

serve their communities, boost small businesses, increase individual savings, and for other purposes'."

(b) **TRANSITION PERIOD.**—Any small bank holding company that was excepted from the provisions of section 171 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act pursuant to subparagraph (C) of section 171(b)(5) (as such subparagraph was in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act), and any small savings and loan holding company that would have been excepted from the provisions of section 171 pursuant to subparagraph (C) (as such subparagraph was in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act) if it had been a small bank holding company, shall be excepted from the provisions of section 171 until the effective date of the Small Bank Holding Company Policy Statement issued by the Board as required by section 1 of this Act.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

For the purposes of this Act:

(a) **BANK HOLDING COMPANY.**—The term "bank holding company" has the same meaning as in section 2 of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 (12 U.S.C. 1841).

(b) **SAVINGS AND LOAN HOLDING COMPANY.**—The term "savings and loan holding company" has the same meaning as in section 10(a) of the Home Owners' Loan Act (12 U.S.C. 1467a(a)).

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The bill (H.R. 3329), as amended, was passed.

CREDIT UNION SHARE INSURANCE FUND PARITY ACT

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Committee be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 3468 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

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

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3468) to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to extend insurance coverage to amounts held in a member account on behalf of another person, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. DURBIN. I further ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The bill (H.R. 3468) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

PROTECTING VOLUNTEER FIRE-FIGHTERS AND EMERGENCY RESPONDERS ACT OF 2014—Continued

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE ACTION ON IMMIGRATION

Mr. LEE. As we all know, President Obama recently announced Executive action on immigration, what he refers to as deferred action, for millions of aliens who are here illegally but who have children who were born in the United States and by virtue of their birth in the United States are U.S. citizens.

Now the President has repeatedly assured the American people that he is not creating a pathway to citizenship for those individuals, but that isn't true. He and his administration have cleared the pathway to citizenship for millions of people who have crossed into our borders illegally. They know that is what they have done, and it is illegal. Immigration law is quite complicated, but here is the bottom line on this issue: If you are the parent of a U.S. citizen, when that child reaches the age of 21, assuming you haven't committed certain crimes or done other things that might exclude you from what the law generally allows, you can get a green card and eventually you can get citizenship. But there is a catch. If you are in an illegal status inside the United States because you crossed into our borders illegally and that is how you became an illegal alien—that is, you entered without inspection, as that term is known in immigration circles—then in order to get back on the path to citizenship you are first required under existing law to leave the country and then to come back across the border into the country legally. Because you broke immigration laws before you came into the country, the law says you have to wait either 3 years or 10 years to return, depending on how long you were inside the country illegally before you left.

When we talk about clearing the path to citizenship for this set of immigrants—that is those who are close relatives of U.S. citizens—that is what we are talking about: getting around the rule that those who cross our border in secret must leave the country, wait a period of years outside the country because they broke our laws, and then return.

So when the President says he isn't clearing such a path to citizenship, that is Washington shorthand for, don't worry, I am not circumventing the law.

What stands between these people and citizenship is the need to enter the country lawfully, which they cannot do until they leave, wait a period of time that Congress has set by law, and then and only then come back. The President claims he is not touching this rule, but that is exactly what he is doing and exactly what he has done, and he is doing it through a program called advance parole. Advance parole is essentially a form of permission for

an undocumented immigrant to travel outside the country and then return. When he gets back to the country and approaches the border, he presents an advance travel document to border officials and they will parole him into the country.

What is more, the President has announced if you leave the country under a grant of advance parole, the administration will treat you as though you never left at all, waiving the 3-year to 10-year wait mandated by Congress for people who have come here unlawfully and then left the country.

When that is done, as it turns out, the illegal immigrant will become eligible to take advantage of a different way to become a citizen: getting what is known as adjustment of status. Adjustment of status, which gives you a green card without having to leave the country, is available to parents of U.S. citizens so long as they crossed our border lawfully, which advanced parole lets them do.

So how hard will it be to get advance parole, which leads to a green card, which in turn leads to citizenship? Well, it is supposed to be very hard. Parole is kind of a temporary emergency pass that lets someone into the country for an extremely urgent reason, even though the law says that an immigrant in that circumstance cannot be admitted for one reason or another.

In fact, there is a Federal statute passed by Congress that restricts the power of the executive branch of the Federal Government to use parole to a very narrow, very confined set of circumstances. That law, INA section 212(d)(5)(a), says that the executive branch may parole individuals into the United States "only on a case-by-case basis for urgent humanitarian reasons or significant public benefit."

That term "urgent humanitarian reasons" means conditions such as getting medical treatment or perhaps attending a funeral of a close family member. "Significant public benefit" usually means circumstances such as one being a witness in a crime and as such needing to come into the country to testify at trial.

To be clear, it is illegal—illegal—to parole people into the country who don't meet that standard. But for deferred action recipients, here is the standard the President is using: A person warranting advance parole, which again also eventually leads to citizenship, must file a form I-31 with USCIS. The instructions for this form explain that deferred action recipients can get parole for "educational purposes, employment purposes or humanitarian purposes . . ."

I continue:

Educational purposes include but are not limited to semester abroad programs or academic research;

Employment purposes include but are not limited to overseas assignments, interviews, conferences, training or meetings with clients. . . .

In no universe is a meeting with a client or a conference an urgent humanitarian reason. Nowhere in the universe are those circumstances for a significant benefit to the American public.

Imagine this scenario. Imagine that a foreign national approaches our border. The border officials ask the individual for a visa, and he says, oh, I don't have a visa, but I do have a business meeting in Denver. Can I come in, even though I don't have a visa? There is no doubt he would be turned away promptly. But for the new deferred action recipients under the President's Executive action plan, so long as you have a business meeting in Toronto or an overseas assignment in Buenos Aires, you can get permission to leave and be paroled back into the country immediately upon your return, along with the government's promise to ignore the 3-year or 10-year bar that is supposed to keep you out of the country. And once you do that, you can adjust your status and get a green card and eventually citizenship.

How do I know this? Well, in 2010 the American Spectator published a leaked Department of Homeland Security memo, a version of which purportedly reached the Secretary of Homeland Security—then-Secretary Janet Napolitano—exploring the administration's options on immigration. That memo explicitly contemplated using parole as a way to sidestep Congress and give citizenship to illegal immigrants who are relatives to U.S. citizens.

It says "individuals could . . . be paroled into the U.S. for purposes of applying for adjustment of status to render immediate relatives of U.S. citizens eligible for parole, DHS could issue guidance establishing that family reunification constitutes a significant public benefit."

So let me be clear. Advance parole leads to citizenship for parents of U.S. citizens. The administration knows that, and they are giving advance parole for reasons such as client meetings that clearly violate Federal law.

This is the danger of unilateral Executive action, drafted in secret and announced to the American people as a fait accompli. In our system, policies are debated in the legislature and their consequences need to be explored through debate. Here, the President's action has avoided that constitutional lawmaking process, but it has also broken existing laws passed by Congress.

Thank you, Madam President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

SERVING AS PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I have been in the Senate just a few weeks shy of 40 years. For the past 2 years I have had the distinct honor of serving this Chamber as the President pro tempore. Just four Senators from Vermont have held this title. I am the first in more than a century.

It has been among my greatest privileges to represent Vermont in the U.S.

Senate, something I dreamed about as a child, and it has been day after day after day a privilege to represent my very special State of Vermont in this body.

It has also been an honor and privilege to serve as the President pro tempore in this institution, the U.S. Senate. This is an institution for which I will always have the greatest respect and affection.

When I assumed the position of President pro tempore, something I had not realized would happen, Marcelle and I welcomed into our family over time nearly 20 invaluable members of the U.S. Capitol Police. As President pro tempore and third in the line of succession, the office comes with a security detail. It is not something I had asked for. In fact, I said, well, I don't really need that, and they said: You don't get any choice in the matter.

I got to know them well. I had a background in law enforcement before I came to the Senate, but I have never served with such professionals as those who comprise this team. They sacrifice time at home. They sacrifice time with their families and weekends and holidays. I could not be more grateful for their dedication to public service and for their professionalism and good nature. They are an example of what the best in law enforcement should be.

The U.S. Capitol should be very proud of our U.S. Capitol Police and especially of those who are in this unique dignitary protection division. Those who serve on such details are trained to blend into the background. You might forget they are there, but they are, and they miss nothing. When I try to give them credit for the work they do, they say: Well, that is just our job. It is a lot more than their job. It is true professionalism and it is something that makes everybody in law enforcement and should make everybody in the U.S. Senate proud.

I want to recognize their commitment and acknowledge their service. The members of this detail include Sergeant David Ribb, Thomas Andriko, Henry Smith, Shane Powell, Eric Boggs, Robert Schultz, Antonio Carofano, Amy McDaniel, John Jastrzebski, Ryan Rayball, Ryan Andrews, Jay Schmid, Austin Reinshuttle, Sean Keating, Anthony Ravenel, Gideon Maran, John Brito, Luis Pimentel, Jose Ramirez, Jr., Robert Leh, James Melenson, Edward Wojciechowski, and Marc DesJames, who recently retired.

Next year when Congress reconvenes, we will elect a new President pro tempore, my friend Senator ORRIN HATCH. I will continue as dean of the Senate, and a future President pro tempore emeritus. I wish ORRIN HATCH the best, and I know he is going to be in safe hands with the dedicated members of the President pro tempore's security detail.

Again, having served in law enforcement, having considered that a very significant part of my career, I have

never seen more professional police officers than these men and women. Every one of us as Senators should be glad they are there.

Madam President, on another matter, after 9 months of hearings and briefings, many long days and nights of negotiations, this past weekend the Appropriations Committee completed work on the fiscal year 2015 Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act.

Earlier this year many of us came to the floor and praised Chairwoman MIKULSKI for her heroic efforts to pass the fiscal year 2014 omnibus. While many in Washington thought that feat could not be repeated 2 years in a row, as the most senior Member of the Appropriations Committee I knew she would prove them wrong, and she did. Chairwoman MIKULSKI rallied her 12 subcommittees and reached across the aisle to negotiate this omnibus and avoid another shutdown. Without her, this would not have been possible.

Similar to Chairwoman MIKULSKI, my friend Senator SHELBY from Alabama, the committee's vice chairman, also deserves a great deal of praise for the role he played. Without Senator SHELBY's recognition of the importance of passing appropriations bills rather than continuing to fund the government on autopilot, we would not have reached this point.

As chairman of the Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Subcommittee, I also wish to thank the ranking member, LINDSEY GRAHAM, chairwoman KAY GRANGER, and ranking member NITA LOWEY in the other body. They were always able partners, whose wealth of experience—I will emphasize that—wealth of experience is invaluable to the subcommittee's work, and it is reflected throughout the final agreement.

I look forward to working with the incoming subcommittee chairman LINDSEY GRAHAM next year to continue to fund the diplomacy and foreign aid programs that are essential to protecting U.S. interests around the world in a manner that reflects American values.

The State, Foreign Operations portion of this omnibus was negotiated with the full participation of representatives of both parties in both Houses of Congress as a balanced, bipartisan bill. Every word was discussed and agreed to by Republicans and Democrats, and our respective subcommittee bills have been publicly available since they were reported out of committee in June.

