

Carolina has asked for, as we stand here today when essentially what we are talking about is a promise that has been broken by this Congress to the American people for 50 years.

I thank, through the Chair, my colleague from North Carolina for trying to rectify that.

I am disappointed that our unanimous consent request was objected to, but I know this measure has plenty of support. As he mentioned, we led an amendment on the floor last week with the exact same text of the bill that we are discussing today. When the dust settled, that amendment received 59 votes, but I have a hunch that it would comfortably clear the 60-vote threshold were it to be considered again. And it should be considered again.

The measure is simple. As Senator BURR said, it simply reauthorizes the Land and Water Conservation Fund and ensures that a dedicated portion of LWCF funds go to provide new access for our Nation's sports men and women.

As most in this body know, LWCF is one of the country's best conservation programs. It provides \$900 million annually to preserve our public lands and increase access to them. Not only do we need to pass this bill to reauthorize the program, but we need to ensure that we dedicate full and mandatory funding to the initiative, as Congress intended when we created the program in 1964.

Historically, LWCF resources have been used for all types of projects, ranging from building city parks to purchasing small parcels of isolated land from willing sellers and all the way to preserving our Nation's historic battlefields.

In Colorado, we have used LWCF for a wide variety of projects beyond traditional conservation. For example, LWCF was of critical importance to our State following a major natural disaster in 1976. That year an intense rainstorm caused massive flooding around Colorado's Big Thompson River. The flood claimed the lives of 145 Coloradans and caused more than \$35 million in damages.

Once the horrible tragedy passed, the community had to rebuild. Rather than constructing houses back in the flood plain, Larimer County turned to LWCF to acquire the affected land and compensated the families whose homes were destroyed.

Those flood plains are now home to four new county parks—popular destinations for birdwatchers, anglers, and family picnics—instead of vulnerable structures. When another huge flood hit in the fall of 2013, the rivers ran black and eventually surged over their banks, as we can see from this photo I have in the Chamber.

Luckily, the flood plains, protected by LWCF and the creativity of our local folks, saw much less damage this time. The floodwaters inundated the open, undeveloped spaces instead of destroying homes and businesses, and

Larimer County avoided about \$16 million in estimated property damages.

It is incredible to think that an LWCF investment of just over \$1 million in 1976 saved us more than 15 times that amount in 2013.

Beyond the example from Larimer County, communities all across Colorado have used LWCF to preserve sensitive landscapes and to help their local economies. This past summer, we completed a huge LWCF project in the San Juan National Forest near the town of Ophir. I spoke briefly about this project last week, and I will mention it again today because the work of the town of Ophir and the people of Ophir, along with their partners, the Trust for Public Land, were truly remarkable.

If memory serves, it is a project that took 12 years from start to finish. It had to be done in phases. LWCF funds were used to acquire several old mining claims above town, preserving the scenic beauty and ensuring that the area will remain undeveloped forever.

In this picture, if you ignore the center with these people in front of me, we can see how beautiful it is. This is a picture of the newly preserved landscape in Ophir. A group of us gathered to celebrate the accomplishment this past summer.

Most of these mountain communities get huge portions of their revenue and business from recreation and tourism. It is for some of these reasons that the town felt the Land and Water Conservation Fund literally helped secure their economic future.

This is a small, rural community in my home State. It is far away from this floor. LWCF has made a huge difference for Ophir.

These are two stories from Colorado, but I know they have been replicated thousands of times across the country and in all 50 States. Those stories and accomplishments alone make this bill worth supporting.

As I mentioned earlier, Congress wrote and passed LWCF in 1964, and it is beyond time to reauthorize it. Senator BURR has shown great leadership in crafting a bill to do just that.

Conservation policies—from LWCF to farm bill easement programs, from wilderness to national parks—are important to the American people. The American people support this work. Protecting our land and water is part of our everyday lives in Colorado, and I know our State is not the only one.

Conserved lands and wide-open spaces are a huge economic driver across the country, a huge part of our culture. They are who we are in the West. We should do right by the American people and reauthorize this program as soon as possible. Then we ought to work together to ensure that LWCF gets the full and mandatory funding going forward that was promised 50 years ago by Congress.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

REMEMBERING AMBASSADOR ROBERT E. WHITE

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, on January 13 of this year, our country lost one of its most courageous diplomats—Ambassador Robert E. White. Ambassador White was 88 years old.

