

Tester
Udall

Warner
Warren

Whitehouse
Wyden

Udall
Warner

Warren
Whitehouse

Wicker
Wyden

NOT VOTING—1

Vitter

The conference report was agreed to.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF A RULE SUB- MITTED BY THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD— VETO

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Chair lay before the Senate the veto message to accompany S.J. Res. 8.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the veto message.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Veto message to accompany S.J. Res. 8, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the National Labor Relations Board relating to representation case procedures.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to table the veto message to accompany S.J. Res. 8, and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DAINES). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 96, nays 3, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 172 Leg.]

YEAS—96

Alexander	Feinstein	Murkowski
Ayotte	Fischer	Murphy
Baldwin	Flake	Murray
Barrasso	Franken	Nelson
Bennet	Gardner	Paul
Blumenthal	Gillibrand	Perdue
Blunt	Graham	Peters
Booker	Hatch	Portman
Boozman	Heinrich	Reed
Boxer	Heitkamp	Reid
Brown	Heller	Risch
Burr	Hirono	Roberts
Cantwell	Hoeven	Rounds
Capito	Inhofe	Rubio
Cardin	Isakson	Sanders
Carper	Johnson	Sasse
Casey	Kaine	Schatz
Cassidy	King	Schumer
Coats	Kirk	Scott
Cochran	Klobuchar	Sessions
Collins	Lankford	Shaheen
Coons	Leahy	Shelby
Corker	Lee	Stabenow
Cornyn	Manchin	Sullivan
Cotton	Markey	Tester
Crapo	McCain	Thune
Daines	McCaskill	Tillis
Donnelly	McConnell	Toomey
Durbin	Menendez	
Enzi	Merkley	
Ernst	Mikulski	

NAYS—3

Grassley

Moran

NOT VOTING—1

Vitter

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

PROTECTING VOLUNTEER FIRE- FIGHTERS AND EMERGENCY RE- SPONDERS ACT—Resumed

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, what is the pending business before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is H.R. 1191, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1191) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

Pending:

Corker/Cardin amendment No. 1140, in the nature of a substitute.

Corker/Cardin amendment No. 1179 (to amendment No. 1140), to require submission of all Persian text included in the agreement.

Blunt amendment No. 1155 (to amendment No. 1140), to extend the requirement for annual Department of Defense reports on the military power of Iran.

Vitter modified amendment No. 1186 (to amendment No. 1179), to require an assessment of inadequacies in the international monitoring and verification system as they relate to a nuclear agreement with Iran.

Cotton amendment No. 1197 (to the language proposed to be stricken by amendment No. 1140), of a perfecting nature.

Cotton (for Rubio) amendment No. 1198 (to amendment No. 1197), to require a certification that Iran's leaders have publically accepted Israel's right to exist as a Jewish state.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the Corker amendment No. 1140 to the desk.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the Corker amendment No. 1140 to H.R. 1191, an act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

Mitch McConnell, Bob Corker, Joni Ernst, Rob Portman, Johnny Isakson, Shelley Moore Capito, Thad Cochran, Orrin G. Hatch, David Perdue, Daniel Coats, Jeff Flake, Kelly Ayotte, Cory Gardner, John Hoeven, Roger F. Wicker, John Thune, John Cornyn.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to H.R. 1191 to the desk.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on H.R. 1191, an act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

Mitch McConnell, Bob Corker, Joni Ernst, Rob Portman, Johnny Isakson, Shelley Moore Capito, Thad Cochran, Orrin G. Hatch, David Perdue, Daniel Coats, Jeff Flake, Kelly Ayotte, Cory Gardner, John Hoeven, Roger F. Wicker, John Thune, John Cornyn.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorums required under rule XXII be waived.

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

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

The Senator from Iowa.

U.S. MARSHALS SERVICE

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, the U.S. Marshals Service performs many important functions. Marshals protect Federal judges, they transport Federal prisoners, and they apprehend fugitives. The marshals operate the Witness Security Program, and they manage the Asset Forfeiture Program. The work is vital and sometimes even dangerous.

Given the important nature of the work, it is all the more essential that its leaders carry out their mission with integrity and openness. Unfortunately, the evidence suggests that there are serious questions about the leadership of the Marshals Service. The growing number of allegations brought to my office by whistleblowers is very alarming. It suggests there may be a pattern of mismanagement.

In several letters to the Justice Department, I have asked about multiple personnel actions allegedly driven by favoritism rather than merit.

The first example involves the Director of the U.S. Marshals Service, Stacia Hylton. In September 2011, Director Hylton sent an email from her personal email address to Kimberly Beal. At the time, Beal was the Deputy

Assistant Director of the Asset Forfeiture Division. The email included the resume of an applicant for a highly paid contractor position.

Beal apparently went to unusual lengths to ensure that the applicant, who knew Director Hylton in college, was hired. Emails indicate that Ms. Beal inserted herself into the hiring process even though a contractor representative told her the applicant was unqualified. She directed subordinates to remain silent about the applicant's lack of qualifications. Ms. Beal traveled to Boston to interview the applicant in person. According to the whistleblower, she did not travel to interview other candidates for similar positions.

After the contractor hired the applicant, Director Hylton placed Ms. Beal in the position of Acting Assistant Director of the Asset Forfeiture Division—a position she now holds permanently.

