

have a number of rockets. It is estimated they have 10,000 of them.

They have something called WS-1E. It is a Chinese rocket, but they got the blueprints—Iran did from the Chinese—and, of course, they shipped these surreptitiously into Gaza. They will travel some 30 miles and they carry about 40 pounds of explosives.

They have another one called the Fajr-5. This is an Iranian rocket. It is the most prestigious weapon of Hamas.

The Iranian Revolutionary Guard gave Hamas the technology to manufacture those. They carry a warhead of 400 pounds. They will travel about 55 miles. I repeat, these aren't firecrackers.

They have another missile in their arsenal. It is called a Khaibar M-302. It is a Syrian-made missile with a range of some 12 miles. They carry a 300-pound warhead and, of course, it goes far enough that they believe that with the Fajr and this one, Tel Aviv is within their sights.

The one they have the most of is called the Qassam-1 manufactured in Gaza, with no guidance system, a 3-mile distance, and a 10-pound warhead; the Qassam-2 has 9-mile distance and a 20-pound warhead.

They have something called a Grads. They have lots of weapons—lots of them—and they indiscriminately fire into Israel. These aren't grenade launchers; these are missiles, huge weapons. These rockets are professionally engineered from Iran, Syria, and other countries. They are smuggled into Gaza. They manufacture a few of their own, as I have indicated. These are serious weapons of war.

Hamas also continues to try to construct and use its sophisticated tunnels into Israel, which as one Member of Hamas recently bragged, allow Hamas fighters to invade Israel and kill Israelis.

Hamas's responsibility in the Gaza clash is a fact, but the U.N. Human Rights Council didn't make a single mention of this terrorist organization.

How many of these nations, such as Venezuela, China, Vietnam, and other nations—I wonder how this organization feels about their human rights. How many of these nations which condemned Israel would allow their own citizens to suffer through endless rocket fire—endless rocket fire.

I talked to one American doctor who goes to Israel, as he does often, and all night long there was one air raid siren after another. It has been going on there for weeks. This U.N. resolution that was passed does not mention a single word, nothing.

What is Israel supposed to do?

We all lament the loss of life. It is heartrending. But what else is Israel to do after rocket after rocket after rocket plunges into its territory.

I met with a man today who owns an oil company, oil exploration. They do oil exploration in Nevada. It is called Noble Energy. They are the ones who helped develop gas and oil fields in

Israel. This is relatively new, but they say there are rockets dropping all over.

As I mentioned earlier this morning, Iron Dome doesn't protect all of Israel. They need more Iron Domes. Everyone, no matter what they are doing, they can be out in Gaza working in the oil fields and missiles are flying all over from Hamas.

I condemn Hamas's terrorism. We should. Their terrorism is not only against Israel; it is against their own people. As I heard the Republican conservative columnist in the New York Times David Brooks say in the NewsHour—I am paraphrasing, but this is what he said: This is the first conflict I have known where the enemy says: Kill more of us.

I join my friend the Republican leader in doing what other nations refuse to do: condemning the United Nations Human Rights Council's biased resolution. We in this resolution condemn Hamas. The countries that have voted for this are Venezuela, Cuba, China. I repeat, how would they like to look at their human rights violations?

In this resolution, we as a country support in this conflict a lasting peace which can only be realized through the demilitarization of Gaza.

They talked about tunnels. These are not tunnels; these are major operations costing millions of dollars to dig a hole in the ground.

Why? To go into Israeli settlements and kill innocent people.

In offering the resolution before the Senate we stand with Israel and its right to defend itself, its security, and most importantly its people.

I said earlier I am disgusted—as someone who has been a supporter of the United Nations ever since I have been in government—and the United Nations better take a look at this organization. This is “disgusting”—I use it for the third time, as I mean it.

MAKING EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2014—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

MEDICARE

Mr. MERKLEY. I rise today to address a topic that is vital to seniors in Oregon and to seniors across our Nation, and that is our Medicare program.

I know how important Medicare is because I grew up in a blue-collar working family. My dad was a millwright and a mechanic. He believed in hard work. He took a lot of satisfaction from his job. A millwright is the individual who does all the mechanical work to keep the mill running. He said if he did his job right, the mill was open, the workers had a payday, the company made money, and everyone was happy.

Meanwhile, my mother managed the finances, and she stretched a dollar as far as anyone possibly could. She

shopped for bargains. She used coupons. She collected Green Stamps, and they were able to save, to buy a home, and to have a foundation for raising their children.

I benefited from that enormously.