My Democratic clerk of the subcommittee, Tim Rieser, made sure everybody in both parties were kept apprised of everything we did. I want to thank him, Janet Stormes and Alex Carnes of the Democratic staff, as well as Paul Grove, the Republican clerk, and Adam Yezerski of the Republican staff. They all played an essential role.

Others who were indispensable and deserve our thanks are Valerie Hutton, Celina Inman, Elmer Barnes, and

Penny Myles of the editorial and printing office, who worked long hours to produce draft after draft of the bill. They do an outstanding job.

Division J of this omnibus for the Department of State and Foreign Operations provides a total of \$51.8 billion in discretionary budget authority to protect U.S. security, humanitarian, and economic interests around the world.

Anybody who doubts that these funds are important should think about the devastation being wrought by ISIL in Syria and Iraq and its impact on neighboring Lebanon and Jordan, in addition to what is happening in the Central African Republic, South Sudan, and other areas where hundreds of thousands of people have been displaced by ethnic and tribal violence. Part of this funding will support aid for refugees and other victims of disasters, and we provide \$1.5 billion above the budget request. The bill also includes additional funds to help Ukraine and other former Soviet republics counter Russian aggression.

It provides \$2.5 billion in emergency funding to respond to the Ebola epidemic, which reminds us all that a deadly virus is often only one airplane trip away from our shores.

The bill includes full funding for diplomatic security, which unfortunately we need today.

As far as U.N. peacekeeping, the bill provides funding and authorities to fully meet our commitments.

It includes an increase above the budget request for PEPFAR and other global health programs, which I was very pleased about considering that those increases did not require cuts to other critical programs.

The bill includes additional funding for educational and cultural exchanges. It provides funding to address the gang violence and poverty that contribute to the migration of unaccompanied children from Central America. That problem ebbs and flows but cannot be ignored. We have seen the flood of young children across our southern border, risking their lives rather than staying and being attacked and raped in their own country, or forced into gangs and made to shoot and kill and rob.

I am very pleased we were able to include the amounts requested for programs to protect biodiversity and tropical forests, support clean energy and reduce global warming, combat wildlife poaching and trafficking. These are important national security issues.

I am also pleased that provisions relating to our commitments to the international financial institutions, particularly relating to evaluations, beneficial ownership, human rights, industrial-scale logging, and financing for large dams, were included. I look forward to discussing them with the Treasury Department, State, and USAID.

The provisions relating to a Small Grants Program to provide small, multi-year USAID grants to small enti-

ties, timely feedback from beneficiaries of humanitarian assistance, and reforms to provide incentives for Foreign Service Officers to support sustainable, locally-driven development, are also important.

There is a lot more in this bill to support friends and allies so they can combat disease, hunger, poverty, strengthen the rule of law, and protect human rights. These are all programs that are directly linked to our national security. They fulfill our moral obligation as Americans, as members of the wealthiest, most powerful Nation on Earth.

There are some things that I wish were not included, particularly a House provision carried from last year that would weaken limits on carbon emissions from projects financed by the Export-Import Bank and Overseas Private Investment Corporation. Our European partners are wisely ending public subsidies for coal in favor of cleaner, healthier, renewable energy, but the House continues to block such progress here.

I am very disappointed the Senate provision to bring the United States into compliance with the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations was rejected again this year by the House. The Bush administration spoke of the necessity of this, as has the Obama administration.

Mr. President, no bill is perfect, and this one is no exception. But the State, Foreign Operations portion of the omnibus is a whole lot better than a continuing resolution that ignores the changing global realities and challenges we face.

It was a collaborative effort from beginning to end with Republicans and Democrats alike, and it should be supported overwhelmingly.

I see my friend, the distinguished senior Senator from Texas on the floor seeking recognition, so I will yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican whip.

Mr. CORNYN. It is good to see the senior Senator from Vermont back and in good health. I know he has been struggling a little bit with this crazy weather we are having, and we are glad to see him back.

On November 5, 2009, a radical jihadist, by the name of Nidal Hasan, who happened to also be a major in the U.S. Army, opened fire at Fort Hood, TX, claiming the lives of 12 U.S. soldiers, one civilian, one unborn child, and wounded more than 30 other people. It was a shocking tragedy and event.

Shortly after the attack, it became clear that Hasan was motivated by the same poisonous ideology that spurred the attacks on September 11, 2001; in other words, this was an act of domestic terrorism. Yet due to the narrow and outdated definition of "international terrorism," the Fort Hood victims have not been awarded the same medals and recognition as other military victims of terrorism.

Furthermore, the Obama administration took the position of claiming that the 2009 Fort Hood victims were not eligible for Purple Hearts because this was workplace violence—believe it or not. They further said they didn't think Hasan was acting under the explicit direction of a foreign terrorist group, so they were not qualified for these Purple Hearts and this recognition.

When our men and women in uniform come under hostile fire from a terrorist, they and their families should receive the full honors and full recognition and benefits that accompany such courageous service. That is why I have authored legislation in the Senate making these victims of the November 2009 attack at Fort Hood eligible to receive the Purple Heart or the civilian equivalent.

Last week I was pleased that the House of Representatives passed the Defense authorization bill, which includes the legislation I authored awarding Purple Hearts to victims of this terrorist attack.

I wish to thank my good friends Congressmen WILLIAMS and CARTER for their steadfast dedication to seeing this to conclusion and to fruition.

While long overdue, this is welcome news to the wounded, the families of the fallen, and the entire Fort Hood community, because even after 5 years, the wounds from this horrific attack are still there, especially for the families of people such as Michael Cahill, a civilian physician's assistant and retired soldier, and Army CPT John Gaffaney, both of whom charged the shooter and sacrificed their lives to save others around them.

The close-knit community at Fort Hood has endured great loss in recent years, and I am pleased we are now just one step closer to delivering this important piece of justice to the victims and their families. It is my hope that once the Defense authorization bill clears this Chamber, that the President will act quickly in signing this legislation into law because any further delay is a continuing injustice to all of the victims from that day and indeed all of the good people at Fort Hood.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

FAREWELL TO THE SENATE

Mrs. HAGAN. Madam President, it is with great honor and gratitude that I rise to reflect on the last 6 years, which have been some of the most rewarding and transformative of my life, and to thank the people who have been by my side as we worked to make our great State and this great country even better.

First and foremost, I wish to thank the people of North Carolina for allowing me to serve them in the Senate. Six years ago you sent me to Washington to fight for the priorities that make our State great, and I have put North Carolina first every single day. I have

been honored to stand up for our teachers, our students, to fight for our seniors, to help create a business climate that promotes job growth, to build an economy that works for everyone, and to make sure we keep our promises to our servicemembers and to our veterans.

I am extremely proud of what we have been able to accomplish, and I am forever humbled and grateful for the opportunity to serve.

I also wish to thank my family; my husband Chip, who is my rock, and my three children, Jeanette, Tilden, and Carrie, and my two great sons-in-law, Will and Martin.

These past 6 years have been extremely full of exciting milestones for the Hagan family. Since my term began, my two daughters have both gotten married and they both had babies. I have a 1-year-old grandson Harrison and a 1-week-old granddaughter Christine. So when I said earlier that these past 6 years have been transformative, I wasn't kidding.

I also wish to thank my dad Joe Ruthven, who is one of my most trusted advisers and a constant source of inspiration for me, as is his wife Judy, my stepmom, for all of her love and support.

I wish to thank the Capitol Police here in Washington. I don't think we recognize these people enough for the incredible work they do to keep us safe.

And, of course, I wish to thank my unbelievably hard-working staff whom I consider to be a part of the official Hagan family. These folks are top-notch. Their commitment to our State and the people we serve is unmatched. They are passionate and compassionate, and I am so grateful to have had them by my side over these last 6 years. I ask unanimous consent that a list of their names be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STAFF OF SENATOR KAY R. HAGAN

Michelle Adams, Ayo Adeyeye, Tyler Aiken, Natalia Aldana, Stephanie Allen, Patrick Ayers, Devan Barber, Micah Beasley, Caroline Brantley, Patrick Brennan, Nancy Brenner, Emorie Broemel, Christopher Cannon, Angelo Caravano, Bess Caughran, Marshall Cesena, Justin Clayton, Molly Conti, Carrie Cook, Perrin Cooke, Travis Cooke, Ashley Copeland, Kathryn Davidson, Curtis Davis, Andrew Devlin, Sage Dunston, Ashley Eden, Brittany Ellis, Karen Evans.

John Fain, Elizabeth Farrar, Sharon Fisher, Colleen Flanagan, Margaret Freshwater, Amanda Gabriel, Tiffany Germain, Jennifer Gradnigo, Mary Hanley, Simone Hardeman-Jones, Mike Harney, Freddie Harrill, Jenny Hartsock, David Hartzler, Christopher Hayden, Christina Henderson, David Hoffman, Julie Holzhuter, Cristina Jacome, Jennifer Johnson, Michael Jones, Rosemary Kennedy, Meenal Khajuria, Crystal King, Catherine Kuerbitz.

John Labban, Tasmaya Lagoo, Stephen Lassiter, Samuel Lau, Margaret Lawrynnowicz, Caitlin Legacki, Jason Lindsay, Travis Manigan, Elizabeth Margolis, Shaniqua McClendon, Patrick McHugh, Will

Medley, Kathryn Merrill, Forest Michaels, Melissa Midgett, John Minor, Joyce Mitchell, Amber Moon, Christopher Moyer, Sara Mursky-Fuller, Brian Nagle, Adeline Noger, Thomas O'Donnell, Emily Osterhus, Elizabeth Outten, Allison Parker, Tyler Patrick, Joseph Peele, Roger Pena, John Pfeiffer, Benjamin Piven, Stanley Purple.

Cierra Raleigh, Rikkia Ramsey, Hanna Raskin, Jean Reaves, Ryan Regan, Matthew Rumley, Leo Schmid, Tatyana Semyrog, Christopher Sgro, Lindsay Siler, Valarie Simpson, Leland Slade, Hannah Smith, Tremayne Smith, Aaron Suntag, Joshua Teitelbaum, Clayton Thomas, John Tillman, Karen Wade, Brittany Wakefield, Muthoni Wambu, Brandy Warwick, Timothy Webster, Alissa Sadie Weiner, Meshia White, Andrew Wilkins, Johnnie Williams, Sue Wink, Margaret Winslow, Abigail Youngken, Tracy Zvenyach.

Mrs. HAGAN. My staff knew how important it was to me that my office be as open and as accessible as possible to the people of North Carolina, and my team worked every single day to help us reach that goal. Over the last 6 years, we held a townhall in every 100 counties across North Carolina. In DC, we have held a Carolina Coffee every Wednesday and we welcomed thousands of North Carolinians to come visit us. We have also resolved more than 36,000 constituent cases for the people of North Carolina, from helping veterans access their benefits with the VA to helping families struggling with high mortgage rates to be able to stay in their homes, to helping small businesses cut through the bureaucratic redtape.

While my North Carolina staff was there for the folks in our State day in and day out, my DC team was helping me fight for North Carolinians in Washington.

