



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, JUNE 7, 2013

No. 80

House of Representatives

The House was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Monday, June 10, 2013, at 3 p.m.

Senate

FRIDAY, JUNE 7, 2013

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Retired Admiral Barry Black, offered the following prayer.

Let us pray.

Eternal God, who sets boundaries for the sea to make it obey Your mercies, thank You for Your faithfulness. You save us from distress, rescue us from danger because of Your great love. Lord, uphold our lawmakers and renew their strength. Empower them to bravely face the challenges of our time. When they are bewildered, lead them with Your grace. Give them the wisdom to prepare now for the difficult seasons before them. May they obey Your teaching, striving to be guided by Your words.

And, Lord, bless our Senate pages on this their graduation day.

We pray in Your holy Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following my remarks—and perhaps Senator MCCONNELL's, if he wishes to speak—the Senate will resume the motion to proceed to S. 744, the comprehensive immigration legislation, on which the Chair has done a masterful job of getting us to where we are on this matter as chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

The time until 1:30 p.m. will be for debate on the motion to proceed.

Mr. President, I have been told we need a little extra time, so what we will do is extend that time until 2 p.m.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

I ask unanimous consent that the prior order, which is in effect, be extended until 2 p.m., and that the extra half-hour be equally divided between the majority and minority, each taking 15 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be recognized at 2 p.m.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. There will be no rollcall votes today. The next rollcall vote will be on Monday at 5:30 p.m. on passage of the farm bill.

IMMIGRATION REFORM

Mr. REID. Mr. President, today Senators will have an opportunity to debate the bipartisan immigration bill reported by the Chair's committee last month. As I have already done once

today, I again commend the chairman of that committee Senator LEAHY for leading a thorough and transparent process in the committee.

I thank Senator SESSIONS for working with us yesterday to move forward on this measure as quickly as possible. As I have said before, Senator SESSIONS and I—once in a while—disagree on substance, but we have always had a friendly relationship, which I appreciate.

I applaud the efforts of the Gang of 8—four Democrats and four Republicans—to set aside partisanship to address a critical issue facing our Nation. The system is broken and needs to be fixed.

It is gratifying to see the momentum behind this package of commonsense reforms, which will make our country safer and help 11 million undocumented immigrants get right with the law.

I had a number of meetings over the last few days with pollsters who have taken a look at this legislation, and they all acknowledge that the vast majority of American people want us to move forward. Democrats, Independents, and Republicans recognize the system is broken and needs to be fixed. They all agree on a pathway to citizenship.

I have been committed to a process that is as open as possible for amendments. I don't want to say totally because sometimes with the procedures we have here—as with the farm bill—people throw a monkey wrench into things, and we are not able to do things as we would wish to do them.

We will wrap up work on this legislation before the July 4 recess. I hope

• This “bullet” symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S3997

Senators will take advantage of today's time for debate. I look forward to a thorough and thoughtful discussion of the deliberation in the days ahead.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

Mr. REID. Will the Chair announce the business of the day?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KAINE). Under the previous order, leadership time is reserved.

BORDER SECURITY, ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY, AND IMMIGRATION MODERNIZATION ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to S. 744.

The clerk will report the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 80, S. 744, a bill to provide for comprehensive immigration reform, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 2 p.m. will be equally divided, with the Senator from Alabama Mr. SESSIONS or his designee controlling 3 hours 15 minutes, and the majority or his designee controlling the remaining time.

The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I thank the majority leader for his kind comments. I also note that throughout the markup and debate on the immigration bill, his advice and his counsel was always there. We discussed it many times, and I appreciate the fact he made it very clear the bill would come up at the time he said. We would not have it here without his strong support, so I appreciate Senator REID's very nice comments this morning.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, this is important legislation, the immigration bill. I was able to have a discussion with Senator REID yesterday. He was moving forward on the motion to proceed to the bill which requires considerable debate. I asked for and insisted on the opportunity to have some time today to talk about it, and he agreed to that. I think that was a good step, and I thank him for that agreement.