I knew Bob White, who graduated from my alma mater, Saint Michael's College in Vermont, in 1952, just 9 years before I did. But I would have admired him greatly no matter what college he went to because he had the qualities every American diplomat should possess—outstanding intellect, unimpeachable integrity, great courage, and a devotion to the ideals and values of this country.

In the 1980s, during the civil war in El Salvador, the United States—in what most historians now know was a tragic mistake—steadfastly supported the Salvadoran Army despite abundant evidence that some of its elite units were operating as death squads, arbitrarily arresting, torturing, and murdering civilians suspected of supporting the FMLN rebels.

Unlike some other U.S. officials who turned blind eyes to the heinous crimes that were being committed in the name of fighting communism, Ambassador White refused to remain silent. He publicly condemned the Salvadoran military and their rightwing backers who were implicated in atrocities such as the assassination of Archbishop Oscar Romero, who just days ago was put on the path to sainthood by Pope Francis, and the massacre of four American churchwomen.

For speaking out on behalf of the victims of those crimes, Bob White paid dearly. He was ridiculed by some in Congress and he was summarily removed from his job by then-Secretary of State Alexander Haig.

A January 15 obituary in the Washington Post describes Bob's life and career. As I was reading it, I could not help but wonder how things might have turned out differently if the powers—that-be during the 1980s had listened to him. My wife Marcelle and I talked about that. We asked ourselves: How many lives might have been saved if the Reagan administration, instead of firing Bob in 1981, had recognized the truth of what he was saying and supported negotiations to end the war in El Salvador.

Instead, the war dragged on for another decade, costing the lives of tens of thousands of people, mostly civilians. The tide only started to turn in 1989 after the cold-blooded murder of the six Jesuit priests, their housekeeper and her daughter, at the University of Central America. It was a

horrific crime that top-ranking army officers tried to cover up.

It was thanks to the late Congressman Joe Moakley and his then-staff aide, now Congressman JIM MCGOVERN, Bob Woodward, and Salvadoran investigator Leonel Gomez, whom I also came to know and respect, that the plot was uncovered and the killers identified.

During this time I talked often with Bob and I learned even more about those who were involved. After talking with him I went to El Salvador. The Salvadoran officials wanted me to see how they were investigating what had happened. They knew I had prosecuted murder cases, and they arranged for me to meet with the country's chief investigator. As he described the so-called investigation it just confirmed Ambassador White's suspicions. I told the Salvadoran investigator, and I told the press who were there, that they were conducting an obvious cover-up. Anybody who saw what they were calling an investigation would realize what they were doing.

As I left El Salvador, it was so obvious that rather than shamelessly removing Ambassador White from his post how much better things might have been if the State Department had recognized him for the true patriot he was and treated him as an example of what other U.S. diplomats should emulate.

Bob didn't stop when he left the Foreign Service. He went on to head the Center for International Policy where he continued his advocacy for human rights, defending the ideals and championing the causes he believed in right up to his death.

I like to think that all of our Foreign Service Officers aspire to follow in the footsteps of Ambassador Robert White. I hope they will learn from his example. If they do, the United States will be better served and the world will be a better place.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the Washington Post obituary, and an article about Ambassador White by Margaret O'Brien Steinfels in Commonweal magazine.

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

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 15, 2015]

ROBERT E. WHITE, WHO CRITICIZED POLICY ON EL SALVADOR AS U.S. AMBASSADOR, DIES AT 88

(By Pamela Constable)

In 1980, when El Salvador was erupting in guerrilla war and military violence, the Carter administration sent a little-known Foreign Service officer into the maelstrom as its new ambassador, hoping he could help the U.S.-backed government there find a reformist middle ground and prevent a full-scale revolution.

Instead, Robert E. White became a controversial and outspoken critic of assassinations and massacres being carried out by American-trained military units and private right-wing death squads. His views cost him his diplomatic career but earned him the respect of many Salvadorans and, ultimately, the vindication of history.

Mr. White, who had previously served as U.S. ambassador to Paraguay, died Jan. 14 at a hospice in Arlington, Va. He was 88. The cause was bladder and prostate cancer, said a daughter, Claire White.

