

leader has opined, helping our constituents stay employed is our duty as a Senator.

Frankly, a vote against this bill is a vote against American jobs. There is absolutely no excuse, no justification, for any Member of this body to vote against this legislation. But as of late, Senate Republicans have repeatedly blocked legislation, such as the Bring Jobs Home Act, which is good for the American people.

Remember, the Longfellow quote that I mentioned at the beginning of my remarks: "It takes less time to do a thing right than it does to explain why you did it wrong."

The wisdom of Longfellow's quote is there, and each time another good bill is blocked by the Senate Republicans we must think of Longfellow and what he said: "It takes less time to do a thing right than it does to explain why you did it wrong."

Each time after Republicans have voted against legislation that is good for working families, an odd scene has developed on the Senate floor. A procession of Republicans makes it way to the floor and individually Senators begin to explain why they voted against a good bill, trying to explain why Americans don't deserve a fair shot. For example, after voting against an increase in the minimum wage, after voting against equal pay for women, after voting against cost-cutting energy efficiency, and after voting against student loan refinancing, after all of these votes, the same spectacle unfolds immediately after. The Republicans come through that door and try to make their case.

All the American public wants is a fair shot at a good life. Instead of voting for a good piece of legislation that would benefit folks back home, they spend time explaining why they did the opposite.

Maybe our vote today will be different. Maybe Senate Republicans will finally focus on the many families depending on the jobs we are trying to protect. If they do, they will vote to bring jobs home. This legislation is important and necessary. If they do, they will vote to keep American jobs from going overseas.

Those of us who do the right thing and vote for this will not need to explain because we have done the right thing; and that is because our constituents know we work to give them a fair shot at good, secure jobs.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARKEY). The minority leader is recognized.

EPA REGULATIONS

Mr. MCCONNELL. The Obama White House likes to pretend that its war on coal is about protecting the planet. Yet his newest regulations would hardly do a thing to impact global carbon emissions.

The President's own EPA Administrator basically admitted it when she said a few years back that U.S. action

alone won't meaningfully impact global CO₂ levels.

They don't seem to care that their regulations would devastate the lives of whole families in my State, working-class Kentuckians who just want to put food on the table and give their children a better life.

They don't seem to care that their regulations threaten to undermine Kentucky's traditionally low utility rates, splinter our manufacturing base, and shift well-paying jobs overseas. They don't seem to care that the people who stand to be hurt most by their regressive policies are those who can afford it the least.

As a candidate President Obama wasn't just open about his plan to make American energy bills skyrocket, he was pretty cavalier about it too. For him it was a necessary sacrifice to achieve an ideological aim.

But for a working mom in Ashland, KY, a skyrocketing utility bill can mean the difference between an annual trip to Lake Cumberland and a tearful apology to her kids. It can mean choosing which bills to pay this month and which to put off just a little longer. It can mean birthday disappointments and missed credit card payments.

These types of consequences may not be a big deal to the President, but for many people in the country and many in Kentucky, they are a very big deal. Families have had to put up with enough in nearly 6 years that this administration has been in power: higher medical costs, stubborn unemployment, and the feeling of less opportunity.

What I am saying is middle-class families deserve a break. They deserve to have Washington battling in their corner instead of against them. That is why I keep fighting this war on coal.

Later this morning I will take my message to one of the administration's so-called listening sessions on these extreme energy regulations. The Obama administration may have been too afraid to hold a hearing anywhere near coal country, but that doesn't mean they will be able to ignore the voice of my constituents. I will be joined by Kentuckians who have had to travel hundreds of miles just to get here.

One of them is Jimmy Rose, the former coal miner from Pineville who rose to national attention with his song: "Coal Keeps the Lights On." As Jimmy puts it: "Coal keeps the bills paid, clothes on the backs, and shoes on the feet." And that is true for so many in our State.

I will note the irony that the administration's so-called listening session in Atlanta had to switch locations due to a significant power outage.

As one person put it, the power outage is either cruel irony or a glimpse of coming cruel reality; that is, of course, if the Obama administration and the EPA are successful in their quest to end the use of affordable, reliable coal. It is hard to disagree.