We have a lot to talk about. The matters are complex and important, and I urge my colleagues to pay real attention to the legislation. This is the bill, as printed, front and back of each page. It was reportedly going to be 1,000 pages, and our colleagues were proud to say it was 800 pages. Since then, more has been added to it, and now it is over 1,000 pages again.

It is very complex and there are certain key points with multiple references to other code sections that are in existing law; therefore, it is very difficult to read.

It takes a considerable amount of time, and I don't even suspect the Gang

of 8 has had the time to read, digest, and understand fully what is in the legislation.

We are a nation of immigrants. The people whom I know who are concerned about this legislation in Congress are not against immigration. I certainly am not. We admit about 1 million people a year legally into our country, and that is a substantial number by any standard. Indeed, it is the highest of any country in the world. It is important we execute that policy in an effective way as it impacts our whole Nation.

Immigration has enriched our culture. It has boosted our economy, and we have had tremendously wonderful people who have come here—people who have contributed to our arts, our business and economy, science and sports. We have had a good run with immigration in a lot of ways, but we need to ask ourselves at this point in time: Is it working within limits? Are the American people happy with what we are doing? Are we moving in the right direction?

We know our generous policies have resulted in a substantial flow of people into the country, and our challenge today is to create a lawful system of immigration that serves the national interests and admits those people into our country who are most likely to be successful, to prosper, and to flourish, therefore, most likely to be beneficial to America. Surely we can agree that is a good policy, and it has not been our policy prior to this.

We have both the enormous illegal flow of people into the country as well as a legal flow that is not evaluated in a way that other advanced nations do when they execute their policies of immigration, for example, Canada. We should establish smart rules for admittance, rules that benefit America, rules that must be enforced, and must be lawful. We cannot reject a dutiful, good person to America and then turn around and allow someone else who came in illegally to benefit from breaking our laws to the disadvantage of the good person who, when told no, had to accept that answer. It is just the way we are.

So we must establish smart rules for admittance, rules that benefit America, and these rules have to be enforced—and that is not happening today.

The current policies we have are not serving our country well; therefore, a reformed immigration system should spend some time in depth in public analysis of how and what we should consider as we decide who should be admitted, because we cannot admit everybody. When that is done, we need to create a system we can expect to actually work to enforce the standards we have. I believe we can make tremendous progress, and we can fix this system. It needs to be fixed.

The legislation that has been offered by the Gang of 8 says they fixed it. Don't worry; we have taken care of all

that is needed; we have a plan that will be compassionate to people who have been here and we have a plan which will work in the future and end illegality. Well, it won't do that, and that is the problem.

It will definitely give amnesty today. It will definitely give immediate legal status to some 11 million people today, but the promises of enforcement in the future, the promises that the legislation will focus on a way that enhances the success rate of people who come to America is not fulfilled in the legislation.

Read the bill and see what is in it. I wish it were different. We will talk about in the days and weeks to come what is in the bill and why it fails. I can share with everyone how it is we came to have such a flawed bill before us. We need to understand that as we go forward.

I am amazed the Gang of 8 has sent such legislation forward, and how aggressively they defended it in the Judiciary Committee. We did have a markup in the Judiciary Committee. We were allowed to offer amendments and had some debate there, but it was an odd thing. Repeatedly members who were not even in the Gang of 8 said: I like this amendment, but I cannot vote for it because I understand it upsets the deal. We need to ask ourselves: Who made the deal? Whose deal is this? How is it that the deal is such that Members of the Senate who agreed to an amendment say they must vote against the amendment because it upsets some deal? Who was in this room? Who was in the deal-making process? So I think that was a revealing time in the committee. They had agreed and stated openly there would be no substantial changes in the agreements the Gang of 8 made, and they would stick together and vote against any changes except for minor changes. There were a number of amendments accepted, a number of Republican amendments accepted. Many of those were second degree or altered by the majority in the committee, but none of those fundamentally altered the framework and the substance of this legislation. I don't think that is disputable, and we will talk about that. So this is the problem we are working with.