North Carolina is proud to be the most military-friendly State in the Nation. As a member of a military family, it is important to me to work every single day to keep our State the most military-friendly State. My husband is a Vietnam veteran. My dad and my brother served in the Navy. My father-in-law was a major general in the Marine Corps. I have two nephews on active duty. One is an F-15 fighter pilot and the other one is a Navy Seal. So when I say one of my top priorities was ensuring Federal policies worked for our veterans in active-duty military, they are not just words, it is truly a personal obligation.

That is why nearly 6 years ago, when Jerry Ensminger, a retired marine, shared with me the story of his daughter Janey, my heart broke for him. Janey died of leukemia at the age of 9 because of contaminated water on the base at Camp Lejeune. He dedicated his life to seeking justice for his daughter and other Camp Lejeune victims. I found it absolutely unconscionable that the Federal Government had denied this man, who served our country, the answers he needed after all he had been through. I wanted to do whatever I could to help, and it was one of the greatest honors of my life to work alongside my North Carolina colleague

Senator BURR to pass the Janey Ensminger Act, to help Jerry and the servicemembers and families affected by water contamination at Camp Lejeune and to give them the answers and the health care they deserved.

It was also important to me that all Americans remembered and understood the sacrifices made by our military and their families. During my time in the Senate, I had the opportunity to speak on this very floor about some of the brave servicemembers from North Carolina, many of whom made the ultimate sacrifice, and many of whom lost their lives while trying to make the world a better place and safer for the rest of us. I had the opportunity to speak with many of their families and their stories were both moving and heartbreaking.

I spoke with Terry Marquez, whose son Justin died from small-arms fire wounds he received while on foot patrol in the Wardak Province in Afghanistan just 1 month after he arrived in theater. He was only 25 years old when he died.

According to Justin's mom Terry, as Justin grew up in the Army, he was like a fine wine, he just kept getting better with age. He believed in protecting others. He believed in making the world a better place. He believed in standing up so that others might not have to. Justin embodied the selflessness and courage that defines the men and women of our armed services.

Shortly after sharing Justin's story on the Senate floor, I invited his mother to be my guest at the State of the Union Address. Her presence reminded not just me but so many of the Senators that she met that night—and she knew them all—how important it is that we uphold our promises to the men and women who put their lives on the line for each and every one of us. It has been an honor to help be one of those voices for our servicemembers, veterans, and their families in Washington.

As one of 20 women in the Senate, I have also enjoyed being a voice for women and children. As women Senators, we bring a unique perspective to the policymaking dialog. We understand the issues facing women and families because we have been there. Some of us are moms and some are grandmoms. We know what it is like to balance that family checkbook and simultaneously run the business and a carpool, and to want the best possible future not only for our children but for all the children throughout the United States.

More important than that, the women of the Senate know how to bridge the partisan divide to get the job done. Together we passed the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act, the first bill I cosponsored as a U.S. Senator. We kept student loan rates from doubling. We pushed for initiatives such as my newborn screening bill to ensure that every child has a healthy start in life. I am proud of the work we have done together to support our families and to

set this country on a path to a brighter future.

But the fact is we need a lot more of that in Washington. If we are going to address the biggest challenges facing our country, we have to break through the political gridlock and confront these issues together—head on, united; not as Republicans and Democrats, but working together on behalf of the American people. We need to work together to tackle the rising cost of college that is putting higher education out of reach for too many students and then burdening them with unsustainable debt. We need to reform our education system to ensure that every child has the tools and the technology we have to have today and that we have to understand and be an expert in that technology in order to be successful in this competitive environment.

The economy is improving, but wages are stagnant. We must find ways to ensure that Americans working full time are not living in poverty.

We need to help middle-class families get ahead and ensure that working women are receiving the support they need, whether it is fair pay, affordable childcare, or time to care for new babies or seriously ill family members. There is so much work to be done. It is my hope these issues can be addressed in the 114th Congress, but doing so is going to take cooperation from all 100 Members of this body.

The men and women I have worked with during my time are some of the most dedicated, passionate people I have ever met. And there are so many, I am only going to name a few.

BARBARA MIKULSKI was my first mentor, the dean of the women. She waltzed me down the aisle to get sworn in. She is one of the greatest advocates for women and for families. And I know that PATTY MURRAY, the mom in tennis shoes, is a dynamite negotiator. MARK WARNER, one of my 2008 classmates, is a leader in seeking bipartisan solutions. SUSAN COLLINS is a great friend and a proven consensus builder. CHUCK SCHUMER is a trusted adviser who embodies what it means to be a fighter.

There are so many to name, and I love them all. But I know the Members of the Senate can make progress on these issues that matter so long as we put politics aside and work together.

One of my guiding principles is “to whom much is given, much is expected.” Six years ago, North Carolinians gave me an opportunity to be a voice in Washington, and I have put North Carolinians first every single day. I urge my colleagues to do the same—to remember who they are fighting for, not who they are fighting against, to see past the deed, to see past the d or the r, to work together in a bipartisan fashion as I have tried to do to move this country forward.

Working with all of my colleagues and serving North Carolina in the U.S. Senate is a huge honor.

God bless you all, and God bless the U.S. Senate. Thank you.

I yield the floor.

(Applause, Senators rising.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

TRIBUTE TO KAY HAGAN

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, first let me commend my colleague from North Carolina, KAY HAGAN, who has been an extraordinary asset in the U.S. Senate. She has shown political bravery to the highest degree over and over again, taking what she knew were the right votes even when they were politically tough votes. I just listened to her farewell address and I couldn't agree with her more, that she put the people of North Carolina ahead of everything else in terms of her service in the U.S. Senate. It has been an honor to serve with her, to get to know her husband Chip and her family, and I wish her only the best for whatever her future undertakings may be.

DEATH IN CUSTODY REPORTING ACT

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, on Tuesday I was pleased to chair an important hearing in the Judiciary Subcommittee on the Constitution, Civil Rights and Human Rights that took a look at the state of civil rights in America today.

We heard compelling testimony from our colleagues, including Senator CORY BOOKER of New Jersey, Congressman LUIS GUTIÉRREZ of Illinois, and Congressman KEITH ELLISON of Minnesota. We also heard from civil rights leaders Wade Henderson and Laura Murphy, and from Dr. Cedric Alexander of the National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives.

It was a powerful hearing. We talked about Michael Brown of Ferguson Missouri, Eric Garner of Staten Island, and the growing sentiment across our Nation that the criminal justice system needs to be improved.

In particular, we talked about challenges that our Nation faces when it comes to restoring the trust of the minority communities in our government. Every witness, every Senator at the hearing agreed. We need to do more—not just wring our hands but to hold hands together and find solutions.

One issue we discussed at the hearing was the need for law enforcement to be more transparent. We discussed important legislation—called the Death in Custody Reporting Act—that would mark a significant step forward when it comes to transparency. The Death in Custody Reporting Act would take the simple step of requiring States and Federal law enforcement agencies to report to the Department of Justice basic statistical information regarding deaths that occur in law enforcement custody. This would include information about the name of the deceased, when the death occurred, how it occurred, and which agency was involved. It would apply when a person is being arrested or detained by local, State, or Federal law enforcement and when a person is incarcerated. The bill also di-

rects the Attorney General to study this information and provide recommendations on how these deaths can be reduced.

It seems like such a simple matter to require accurate information to be collected. In fact, Congress used to require that information, but it expired in 2006. As a result, we have not had accurate national statistics regarding deaths in incarceration and custody.

Last week the Wall Street Journal reported that it surveyed police departments about deaths that occurred in police custody between 2007 and 2012 and found that more than 550 deaths occurred during that time and were not included in national statistics.

As we engage in a national conversation about reforming police tactics, we need accurate data in order to make the right reforms. At our hearing, our witnesses from the civil rights and law enforcement community agreed it was time to start gathering this information.

I am pleased that last night at the end of the session, the Senate passed the Death in Custody Reporting Act by unanimous consent. It is an important step forward toward transparency, accountability, and restoring confidence.

Let me give credit where it is due. For years this legislation has been championed by my friend Congressman BOBBY SCOTT of Virginia. I commend him for his dedicated efforts. I also commend my colleague Senator RICHARD BLUMENTHAL of Connecticut, who has strongly advocated for this bill in the Senate, including in our hearing on Tuesday.

Let me also give thanks to PATRICK LEAHY, chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, and House Judiciary Committee ranking member JOHN CONYERS for their support of this legislation.

This is not a partisan bill. It passed the House last year by a voice vote. Now it has cleared the Senate and is on its way to the President. The passage of this legislation shows that we can work together across the aisle and make progress. Make no mistake—we have a lot of work to do to improve the state of civil rights in America. There are many more steps we must take to restore the confidence of all Americans in our criminal justice system. The passage of this legislation by Congress is an important step in the right direction.

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

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

TRIBUTES TO MARK UDALL

Mr. BENNET. Madam President, I wish to take a moment today to speak about my friend MARK UDALL, who is

soon going to be finishing his term. MARK's sister Doty describes him as an OK politician but an extraordinary public servant. I think it is fair to say that MARK could never reduce his role as a representative of the people of Colorado to just politics. It is not in his DNA.

It is with a very heavy heart that I see him leave the Senate, because he is my friend. But it is especially sad at a time when MARK's kind of leadership and constructive engagement is exactly what this place needs.

"UDALL" is a name that is synonymous with the West, and MARK and the collective service of the Udall family have come to represent the very best of our western way of life. They have embodied that pioneering and entrepreneurial spirit dating back to the days when Americans were building entirely new lives on the frontier. They have a historic love for the beauty and majesty of the West. They have spent lifetimes protecting it.

Mo and Stu Udall, MARK's uncle and father, both served our country during World War II. Stu was elected to serve the Second District of Arizona. When President Kennedy asked Stu to serve as the Secretary of Interior, Mo won Stu's seat in Congress.

Unlike his son MARK, Mo never ran for the Senate. He explained why. He said:

I told the Arizona Press Club with [Barry] Goldwater present that there were three reasons I was not running for the Senate: 1. I love the House. 2. My wife and family are against it. And 3, I have taken a poll and you are going to beat the hell out of me.

Although, he did run for President. The New Republic reported on that:

The Arizona Congressman, Morris Udall liked to tell a story about a response he got at a barber shop in Maine: He looked in at the door and, meaning to introduce himself, said "Mo Udall, running for president." "Yeah," the barber said, "we were just laughing about it this morning."

It is not hard to know where MARK acquired his self-deprecating approach to the world, just as it not hard to know where he inherited his commitment to civil rights, to conservation, and to good government.

MARK has said it was during this time that his political views were formed. He himself went on to seek office.

In 2008, when MARK was elected to represent Colorado in the Senate, his cousin TOM—Stu's son—was elected to serve the State of New Mexico and is one of our colleagues today.

MARK UDALL's connection to the West and to public service comes from both sides of his family. Mo Udall, a man of many talents, met Patricia Emory, MARK's mother, while playing baseball in Colorado. Patricia or "Sam" Udall was a sharpshooter, pilot, Peace Corps volunteer at the age of 56. She was a native Coloradan and the person MARK credits most for his passion for the outdoors, for backpacking and climbing.

Today in the 21st century we face a profound set of challenges and a dra-

matic test of our democratic institution. Can what MARK UDALL often calls this glorious experiment in self-government continue to thrive into the next century and beyond?