The point is the President's extreme energy regulations are little more than

a political turnout strategy masquerading as a serious environmental policy. Not only could they end up making the environment worse rather than better but they threaten to hurt countless middle-class families in the process while shipping American jobs overseas.

So they need to be stopped. The administration needs to be stopped. Kentuckians aren't going to take this lying down. We are going to keep fighting back.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

BRING JOBS HOME ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 2569, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2569) to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America.

Pending:

Reid amendment No. 3693, to change the enactment date.

Reid amendment No. 3694 (to amendment No. 3693), of a perfecting nature.

Reid motion to commit the bill to the Committee on Finance, with instructions, Reid amendment No. 3695, to change the enactment date.

Reid amendment No. 3696 (to (the instructions) amendment No. 3695), of a perfecting nature.

Reid amendment No. 3697 (to amendment No. 3696), of a perfecting nature.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees.

The assistant majority leader.

Mr. DURBIN. I am going to be joined shortly on the floor by Senator JOHN WALSH of Montana and Senator DEBBIE STABENOW of Michigan, who are going to speak to the bill that is pending before us.

Until they arrive I wish to set the context here. We are trying to create incentives in the Tax Code to bring good-paying manufacturing jobs back to the United States, to incentivize companies that will bring jobs from their overseas facilities back into our country and put Americans to work. How we pay for it is we reduce the current subsidies which we give to American companies to ship jobs overseas. Pretty simple.

So the vote really comes down to the question of whether Democrats and Republicans in the Senate want to create an incentive in the Tax Code to keep jobs—good-paying jobs—in America, to build the workforce in America so that they have a future, and to discourage shipping American jobs overseas. I don't know what the debate is about. I don't know what Republican can go to a town meeting in any State in the Union and argue that this is not a good

idea. It is a very important idea, and it is one that we want to use to repopulate the United States with good-paying jobs and hard-working families getting the kind of money they deserve.

We are in the midst of a debate now—a national debate that has touched the State of Illinois—about something called inversion. Most people are not familiar with that term. It is a situation where, at least on paper, an American company moves its headquarters and operations to a foreign country to avoid paying American taxes. We have major companies that are doing that. Some are considering making that move. The President spoke to it last week, and I think the President hit the nail on the head. It isn't a question of whether it is legal; it is a question of whether it is right.

Is it right for a pharmaceutical company that is dependent on the Federal Government to build their company, build their products, and build their profitability, to walk away from their tax responsibilities in America? You don't put a successful drug on the market unless it starts with research, and most research begins with our government. The National Institutes of Health, for about \$30 billion a year, does basic research that leads to new discoveries, new drugs. Those efforts of basic research are converted into pharmaceuticals and drugs that are then developed by these private companies.

When the private companies think they have finally found the right combination, they have to submit their drug to the Food and Drug Administration, which is a regulatory agency in Washington that tests their drug to make sure that it doesn't harm people and that it performs as promised. It takes some time. It takes a lot of taxpayer money. But when the Food and Drug Administration then hands down its decision that your drug is safe to go on the market, you have just received the most amazing endorsement possible in the world for a drug—that the U.S. Food and Drug Administration has approved it for sale in the United States of America. That is a ticket to success and profitability, but that isn't the end. You have to protect your right in that drug, and to protect it you go to the U.S. Patent Office and make sure there is a registration that protects your legal right to make a profit on that drug and keep others from duplicating it at your expense.

Look at the process that led to the profitability of these blockbuster drugs—National Institutes of Health research, taxpayer funded; Food and Drug Administration approval, taxpayer funded; Patent Office protection, taxpayer funded.

Now major pharmaceuticals are saying: Well, it sure would be nice to stay in America, but what we are going to do is move our corporate headquarters to a European country or perhaps to the island of Jersey—which I am not sure I could find on the map—and in doing so, we won't have to pay as much in Federal taxes to America.

Is that ingratitude? It certainly is. You have used all these Federal agencies to become profitable, and now you walk away from your Federal tax responsibility.

There is another side to this coin. When these companies invert and move overseas, the tax they don't pay is a burden shifted to other American companies and other American taxpayers. They are getting off the hook for American taxes, but they are pushing the burden on to others.

