

her future endeavors in the private sector.

I certainly wish you, Meredith, the best in the future. You are a wonderful person. You are kind, thoughtful, and considerate always. You are never rude to anyone. And the pressure that is on each of you to do this yesterday, do it right now, and do it sooner than you are capable of doing it—you have always been polite and never rude to anyone.

So I am grateful to you for your service to the Senate and, in doing that, your service to the country.

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 Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

IMMIGRATION REFORM ANNIVERSARY

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, one year ago tomorrow, the Senate came together to pass historic legislation to reform our broken immigration system. We did so with a strong bipartisan vote and after weeks of exhaustive work. The Border Security, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Modernization Act would unite families, spur the economy, and help protect our borders. Above all else, this historic legislation would create an immigration system that is worthy of our American values.

Today, our system does not reflect the values we hold as a nation. It is devastating that after 1 year, the House has yet to pass desperately needed immigration reform. The cost of inaction is all around us, from the millions of workers who are forced to live in the shadows without fully contributing to our economy, to the foreign-born students who are taking their skills overseas when they graduate instead of investing their talents here, to the uncertainty that continues to plague our agricultural and dairy industries because of unstable work visa programs. Families are being torn apart by deportations, and visa applicants around the world find themselves stuck in limbo because of our lengthy visa backlogs. However, nowhere is the cost of inaction more evident than in the faces of the young children sleeping on cold floors in detention centers on our border.

The humanitarian crisis at the border is growing, and we have a moral duty to address it. I was glad this body came together last year to support my bipartisan Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act, which included important new provisions to improve the treatment of unaccompanied children at our border. This vital legislation, signed into law as part of the Leahy-Crapo Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013 provides additional advocates and support for the unaccompanied youngsters who come to our border often fleeing violence and abuse in their country of origin. I was proud when the Republican-controlled House voted overwhelmingly to support these important protections for unaccompanied minors. But they address just one piece of a rapidly growing problem. To truly address the crisis we are seeing today, the Republican House must act to pass bipartisan and comprehensive immigration reform.

Those Republican critics who claim we must first secure our border before the House will vote on immigration reform should actually read the bipartisan Border Security, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Modernization Act that the Senate passed last year. The bill would double the number of Border Patrol agents and authorize the completion of a 700-mile wall at the southern border. This language was a Republican demand during Senate consideration of the legislation. While I did not agree with it, I voted to authorize this so-called border surge because I supported the broader reform that would do so much for the families and DREAMers who contribute to the fabric of this Nation. Border security measures take up an entire title of the legislation, allocating billions of dollars to border security in addition to the considerable expenditures already authorized by existing law. Those measures are reinforced by “triggers” that must be satisfied before undocumented individuals may apply for permanent residence under the bill. These issues were hard-fought in the Senate, and the result was legislation that dramatically reshaped the landscape for border enforcement. So I say again, those who claim we must secure our border before passing immigration reform should look at the bill this Senate passed with broad bipartisan support a year ago.

Americans have seen too much inaction in Washington. The issue before us is too important to simply put off for another time. Just as House Republican leaders set aside partisanship to do what is right by passing the Leahy-Crapo Violence Against Women Act, they should again recognize that a majority of the Chamber supports passing comprehensive immigration reform. Immigration reform should not be held back due to partisan caucus rules that say only legislation supported by the majority of Republicans can be considered. All Members, Democrats and Re-

publicans, should have the courage to vote. House Republican leaders cast aside partisanship and showed their courage last year by bringing the Leahy-Crapo Violence Against Women Act to the floor. They should do so again today.

Legislating is about making tough choices. It is not about standing on the sidelines and complaining that this solution is not perfect. It is about supporting efforts that move this country forward. The bipartisan legislation we passed had the support of businesses, community and faith leaders. It received support from groups ranging from the chamber of commerce and Americans for Tax Reform to law enforcement, university presidents, civil rights groups, and community advocates. Voices from across the Nation and the political spectrum came together in support of enacting long-overdue reforms.