MARK has carried the tradition of his family by serving as a moral forward-pointing compass. Throughout his career he has defended personal freedom and liberty, and he has built a legacy of conservation and preservation. As a member of the Colorado General Assembly representing Longmont and parts of Boulder County, MARK toughened the laws against poaching big game as trophy animals. As a Member of the House of Representatives, he worked across the aisle to establish the Rocky Flats Wildlife Refuge, cleaning up the former nuclear site and preserving 4,000 acres of wild land near Denver. He established the James Peak Wilderness Area, protecting 14,000 acres of some of our most scenic land in Gilpin and Grand Counties. He passed the Rocky Mountain National Park Wilderness Act to designate nearly 250,000 acres within the park as wilderness, including Longs Peak, which is actually a 14er that I have climbed. MARK UDALL has climbed all of them in Colorado, every single 14er we have, because they are included in the tallest 100 mountains that we have, each one of which has been summited by MARK UDALL. These are lands that will be protected long after any of our political careers are over and long after they remember who it was who protected those lands to begin with. But if anybody cares to check, they are going to know that it was MARK UDALL.

MARK has been vocal, active, and effective in his fight against climate change and in his promotion of renewable energy. He was the statewide co-chair of the successful 2004 campaign to pass Colorado's amendment 37. This measure required Colorado's power companies to generate most of their electricity from renewable sources. Colorado was the first State in the Union to take the issue to the voters. Amendment 37 passed. MARK UDALL was the driving force behind that effort. After his victory in the State, MARK took this issue to the House of Representatives. The House has twice passed the national renewable electricity standard championed by MARK.

During his time in the Senate, he has continued to push for a national policy, and his doggedness in standing up for Colorado's wind energy production saved thousands of good-paying jobs across the State and ensured that we will continue to lead the Nation in developing our clean energy economy.

The same is true for our ski areas, which have expanded recreation activities and summertime job opportunities thanks to a law MARK passed in this Senate.

Colorado's aerospace industry is thriving in part thanks to MARK UDALL. His work on space policy also dates back to his time in the House of Representatives as ranking member on

the Space Subcommittee. MARK helped revitalize aeronautics and aviation research and development at NASA and ensure that the Hubble space telescope received service and funding.

In the Senate, MARK helped lead the Colorado delegation opposition to a proposal that would have canceled the Orion Program, costing the State 1,000 jobs. The administration backed off. Last week, with a shuttle and rocket—both built by companies based in Colorado—NASA launched a successful test flight of the Orion vehicle. We will again carry astronauts into space, traveling deeper than ever before and eventually maybe even visit Mars.

As everybody in this Chamber knows, MARK has been a staunch defender of the rights and freedoms we cherish as westerners. As a member of the Senate Armed Services and Intelligence Committees, MARK fought every single day he was here to protect the security of the American people and the Bill of Rights. He has taken on NSA and CIA when they violated our constitutional values.

In 2011 he worked on a classified level to pressure intelligence officials to dismantle a massive email collection program that affected American privacy. Administration officials were unable to provide evidence that the program was effective. It was shut down. It only became public information when the New York Times reported on it in July of 2013.

Well before Edward Snowden made headlines in 2013, MARK warned of the NSA's overreach. In 2012, on this Senate floor, he warned the American people that they would be shocked to learn about what the NSA was doing in secret. He introduced landmark, bipartisan surveillance reform legislation with Senators RON WYDEN, RICHARD BLUMENTHAL, and RAND PAUL. It became the basis for the USA FREEDOM Act, which received 58 votes just a few weeks ago. There was a time, before the relentless use of the filibuster, when a majority of votes in the Senate would have been enough to ensure passage of that bill.

Earlier this week the Intelligence Committee released the executive summary of the Senate Intelligence Committee's study of the CIA's detention and interrogation program. Nobody in this place fought harder than MARK UDALL to shed light on these tactics. His goal from day one has been holding the CIA accountable, shedding light on this dark chapter of our history, and ensuring that the neither the CIA nor any other agency or future administration would make the grievous mistakes that were made here. He accomplished his goals with respect to the process without leaking classified information but by applying pressure both politically and privately until the report was finally released. He has been effective because he has stood on consistent principle on every issue we have faced.

He voted against the PATRIOT Act. He opposed the war in Iraq. He helped

lead the fight to end don't ask, don't tell.

MARK truly is the very best of what it means to be a public servant: independent, responsible, tough, focused on the future, and possessing an abiding can-do spirit. His calm presence, his unassuming nature, and his ability to see pure good in those around him are exactly what we so desperately need in our process today.

Simply put, MARK UDALL has fought for Colorado families in the most constructive way possible—by pushing thoughtful commonsense solutions—but has never ever fought to achieve a partisan political fleece.

When Colorado was struck with a series of natural disasters, from wildfires to floods, MARK was at his very best, standing up for our State and our families to lead the efforts to ensure that our communities had the support they needed to recover and better prepare for the threats we faced next. He has strengthened the way we respond to the growing threat of wildfire by emphasizing preservation efforts that will save lives, property, and tax dollars. We would expect nothing else from a man who has dedicated himself and his career to standing up for Colorado families, the middle class, and the values of the American West.

As a Senator, a Representative, a State legislator, director of the Colorado Outward Bound school, MARK has been a model public servant. He has lived up to and exceeded the high standards his family has set for more than a century. Throughout all of his work, MARK has always fought against the dysfunction that persists in Washington.

It is true, however, that MARK cannot take full credit for the work. His wife and partner Maggie Fox shares his commitment to leaving more opportunity for the next generation. She has worked as a teacher and community organizer on the Navajo and Hopi reservations of Arizona, New Mexico, and for the Colorado, North Carolina, and Northwest Outward Bound schools. She has become a leading voice in many efforts to protect our land, our air, and our water. Their partnership is a genuine one. It has made MARK's work possible.

MARK's staff has been among the finest, most professional, and most effective in the Senate. It has been a pleasure for me and for my staff to work alongside them on behalf of the people of Colorado.

Over the past few years I have learned that really there are two broad categories of people in Washington: There are those who embrace and add to the dysfunction because it serves their ideological convictions or gives them an opportunity to star on the cable news or both. Then there are the people who are actually trying to save the place. They are looking for areas of compromise to break the gridlock and to move us forward.

MARK is one of the good ones, and I have no doubt he will continue to make

profound contributions to Colorado and to our Nation in a variety of ways, but we are diminished by his loss. Every one of us, for the sake of this institution, would do well to live up to the example MARK UDALL has set.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Madam President, I thank Senator GRASSLEY for allowing me this time to talk about my cousin, MARK UDALL. First, let me say to Senator BENNET, I know that MARK feels he could not have had a better partner, a better friend, and someone to work with on Colorado issues and the great national issues than Senator BENNET.

Senator BENNET spoke eloquently of MARK's incredible record in public service. Two years in the Colorado legislature, 10 years in the House of Representatives, and 6 years here in the U.S. Senate. I served with MARK in the House, and here in the Senate. He is not only my cousin. He is not only an extraordinary public servant. He has been a great ally, as we have worked on the issues together.

MARK has been—and will continue to be—a champion, for the environment, for civil liberties, and for a government that is as open and good as the people we are privileged to represent.

MARK has been a courageous and outspoken leader in the fight against climate change. He knows that global warming is not just a threat to our environment, but to our national security and our economy. He and I have worked on this issue throughout our time in public service, pushing to expand clean energy production and for common sense steps to reduce pollution. He and I introduced, and got passed, a renewable electricity standard when we were both in the House to increase the use of renewable energy and create jobs across the country. When the Senate passes a similar RES, which I believe it eventually will, MARK you will share in that victory, for all your determination and hard work to make it happen.

Our dads loved the land. They taught us to love it as well. MARK doesn't just climb mountains. He protects them, so that generations to come will enjoy this legacy of natural treasures. Together we have fought for full funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund and for wilderness preservation. He has accomplished so much that will live on, long after we all are gone.

MARK has also been a true leader on the Senate Intelligence Committee and the Armed Services Committee. He is absolutely fearless, and undaunted, in defense of our Nation, and in defense of our liberties. We both opposed the original Patriot Act, as well as its reauthorization. MARK has been eloquent and tenacious in warning of overreaching surveillance, and secret interrogations. The Intelligence Committee released its study of the C.I.A.'s secret program this week. No one fought

harder to hold our government to account, in insisting that we must not only be secure, but we must honor the values that define us. We can and must do both. History will remember his invaluable role in making it possible for the American people to have this great and necessary debate.

Madam President, my dad once said that, in the end, it is not the awards you receive, it is not the trophies in the garage, or the honors on the shelf, it is what the people who know you best really think of you. To those of us who know MARK—in our family, here in Washington, and in his beloved State of Colorado—he is the real deal.

I remember when MARK's dad, Mo, ran for President in 1976. Mo lost the nomination to Jimmy Carter. In his concession speech, he recalled the words of Will Rogers, "Live your life so that whenever you lose, you are ahead." Mo went on to say:

And I am ahead. I'm ahead in staff people who love me and believed in me. And I'm ahead because I have love, respect and admiration for all of you in this room.

That was true of Mo. It is equally true of MARK. In his years of public service, and in the years to come, that will always be said of MARK. Whatever the task, whatever the challenge, he meets it head on. In the Congress, and in his day to day life, he is practical, independent, and always generous of himself.

MARK, wherever you go, wherever you are, win or lose, you are ahead—and we all are ahead whenever you are in the room. Or I might say whenever you are on the trail, or the mountain-side. We find you out on the trail as likely as anywhere else.

But, then, that has always been the case with MARK, and with all our family. If you are a Udall, you spend a lot of time outdoors, and gladly so. And we never know when we will run into each other. A number of years ago, I was hiking up a mountain in Argentina. All of a sudden, there on the trail at 16,000 feet, was MARK, coming back from the summit. So, I never know when I'm going to run into him, but Madam President, let me say, I am always glad when I do.

MARK, for me, you have always set an example. You have always been true to the legacy of our family. I know that will never change, whatever your endeavors. So, to you, and Maggie, and Jed and Tess, Jill and I wish you all the best, in this new chapter in your lives.

I thank Senator GRASSLEY for allowing me this courtesy. It is always wonderful to work with CHUCK. He is a first-class Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

GREENHOUSE GASES

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I have said before on the Senate floor that the proposed Environmental Protection Agency regulations to limit carbon dioxide are an example among far too many of Executive overreach by this administration.

Anyone who knows the history of the Clean Air Act—and I was here for the last major revision in 1990—who has read the text of that law knows it was never intended to address greenhouse gases or climate change.

The Clean Air Act is designed to address traditional pollutants that have a direct impact on human health and the environment. However, when Congress declined to pass legislation supported by President Obama that would have created a cap-and-trade system targeted at greenhouse gases, the President gave a speech saying he would act on his own. In trying to regulate greenhouse gases under the Clean Air Act, which was not designed for that purpose, the EPA had to fit a square peg in a round hole.

As a result, when a number of key provisions in the Clean Air Act didn't say what the EPA would like them to say, the EPA simply reinterpreted those provisions to say something different or ignored them. In effect, the EPA was unconstitutionally rewriting a law passed by the Congress.

We all know what article I, section 1 of the U.S. Constitution says: "All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States . . ."