We have to come to grips with the reality that many major companies are using global commerce and global opportunities at the expense of America. We have to encourage good-paying jobs in this country and companies that stay in this country. In our Tax Code we need to reward American-based companies headquartered in America, with their jobs in America, paying a good wage, good benefits, and veteran preferences. Give them a break in the Tax Code. Don't subsidize companies that want to move their jobs overseas.

The bill before us gets to that basic question: Should our Tax Code incentivize bringing jobs back from overseas or should it incentivize and encourage shipping jobs overseas? It is a simple vote, and I hope it is overwhelmingly positive and bipartisan when it comes before us.

We know our country can grow with the right encouragement because we are lucky. For those of us who were born here, we were born into one of the strongest democracies in history. We were born into an economic system that creates opportunity for those who are educated and trained and strive to improve themselves. We also know we have a responsibility here in the Senate, in the House, and in the White House to create a tax climate and an economic climate for that kind of growth. That is what we are trying to do with this bill—give a fair shot for American companies so they can bring jobs home and be incentivized and rewarded to do it and discourage the companies that do just the opposite.

I think this is a front-and-center issue. Good-paying jobs are the key to restoring the middle class in America—something I think is long overdue to create an incentive for people who are struggling to see at the end of that rainbow the chance to raise a family in a good neighborhood and a good church and parish and a good State that really helps America.

I will be supporting this measure before the Senate this morning.

I yield the floor and suggest that during the quorum call the time be equally divided between Democrats and Republicans.

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

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican whip.

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

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

RETURNING AUSTIN TICE

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I wish to make some remarks about the ongoing humanitarian crisis that is occurring on our southern border in Texas. I have spoken on this subject a number of times. Before I do that, I would like to say a word about a decorated U.S. Marine Corps veteran, an award-winning journalist, and a courageous seventh-generation Texan by the name of Austin Tice.

In 2012 Austin went to Syria as a civilian. He went to report on the brutal civil war that has now claimed the lives of more than 170,000 Syrians, caused a huge refugee crisis in Turkey, Lebanon, and in other countries in that region and has destabilized that entire region. Austin was a strong believer in the freedom of the press and the importance of letting his fellow countrymen know what was happening in the Syrian civil war.

During his time in Syria his works were published in The Washington Post and the McClatchy News, among other news outlets.

On August 14, 2012, he was kidnapped and no one has heard from him since. His family is understandably concerned about his well-being and his whereabouts. It has been nearly 2 years and his family and friends still have no idea where he is, who is holding him or what they might want in exchange for his freedom.

I once again call on the Obama administration to do whatever they can, through the resources the Federal Government has, to locate and safely return Austin Tice to his family.

I say once again to Austin's family: We have not given up. We will never give up until we find your son and bring him safely home.

BORDER CRISIS

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, 1 month ago President Obama gave an interview with ABC News in which he was asked about the massive influx of unaccompanied minors—mainly from Central America—who are crossing the southwestern American border, most notably into Texas where we have seen 57,000 unaccompanied children since October.

Unless any of my colleagues think this problem will just go away, let me remind everyone some of the projections are that if we don't do anything to deal with the causes or deal with the remedy to this growing humanitarian problem, it will get worse. Indeed, some estimates are that as many as 90,000 unaccompanied minors will come this year alone, and the number could well rise to 145,000 next year. That would tend to track the historical trend we have seen—both the combination of the impression that the Obama administration is less than serious about enforcing our immigration laws, as well as this loophole in the 2008 human trafficking law that is being exploited by the cartels which is helping

them make money. This is part of their business model because they charge by the head, by the child, by the person, and then they bring them through these smuggling corridors from Central America, through Mexico, into South Texas. It is a great business model for them.

The problem is it is a horrific experience for the immigrants who subject themselves to the tender mercies of the cartels that care nothing about them as human beings. They rape the women, kidnap the migrants, and then hold them for ransom. We know—because of the perils of that journey on the top of that train called *The Beast*—that many immigrants are severely injured, some losing limbs, and others are killed or die from exposure as a result of the process from Central America.

I say to my colleagues who think doing nothing is an option that people are losing their lives, people are being injured, and women are being assaulted. These migrants are being held for ransom and kidnapped. It is not compassionate to allow this to continue, but that is what illegal immigration looks like in 2014.