I have been privileged to serve in this great body for nearly four decades because of the trust of the people of Vermont. In my time here, I have rarely seen such commitment to an issue as I did last year to comprehensive immigration reform. What was initially a proposal from the so-called Gang of 8 went through an extensive committee and floor process to allow every Senator to offer their input. The result was an historic bill supported by 68 Senators from both sides of the aisle. I congratulate those Senators for their hard work to pass this historic legislation. They share my belief that the status quo is not an option. President Obama, who has called the crisis at the border an “urgent humanitarian situation,” knows that maintaining the system we have in place today is not an option. We need a long-term plan to address the many problems in our immigration system and to ensure that in the future we have the tools to address crises like the one we are seeing now. That solution lies in passing the Senate immigration bill.

There is still time this year to accomplish meaningful and historic reform. I urge Republican leaders in the House not to waste another day and to bring up the bipartisan Border Security, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Modernization Act.

ECUADORAN AMAZON OIL DRILLING

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I wish to call attention to a recent decision by the Ecuadoran Government to issue a permit for oil drilling in the Yasuni reserve in the Amazon region. This should raise alarm bells in the international community for a number of reasons.

It was not long ago that President Correa was supporting a lawsuit against Chevron, citing contamination that resulted from oil exploration by Texaco, the previous owner of the

wells, in the Amazon region of Ecuador. That case, while fraught with allegations of corruption and ethical violations, shone a spotlight on the undeniable environmental damage, water contamination, and health problems associated with those oil wells, as well as on the rich biodiversity and indigenous populations in that region.

But the Correa administration has now backstepped, deciding to allow the state-run oil company Petroamazonas to begin exploratory drilling. Given the history, one can only be concerned about the threat this poses to one of the most biologically diverse regions in the world and the people who live there.

I am also disappointed by the circumstances leading up to the decision to begin oil production. Having failed in its far-fetched attempt to elicit contributions from the international community in exchange for halting plans to drill in the reserve, the Correa administration is moving ahead with this ill-conceived project. In other words, if someone else won't pay to prevent the Ecuadorian Government from potentially despoiling their own forests, they will drill there themselves despite the grave problems that occurred in the past.

Nobody questions Ecuador's need for energy. Nobody doubts Ecuador's right to drill for oil. But we all have a responsibility to protect areas especially rich in biodiversity for future generations. We also have a responsibility to respect vulnerable indigenous cultures. While no country, including the United States, can claim perfection in environmental stewardship, we need to collectively learn from our mistakes and avoid repeating them.

FAMILY SMOKING PREVENTION

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I rise to mark the 5-year anniversary of the Family Smoking Prevention and Tobacco Control Act. This legislation was a landmark in the decades-long fight against the No. 1 cause of preventable death in the United States—tobacco use.

The Family Smoking Prevention and Tobacco Control Act passed in 2009—15 years after Dr. Kessler, the FDA Commissioner, began trying to regulate tobacco and 45 years after the Surgeon General's landmark report on tobacco use and lung cancer. For the first time in history, this law gave the FDA the authority to regulate the manufacturing, marketing, and sale of tobacco products.

One express aim of the law was to reduce rates of tobacco use among children. The law achieved this by restricting sales to minors, banning flavored cigarettes, banning tobacco-brand sponsorships of sport and entertainment events, banning free samples, restricting advertisements to children, and more.

The results speak for themselves. Just this month, the CDC reported that

cigarette smoking among U.S. high school students has dropped to the lowest level in 22 years. According to the National Youth Risk Behavior Survey, the percentage of students who reported smoking a cigarette in the last 30 days fell from 27.5 percent in 1991 to 15.7 percent in 2013. In Illinois, the percentage of students who are current smokers dropped by more than half between 1993 and 2013.

The FDA's implementation of this law is incomplete, and it needs to act now to reverse worrying trends. The CDC reports that e-cigarette use among middle and high school students more than doubled in 1 year, from 2011 to 2012. The same study found that one in five middle school students who reported using e-cigarettes had never tried conventional cigarettes. E-cigarettes could be a gateway to nicotine addiction and smoking. A new study released in the JAMA Pediatrics goes even further. This study found that middle and high school students who used e-cigarettes were more likely to smoke traditional cigarettes and less likely to quit smoking. If current smoking trends continue, 5.6 million American kids will die prematurely from a smoking-related illness.