His brief tenure in San Salvador was marked by atrocities that became synonymous with right-wing violence during an era of ideological conflicts in Central America: the assassination of Catholic Archbishop Oscar Romero in March 1980 while he was saying Mass in the national cathedral, and the abduction and killing that December of four American women church workers: Maryknoll sisters Ita Ford and Maura Clark, Ursuline Sister Dorothy Kazel and lay missionary Jean Donovan.

Mr. White, who once said he was inspired to join the Foreign Service by a "quotient of idealism," worked to promote human rights, economic reforms and political negotiations between leftist rebels and El Salvador's civil-military junta. But he soon found himself at loggerheads with the rightist military and land-owning establishment, which had powerful allies in Washington and Miami.

Unable to keep silent as security abuses mounted, Mr. White began denouncing them in diplomatic cables, then in interviews and congressional testimony. He famously called rightist political leader Roberto D'Aubuisson a "pathological killer" and charged that he had orchestrated the execution of Romero.

Mr. White also accused the Salvadoran national guard of murdering the Maryknoll women—two of whom he had dined with the night before their disappearance. He was there when the women's bodies were dug up, and he was quoted as vowing angrily, "This time the bastards won't get away with it."

"Bob was transformed by those events, especially the killings of the Maryknolls, from a diplomatic functionary into a person whose ethical and moral convictions conflicted with his job," said Francisco Altschul, the current Salvadoran ambassador to the United States, who was a leftist political activist at the time. "It took a lot of courage and integrity to say what he did and to face the consequences."

Mr. White's outspoken posture drew praise from human rights groups but death threats in El Salvador. His wife once described being warned by her security guard in their affluent San Salvador enclave that "your neighbors would like to kill you."

The ambassador also faced strong opposition from powerful Washington hawks including Sen. Jesse Helms (R-N.C.), who had been annoyed with Mr. White's earlier human rights activism in Paraguay and compared his posting to El Salvador to "a torch tossed in a pool of oil."

By 1981, after the election of Ronald Reagan as president ushered in a new era of anticommunist fervor in Washington, Mr. White's days as ambassador were numbered. After coming into conflict with Secretary of State Alexander M. Haig Jr., Mr. White was removed from his post less than two weeks after Reagan took office. He soon retired from the Foreign Service after a 25-year career, claiming that he had been forced out for political reasons.

"In El Salvador, Bob believed the authoritarian regime was morally repugnant and needed to change, but he worked very hard to avoid the escalation of war and negotiate a solution," said William M. LeoGrande, a professor at American University and author of "Our Own Backyard: The United States in Central America, 1977-1992."

"The tragedy was that U.S. policy changed, El Salvador became a Cold War proxy, and another decade of conflict followed," LeoGrande said.

Once free of the constraints of diplomacy, Mr. White spent much of the next three dec-

ades speaking his mind on U.S. policy and official abuses in Latin America, while holding a series of jobs, including a professorship at Simmons College in Massachusetts and a senior associate position at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace in Washington.

He was a sarcastic critic of Washington's Cold War-era policies in Latin America, particularly what he called the "primitive anti-communism" that produced the U.S. embargo against Fidel Castro's Cuba and support for hemispheric dictators such as Gen. Augusto Pinochet in Chile and Gen. Alfredo Stroessner in Paraguay. He accused the Reagan administration in 1984 of covering up its knowledge of D'Aubuisson's role in the Romero assassination. Administration officials denied the allegations.

In 1989, Mr. White was named president of the Center for International Policy, a liberal think tank in Washington, and held that position at the time of his death. He also visited numerous countries, from Haiti to Afghanistan, with delegations to monitor elections and human rights.

Robert Edward White was born Sept. 21, 1926, in Melrose, Mass. He served in the Navy as a radio operator in the Pacific during World War II. He attended Saint Michael's College in Vermont on the G.I. Bill, graduating in 1952, and completed a master's degree in 1954 at Tufts University's Fletcher School in Medford, Mass.

He joined the Foreign Service in 1955 and served in a variety of positions related to Latin America. He was posted in Colombia, Ecuador, Honduras and Nicaragua, served as regional director of the Peace Corps and was a U.S. representative to the Organization of American States. He was ambassador to Paraguay from 1977 to 1980, when he was transferred to El Salvador.