For those people who come into the country legally, they obviously don't have to turn themselves over to the cartels—these transnational criminal organizations that traffic in drugs and people. These drug cartels are despicable and they will prey on these migrants and those who want to come to the United States. As long as it happens outside of the legal system, they are going to continue to be victimized.

About 1 month ago the President said: "The problem is that under current law, once these kids come across the border, there's a system in which we're supposed to process them, take care of them, until we can send them back."

That is what the President of the United States said 1 month ago. Of course he was referring to a 2008 law that I referenced earlier and has been talked about a number of times. This was a law that was passed by essentially unanimous consent and acclimation. It was a human trafficking law, but unfortunately what we didn't know at the time is that the creative minds of the cartels would learn to exploit a loophole in the law, which treats migrants, particularly unaccompanied children, from contiguous countries differently than we treat migrant children coming from Mexico.

Specifically what happens is they are released after being processed by the Border Patrol, and they are given a notice to appear at a future court date. They are then released into the custody of a family member, many of whom are not legally present in the United States themselves. What we have seen from experience is that many of them don't show up for their court hearings. We don't have sufficient resources committed to make sure people do appear, so they melt into the great

American landscape and have essentially succeeded in coming to the United States—outside of our legal immigration system—and staying here. As long as this loophole continues to exist, they will keep coming.

The President was referring to this human trafficking statute that has become an effective magnet for illegal immigration, and it is not just children who are taking advantage of it. I talked to the Secretary of Homeland Security yesterday morning. We have seen a huge surge in parents with young children as well. They are exploiting the same loophole because we don't have adequate detention facilities to keep them safe pending any court hearing and pending repatriation back to their country of origin unless they have a valid claim for asylum or some other claim for immigration relief.

The loophole that is in the 2008 law is effectively part of the cartel business model. We have colleagues who believe the compassionate response is to do nothing to close that loophole, and I hope they will come to understand it is the opposite of compassion to allow this loophole to exist and allow the cartels to continue to use these children and other migrants as a commodity by smuggling them into the United States.

This situation has also overloaded the capacity of many of our local communities that have big hearts and want to treat these migrants, particularly the children, with compassion, but they have become overwhelmed. We have seen, as these children have been warehoused in other parts of the country, many communities are starting to feel the backlash. While people have big hearts and believe we ought to try to help people in need, particularly children, they realize that ultimately they are the ones who will have to pick up the tab for health care, education, and the like.

They are also concerned about whether they will actually be able to assimilate these immigrants, which has always been the American way, and the way we have done that is through legal immigration and an orderly immigration process which complies with the rule of law.

We are a nation of immigrants and we should be proud of that, but we should not be proud of this uncontrolled flow of people coming into the country, exploiting this gap in the 2008 law, making money for the cartels, and exposing these migrants to horrific treatment, some of whom don't even make it here. We should not consider that compassion; it is not. It is the opposite of compassion. We ought to try to do something to fix it, and we have it within our capacity to do so.

Earlier this week the White House Domestic Policy Council Director Cecilia Munoz said the administration was "absolutely interested" in reforming this law to create an efficient repatriation process for the unaccompanied

minors. Good for them. I hope that is the case, but unfortunately I get the sense that the people who understand this gap in this 2008 law—this flaw or this loophole—have not been able to win the argument with the political folks at the White House who don't want to be seen repatriating these children back to their home country because they are worried about the upcoming election.

Secretary of Homeland Security Jeh Johnson has repeatedly emphasized to me in private as well as publicly the need to change this law and to establish a more efficient system of removal to one's home country.

To be sure, there are going to be valid claims for asylum. If someone is a victim of human trafficking, they can get a T visa, they call it, so they can cooperate with law enforcement in the United States. If you are like the young boy whom I saw in McAllen, TX, 2 weeks ago—I asked him where his parents were. He said they were dead. That young boy could qualify for a special immigrant visa as a minor child having been abandoned or who is an orphan. So there are ways valid claims for relief can be processed, but right now these claims are not being made because people are just melting into the great American landscape, and they keep coming.