So how did the legislation become as ineffective as it is? I contend—I think it is quite plain—it is because it was not written by independent Members of the Senate in a more open process but was written by special interests. I wish to share some thoughts on that subject right now because I think it goes to the heart of the difficulties we have.

There were continual meetings over a period of quite a number of months that got this bill off on the wrong track in the beginning. Powerful groups met, excluding the interests of the American people, excluding the law enforcement community. Throughout the bill we can see the influence these groups had on the drafting of it. Some of the groups actually did the drafting.

A lot of the language clearly came from the special interest groups engaged in these secret negotiations.

What is a special interest group? A special interest group is a group of people who have a commitment, an interest they want to advance, but they don't pretend to share the national interest. So maybe it is a legitimate special interest, maybe it is not a legitimate special interest, but they have a special interest, a particular interest they want to advance.

So this is what happened: Big labor and big business were active in drafting this legislation, with the entire deal obviously hanging on, it was reported, their negotiations. For example, the *Wall Street Journal*, March 10:

Competing interests abound. The Chamber of Commerce and businesses it represents are locked into negotiations with the AFL-CIO about workers in industries like hospitality and landscaping. Meanwhile, farm-worker unions have been quietly negotiating with growers associations about how to revamp short-term visas for agricultural workers. And senators on both sides of the aisle are weighing in to ensure their state industries are protected.

The *Washington Post*, March 10: "Hush-hush Meetings for Gang of 8 senators as they work on sweeping immigration bill." The article reads:

They are struggling on the question of legal immigration and future workers, and are trading proposals with leaders of the AFL-CIO and the Chamber of Commerce to try to get a deal.

"Try to get a deal," they are working on a deal.

How about this: *Roll Call*, March 21:

Talks led by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and AFL-CIO over a new guest-worker program for lower-skilled immigrants are stalled, prompting members of the bipartisan group of eight senators to get personally involved to try to nudge the negotiations on to resolution.

So the Senators were not in those discussions. The Senators, when it got to be tough and things weren't moving along, they came in to try to egg it on, to get the agreement. Who is the agreement between? It is between the unions and big business, which are representing the American worker, effectively.

New York Times, March 30:

The nation's top businesses and labor groups have reached an agreement on a guest worker program for low-skilled immigrants, a person with knowledge of the negotiations said . . . Senator SCHUMER convened a conference call on Friday night with Thomas J. Donohue, the president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and Richard L. Trumka, the president of the AFL-CIO, the nation's main federation of labor unions, in which they agreed in principle on a guest worker program for low-skilled, year-round, temporary workers.

We know there is one group not included in these talks, and that is the group given the duty to enforce the immigration laws. The national ICE union, the customs and enforcement organization, pleaded with the Gang of 8 to consult them. They urged the Gang of 8, they wrote letters to the

Gang of 8, and I sent information to the Gang of 8 asking them to consult with the officers who have the duty to enforce this law, but to no avail. They were shut out of every meeting and never have been consulted.

It is interesting to note, however, that others weren't shut out of the meeting. They weren't left out of the room.

The *Washington Post*, April 13:

While Obama has allowed Senate negotiators to work on a compromise that can win approval, a White House staff member attends each staff-level meeting to monitor progress and assist with the technical aspects of writing the bill.

So there has been an attempt to suggest that this is truly a congressional action, that the White House is just sort of hands off. But we know the White House is deeply involved in this and approving every aspect or disapproving aspects they don't like. The question is, Who is influencing this? Who is influencing the White House, President Obama?

The *Daily Caller*, on February 6, notes this:

On February 5th, Obama held a White House meeting with a series of industry leaders, progressive advocates and ethnic lobbies, including La Raza, to boost support for his plan that would provide a conditional amnesty to 11 million illegal aliens, allow new immigrants to get residency for their relatives and elderly parents, and also establish rules for a "Future Flow" of skilled and unskilled workers. The invitees included the CEO of Goldman-Sachs, Motorola, Marriott, and DeLoitte.