But despite the foundation they had, their prospects in retirement were dependent upon two critical programs: Social Security and Medicare. Social Security and Medicare—a basic pension and affordable health care—are simply essential for millions of working families in retirement. They are the difference between poverty and stability. The way I see it, Medicare is a covenant with our seniors. It is a covenant with the 650,000 Oregonians who are on Medicare now. It is a covenant with the hundreds of thousands who will utilize Medicare in the years to come. It is certainly a covenant with the millions across America who depend on it—families. Those working families across America are families like my parents, who worked hard their whole lives, paid into Medicare, and expect Medicare to be there for them when they retire. We cannot break that covenant.

The first step in keeping faith with our seniors is this: protecting what works. Pretty simple. We would think that is a no-brainer. But in fact, in Washington, a simple proposition like this—a no-brainer—is sometimes enormously controversial.

For several years now, many in Washington here, and including this Chamber, have been pushing to privatize, to voucherize or to just plain weaken Medicare. They don't understand how important this program is for the secure retirement of our seniors. They don't understand how important this covenant is between each working generation and our retirees. In fact, the House of Representatives has repeatedly voted to effectively end the Medicare Program that Americans know and love and to stick our seniors with an enormous financial burden in their retirement years. This is just a simple way to describe that, and that is to say it is simply wrong.

Others have said: Let's raise the Medicare retirement age to 67 or perhaps 70. I think, when I hear that, about my townhalls. In my townhalls—and I hold one in every county in every year—people come and talk about whatever they would like. I recall a woman coming to a townhall and she said: Senator, I am in my early sixties. I have several major health problems. She went on to describe them, and she said: I am just trying to stay alive until I can make it to age 65 and have access to Medicare.

I have heard that theme of just trying to make it until they can reach that Medicare age in townhall after townhall.

Sometimes those who work in offices, in company circumstances, don't realize how much actual physical labor takes a toll on the body. If someone is working in a post office and moving bags of mail day in and day out, as one

good friend of mine has done throughout his career, it is very likely one would have a bad back and so on and so forth. Then of course there are the diseases that strike like lightning.

Yes, those who happen to have jobs with corporations that provide a wonderful health care program are in a little better shape. But for our seniors, Medicare is a gem—a gem they have contributed into their entire lives, and it needs to be there for them.

So for some who see the difference between 65 and 67 as some modest administrative change, for working Americans it is a monumental chasm and they fear falling into it.

The good news is there is a very simple action the Senate could take right now to protect our covenant with our seniors. The Medicare Protection Act, which I have cosponsored along with Senator PRYOR and others, makes three modest but important changes to our law: It expresses the sense of the Senate that the Medicare eligibility age should not be increased. It expresses the sense of the Senate that the Medicare Program should not be privatized or voucherized. Third, it amends the Congressional Budget Act so that any attempt to reduce or eliminate guaranteed benefits or to restrict eligibility criteria, such as raising the eligibility age, cannot be passed through the budget reconciliation process. This is particularly important since the House has made repeated attempts to end Medicare as we know it, and to do so using the budget process—the Ryan budget—rather than through stand-alone legislation.

It is time to ensure that we keep our covenant with our seniors. It is time to bring this bill to the floor, to debate it, and to pass it.

Tomorrow happens to be the anniversary on which Medicare was signed into law 49 years ago. Maybe a great way to celebrate the 49th birthday of Medicare would be for this Chamber to debate this bill tomorrow and pass it. If not tomorrow, I would like to see it done in this work period. And if not in this work period, let's come back and address this in September.

The days that are left in this 2-year cycle of the Senate are rapidly disappearing, and our seniors are concerned about this constant attack, this constant effort to undermine these programs such as Social Security and Medicare that they have paid into throughout their life and that they expect to be honored when they are retired.

Let's bring this bill to the floor. Let's ensure that American seniors can stop worrying about these assaults on their retirement—retirement security they so much deserve.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

(The remarks of Mr. HELLER pertaining to the introduction of (S. 2658) are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. HELLER. I yield the floor.

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, first let me express my thanks to Senator GRASSLEY for letting me step ahead of him and I thank the Senator as well for a number of courageous votes today. I also express my gratitude to him and to the Presiding Officer.

I understand earlier on the vote on final passage of the transportation funding legislation 79 Senators voted for the bill as amended. That is a resounding majority of Democrats and Republicans.

The year when Senator GRASSLEY—longer ago than the Presiding Officer and I combined—came here, the idea was for Democrats and Republicans to work together to try to find the middle, to find principled compromises. It has been a while since the Senate actually did that. I feel as though today we were the Senate again. It is gratifying to me, and I just want to thank everyone who voted for the Corker-Boxer-Carper amendment, for Senator WYDEN's support, for everybody who helped to make that amendment part of the bill and supported it in final passage. I hope it sends a message to our friends in the House that will not be lost on them. I hope before they just reject it out of order they will sleep on it and when they wake up in the morning maybe we can have a good conversation. That is not why I rose tonight, but I wanted to get that off my chest and appreciate the chance to do that.