Regardless of where you stand on climate change, we ought to be able to agree that it is not appropriate for the EPA or, for that matter, any administrative agency to twist the law passed by Congress to mean something other than what it says. This isn't a partisan position, and you don't have to take my word for it. Just listen to what President Obama's Harvard professor, renowned liberal constitutional scholar Lawrence Tribe, has written:

The defects in the Proposed Rule transcend political affiliation and policy positions and cut across partisan lines . . .

Continuing:

The central principle at stake is a rule of law—the basic premise that EPA must comply with fundamental statutory and constitutional requirements in carrying out its mission.

The Proposed Rule should be withdrawn. It is a remarkable example of executive overreach and an administrative agency's assertion of power beyond its statutory authority.

Indeed, the Proposed Rule raises serious constitutional questions.

In addition to his reputation as one of the country's most prominent constitutional scholars, Professor Tribe is also a long-time Democratic Party activist. In fact, he served as a judicial adviser to President Obama's 2008 Presidential campaign, briefly worked in his administration, and has been a very vocal supporter of the President. When Professor Tribe says the Obama administration has exceeded its authority, you can take it to the bank.

I should also add, in response to concerns that the EPA regulations are not a legitimate or appropriate response to climate change, I often hear that at least EPA is doing something. Well, aside from the fact that regulatory approach is not legally justified, it is also ineffective.

As Professor Tribe points out on his treatise in this matter:

The Regulatory Impact Analysis (RIA) for the Proposed Rule states that the impact of "reduced climate effects" has been "monetized" but not "quantified." In other words, EPA does not claim that the Proposed Rule would affect the climate. The mismatch and lack of social benefit distinguish the Proposed Rule from other actions by EPA under the Clean Air Act.

This isn't news. President Obama's first EPA Administrator, Lisa Jackson, confirmed in testimony before a Senate committee that: "U.S. action alone will not impact world CO₂ levels."

So these regulations will have no measurable environmental benefit, but will have tremendous costs, particularly for the Midwest, given our energy mix.

The EPA rules are all pain and no gain.

This is not an argument about environmental policy. I am proud to be a leading advocate for renewable energy, and I believe there is room for some bipartisan agreement about diversifying our Nation's energy sources.

However, I want you all to know that I agree with Professor Tribe that regardless of the underlying policy goals, the rule of law must be respected and the proposed rule should be withdrawn. I hope President Obama will learn from his former Harvard professor and end with the President of the United States doing the right thing.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

PREWAR IRAQ INTELLIGENCE

Mr. LEVIN. Madam President, I wish to speak for a few moments about one of the most significant events in my 36 years as a U.S. Senator, the war in Iraq. I want to speak about important historical records crucial to our understanding of why we went to war against Iraq in 2003, I want to enter into the public record recent revelations not yet made public, and I make one more public call for a key document to be made fully public.

I will begin by renewing a request to the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, John Brennan. It is a request I have also made to his predecessors: I ask Director Brennan to declassify fully a March 13, 2003 CIA cable debunking the contention that 9/11 hijacker Mohammad Atta had met in Prague with an Iraqi intelligence official named Ahmad al-Ani.

Earlier this year, Director Brennan wrote to me, refusing, as did his predecessors, to fully declassify the CIA cable. But in his letter to me he makes public for the first time a few lines from that document. While this is a significant addition to the public record, and I will discuss that in a moment, it is still not the full cable, and I am calling on him to declassify and release the full cable.

In order to understand why I am making that request, we need to return to early 2003.

On March 6, 2003, just two weeks before U.S. troops would cross the Iraqi border, President Bush held a prime-time televised press conference. In that press conference he mentioned the Sept. 11, 2001, terror attacks eight times, often in the same breath as Iraqi dictator Saddam Hussein. There was a concerted campaign on the part of the Bush administration to connect Iraq in the public mind with the horror of the Sept. 11 attacks. That campaign succeeded. According to public polls in the week before the Iraq war, half or more of Americans believed Saddam was directly involved in the attacks. One poll taken in September 2003, 6 months after we invaded Iraq, found that nearly 70 percent of Americans believed it likely that Saddam Hussein was personally involved in the Sept. 11 attacks. Americans who believed in a link between Iraq and 9/11 overwhelmingly supported the idea of invading Iraq. Of course, connections between Saddam and 9/11 or al Qaeda were fiction.

America's intelligence community was pressed to participate in the administration's media campaign. Just a week after the President's prime-time press conference, on March 13, 2003, CIA field staff sent a cable to CIA headquarters, responding to a request for information about a report that Mohammad Atta, the leader of the Sept. 11 hijackings, had met in 2001 with an Iraqi intelligence official in the Czech capital of Prague. In stark terms, this CIA cable from the field warned against U.S. government officials citing the report of the alleged Prague meeting.

Yet the notion of such a meeting was a centerpiece of the administration's campaign to create an impression in the public mind that Saddam was in league with the al Qaeda terrorists who attacked us on 9/11. On multiple occasions, including national television appearances, Vice President Dick Cheney cited reports of the meeting, at one point calling it "pretty well confirmed." Officials from Donald Rumsfeld's Pentagon, who set up a sort of rogue intelligence analysis operation, briefed senior officials with a presentation citing the Prague meeting as a "known contact" between Iraq and al Qaeda.

Why am I bringing up a CIA cable from more than a decade ago? Isn't this old, well-covered terrain? No, it isn't. This is about giving the American people a full account of the march to war as new information becomes available. It is about trying to hold leaders who misled the public accountable. It is about warning future leaders of this nation that they must not commit our sons and daughters to battle on the basis of false statements.

There is no more grave decision for a nation to make than the decision to go to war, and there is no more important issue for every member of Congress than the decision to authorize the use of military force—A decision to authorize force is a decision to unleash the

might of our Armed Forces, the strongest military on the planet. It commits the men and women of our Armed Forces to fight, and perhaps to die, on the battlefield. The decision to go to war must be careful, considered, and based on the facts.

Such careful consideration was tragically absent in the march to war in Iraq.

Here is what the Vice President said on December 9, 2001, in an interview on "Meet the Press": "It's been pretty well confirmed that he [Atta] did go to Prague and he did meet with a senior official of the Iraqi intelligence service in Czechoslovakia last April, several months before the attack."

Far from "pretty well confirmed," there was almost no evidence that such a meeting took place. Just a single unsubstantiated report, from a single source, and a mountain of information indicating there was no such meeting, including the fact that travel and other records indicated that Atta was almost certainly in the United States at the time of the purported meeting in Prague.

It was highly irresponsible for the Vice President to make that claim. Calling a single, unconfirmed report from a single source "pretty well confirmed," as he did on Dec. 9, 2001, was a reckless statement to make on such a grave topic as war, in the face of overwhelming doubt that such a meeting occurred.

Yet Vice President Cheney's reckless statements continued, even as evidence mounted that there was no Prague meeting. In September 2002, he said Atta "did apparently travel to Prague on a number of occasions. And on at least one occasion, we have reporting that places him in Prague with a senior Iraqi intelligence official."

The Vice President made those statements in the face of a then-classified June 2002 CIA assessment that said the alleged meeting was "not verified," called the information about it "contradictory," and described assessments of Iraqi cooperation with al Qaida terror plots as "speculative." The Vice President made those statements in the face of a July 2002 Defense Intelligence Agency analysis, which reported that there was no evidence that Atta was in the Czech Republic at the time. He made those statements despite a Defense Intelligence Agency memorandum in August 2002 rejecting the claims by a rogue intelligence analysis shop at the Pentagon that the meeting was an example of a "known contact" between Iraq and al Qaida.

That brings us to the March 13, 2003 cable. It is unfortunate that I cannot fully lay out the contents of that cable, because much of it remains classified. But as the Senate Intelligence Committee's 2006 "Phase II" report indicates, it appears that the cable was sent in response to a request from headquarters at Langley for comment on the claim that Atta and al-Ani had met in Prague because the White House

was considering a reference to a Prague meeting in a speech. At that time, according to then-CIA Director George Tenet's memoir, the CIA had been given a draft of a speech by Vice President Cheney containing assertions about connections between Iraq and al Qaida. Tenet writes in his memoir that he had to object to the President that the speech went "way beyond what the intelligence shows. We cannot support the speech and it should not be given."

The text of this cable and the information surrounding it was almost entirely redacted by the CIA from the Intelligence Committee's 2006 Phase II report. A number of us objected to that redaction at the time the report was made public; indeed, the Majority Leader introduced legislation which I cosponsored that would have declassified the cable, legislation Republicans blocked. At the time of the report's release, I joined several members of the Intelligence Committee, including Ranking Member ROCKEFELLER, Senators FEINSTEIN, WYDEN, Bayh, MIKULSKI and Feingold, in concluding that the administration's decision to keep the contents of the cable classified "represents an improper use of classification authority by the intelligence community to shield the White House."

In the years since I have sought declassification of the March 2003 CIA cable on numerous occasions. Twice, in 2011 and 2012, I wrote to then-CIA Director Petraeus asking him to declassify the cable. Then in February 2013, I asked Director Brennan during his confirmation hearing whether he would contact the Czech government to ask if they would object to declassification of the cable, and he responded, "Absolutely, Senator, I will."

Despite his commitment, I heard nothing from Director Brennan for some time. Finally, in March of this year, more than a year after his public commitment to me, I received a letter from Director Brennan.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that Director Brennan's March 13, 2014, letter to me be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DIRECTOR,
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY,
Washington, DC, March 13, 2014.

Hon. CARL LEVIN,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: At my confirmation hearing you requested that I pursue declassification of a 2003 communication related to an alleged meeting between Mohammed Atta and an Iraqi intelligence officer, which was referenced in the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence's September 2006 report entitled *Postwar Findings about Iraq's WMD Programs and Links to Terrorism and How They Compare with Prewar Assessments*.

I understand that your principal concern is that the historical record be as complete as possible regarding this period in our history, and on this point we are in agreement. The American people deserve as full an under-

standing as possible of these historical events, consistent with the national security interests of the United States. Consequently, having worked with our declassification review experts, I can confirm the following information, which describes the substance of what the communication relayed with respect to the meeting at issue, without compromising national security:

On 13 March 2003, CIA headquarters received a communication from the field responding to a request that the field look into a single-source intelligence report indicating that Mohammed Atta met with former Iraqi intelligence officer al-Ani in Prague in April 2001. In that communication, the field expressed significant concern regarding the possibility of an official public statement by the United States Government indicating that such a meeting took place. The communication noted that information received after the single-source report raised serious doubts about that report's accuracy.

In particular, the field noted that while it remained possible that a meeting between Atta and al-Ani took place, investigative records subsequently placed Atta in the United States just before and just after the date on which the single-source report said the meeting was to have occurred, making it unlikely that Atta was in Prague at the time of the alleged meeting. The field also warned that both FBI and CIA had previously told foreign intelligence officials that they were skeptical that Atta was in Prague. Finally, the field observed that "identifications" like the one that was made by the source of the earlier report, during a period of high emotion four months after the September 11 attacks, could be faulty and would require further evidence. The field added that, to its knowledge, "there is not one USG [counterterrorism] or FBI expert that . . . has said they have evidence or 'know' that [Atta] was indeed [in Prague]. In fact, the analysis has been quite the opposite."

I hope this letter answers any outstanding questions about the correspondence in question and addresses our shared interest in creating an accurate and complete historical record.