So they are in the meeting, apparently.

Also, we know participating in a lot of these discussions was the American Immigration Lawyers Association. This group obviously was involved in writing the bill, and I have to tell my colleagues that they will be the biggest winners of this legislation.

Time and again, rules that were fairly clear—and probably should have been made clearer—are muddled, provisions were placed in that will create litigation and encourage lawsuits, delays, and will increase costs. For example, "hardship" is the new standard for many waivers and exemptions in this bill, in many cases the exemptions are for family problems and other things of that nature. Well, when ICE says a person should be deported, then the deportee has the ability to say: Well, I have a hardship. My mother is here, I have a brother who is sick, or I need this or that.

What does "hardship" mean? It means a trial. That is what it means. So the Immigration Lawyers Association was substantially involved in the meetings.

Politico, on March 9, said:

In a bid to capitalize on the shared interest in immigration reform, a budget deal and new trade pacts, the White House has launched a charm offensive toward corporate America since the November election, hosting more than a dozen conference calls with top industry officials—which have not previously been disclosed—along with a flurry of meetings at the White House.

Continuing the quote:

Participants on the recent calls include the heads of Goldman Sachs, the Business Roundtable, Evercore, Silver Lake, Centerbridge Partners, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce as well as the heads of Washington trade groups representing the banking industry, such as the Financial Services Roundtable.

So they have been involved in these discussions. Even foreign countries have had a say in drafting our law.

The *Hill*, on February 7, reported:

Mexico's new Ambassador to the U.S., Eduardo Medina-Mora, has had a "number of meetings with the administration" where the issue of immigration has come up since he took office last month, said a Mexican official familiar with the process. He is expected to meet with lawmakers shortly as legislation begins to take form. "Probably like no other country, we are a player in this particular issue," the source said.

Well, the law officers weren't in the room, we know that. People who question economically the size and scope and nature of our immigration system weren't in the room.

So in case anyone doubts the role of special interests in drafting the legislation, pay attention to this quote by Frank Sharry, executive director of the liberal pro-amnesty group, *America's Voice*, in the *Wall Street Journal*, April 17:

The triggers are based on developing plans and spending money, not on reaching that effectiveness, which is really quite clever.

In other words, the sponsors of the bill were telling everyone they had triggers in the bill that would guarantee enforcement of laws in the future about immigration flow into America, and that if enforcement didn't occur, the triggers would stop people from being legalized and end the process. That is not so. We have studied the language and we know the triggers are ineffectual and are not significant and won't work. That will be explained in the days to come.

Mr. Sharry acknowledges it. He said it was clever to have these faux triggers—these triggers that will not work—because we can tell everybody: Don't worry, the legality will not occur if the enforcement doesn't occur. But in clever ways they drafted a bill that will not work. They will say it works, but it will not work.

Again, with all of the slush funds in this bill, there are a number of them that go to private activist groups, community action groups. It is easy to see that special interests had a seat at the negotiation table.

The *National Review*, on May 29, reported:

A number of immigration-activist groups, such as the National Council of La Raza, would be eligible to receive millions in taxpayer funding to "advise" illegal immigrants applying for legal status under the bill.

So money will go to these activist groups, such as La Raza. La Raza is responsible for advocating, not enforcing, our laws. So La Raza is in the meetings. La Raza is an open advocate for not enforcing laws involving illegal immigration. They are active participants in advocating for amnesty. They

are going to get money out of the deal with some of the grant programs, while the law officers who have the ability to tell the committee, the Gang of 8, how to make the system work are shut out of the process.

Were prosecutors involved in the process? No, they have not been.

The National Immigration Forum, a pro-immigrant group, has been involved in some of these discussions.

So some people have said the bill had to be drafted in secret, but that the markup process in the Judiciary Committee would be open and transparent. But that is only partially so. We did have a markup. We were allowed, those who had objections to the bill, to offer amendments, as did those who support the bill. We had the opportunity to talk and offer amendments. But at every turn in the committee the members of the Gang of 8 expressed support on occasions for certain amendments, only to vote against the amendment. Due, they said, to the agreement, they had to vote together and against significant amendments, regardless of their personal feelings.