I rise this evening in support of the emergency supplemental appropriations bill introduced, I believe, last week by Senator MIKULSKI.

The bill as you will recall will provide some \$2.7 billion in order to address the humanitarian challenge that is playing out in recent weeks on our southern border with Mexico. This money will ensure that the agencies charged with securing our borders don't run out of money this summer. More importantly, it will address some of the underlying root causes of the problems we face along our southern border.

As we all know, we are facing an unprecedented surge in migration from three countries. They are El Salvador, Honduras, and Guatemala. A large number of migrants from these countries are families. Some of them are unaccompanied children. Some of those unaccompanied children are as young as 4, 5 and 6 years old. Let me be clear. These children and these families are not slipping past our borders unprotected. They are being apprehended in large numbers by the Border Patrol almost as soon as they touch U.S. soil. Some of them, many of them actually, turn themselves in voluntarily to our Border Patrol.

Although the influx has slowed in recent weeks, the sheer number of children and families coming across our

southern border in South Texas earlier this summer overwhelmed the Border Patrol—overwhelmed Health and Human Services and other Federal agencies. The administration and Secretary Jeh Johnson, Secretary of Department of Homeland Security, have responded to this situation with what I will describe as an "all hands on deck" approach.

The Federal Emergency Management Agency is coordinating the DHS-wide response to the problem. The Department of Defense has provided space on some of its military installations to house unaccompanied minors until Health and Human Services can find a placement for them. Immigration and Customs Enforcement has greatly expanded its ability to detain and remove families, and we have surged Border Patrol agents, immigration judges, and other personnel to the border to help process these people.

These measures have been working. For example, the amount of time people are detained before they are removed has decreased significantly in recent weeks, but these emergency measures are expensive and none of the Federal agencies involved have the money they need to sustain the aggressive steps they are taking to deal with this situation.

The consequences of not moving forward with this legislation are severe. Let me give some examples of what failing to act will mean. Without this emergency funding, Immigration and Customs Enforcement could be forced to release thousands of people currently being detained and to stop operating repatriation flights. Health and Human Services could be forced to cut back on the number of children it can care for. Children would be forced to stay longer at Border Patrol stations and Border Patrol agents would spend more of their time taking care of children and less time pursuing the smuggling networks operating along our borders.

Some of my colleagues are suggesting that we will not be able to pass this supplemental until September and that the administration can just move money around until then to make up for the shortfall. That may have been more feasible earlier in the fiscal year, but doing so now will likely have some significant unintended consequences. For example, it would impair our border security because DHS may have to reduce aerial support for the Border Patrol or stop replacing the badly needed x-ray machines at our ports of entry. Our ability to respond to natural disasters could also be harmed.

I also understand my colleagues in the House introduced a bill today that would provide \$659 million to deal with this crisis. That is roughly one-quarter of what Senator MIKULSKI has introduced, and \$659 million is just a drop in the bucket from what is needed. Incredibly our friends in the House are offsetting this funding by raiding other critical operations which is what Senator MIKULSKI's bill is trying to avoid.

Failing to move an emergency supplemental this week would be in my view unconscionable. I urge all my colleagues to do the right thing and make sure we deal with this before we leave for 5 weeks.

Dealing with the challenge we are facing on the border is, rightly, our main focus right now. However, we cannot lose sight of the root causes that are driving the surge in migration in the first place. In this country all too often we focus so much of our attention on dealing with symptoms of problems and not enough attention on addressing the underlying causes. This is particularly true on our borders. Listen to this. Since 2003 we have spent \$223 billion—that is almost one-quarter of a trillion dollars—enforcing our immigration and customs laws, strengthening our borders, strengthening the security of our borders—almost one-quarter of a trillion dollars. We have spent a small fraction of this—a very small fraction—actually less than 1 percent helping El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras improve conditions for their citizens.

I commend the President and Chairman MIKULSKI for including \$300 million in this emergency supplemental request aimed at addressing what I am convinced are the root causes of this problem. What are they? The lack of economic hope, lack of jobs in Central America, combined with increasing violence and insecurity in the region. I know. I have been there. I have been to two of those three countries, Guatemala and El Salvador. This year down to Mexico, down to Colombia, which 20 years ago was just about a failed nation. Remember in Columbia roughly 20 years ago when a bunch of gunmen rounded up the Supreme Court judges in the country and took them out and shot them to death? That was Colombia 20 years ago. They are no longer a failed nation. They came back from the brink. They are a strong partner of ours, along with Mexico, to turn this situation around in these three Central American countries which are the source of all this migration to our country.