Sincerely,

JOHN O. BRENNAN.

Mr. LEVIN. The letter contains no indication that he had asked the Czech government for its view, as he committed to do. But Director Brennan's letter includes, and therefore finally declassifies, this very clear statement from the cable: "[T]here is not one USG [counterterrorism] or FBI expert that . . . has said they have evidence or 'know' that [Atta] was indeed [in Prague]. In fact, the analysis has been quite the opposite."

Again, that cable was sent to CIA headquarters on March 13, 2003—a week before our invasion of Iraq. But the Vice President of the United States, Dick Cheney, continued to suggest the meeting may have taken place. He said the following about the meeting on "Meet the Press" on September 14, 2003—6 months after CIA received that cable: "We've never been able to develop any more of that yet either in terms of confirming it or discrediting it. We just don't know." Here is what he told the Denver Post newspaper on January 9, 2004: "We've never been able to collect any more information on that. That was the one that possibly tied the two together to 9/11." Here is what he told CNN on June 17, 2004: "We

have never been able to confirm that, nor have we been able to knock it down. We just don't know."

Mr. President, those statements were simply not true. We did know. We did know that there was no evidence that such a meeting had taken place. We did know there was ample evidence it did not take place. We did know that there was, as the CIA cable says, "not one" government expert who said there was evidence that Atta met with Iraqi intelligence in Prague. The Vice President recklessly disregarded the truth, and he did so in a way calculated to maintain support for the administration's decision to go to war in Iraq.

There is a second recent revelation about how the "Prague meeting" progressed from unsubstantiated report to justification for war. It comes from Jiri Ruzek, who headed the Czech counterintelligence service on and after 9/11. Mr. Ruzek published a memoir earlier this year, which we have had translated from Czech. It recounts the days after the terror attack, including how his nation's intelligence services first reported a single-source rumor of a Prague meeting between Atta and al-Ani, how CIA officials under pressure from CIA headquarters in turn pressured him to substantiate the rumor, and how U.S. officials pressured the Czech government when Czech intelligence officials failed to produce the confirmation that the Bush administration sought.

Mr. Ruzek writes:

It was becoming more and more clear that we had not met expectations and did not provide the 'right' intelligence output.

Mr. Ruzek continues:

The Americans showed me that anything can be violated, including the rules that they themselves taught us. Without any regard to us, they used our intelligence information for propaganda press leaks. They wanted to mine certainty from unconfirmed suspicion and use it as an excuse for military action. We were supposed to play the role of useful idiot thanks to whose initiative a war would be started.

That is chilling. We have a senior intelligence official of a friendly nation describing the pressure that he and other Czech officials were under to give the Bush administration material it could use to justify a war.

When it came to the most serious decision a government can make—the decision to commit our sons and daughters to battle—the Bush administration was playing games with intelligence. The full, still classified cable includes critically important, relevant information, and it has been redacted and denied to the public in order to protect those in the Bush White House who are responsible.

The March 13, 2003, cable is an invaluable record in helping the American people understand how their elected officials conducted themselves in going to war. Continuing to cloak this document with a veil of secrecy, revealing a few sentences at a time, allows those who misled the American people to continue escaping the full

verdict of history. It deprives the American people of a complete understanding of how we came to invade Iraq. In his letter to me, Director Brennan writes, "I understand that your principal concern is that the historical record be as complete as possible regarding this period in our history, and on this point we are in agreement." But Director Brennan's apparent refusal to do what he has committed to do—to ask the Czech government if it objects to release of the cable—now takes on the character of a continuing cover-up.

I believe decisionmakers should have to face the full, unadulterated, unredacted truth about their decisions. The American people should know the full story, not just so we can understand the decisions in 2002 and 2003 that took us to war, but as a warning to future leaders against the misuse of intelligence and the abuse of power.

Very briefly, what I am doing in this statement, which is now in the record, is I am asking CIA Director Brennan to fully declassify a March 13, 2003 cable from CIA field officers to headquarters. This cable provides information about the Bush administration's campaign to build public support for the Iraq invasion.

One part of that campaign was the repeated misleading suggestion that Mohammed Atta, leader of the 9/11 hijackers, had met with an Iraqi intelligence official in Prague.

I received a letter from Director Brennan making public for the first time some of the cable's contents. He quotes the cable as saying:

There is not one USG [counterterrorism] or FBI expert that . . . has said they have evidence or "know" that [Atta] was indeed [in Prague]. In fact, the analysis has been quite the opposite.

In my statement just entered into the RECORD, I also discussed recent revelations by the former head of the Czech intelligence agency about U.S. pressure to confirm the report of that meeting.

The American people deserve to know the full truth about this episode and particularly in light of the new revelations from a top Czech official.

I have renewed my request to Director Brennan to declassify the entire cable.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

FAREWELL TO THE SENATE

Ms. LANDRIEU. Madam President, it is my pleasure to take a few minutes on the floor to give a farewell message, and I thank you for your courtesies. I begin with a Scripture, Philippians 4:7, New American Standard Bible, that reads: "And the peace of God, which surpasses all comprehension, will guard your hearts and your minds in Christ Jesus."

Truly for the first time in my adult life I have felt that extraordinary peace about something that was unexpected, but is certainly something that

I accept. It has really been amazing as a Christian, as an adult, and as a leader to find myself in this place in a time that should be a time of sadness, but all I can feel is actual joy. It is quite amazing.

It has never happened to me before, so I thought it would be wonderful to share—with so many of my friends, supporters, family, staff, and colleagues listening in—for a few minutes to say that it is absolutely true, and I am a testimony to this extraordinary peace since just a few days before the election and since then. I think it is because I feel and know that God has called me to another place.

Before being a Senator, a wife, and a daughter, I am a Christian, and my faith really is central to my life. My parents always taught me to put my faith where it belongs—in God himself. So it is really with that sense of gratitude and joy that I have been given an opportunity to serve my State, my region, and my country for now almost 34 years—which is quite amazing—having started at a very young age and still being relatively young.

So let me just share some remarks about that time, and particularly the time here in the Senate. I want to begin by thanking my family, and particularly my extraordinary husband Frank, who has been a partner and, as I said on election night, not only an encouraging and supportive partner but one who has literally egged me on. When I wanted to quit, he would say: No, you have to continue to serve. He is not only an accomplished lawyer and professional, but also an elected official in his own right, he came from a family that was dedicated to public service, having both of his parents being very active in party politics—first the Republican Party and then the Democratic Party. But that is a whole other story. They are both strong civil rights leaders—my husband as well—and always encouraging me and being willing to share the burdens of public life as well as sharing in the great joy.

Our son Connor is now 23 years old, and our daughter Mary Shannon is now 17. The reason I mention that is because Connor was 5 when we were elected to the Senate. Mary Shannon was adopted the first year we were here. On election night, she looked at me—and she is just so beautiful at 17—and she said: Mom, it is going to be a little strange. I have only known you as a Senator. So I warned her that now that I am going to be a full-time mom this is going to be a real problem for her. She is not looking forward to it.

To our new daughter-in-law Emily, and especially to our precious little Maddox Parker Snellings, who many people saw on election night—now, Maddox gets the distinction. He is 10 months old, but he gives me the most joy, and I used to keep a picture of him during all my debates. There were only three, as you all will remember, but I would keep a picture of him because

my staff kept telling me: You have to smile more. I kept saying: But I can't, because I am really aggravated. They said: No, you have to smile. So my solution was to put a picture of Maddox on my podium and, of course, I then smiled through the whole debate. That is a trick for those who will be continuing to debate.

To my mother and father, who are the light of not only our family but the light of our community, the light of the Nation in many ways—they had 9 children, 37 grandchildren, and now 6 great grandchildren. They are in wonderful health, they are watching right now, and I can only say they are two of the most extraordinary individuals I have ever known. Our family is truly blessed by their sacrificial leadership.

Let me also mention my eight siblings—eight brothers and sisters: Mark, Melanie, Michelle, Mitchell, Madeleine, Martin, Melinda, and Maurice, Jr.—all m's. That is another story. There are all of our spouses, my nieces and nephews, who campaigned with me up until the last day. My godchild Sasha literally knocked on doors with me. I was teaching her how to knock on doors before the campaign was over so the tradition could carry on in our own neighborhood where we have lived since I was 5 years old—Broadmoor in New Orleans.

When I first got here 18 years ago, I literally could not find the side door. I didn't know anything. I wasn't even expecting to be here. It was kind of like a dream that I got here, because I had run for Governor, wanted to be the Governor, and served 16 years in my State. I knew that was what I was being called to do—and I see LAMAR ALEXANDER—to change our education system, to do some coastal work, and then I landed here. But I literally knew nothing of how to be a Senator.

I stumbled a great deal in my first years. But I want to thank my chiefs of staff, Norma Jane Sabiston, Ron Faucheux, Jason Matthews, Jane Campbell, and Don Cravins. I had five of the most remarkable chiefs of staff, who, with me, learned how to do this job and to do it well. We never forget where we came from, and they are still—all of them—with me, and all of us are still working to make our State the very best that it can be and to make our country the very best that it can be.

To three staffers who have been with me for almost 20 years—Alicia Williams is the longest serving office manager, I think, in the Senate. She was here when I arrived and stayed with me. She was with Bennett Johnston. T. Bradley Keith has been with me for 22 years as a former staffer in a former life, before I was a Senator, and now as my long-time State director. And Shannon Langlois has been, I think, with the Senate for almost 30 years. She is a caseworker. She was, again, with Bennett Johnston and stayed with me. She has literally given her life to thousands, hundreds of thousands of

cases in Louisiana and trained every caseworker that I had for 18 years, and they just did phenomenal work.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD my current staff, all of whom are here—my personal staff, my energy staff, and my homeland security staff.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PERSONAL STAFF OF MARY LANDRIEU

Alexander Damato, Alex Sewell, Alicia Williams, Alyson Azodeh, Andrew Holleman, Ashley Scott, Christina Jones, Christopher Etienne, DerKirra Wilkerson, Don Cravins, Eva Kemp-Melder, Jaren Hill, James "Wes" Kungel, Jim Simpson, Katie Lewallen, Lauren Spangler, Leslie Leavoy, Libby Whitbeck, Matthew Lehner, Marianna Knister, Megan Blanco.

Rob Sawicki, Ross Nodurft, Will Harris, Whitney Reitz, Zach Butterworth, Zephrairie Buetow, Kelsey Teo, Meghann Morin, Shannon Langlois, T. Bradley Keith, Terrence Lockett, Sherree Hunter, Laverne Saulny, Cathleen Berthelot, Zach Monroe, Tani Bradford, LeNelle Williford, Michael Jackson, Mark Herbert, Darlene Manuel.

ENERGY COMMITTEE STAFF

Elizabeth "Liz" Craddock, Afton Zaunbrecher, Aisha Johnson, Allen Paul Stayman, Bryan Petit, Caroline Bruckner, Clayton Allen, Dan Adamson, Darla Ripchensky, David Brooks, David Gillers, Dominic Taylor, Elizabeth Weiner, Fanyisha Matthews, Herman Bubba Gesser, III, Jan Brunner, Jonathon Burpee, Kristen Granier, Lindsay McDonough, Mark Tiner, Megan Brewster, Meghan Conklin, Paul Davis, Renae Black, Sallie Derr, Sam Edward Fowler, Sa'Rah Hamm, Will Dempster.