The gang influenced other members on the committee to do the same. The *Huffington Post*, April 16, headline: "Senate Immigration Group Turns to Keeping Fragile Agreement Intact."

It goes on to quote Senator McCAIN as saying:

We will pledge to oppose, all eight of us, provisions that would destroy the fragile agreement we have.

So they have an agreement. They have an agreement with the unions and big business and the agribusinesses and the food processors and La Raza and the immigration lawyers. They have an agreement with them, and they are going to defend it, even though they acknowledge amendments that were offered would improve the bill. This is no way to serve the national interest, in my view.

In discussing an amendment that would require workers to make a good-faith effort to hire American workers first, Senator WHITEHOUSE said this—this is what happened in the committee—

I'm in a position which I'm being informed that this would be a deal breaker to the deal. I, frankly, don't see how that could be the case, but I'm not privy to that understanding, and so I'm going to vote in support of the agreement that has been reached.

In other words, Senator WHITEHOUSE says: Well, I do not understand this. I would like to vote the other way, but I am told you have a deal and this would damage the deal and so I cannot vote for it. He was not even in the Gang of 8 but went along with that.

Related to that same amendment, Senator FRANKEN echoed the remarks, saying:

I really just want to associate myself with Senator Whitehouse's remarks.

He goes on to say:

I don't want to be a deal breaker.

In discussing an amendment that would increase family-based immigration, Senator FEINSTEIN noted:

I think it's been a unique process because those people who are members of a group that put this together have stood together and have voted against amendments that they felt would be a violation of the bipartisan agreement that brought both sides together.

I am not sure that is always good. I am not sure that is the right thing to do to set public policy in America: to have some secret agreement, reached with a group of people we hardly know who they are, trump the ability to do the right thing for the American people.

I want to say that is what has happened here. And the point to make is, and what I think our colleagues need to understand and the American people need to understand: In reality, the special interests—La Raza, the unions, the corporate world, the big agriculture businesses, the food processors—they are the ones that made the agreement in this process, and the Senators merely ratified it, and they cannot agree to a change because they promised these special interest groups things. So if La Raza would accept point A that somebody wanted accepted, and the unions would accept point B, then they would both agree: I will do A if you will do B.

Then the bill gets to the floor and somebody says: A is wrong and we should not put that in the bill. Let's change that. Oh, no, we cannot change that. We have an agreement. The agreement with who? La Raza, the agribusinesses, the Chamber of Commerce, Microsoft, Zuckerberg. That is what happened here. I am just telling you. And the people who drafted this bill, the people who have advocated these special interests—we should not be surprised at their influence. Businesses, groups, organizations have special interests. There is nothing inherently wrong with that. What is wrong is that Members of Congress—Members of the Senate—need to be representing the national interests, the people's interests, the workers' interests in America. That is what we need to be doing—not representing the special interests.

I have to tell you, the openness of this is sort of breathtaking to me. Who is protecting the national interests? Did they have any of the top-ranked economists in this country being asked what would be the right number of low-skilled workers to bring into America? Did they have any of the top experts say how many advanced science degrees can we have? How many of our college graduates are unemployed? What is the right number? None of this was apparently discussed by our colleagues who allowed this process to go forward.

I would say, finally, with regard to the special interests, they have no interest—virtually none of them that were involved in this process—of guaranteeing in the future that we do not have more illegally immigration. That is the failure here. They do not have any interest in that and, therefore, there was no intensity of interest in that aspect of the legislation.

Oh, there was a lot of interest in how many computer programmers could be admitted or how many agriculture workers or how many low-skilled factory workers or construction workers or other workers. They all worried about that. They fought over that. That is what these negotiations were about. There were internal discussions and disagreements.

But nobody was investing any time or interest in the second phase of this. If you have an amnesty, if you have a legality of millions of people who came here illegally, what are we going to do to ensure it does not happen in the future?