Based on my recent conversation with Central American leaders as recently as last week, the Ambassadors of these three small countries as well as the Ambassador to Mexico, and based on trips to the region, I believe one of the critical needs is to foster economic growth and create jobs. How might we do that? One, by helping restore their rule of law. In those countries we have police who don't police. We have prosecutors who don't prosecute and we have judges who don't adjudicate. We have prisons that either don't rehabilitate or punish. We have kidnappings and extortions. We have people who are scared to stay there and live there and they are bailing. They are voting with their feet. We need to help them restore the rule of law, much as we helped other countries such as Colombia from the last two decades.

Their energy costs are roughly three times what they ought to be. Most of their energy from the electricity grid comes from petroleum. They could use natural gas and spend half of what they spend for energy. They need to improve their education and workforce skills and access to capital. Those are some of the ways to strengthen their economy.

I am not suggesting any of this will be quick or easy to do. It will require a sustained investment and focus on the region by the United States and also by a number of others. This is not our job alone. This is a shared responsibility, and we need to keep that in mind. But it can be done. In fact, we have already done it with two of our most important allies in Latin America, as I mentioned Colombia and more recently with Mexico, where the economic situation was so bad that more than 1 million Mexicans were traveling across our borders every year—more than 1 million. Today both countries have vibrant democracies and vibrant economies and their citizens have hope for their future. Now there are more Mexicans leaving this country going back to Mexico than are coming this way.

I will say again what I just said. We cannot and we should not do this alone. This is not all on America. This needs to be a shared responsibility with the governments of these three countries, with all the partners in the region, including Mexico and Colombia, with all the private sector nonprofits and institutions of faith. Three hundred million dollars as an emergency supplemental is a downpayment on what will need to be a long-term commitment to our neighbors in the region. This cannot be one and done. If we are serious about addressing the surge, we will need to do more, and frankly so will others—and I would underline “so will others.”

Based on what I have seen, this crisis requires a holistic approach and one that tackles the underlying causes that are pushing people out of Central America and the factors that are pulling them to our borders.

If we turn our backs on these countries I am convinced we will be back 10 years from now dealing with another expensive humanitarian crisis on our border. We don't need that in any of these countries.

I urge all my colleagues to put politics aside and pass this emergency supplemental.

I yield the floor. Thank you so much.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from Delaware and I came to Washington together, and I am so proud of the work he is doing and what he has done. He has been a Member of Congress, Governor, and now Senator and chairman of the Homeland Security Committee. He has done a remarkably good job, and I am very proud of the work he does.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President,

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

TRIBUTE TO NANCY OLKEWICZ

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to a Senate staffer who is retiring after 36 years of service. Nancy Pittore Olkewicz began her Senate career in February 1978 working for Senator Paul Sarbanes of Maryland, who was her home State Senator. She remained on his staff for 23 years, which included the birth of her three children. She values her time with Senator Sarbanes and is especially grateful for the opportunity to work part-time while her three children, Jenny, Brian and Eric, were small.

After leaving Senator Sarbanes' office in 2001, Nancy joined the staff of the Senate Appropriations Committee, where she worked for me on the Energy and Water Development Subcommittee. She later joined the Legislative Branch subcommittee and served as clerk under Senators DURBIN, LANDRIEU and Ben Nelson. During that time she represented Appropriations Committee chairman Robert C. Byrd on the Capitol Preservation Commission and was instrumental in many high-level decisions regarding the construction and operation of the Capitol Visitor Center. Nancy joined the staff of the Senate Sergeant at Arms in 2011 as the legislative liaison to then-Sergeant at Arms Terry Gainer.

I wish Nancy the best of luck in all of her future endeavors. She will be greatly missed by many in the Senate.

BUDGETARY REVISIONS

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I previously filed budgetary aggregates and committee allocations for budget year 2015 pursuant to section 116 of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013. Today I am adjusting those levels to account for three reported bills from the Appropriations Committee.

Section 251 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 establishes statutory limits on discretionary spending and allows for various adjustments to those limits, while sections 302 and 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act allows the chairman of the Budget Committee to establish and make revisions to allocations, aggregates, and levels consistent with those adjustments. The Committee on Appropriations reported three bills that are eligible for an adjustment under the Congressional Budget Act:

1) The State, Foreign Operations, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, which includes \$8.625 billion in budget authority and \$2.5 billion in outlays that is designated as Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO) funding.

2) The Homeland Security Appropriations Act, which includes \$213 million