So Jeh Johnson understands this, Cecilia Munoz said she understands this, and the President has said he understands it, and it has also had bipartisan support. The senior Senator from Missouri Mrs. MCCASKILL has acknowledged this issue, the senior Senator from Delaware, who happens to be chairman of the Homeland Security Committee Senator CARPER, and the junior Senator from West Virginia Mr. MANCHIN have all publicly acknowledged it, as well as Democratic representatives in the border district in Arizona, and the No. 3 Member of the House Democratic leadership. All of them have acknowledged what the problem is and what we need to do to fix it.

Let's review: President Obama described the border situation as a crisis, and I agree with that; it is. He described the 2008 law, which I have talked about, as a problem, which it is. Some leading Republicans and leading Democrats and senior members of the administration believe that reforming this 2008 law is part of the solution and would help resolve the crisis, which it would. They called upon Congress to make the necessary changes, which we should.

At a time of intense political gridlock in Washington, we actually do have some bipartisan agreement on what we need to do to help address the problem. Yet none of these critical reforms can happen in the Senate unless the majority leader allows a vote on the bill I anticipate will come over from the House which will contain a solution to this problem. We have seen a bipartisan group of political leaders

contend it is necessary, if we are actually going to address it, but so far my impression is the majority leader is not going to allow us to have that vote.

Indeed, the majority leader, the majority whip, and the chairman of the Judiciary Committee have all said they reject the need for changing this 2008 law that I have described. The majority leader has gone so far as to say the border is secure. It may look secure from Nevada, where he is from, but it is not secure in Texas, where I live, and it just defies reality.

I wish the majority leader and the President would actually come visit the border. I wish they would visit these processing centers, meet these children, and congratulate the Border Patrol for doing a great job under very difficult circumstances, but so far they have declined. I hope they will reconsider.

Ms. COLLINS, the Senator from Maine, is getting a bipartisan codel to go down to McAllen on Friday, and I look forward to accompanying her on that trip. But if people can make that one trip—at least one trip—they would learn for themselves that the border is not secure.

This isn't a trick. Sometimes I get the feeling that some of my friends in the Senate think we are going to always claim the border is insecure, so we are never going to do the other parts of immigration reform that they want to do or that need to be done. As a matter of fact, in 2011 the President notably said: Well, people won't be satisfied until we create a moat and fill it full of alligators. He ridiculed those who said the border is not secure. Yet last year alone 414,000 people were detained on the southwestern border, 414,000 from 100 different countries—100 different countries—most of them admittedly from Mexico and Central America and South America.

But people should come visit in Falfurrias, TX. They have a Border Patrol stop there where many migrants are let out of the vehicle by their coyote, which is a human smuggler, and forced to walk around this checkpoint in 100-degree-plus weather. Colleagues will find that some of them die from exposure. People can imagine coming from Central America or South America and coming in that hot weather under those conditions. Some of them literally die. So the Border Patrol has established rescue beacons, they call them, where if the immigrant says "I have to get some help," they can actually hit the button on this rescue beacon, and the Border Patrol will come and find them and make sure they get some medical care. Those rescue beacons are in English, they are in Spanish, and they are in Chinese. I assure my colleagues there are not many native Chinese speakers in Brooks County, TX.

The point is, to anybody who will listen, the border is not secure. It is a national security challenge in addition to our other issues.

I ask people to talk to GEN John Kelly, who is head of Southern Command, who says right now 75 percent of the illegal drug traffic coming from Central and South America into the United States—they have to sit and watch because they don't have the adequate resources to stop it. It is the same cartels that are smuggling those drugs that are the criminal organizations that are smuggling the people. They are trafficking in human beings, and they will transport any commodity, any weapon, any person, anything into the United States as long as they can make money off of it. It is just the way they do business.

It is enormously frustrating to hear the majority leader declare the border is secure in spite of the facts and in spite of the bipartisan acknowledgment that we need to fix this 2008 loophole in order to help solve this problem. But there are people who have shown some courage, people such as Secretary Johnson and others, other Democrats who have said, despite the majority leader's pronouncement that we should actually do something, we should actually solve the problem, and we have it within our ability to do that.