I was a Federal prosecutor. I personally tried an immigration case myself. I bet nobody else here can say that. So I am aware you have to have certain legal processes and certain investments in investigative and enforcement mechanisms to make the system work in the future.

As we go forward with this debate, we are going to show—and it is going to be clear—that this has not been fixed and, in fact, the standards of current law with regard to what ought to be done—requirements in current Federal law—are being weakened, some of them eviscerated by this bill.

This bill is far weaker than the 2007 legislation. I do not think there is any doubt about that. It will be clear when we get through it. It was rejected by the American people—the 2007 agreement—and it actually weakens current law in quite a number of significant areas—weakens current law—while we are being told: Do not worry, this is the toughest bill ever.

If I am mistaken, I am sure we will hear about that as we discuss it. This is a great democracy we are part of and I am expressing my view. But I have spent some time on these issues. I was involved with it in 2006 and 2007. I was a Federal prosecutor. I have done this over the years. I know how our ICE agents work, our Border Patrol agents work, our customs and immigration service people work. I have worked with them. I have tried cases for them. I know them personally. They have been left out of this process.

The ICE union has voted no confidence in John Morton, their supervisor. What a dramatic event. I am not aware of that ever happening in my 14 years-plus as a Federal prosecutor—the actual employment union declaring that they have no confidence in their supervisor. And what did they say? They said he spends all his time advocating for amnesty and not enforcing the laws. He is directing us to not follow legal requirements we took an oath to follow.

And get this: The ICE officers have filed a lawsuit in Federal court attacking Secretary Napolitano, or at least the conduct of her office. They have asserted she is not above the law, she is not authorized to direct them not to follow plain requirements of Federal law. The Federal judge initially seemed to accept the validity of the lawsuit.

I have never heard of that before. This is an incredible event. Nobody is even talking about it. It has been the position of this administration, everybody has to know, to see that the law is not being effectively enforced, particularly in the interior of America.

That has basically been—some even acknowledge—a de facto amnesty because you are directing your law officers not to do their duty. You basically eliminated the law. The administration should not be doing that. Congress has refused to change these laws time and again. If anything, they have sometimes increased them, strengthened them. And now we have our agents blocked from enforcing them.

The U.S. customs and immigration service that deals with the visas, deals with the applications for citizenship—CIS, the Citizenship and Immigration Service, they deal with the citizenship processes and the paperwork and all of that. They have written in opposition to this legislation.

So first, the ICE officers—Chris Crane, the head of that group, has written a powerful letter in detail condemning this legislation, saying it will not work, it will make matters worse, and it will endanger national security.

The Citizenship and Immigration Service group that deals with the paperwork and the citizenship processing and the visa work—and a lot of that—has likewise written saying this bill will not work and they oppose it.

Well, I have to say, somebody needs to be thinking about what is going on here. Right. Amnesty—done. The promise of enforcement, the toughest bill ever in the future—no, sir, not there, not close. That is why we have a problem. I cannot understand why people would not want the legal system to be complete, to be effective, and would be followed so we as Americans could be proud of it.

There is a lot of power behind this legislation. I can feel it. When I raise questions, push-back comes. You are not politically correct; you are unkind; you do not like immigrants. That is offensive to me. I believe in immigration. We have a million people who come in here every year legally. I do not oppose that. I do not oppose doing something responsible and compassionate for the people who have been here a long time illegally. But we have to be careful about it.

But the American people are so right on their basic instinct about this matter. I have to say how I believe the American people's hearts and souls are good about immigration. A lot of people think: Well, we have to meet in secret and we have to run this bill through as fast as possible because we do not want the American people to find out about it because they do not like immigrants. Not so. A recent poll revealed something very important, and our Members of this body and the House need to know it. It said: If you are angry about the way things are going with regard to immigration, are

you angry at the people who came into the country illegally or are you angry at the government officials for allowing it to happen? Mr. President, 12 percent said they were angry at the people who entered illegally. Mr. President, 88 percent said they were angry at public officials for not creating a legal system that will work.