HOMELAND APPROPRIATIONS STAFF

Stephanie Gupta, Drenan Dudley, Scott Nance, Chip Walgren, Colin MacDermott, Eric Bader.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Madam President, I want to thank Don Cravins, again, as my chief of staff; Liz Craddock, Staff Director of my energy committee; and Stephanie Gupta, head of homeland security. I know I am leaving them in good hands with what they are going to be doing in the future and with the great leadership that remains here.

I only have a few minutes, so I will just run through a couple of the highlights of some of the accomplishments that I am most proud of and really take this opportunity to thank so many who helped, because the one thing I have learned that most certainly is true, is that if you want to accomplish really big things here—really great things, generational things—you most certainly cannot do that alone. So the first thing you need to do is look for a really good partner—and I mean a partner that will be with you through thick and thin. Sometimes you are lucky enough to find those kinds of partners, and I found them on both sides of the aisle.

The first major piece of legislation I introduced was something that was in my heart for so long, and that was the Conservation and Reinvestment Act. The cosponsors of that bill, amazingly, were Frank Murkowski from Alaska, Trent Lott from Mississippi, John

Breaux from Louisiana, and Senator DIANNE FEINSTEIN from California. Chris Dodd joined me a few days later after we introduced it—and RON WYDEN, Chris Bond, John Warner, and THAD COCHRAN, just to name a few.

At the end of this effort—although this particular bill didn't pass; we missed it literally by inches, and I will describe what that was in a minute—we had 4,500 organizations throughout the country, from the Sierra Club to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and everyone in between in a broad coalition to fund the Land and Water Conservation Fund—and LAMAR ALEXANDER knows more about this than I could ever know, and he will tell you one day the details about the Land and Water Conservation Fund. The Udalls and the Udalls' fathers were very instrumental in the creation of the Land and Water Conservation Fund. It was a promise made but never kept—that this country would set aside about \$900 million a year to purchase land, to build our parks, and to secure recreational opportunities. This country is so blessed—more than any on Earth—with the amount of natural resources we have, and we have not lived up to that promise.

So I introduced this bill as a young legislator. John Breaux said you don't even know what you are doing; how are you introducing a bill like this? I said: I don't know, but I am just going for it because I believe in it. So we never passed it, but it has been in part of almost every piece of energy legislation—in pieces and parts since that day we introduced that. I am very hopeful that war will go on under Senator MURKOWSKI, the daughter of Frank Murkowski, and MARIA CANTWELL, who in many ways got to the Senate because she defeated one of the gentlemen who opposed us on this bill and used it as a platform to get here. So I know she will be committed to finishing the work.

The bill did three things. It fully funded the Land and Water Conservation Fund, a trust fund that will go on for generations. It would fully fund coastal restoration, which is so important not just to Louisiana, because we are literally falling away into the Gulf of Mexico, but it will help SHELDON WHITEHOUSE in his work. It will help DICK DURBIN along the Great Lakes, and it will help CORY BOOKER in New Jersey. If you allocate the funding correctly, it will be grants that these coastal communities can use until we figure out how to clean our atmosphere and how to stop the tremendous pressures that are coming on our coast. Louisiana knows this. We have experienced the worst disasters literally in the history of our country, and they are only getting worse. I will talk about that more in a minute.

But it was because we had laid the groundwork for CARA, Pete Domenici literally felt so sorry for me—he knew how hard we had worked and the coalition was so disappointed when we

lost—that he directed, literally with the stroke of a pen, \$1 billion to the gulf coast in the energy bill for 2005. That money was divided 50 percent to Louisiana and 50 percent to the other States.

Now, I can promise everyone here that for the \$500 million that went to Louisiana, we can account for every penny of it. We know exactly where it went, and we put that down as a downpayment to restoring our coast, which doesn't just belong to us—it belongs to the whole Nation. This is the greatest, the seventh largest delta on the planet. It is what Thomas Jefferson leveraged the whole entire Treasury of the United States to purchase. It is something worth fighting for. We would not be a country without the Mississippi Delta, and we could never have found our way west if we couldn't have supplied the great center of this Nation with the commerce they needed.

Every State along this river—19 of them—use this river and understand what I am talking about. AMY KLOBUCHAR understands this. She is at the top of this river, and I am at the bottom, and we have talked a lot about how important that corridor is. That needs to continue.

Then there was the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act, which I finally passed with Pete Domenici's help, who was my dear friend and one of the most wonderful leaders I have ever worked with. He came from a family with eight children. We had nine, and we are both Catholic and came from the same sort of background. He served with such passion. So he joined with me in passing the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act, which finally secured a permanent stream of revenue for coastal restoration and protection.

But as LAMAR ALEXANDER knows, it left out the land and water, and it left out wildlife. We just couldn't lift it all, so that needs to be corrected.

Finally, there is the RESTORE Act, which I worked on with my colleagues when the BP oil spill killed 11 people in the gulf and spilled 5 million barrels of oil in the gulf. Thanks go to BARBARA BOXER, this extraordinary woman who has been a partner with me. We think very differently about the world. We see things very differently. California is very different from Louisiana. But I will say one thing about BARBARA BOXER. If I had to be in a foxhole with someone, I would want to be with her because she never stops fighting. She and I are very much alike in that regard. Once we set our minds to something there is no dividing us.

People asked why did I send her money for her reelection? Why did I raise so much money from Louisiana? I said that I would do it again because when no one would stand up—well, not no one, but if she hadn't stood up when that BP oil spill went down, and said, I am chair of this committee and I believe the gulf coast deserves this funding, we just wouldn't have had it. It is as simple as that. People do not know

how powerful a chairman is here. When a chairman makes up their mind and they say this is what we are going to do, the rest of the committee, for the most part, goes along. And so BARBARA said that.

With Senator VITTER, of course, who is the ranking member on that committee put his shoulder to the wheel, and we were able to get—well, it is still in court, but we think—a serious downpayment to recover from one of the great ecological disasters of our State, of our country, which is the loss of the gulf coast. This just isn't in Louisiana. This is Texas and Mississippi, and it is going to affect parts of the whole country. But we are on the mend.

I came here to do that work. I came to find money. I found it, and we are going to continue that work. I am thrilled to work with so many of you to get that done.

On education—LAMAR has to leave, but I am glad he is here because I found a great soulmate in LAMAR ALEXANDER—former Secretary of Education, former Governor, a Presidential candidate, and absolutely extraordinarily committed to finding a better way for our children in America to be educated. As proud as we are of the public school system, at the turn of the century, when people in the world were wondering how to build the middle class in the world and lots of countries were struggling with how to do that, America knew. America knew that if you educated your citizens—women, boys, and girls; not just boys, which is what half the world still does, which is a tragedy—if we open up our schools for universal, free education, along with other things, it would lift your country to greatness unsurpassed in the history of the world.

What breaks my heart is to walk into schools today—and MARK WARNER knows this because he was Governor of Virginia—and see children's eyes just completely dulled, sitting there completely bored, teachers who are just sort of going through the motions. It breaks my heart because I know that not only does it limit their lives but it limits the potential of our Nation.

With LAMAR ALEXANDER and a handful of Democrats, I was proud to work with Presidents Bill Clinton and George Bush to pass a series of laws. Evan Bayh comes to mind, Joe Lieberman, John Breaux, and a group of us stood up and said: It is time to stop sending money to the States without accountability. If we need to send money, we need to hold States accountable, and we need to give opportunities for choice to parents and public charter schools.

I am reluctant to go too far on vouchers. You have heard my speech on that. You heard Senator FEINSTEIN's speech on that. But both of us have agreed to support some kinds of strategic vouchers that help poor kids get out of failing schools until we can fix them.

Most importantly, I support high-performing public charter schools, and

I will continue to fight that for the rest of my days. I thank all of you who helped on that and particularly TOM CARPER on the Democratic side and LAMAR ALEXANDER. CORY BOOKER has been an amazing leader and will hopefully continue on that. I thank DICK DURBIN, who is on Appropriations. I had to twist his arm a little bit on some of it, but he ended up coming around and has been an amazing fighter for the right kinds of public schools that serve the children first and the bureaucracy and administration second. I respect teachers. I respect administrators. But our schools should work for the children and their families who so desperately want them to have a great education.

The third issue I wish to speak about, which is a legacy issue, is adoption. I hope I can get through this without tearing up. I don't know why I always had such passion for this issue.

My mother had nine children without one single problem. As a young child, I remember my aunt adopted two children. I think it might have been that; I can't remember exactly. I started to think about all the children in the world who don't have parents. Maybe I was just always so proud when I filled out those forms in Catholic school. I can remember sitting there filling them out: Are your parents divorced or married? I loved checking "married." How many siblings do you have? I loved putting "eight." I was always so proud of my family.

I thought, what do children without parents do? I just could not imagine. So I got very passionate about it. I ended up, of all things, marrying an orphan. My husband was adopted out of an orphanage. So I thought, yes, this is going in the right direction. I thought I would adopt children. I thought he could not say no since he himself was adopted, and so this would work out. Sure enough, we ended up adopting two children.

But this was my passion before I met my husband and before I even thought about adopting. It was as if God put this in my heart, so I have taken it and carried it.

I thank DAVE CAMP; Jim Oberstar, who is deceased; Tom Bliley from Virginia, who is a great leader among us; Larry Craig, who is no longer here, who served as my cochair; and Senator Jesse Helms. Amazingly, I didn't know to be afraid of Jesse Helms; I thought he was a really nice guy. Later, everybody had to tell me how hard he was to get along with. But I went up to him, and I thought he would surely want to help because he had adopted a child. I don't think a lot of people realize that. Sure enough he did, and we passed a great treaty together that serves as the model for international adoption today. JOE BIDEN was the ranking member on the committee. With Jesse Helms's and JOE BIDEN's support, we passed a great treaty years ago, and we are still in the process of making that possible and working it through.

The accomplishments are really quite long, so I am going to submit them for the RECORD. I will only say that the adoption tax credit which BOB CASEY worked on and took up that cause when he got here—I am thrilled and hope we can keep it. I would like to say to AMY KLOBUCHAR how much I appreciate her agreeing to step in and take over the leadership of the adoption caucus on this side and ROY BLUNT, who I think will take it up on the Republican side and continue this great work.

There are over 100,000 children who are waiting for families in the United States. There are over 500,000 children in foster care. These children think it is their fault they are there, and it is not. It is not their fault that their family disintegrated around them. It is not their fault that they got pregnant at 11 and were kicked out of their house. Instead of the family wrapping that child in their arms and helping them to grow, they just kicked them out on the street. It is not their fault.

We need to realize that God does not make trash. He never has, and he never will. Everybody he has made has a purpose and dignity, and we need to honor that and do better work. I have spent a lot of time here on it. I am going to continue to do so. I will never stop working on it. I am very proud of the work we have done.

I will put the rest into the RECORD.