Survivors include his wife of 59 years, Maryanne Cahill White of Alexandria, Va.; three children, Chris White of Manassas, Va., Claire White of Cambridge, Mass., and Mary Lou White of Evanston, Ill.; a brother, David White of Alexandria; and three grandchildren.

A son, Kevin White, died in 2009; a daughter, Laura White, died in 2014.

Mr. White always described himself as a diplomat and a democrat rather than a leftist or moral zealot.

"I don't go out looking for windmills to joust," he told an interviewer from Commonweal magazine in 2001. "And the idea that I'm some sort of martyr? Well, I'm not."

He argued that to avoid ending up on the wrong side of history or in Vietnam-style military quagmires, the United States needed to seek negotiated solutions to all conflicts, maintain a moral component in its dealings with all regimes and respect the will of local populations.

"The military dictators of the world fear democracy more than anything else," he told the Fletcher Forum, a publication of the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, in 1981. "U.S. policy toward Latin America can be summed up in three words: fear of revolution. Because we feared revolution, we consistently opposed the forces of change while uncritically supporting dictatorships and small economic elites. We blinked at repression and participated in the perversion of democracy throughout the hemisphere."

[From Commonweal Magazine, Jan. 19, 2015]

ROBERT E. WHITE, 1926-2015

(By Margaret O'Brien Steinfels)

Robert White, who spent a quarter century in the U.S. Foreign Service and was ambassador to El Salvador at the beginning of its civil war, seems never to have forgotten anything. Among the things he never forgot

were the murders of Jean Donovan and Sisters Dorothy Kazel, Maura Clarke, and Ita Ford. White was present when their bodies were recovered from shallow graves on December 4, 1980. He returned to the embassy as angry as his wife, MaryAnne, had ever seen him. It changed him, she told me in 2001, when I interviewed her for a profile of Bob I wrote for *Commonweal*. Indeed, his refusal to cover up Salvadoran military involvement in their murders—and those of thousands of Salvadorans, including Archbishop Oscar Romero—led to his resignation from the Foreign Service in 1981. He continued his work for democratic reforms and human rights in the Caribbean and Latin America at the Carnegie Endowment for Peace and the Center for International Policy.

Bob, who died on January 13 at the age of eighty-eight, was a great interview; in 2001 I left his Washington office with tapes full of details. He could summon conversations from years past and recount policy details lost in the fog of diplomatic maneuvering. Not only did he remember names and details of long-past events, he was also forthcoming in his analysis of U.S. foreign policy. He had joined the Foreign Service in 1955; after President John Kennedy announced the "Alliance for Progress," he requested assignment in Latin America. Designed to encourage democracy and human rights, the new policy was a turn away from, as White put it, doing the work of "the colonial office." That derogatory title summed up the tangled political and economic relationship between the U.S. and its neighbors to the South. Even when support in Washington faltered after Kennedy's assassination, White tried to keep the policies of the Alliance in play. Full-blown Cold War policies had returned in 1968 with Richard Nixon and Henry Kissinger, coloring White's years in Honduras, Nicaragua, Columbia, Paraguay, and El Salvador. While serving as U.S. representative to the Organization of American States, he faced down Kissinger, whose statements supporting Pinochet were contrary to U.S. policy. This brought White to the edge of dismissal; he won the battle and stayed on to serve in his final post, El Salvador.

A long history of interventions and exploitation of the continent's natural resources made the United States the imperial power that both democratic reformers and Marxists loved to hate. White saw in the reformers the path to more democratic governments and respect for human rights. Washington, focused on Soviet threats and Fidel Castro's support for guerrillas, increasingly favored the dictators and caudillos. Secret agreements were struck between U.S. military and intelligence agencies and their Latin counterparts. This often put the Department of State, though the official representative of the United States, on the margins of both policy and practices. Jimmy Carter's victory in 1976 pressed U.S. policy once again into a human rights agenda; that ended with Ronald Reagan's election in 1980.