I commend FDA for its most recent efforts to bring e-cigarettes, cigars, pipes, and other forms of tobacco under its authority. However, FDA's proposed regulations remain dangerously silent on one of the most pressing questions of all—the marketing of these addictive products to children.

In April, ten of my congressional colleagues and I released a report documenting how leading e-cigarette manufacturers are marketing e-cigarettes to young people. The industry is deploying the same advertising techniques it used to hook previous generations of cigarette smokers. Many of these companies hired glamorous celebrities to push their brands through TV and radio ads, and sponsored events with heavy social media promotion. For example, NJOY advertised its products during the Super Bowl, the Academy Awards, and on ESPN—all programs with substantial children and teen viewership. In just 2 years, from 2012 to 2013, 6 of the surveyed companies sponsored or provided free samples at 348 events—many geared toward youth audiences.

These e-cigarette companies have even revived cartoon characters in a way that calls to mind Joe Camel—the deadliest cartoon of the 20th century. While many of these companies argue that they do not market to children, a robust analysis recently published in the journal Pediatrics suggests otherwise. Between 2011 and 2013, exposure to e-cigarette marketing by children aged 12 to 17 rose 256 percent. Mr. President, 24 million children saw these ads. Not only is the marketing and packaging intended to appeal to young people, so is the product itself. Let me read a list of e-cigarette flavors being marketed today—vivid vanilla,

gummy bears, chocolate treat, and cherry crush. In the face of this mounting evidence, rather than accelerating its efforts, the FDA bowed to industry pressure last week and extended the comment period on its proposed regulations. Every day, 3,200 kids smoke their first cigarette. Every day that the FDA fails to take action costs lives.

As we move to protect kids from new threats like e-cigarettes, we also have to redouble our fight against tobacco use in the military. Nearly 30 years have passed since the first Department of Defense report on high rates of tobacco use among servicemembers and its devastating impact on readiness, productivity, and medical costs. While overall rates of use have declined significantly, smoking rates among servicemembers are nearly 20 percent higher than civilian rates. The use of smokeless tobacco is more than 450 percent higher for servicemembers than civilians. One in three military smokers began doing so after enlisting.

The Department of Defense spends more than \$1.6 billion every year on tobacco-related medical care and lost days of work, and the VA spends an additional \$5 billion a year to treat chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, primarily caused by smoking.

In 1993, after reading about the dangers of secondhand smoke, CAPT Stanley W. Bryant, commander of the U.S.S. Roosevelt, declared that his ship would be smoke-free. He said, "I'm the commanding officer of these kids and I can't have them inhaling secondhand smoke. I wouldn't put them in the line of fire. I'm not going to put them in the line of smoke." Captain Bryant is one of many leaders in our Armed Forces who have tried to protect the men and women under their command from the dangers of tobacco, but at every turn, their efforts have come under fire from the tobacco industry and its allies. Even Bryant's victory was short-lived. Within the year the tobacco industry forced in a new tobacco policy that stripped ships' captains of their authority over ships' stores and mandated that cigarettes be sold on ships.

One of the central problems is the widespread availability of cheap tobacco products on military installations and ships. The Department of Defense policy requires that exchanges set tobacco prices 5 percent below the lowest local competitor. In practice, these discounts are greater. A 19-year-old soldier walking into a PX can buy a pack of Marlboro cigarettes for 25 percent less, on average, than at the nearest Walmart, according to a recent study in JAMA. These discounts are deadly. Extensive research shows that raising tobacco prices is one of the most effective ways to reduce use. Efforts to end these discounts began in the late 1980s, but nearly every attempt has been blocked due to industry pressure.

This spring, Navy Secretary Ray Mabus announced that he is considering a ban on tobacco sales at all