ukraine. There is no doubt as to who pulls the strings. The Kremlin has been relentlessly flaunting their Geneva promises and has done nothing to rein in the militants they control. Mr. Putin needs to get Russian soldiers and other assorted military and intelligence operatives out of Ukraine.

We must not forget Crimea. We must never recognize Russia's forcible, illegal annexation of the Ukrainian territory, which violates every single one of the 10 core OSCE Helsinki principles. We must build on the punitive measures already undertaken against the Russian and Ukrainian individuals who so blatantly violated the international agreements in the Ukrainian and Crimean Constitutions. Violations of another nation's territorial integrity and sovereignty must not be tolerated. Russia's flagrant land grab of Crimea has set a horrible precedent for those countries harboring illegal territorial ambitions around the globe.

I welcome the President's stepping up of economic sanctions on seven Russian officials, including members of President Putin's inner circle and 17 companies linked to Mr. Putin. I also welcome the State Department and Commerce Department tightening pol-

icy to deny export license applications for any high-technology items that could contribute to Russia's military capabilities. I am confident Russia will feel the impact of these sanctions. These, along with the further targeted sanctions announced by the EU earlier this week, will only continue to have a growing impact.

Nevertheless, if the situation in eastern Ukraine continues to deteriorate, or even should the status quo persist, the United States needs to ratchet up these sanctions, and soon, including several sectoral sanctions against Russia's industries such as banking, mining, energy, and defense.

Of equal importance, we need to remain steadfast in helping Ukraine become a stronger democratic state and foster its political and economic stability. The millions of men, women, and children who demonstrated for months for human rights and human dignity spoke loudly and clearly, expressing the wishes of the vast majority of the Ukrainian citizens. The interim government has been working hard under exceedingly difficult circumstances to move Ukraine further on the path of economic and political reforms. We and our international partners need to keep making this progress our focal point. Ukraine needs a lot of help after the devastation wreaked on their economy by the incredibly corrupt and dysfunctional Yanukovich regime.

Ukraine has so many pressing needs. Among the most important are stabilizing the economy and preparing for the most important May 25 Presidential elections. Others include judicial reform, reform of the police and military, seeking justice and rehabilitation for the victims of the violence, including those suffering now at the hands of the pro-Russian militants, helping internally displaced people who are fleeing Crimea, and working to recover the billions in assets stolen by the previous regime.

I am pleased Ukraine's civil society, including Western-educated young people, is firmly committed to the rule of law and democracy and is playing a critical role in helping the Ukrainian Government work toward these ends. NGOs and think tanks have worked with the Parliament to pass a law on the independence of public broadcasting, a bill on public procurement, and one on how judges are appointed—all critical in fighting the scourge of corruption.

The United States is providing concrete assistance through a U.S. crisis support package for Ukraine, which includes support for the integrity of the May elections and constitutional reform, substantial economic assistance, energy security technical expertise, help to recover proceeds of corruptions stolen by the former regime, and other anticorruption assistance, and fostering greater people-to-people contacts. We need to be willing to provide more resources to the Ukrainians as

they actively work to fulfill their aspirations.

Ultimately, these choices will lead to a more secure, democratic, and peaceful world, and that is something that reflects both American interests and American values.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WARNER). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

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

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

(The remarks of Ms. LANDRIEU pertaining to the introduction of S. 2280 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Ms. LANDRIEU. I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the motion to proceed to S. 2262 is now pending?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The leader is correct.

Mr. REID. I have a cloture motion that I would ask to be reported.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 368, S. 2262, a bill to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes.

Harry Reid, Jeanne Shaheen, Michael F. Bennet, Richard J. Durbin, Christopher A. Coons, Bill Nelson, Tom Harkin, Martin Heinrich, Patrick J. Leahy, Richard Blumenthal, Tim Kaine, Patty Murray, Tom Udall, Joe Manchin III, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Angus S. King, Jr., Mark R. Warner.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent the mandatory quorum required under rule XXII be waived.

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

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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