In yet another example, an Assistant Director reportedly directed subordinates to offer a lucrative contract position to a person with whom she allegedly had a personal relationship. Gamesmanship of this sort undermines the confidence of dedicated Marshals Service employees in their leaders.

I could go on and on with examples such as these that have been pouring into my office.

Another problem area is the alleged mismanagement of the Assets Forfeiture Fund. The law requires that proceeds generated from asset sales be used to operate the Asset Forfeiture Program, compensate victims, and support law enforcement. Yet, it appears that some in leadership use the funds to feather their own nests. Money is spent on the “best of the best” in office furnishings and decorations instead of what is really needed to enhance law enforcement. In one example, the fund was used to purchase a \$22,000 conference table. In another example, the fund was used to buy 57 square feet of top-of-the-line granite for the Asset Forfeiture Training Academy in Houston. The Marshals Service claims it cannot even figure out how much the granite cost. Whistleblowers say the official who approved it told the supplier that “cost was not a factor.” And that official has dismissed concerns about wasteful spending of asset forfeiture money on the grounds that it does not come from appropriated funds.

That is not responsible leadership. All money collected through the power of government needs to be spent carefully. Every dollar wasted on unnecessary luxuries in Marshals Services offices is a dollar that cannot be used to support real law enforcement priorities as the law requires. The proceeds of asset forfeitures should not be a slush fund for the personal whims of unaccountable bureaucrats.

How has the Justice Department responded to these allegations? When I asked the Department to explain the efforts to have Director Hylton's favor-

ite candidate hired by a contractor, the Department told me that Director Hylton “did not recommend” the applicant “for any position.” And the words “did not recommend for any position” is a quote.

The Marshals Service says it consulted with its Office of General Counsel before the Department sent its letter denying any improper hiring practices. That is disturbing because the Office of General Counsel has known about these allegations since December 2013. Still, the Justice Department told me that no one did anything wrong. Someone in the Marshals Service General Counsel's Office had an obligation to speak up before the Justice Department issued a false denial. They should have known better.

About 3 weeks later, the Department retracted its earlier denial. In a second response, the Department attached additional evidence that, in its words, “appears to be inconsistent with representations” that it had previously made. That evidence was an email chain showing that then-Deputy Assistant Beal had, in fact, received the applicant's resume from Director Hylton's personal email address. She then forwarded it to other senior leadership, stating that the “Director . . . highly recommends” the applicant. That evidence directly contradicts the denial that the Department initially sent to the Judiciary Committee.

You would think the Department would insist on an independent inquiry after being misled like that. Unfortunately, the Department is still allowing the Marshals Service to investigate itself. Justice Department headquarters is not doing its job when it fails to supervise components within DOJ. There needs to be better supervision and a truly independent inquiry to get to the bottom of these allegations.

Finally, I recognize the courageous whistleblowers who are bringing these shortcomings to Congress's attention. As often happens, many of these whistleblowers have faced retaliation for just speaking up, just telling the truth, just helping Congress do its constitutional responsibilities. But they have been retaliated against, and even today they fear more retaliation will come. Multiple whistleblowers allege that senior leaders submit FOIA requests to seek information on employees who may have made protected disclosures. How sneaky. This is not the purpose of the Freedom of Information Act. Multiple whistleblowers also allege that since receiving my letters, managers within the U.S. Marshals Service have been on the hunt for the identities of those who have made protected disclosures to my office. This behavior is absolutely unacceptable and contrary to the intent of whistleblower protection legislation. Maybe instead of spending time targeting the people who are trying to bring wrongdoing to light, the marshals should focus on providing full and accurate answers to my questions.

The work of the Marshals Service is vital. The men and women doing that work deserve not just our gratitude but our support as well. That support includes demanding responsible and accountable leadership from the Marshals Service.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

MEDICAID

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I rise to speak about one aspect of the budget debate that has been before us, and it involves a major program that affects the lives of not just millions of Americans but literally tens of millions.

We have debates and discussions in this body all the time about our commitment to children, our commitment to older citizens, and a whole range of folks we are concerned about. All of us at one time or another have made pronouncements about how important it is to support children, especially vulnerable children. We also are very concerned that as our parents or older relatives reach a certain age, they get the quality care in the twilight of their lives that we would expect. They are helped through a range of programs and services, actually starting with Medicare.

So we are concerned about our children, we are concerned about our older citizens, and we are also concerned about the middle class. We hear a lot of us speaking about strategies or efforts to help boost the middle class and all of the challenges of the middle class. It is interesting, though, that some issues affect all three of those broad groups of Americans. The issue I am going to talk about is Medicaid. It affects, obviously, children. It affects individuals with disabilities. It certainly affects older citizens across the country. And, indeed, it affects the middle class.

The Senate Republican budget cuts Medicaid funding by more than \$1.3 trillion, and in my judgment—and this is an assertion of an opinion—it would end the program as we know it because of the dimensions of those cuts. The budget would repeal the Medicaid expansion, threatening health insurance for some 14 million Americans, and convert much of the program's funding into block grants.

Let me talk about seniors for a moment. We have had lots of debates about the best policy going forward in the budget as it relates to a whole range of issues, especially programs such as Medicaid. But at the end of the day, it is not the rhetoric or the speeches; it is the votes that tell where one stands and what we prioritize.

We all have our own personal stories about those who have gone before us, and we, of course, always remember our own parents. But when we are talking about our seniors, we are talking about Americans who fought our wars, worked in our factories, taught our children, built the middle class, and