I wish to particularly acknowledge the courage of my friend and colleague HENRY CUELLAR from Texas. He is a proud blue dog Democrat, as he reminds me almost every time I see him, and he has partnered with me in bipartisan bicameral legislation that would actually fix this flaw in the 2008 law. If we could just get a vote on it here in the Senate, maybe we would have a chance to fix the problem and do what the President acknowledged was the problem in the first place.

I am hopeful we can achieve a breakthrough, but we have about 2 more days that we will be in session before the August recess. My constituents back home don't understand why in the world we would leave without fixing this problem, without addressing this humanitarian crisis, because they see the numbers as we see the numbers. They are going to continue to grow and the crisis will get worse unless we act in a sensible way.

The only way we are going to get that breakthrough is if we get some leadership here in the Senate and the majority leader allows a vote on either what the House is going to send us on Thursday or allow an amendment, which I am proud to offer, which has broad support here in the Senate.

But leadership requires more than just giving a speech or an interview and then heading off to the next fundraiser. It requires thoughtful, persistent engagement and a willingness to spend political capital.

We know all of this is controversial. We get that. But it strikes me that when you are getting attacked from the right and the left, that means you are probably doing something that could at least have the potential for being a bipartisan consensus, which, as we know, is the only way anything gets

done here because none of us get everything we want. I would love it if I could get everything I want, but that is not democracy. That is not our system. That is not our constitutional form of government.

I hope the President would tell the majority leader that he believes this 2008 law is a problem, as he said a month ago on ABC News, and I hope he will offer support for his own Secretary of Homeland Security, who I know understands the nature of the problem, but unfortunately I fear he is being outvoted by the political advisers at the White House, not the people making public policy.

The folks in my State and particularly in the region of South Texas and the Rio Grande Valley are watching and waiting and hoping that Washington will act to resolve this ongoing crisis. But we can't act unless the majority leader allows us to act. That is the nature of this institution. He won't allow a vote unless President Obama steps up and leads in order to do what he has acknowledged is the right thing to do and what we must do in order to address this problem.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

MEDICARE ANNIVERSARY

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I wish to speak very briefly about Medicare.

Before 1965, as the Presiding Officer and many others in the Chamber know, nearly half of America's seniors had no health insurance at all. Medicare made certain that seniors had access to affordable health care, and it has lifted millions out of poverty in this country.

Seniors earn their Medicare benefits; they are not given to them. Seniors earn their Medicare benefits through a lifetime of hard work because, as we know, for all of our working lives a portion of every single paycheck is deposited and is guaranteed for benefits for when we turn 65. This is a bedrock commitment. We pay into it and it should be there for all of us when we reach the age of 65.

Today we celebrate the 49th anniversary of Medicare, but I encourage my colleagues to hold the balloons and cake because over the past few years what we have seen down the hall in the House of Representatives is a group of House Members who try to continually chip away at the promise of Medicare. They want to turn Medicare into a voucher system. They even tried to raise the eligibility age.

These proposals in effect shift the cost on to those who can least afford to pay it. They will increase out-of-pocket expenses for our seniors on benefits such as wellness visits, cancer screenings, and lifesaving drugs. These plans will allow insurance companies to cherry pick who they want to cover, setting off a premium spiral that would leave sicker seniors with higher premiums and higher costs, leaving many American seniors without the care they need and the protection they have earned.

These proposals we see coming out of the House of Representatives undermine the integrity of the program. I think it is important for us in the Senate to not allow them to put the health and financial security of our seniors in jeopardy. That is why I have introduced the Medicare Protection Act. It is a responsible commonsense solution. It prevents budget schemes that would reduce Medicare benefits and restrict eligibility, and it sends a strong message that Medicare should not be dismantled, privatized, or turned into a voucher system.

The promise of Medicare is one we must keep. The Senate should pass the Medicare Protection Act. I ask that we keep Medicare strong and affordable for today's seniors and for future generations.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I applaud and commend my friend the Senator from Arkansas. This is very visionary legislation. I support what he is doing, and we are going to do everything we can to move forward on this legislation. We would do it more quickly except we have a few problems with people over here. So we are going to do our best.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF JILL A. PRYOR TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

Mr. REID. I now move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 840.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Jill A. Pryor, of Georgia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eleventh Circuit.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. There is a cloture motion at the desk.