On energy very quickly and then finally disaster recovery, I couldn't have been prouder when I became the chair of this committee. It was quite a miracle. I didn't expect it. I never thought I would last long enough to become the chair because there were so many people ahead of me. It kind of worked out when Max Baucus left to go to China and TIM JOHNSON was retiring that it fell to me. It has been my great joy for 9 months to serve as chair, with LISA MURKOWSKI as my ranking member. Of course, I worked with her father. I didn't sit next to him because I was a junior member, but I worked with him closely, and it has been wonderful working with her. I am so proud that MARIA CANTWELL will step up and take that leadership. I know the two of them work beautifully together. They do see the world differently, but they are two women who know how to compromise and who will be respectful of each other and find a way for our country to move forward.

I can tell you all that in my whole life—which isn't that long, but it has been a pretty good run in public office—there has never been a time when America has been closer to energy independence. What that means to our country is beyond description. We don't have to listen to parts of the world that don't hold our values. We can lift up our country. We can move forward. And it has to be with a combination of fossil fuels, weaning our way to a greener, cleaner environment, and manufacturing right here in America.

I hope you all will put down the swords and pick up the plow and really plow together because this is an amazing opportunity for our country. I sure hope we don't miss it. It is going to benefit and make the whole country, not just our part of the country, more prosperous.

People desperately want to move up into the middle class and stay there and not feel so fragile and feel as if they can have the manufacturing jobs and good energy jobs and really eliminate some of the geopolitical nightmares we have been in, fighting wars for oil. It has to come to an end.

Finally, I will say a word about disaster recovery. When I got to the Senate, my husband and I were looking at each other saying: How did we even end up here? We had no idea. When Katrina hit, it became very clear that this is why I needed to be here.

I had been an appropriator since I was 23 years old. I knew a little bit about budgets. I knew a little bit about how the system worked. I knew how the State and local governments depended on the Federal Government so much funding. I understood the power of HUD and the power of housing and the power of building schools and levees and the Corps of Engineers. So I was perfectly positioned to be able to lead the effort for my State, and they desperately needed a leader. I wasn't perfect. I made lots of mistakes. But I wasn't afraid to try because that is all you can do.

The devastation was so great and it was so unbelievable. Eighty percent of the east bank of the city and much of Jefferson Parish—not quite as bad as New Orleans—and all of St. Bernard—67,000 people in St. Bernard lost everything. Everyone in the Lower Ninth Ward lost everything, which is like a small city unto itself. In New Orleans east, which is like a small city unto itself, 60,000 people lost every school, every house. It was unbelievable.

I say to my colleagues: Thank you for being there for us. I know I aggravated you to death. I know I never stopped asking. But you were the only hope because there was just no way these communities could recover. New Orleans has been there for 300 years. You have heard me say this: We didn't move down there recently to go sunbathing or to build condos; we have been down there for 300 years. The city is going to stay there. The region is going to stay there. And had this government just invested a little bit of the money back that we have given it over time—from our energy resources, from our manufacturing, from the wealth we have created along that great mouth of the river—if the country had just given us a little bit of money—\$500 million here, \$500 million there—and built levees that wouldn't have broken in 52 places, we wouldn't have had \$140 billion in damage.

So when I came to Robert Byrd because President Bush was not that forward-leaning—I will just leave it at

that. There will be a lot more in my book about it, but I will just leave it at that, not very forward-leaning. The person I went to was Robert Byrd. In his old age, he was so wise. He just looked at me. He didn't say much at that time, but he just took my hand and he said: I will be there with you.

He was the chair of the Appropriations Committee, so that meant something. Boy, he was. He helped me write things in a bill that could probably never be possible today. That was when chairmen understood the power to help people to heal wounds and to bring hope and to be compassionate. That is what government is there to do. If government is not there when you have lost everything, then what in the heck is the use of having it?

So we hope we will be able to repay this country for the investments that have been made, and we will. We will do our best. With all of the people who come to New Orleans and all the conventions that come—and we hope we bring joy and happiness when people come—we hope to pay our way and to pay this back over time for what you have done to help us. We are doing a good job of helping ourselves by planning better, doing more smart-growth, sustainable development, building our levees to the point where they won't break again, and we will continue to do that.

So those are some of the legacy pieces I have worked on. It is kind of amazing that these were the things that were in my heart when I was a little girl. I didn't learn this when I was a Senator. I can remember taking a bus when I was in the eighth grade down to the coast and looking at LaFourche Parish for the first time, and for a girl from the poor part of uptown, I kept looking at the nuns who took me, and I said: What world is this? I had no idea about Bayou LaFourche.

When I got to be a Senator, I remembered LaFourche, the bayou, and I remembered how fragile it looked to me even as a child, and I thought, if I can do anything to save this place, I will. I have spent a lot of my time saving it, and it is stronger now. It is still not completely safe, but it is much stronger now.

I tutored in public school. My passion started when the nuns of Ursuline sent me to tutor in a public school, and the little girl whom I tutored, who was my age, couldn't read. I can remember going home to my mother and saying: This is the strangest thing. I just met a little girl. She is my age, and she can't read. Mama, is that possible, that children don't know how to read?

I can remember her sitting me down and explaining to me why some children couldn't read, and I said: That doesn't seem right to me. I made up my mind then that I would work.

The reason I say this is because there are a lot of young people listening to this, and I just want you to know, just listen to your heart because God puts these things in your heart at very

young ages. If you don't block it out, if you are not cynical and if you hope and live openly, those dreams can come true. Then you can make a profound difference in rebuilding a school system, which I am continuing to work on, or make sure every orphan in the world knows that they are loved and that we are going to work hard to find them a family; to build this great gulf coast, where I spent my life growing up as a child and knowing that it is worth saving. It may not be as sexy as the west coast or as prosperous as the east coast, but the gulf coast is really worth fighting for. It is a very special place in our country. I learned to love it as a child, and I will fight for it as an adult.

Finally, let me just say a few thank-yous in closing. A thank-you to my mentor Lindy Boggs, who coached me every step of the way; to my mentor John Breaux, who got me into this gig in the first place.

I thank Bennett Johnston, who taught me about being a proud member of the Energy Committee; Senator Tom Daschle, who saved my skin more times than I can tell you; Kent Conrad, who taught me about the budget; Chris John and Jim McCreery and Richard Baker in my delegation, who were Democrats and Republicans—we worked together to do amazing things. I also thank CEDRIC RICHMOND, who still works closely with me, and CHARLES BOUSTANY, whom I admire a lot. I thank other Members who are no longer here: Olympia Snowe—we were the first two women to chair a major committee—well, actually a minor committee, the small business committee; and Lisa and I were the first to chair and be a ranking member of a major committee. I couldn't have worked with two more remarkable women. I thank Senator Joe Lieberman, who was a leader of the DLC and a great mentor of mine on foreign policy issues; Senator Ted Stevens, who was as grumpy as could be but really did take me under his wing and teach me a lot; Senator Danny Inouye; Senator Robert Byrd. And I am going to put others into the RECORD: Senators MIKULSKI, CARPER, HEITKAMP, MANCHIN, CANTWELL, BEGICH, PRYOR, and HAGAN.

I want to say a special word to the Black Caucus. I represent 30 percent African Americans in my State. You know, all groups of people are hard to represent, and my State is so diverse, and I have tried so hard to be respectful of all the different groups in my State.

I thank the Black Caucus—both the local elected officials and the National Black Caucus—for being such a great partner with me and helping me to understand about compassion, forgiveness, faithfulness, and for trust. Their spiritual strength is so amazing. I thank them very much for coming down to help me.

I thank labor, who brought me here. They encouraged me to run when I was 23 years old, and I tried to never leave

them. Only 8 percent of my State is now organized. I have never left them. I think you should leave with the people who brought you to the dance, and they most certainly did.

I thank HARRY REID, who has been an amazing friend to me and who, most importantly, has been a great friend to my family. He has honored us in so many small ways, and I just love him for his tenacity and his leadership.

I thank you all. I hope I didn't leave anyone out. It has been a joy, but I know God is calling me to a different place. I am not the least bit sad and I am not the least bit afraid because it has been a remarkable opportunity to serve with all of you, and I thank you very much.

(Applause, Senators rising.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALSH). The Senator from Louisiana.

TRIBUTE TO MARY LANDRIEU

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I rise to thank Senator LANDRIEU for her tireless service in the U.S. Senate to our State and to the country. I have had the pleasure of knowing MARY for a long time. She was in her second year of service in the Senate when I first came to Washington to the U.S. House, but it is far longer than that, probably longer than anyone in this Chamber realizes. Both sets of my grandparents live all of 3 blocks from where MARY grew up, and I grew up all of 10 blocks from there. MARY and my brother Jeff were grammar school classmates starting at kindergarten.

Of course, here in the Senate I had the honor of working with MARY on so many important issues and challenges. From the moment we worked together on key Louisiana issues, we determined on those issues to put aside any partisan concerns when those crucial priorities were at stake.

As she alluded to, the most challenging and trying time in all of that experience was just a few months after I first came to the Senate when Hurricanes Katrina and Rita struck. Neither of us could have ever imagined facing the challenges our State and Mississippi and others faced and facing the challenges we faced in the Senate trying to respond in a robust and full and responsible way. I am sure it was the most trying work for both of us in our careers.

Louisiana faced unprecedented disaster and desperation, and that brought us together all the more to work for those crucial Louisiana needs and priorities. We traveled together, of course, to see the damage and meet with our neighbors and local leaders all around the State. Her staff and mine worked directly together around-the-clock, really, for months, sometimes in my office, sometimes in hers, always with the same goal of doing everything possible to help our neighbors and Louisiana citizens get through that disaster and get through to a full recovery.

Those trials, of course, didn't end with Katrina and Rita. There were

other similar challenges which brought us together and on which MARY was a distinguished leader. She was always a champion for domestic energy production, and Louisiana will enjoy a far fairer share of oil and gas revenue under the legislation commonly referred to as Domenici-Landrieu.

After the infamous BP oilspill in 2010, MARY pushed for the RESTORE Act legislation to dedicate revenue from the fines to oilspill recovery in the affected areas.

As Louisiana fights continually against the loss of coastal wetlands, major restoration work is moving forward because of MARY's years of hard work directly related to that.

Due to MARY's strong support of our Nation's military, our fighting men and women are better off. The bases in Louisiana, which are important to our communities and to the Nation's defense, continue to have what they need for their vital mission. Our veterans face challenges and most recently faced the crying need for new health care clinics in Louisiana, and MARY helped make those finally happen, finally move forward, including pushing the case fervently and directly to administration officials.

In a very personal and dramatic way, MARY is enthusiastic in promoting children's welfare and supporting adoption. Her dedication internationally was recognized when Russia banned her travel after her direct and well-founded criticism of Russia's action to curb adoption by Americans.

In all of this work, one thing is always crystal clear—certainly crystal clear to me—with Senator LANDRIEU: Louisiana has always been first in her heart and her top motivation, and she has had a distinguished career of service in the Senate on all of those issues I mentioned and many more. All of us in Louisiana gives her our sincere thanks for that.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Thank you, Mr. President.

With Senator MARY LANDRIEU's permission, I want to do a quick interlude to send a bill over to the House.

CENTRAL OREGON JOBS AND WATER SECURITY ACT

Mr. MERKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the energy committee be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 2640 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

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

The clerk will report the bill by title. The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2640) to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to adjust the Crooked River boundary, to provide water certainty for the City of Prineville, Oregon, and for other purposes.