White had long found himself the middleman in many of the struggles between Latin American governments and reformers as well as with his own government. His job was to work with each country's political leaders, notwithstanding their anti-democratic policies. While they might tolerate his cajoling and plain speaking about land reform, fair elections, and human rights, they usually had a U.S. military representative or CIA agent to turn to for direct contact with Washington (often someone on the ambassador's own embassy staff). At the same time, White made it his business to seek out and get to know sympathetic academics, journalists, labor leaders, clergy, and reformers in the Christian Democratic tradition. He understood the central role the

Catholic Church, especially its cardinals and bishops, played among the social and political elites. His friendship with some and parrying with others gave him behind-the-scenes influence; his attendance at Mass could be the occasion for a pointed homily on topics a prelate might otherwise avoid. If White was regarded with suspicion and contempt, especially by Salvadoran politicians and military, his reputation among Americans (and American Catholics) opposed to their endemic violence and abuse was hardly better. The U.S. ambassador was seen to be compromised by his position and not to be trusted.

After his resignation, White more than any U.S. official exposed the hidden ties between U.S. military and intelligence and their Latin American counterparts. He testified against Salvadoran military for their complicity in torture and murder, especially of the American churchwomen. He never ceased pressing for better political and economic conditions in Latin America, termination of sanctions against Cuba, and an end to human rights abuses not only by dictatorships but also by democracies. Bob's work as an ambassador—from the United States at its best—never really ended.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY FUNDING

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, for the second time in 2 days our friends across the aisle have killed important funding for the Department of Homeland Security, a bill worth about \$40 billion that was passed by the House of Representatives and sent over for the Senate to consider.

I continue to be amazed, watching Member after Member across the aisle come down here and vote to block this important piece of legislation, and then, in the same breath, accuse the majority of threatening to shut down the government. It strikes me as surreal. They are the ones filibustering the funding for the Department of Homeland Security, and they are claiming we are trying to shut down the government.

I know it is sometimes hard to explain what happens in the Halls of Congress and Washington, DC, but my folks back home can't understand how they can block something and then claim they are for it—and then the people who are actually advocating for the passage of this funding, claiming somehow we are going to shut down the government. It just doesn't make any sense, and it is the kind of double talk I think people have come to despise and associate with Washington, DC, and Congress.

That is one reason voters so overwhelmingly repudiated the status quo

on November 4 and said: We want new management, and we don't want business as usual in Washington, DC.

Speaking of saying one thing and doing another, on this side of the aisle we pointed out some of the tough talk from some of our friends on the other side of the aisle, Senate Democrats, last fall when the President made clear he intended to follow through on a series of unilateral immigration actions that he, himself, on 22 different occasions had said he did not have the authority to take.

Indeed, it is my view this is unconstitutional. He can't pass or make a new law without following the constitutional pathway, which requires Congress to consider it, vote on it—both Houses—and then send it to the President for signature. For the President just simply to make it up out of whole cloth is dangerous, to say the least.

I guess if the President doesn't like any other aspect of our laws, this President—or any future President—might claim the sole authority to change it without following the procedures laid out in the U.S. Constitution.

I know what the President did last fall in this Executive action on immigration makes a number of our colleagues across the aisle uncomfortable because they are quoted in the newspaper as saying so. But now somehow in this mind meld going on, on the minority side, they now are walking in lockstep, voting against proceeding to consider this Homeland Security appropriations bill, even though, by my count, at least seven Democrats expressed deep concern with the President's unconstitutional action.

Here is what the Senator from West Virginia said, talking about the President:

I wish he wouldn't do it.

The junior Senator from Minnesota said:

I have concerns about executive action.

The same kind of concerns I have just expressed.

The senior Senator from Missouri felt the same way, saying about the President's unilateral action:

How this is coming about makes me uncomfortable, [and] I think it probably makes most Missourians uncomfortable.

It made the President of the United States uncomfortable, so uncomfortable on 22 occasions he said he couldn't do it—and then he did it.

It makes me extremely uncomfortable, too, and it certainly makes the vast majority of the people I represent back in Texas uncomfortable as well.

We are a nation of laws. I know we say that all the time, but it is one of the things that distinguishes us from so much of the rest of the world where, no matter who you are—whether you are the President of the United States or the most humble person in the country—the rules apply to you equally. That is what it says over the top of the Supreme Court Building. Look at the front of the building. It says, "Equal Justice Under Law."