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

The bill 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 nomination of Jill A. Pryor, of Georgia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eleventh Circuit.

Harry Reid, Patrick J. Leahy, Christopher A. Coons, Sheldon Whitehouse, Patty Murray, Amy Klobuchar, Maria Cantwell, Jack Reed, Bill Nelson, Elizabeth Warren, Tom Udall, Mazie Hirono, Richard Blumenthal, Barbara Boxer, Tom Harkin, Benjamin L. Cardin, Charles E. Schumer.

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

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. REID. I now move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

BRING JOBS HOME ACT—Continued

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following my remarks, Senators COONS, SESSIONS, STABENOW, and WALSH be permitted to speak for up to 5 minutes each prior to the cloture vote on S. 2569, with Senator COONS being the first to be recognized.

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

The Senator from Delaware.

PARTNERSHIP WITH AFRICA

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I have never been more optimistic about Africa and about the potential for a U.S. partnership with Africa than I am today.

Every year I host a conference in my home State of Delaware called "Opportunity: Africa" that brings together Delawareans and Africans, leaders from across our country and from the continent interested in building and strengthening new ties. Every year it has grown in participation, in the scope of issues we have looked at, and in the number of Delaware businesses interested in the opportunities in this continent of 54 countries. At this past March's conference, President Clinton delivered the keynote.

The hunger to build new relationships between business, government, the faith community, and those in the African diaspora is undeniable. What is required of us is to think anew and dedicate ourselves to building partnerships of mutuality and that last. In this Chamber that will mean passing a reauthorized African Growth and Opportunity Act that does more to encourage and facilitate real two-way trade than the current law and to take up and pass the bipartisan Power Africa law that will strengthen investment in infrastructure and in electricity across the continent.

Next week it means coming together with Africa's government and business leaders to forge new relationships built on mutual respect and the opportunities we share.

I urge my colleagues and my friends throughout the business community to seize this opportunity and focus on the bright future it could create. An Africa that trades with us, that can defend itself, that can secure itself, and that empowers its citizens is the Africa we see, and that is an Africa which we in the United States are uniquely suited

to help its people build. We have already built a powerful foundation for partnership through our investments in public health and education, clean water, democracy, and good governance.

After 50 years in the Peace Corp and more than a decade of PEPFAR—President Bush's groundbreaking commitment to combating HIV and AIDS—we are better regarded in Africa than in anywhere else in the world. From our universities, to our businesses, to our military training and partnerships, to the vibrant Africa diaspora community spread throughout this land, we have tools no other Nation has. The opportunity for progress is extraordinary. By helping to build a broad and sustainable middle class across this continent, American workers and businesses will have more people to sell their products to and more markets in which to invest. The more we partner with African businesses, the stronger they will become.

Genuine partnerships such as this must be the foundation for our relationships with Africa going forward, and we have a lot to gain as well.

As many have commented, in the last decade 6 out of 10 of the fastest growing economies in the world have been in Africa, and that number will only rise. Other countries have noticed the opportunity. China's exports to Africa, for instance, have outgrown ours 3 to 1 since 2000, and 5 years ago China eclipsed us as Africa's largest trading partner. So it is no surprise that since 2000, China has hosted five summits with African heads of state. Let's be clear, the Chinese, in seeking opportunities for this century, will not miss the "next China." So we have a lot of ground to make up.

It is also critical we recognize that we should not just mimic the ways in which the Chinese are seeking opportunity in Africa. They bring a policy of nonintervention in domestic affairs. We bring American values—a focus on democracy, on governance, on human rights, as well as the attractiveness of our technology, our resources, and the relationship with our diaspora community.

This week we have had remarkable opportunities for our President, our Secretary of State, and several of us from this Chamber to meet with young African leaders as part of a program that brought 500 inspiring young African leaders to Washington.

Next week we will welcome more than 40 heads of state from across the continent—a summit that I hope signals the next big step in building strong and sustainable partnerships throughout the continent.

President Obama, leaders from this Chamber, leaders from the Cabinet, and from across America's corporate community will join for 3 days to allow us to refocus our efforts on the continent, to seize this moment, and to move forward. It is my hope that this Chamber, this Congress, will take advantage of