Doesn't that speak well of the American people? You could be angry about somebody who came into our country in violation of the law. But I think the American people understand that people want to come here, and it is our duty to stop it. They have been pleading with Congress for over 30 years to do something about it, to create a lawful system, to end the lawlessness, to do the right thing, to create immigration processes that we can be proud of, such as Canada has and other countries around the world have.

We believe in immigration. We want to do the right thing, but it needs to be lawful. We have more applicants for admission into America than we can possibly accept. I was in, I believe, Peru with Senator Specter a number of years ago, and a poll was called to our attention from Nicaragua that said 60 percent of the people in Nicaragua said they would come to America if they could—60 percent. Then the Ambassador in Peru told us they had a poll around there that said 70 percent.

Well, everybody cannot come to America.

We are not able to assimilate or absorb that. We all know that. We all agree with that. So therefore you set rules and processes that we can be proud of, that are fair and objective, and that people who want to come meet those standards and they wait their turn and they come lawfully.

We have had from this administration and prior administrations—President Bush also—too little interest in seeing that the law is enforced. We have loopholes in our laws and processes that need to be fixed. We can do that with a good immigration bill, but this one does not get it done.

I noticed that my friend did an op-ed yesterday—Karl Rove, who was President Bush's political adviser, a man of great talent back in the day that we were in college together. He quotes a lot of polls that say the American people are willing to accept legal processes and status for people in this country. I acknowledge that. They are. But he does not quote the polls that say overwhelmingly that they want the illegality ended. They want border security first because they are smart enough to know that if we do not get border security now, we may never get it. In fact, they want to get it. History tells us so.

He did not quote a recent Rasmussen poll. This is what was in the Rasmussen polling report. The so-called Gang of 8 proposal in the Senate legalizes the status of immigrants first and promises to secure the border later. By a 4-to-1 margin, people want that proc-

ess reversed. My good friend Karl Rove did not quote that.

Additionally, while voters think highly of immigrants, which speaks well of us as American people, they do not trust the government. That skepticism is growing. In January 45 percent thought it was at least somewhat likely that the Federal Government would work to secure the border and prevent future illegal immigration. Today only 30 percent has that confidence. Why? Because they are beginning to learn that this bill does not do what they were told it was going to do.

The growing awareness of the border control issue has led to other shifts in public opinion as well. Early in the year Democrats were trusted more than Republicans on the issue of immigration. Now that has switched. Well, we are not interested in politics, we are interested in doing the right thing. When we do the right thing, the people will affirm it.

So Mr. Rove goes on to say: Now, do not say amnesty.

My friend Karl: Do not say amnesty. That is a bad thing for you to say.

Well, let me just say that under the legislation that is before us now, we would have a circumstance immediately where people will be given legal status. They will be able to get any job and they are here safe and sound. Unless they get arrested for a felony or something very serious like that, they are put on a path that guarantees them the ability to go all the way to citizenship.

Mr. Rove says they have to pay a \$1,000 fine over 6 years. What is that—\$170 dollars a year, \$15, \$12 a month? So this is the punishment? You pay \$12 a month worth of fines, which allows you not to have to go home even though you entered the country illegally, did not wait your turn, and you are guaranteed a path to citizenship. Then at the end you have to pay another \$1,000 some 10, 13 years later. So this is the punishment in the legislation. But the people who came illegally get exactly what they wanted immediately, which is to stay here, have the ability to work here. They will get a Social Security card. They will get the ability to go to any job in the country. They will have an ID that would allow them to do that. So they will be able to compete for any job in America. They will be able to compete for jobs that our husbands and sons and daughters and grandchildren might be competing for out there. There will be 11 million in that position.

So I do not think my friend Karl is making a very strong point there that this is some sort of punishment. He says: They must pay taxes. Well, hallelujah. Should you not pay taxes? They are "barred from receiving any Federal benefits, including welfare and ObamaCare." That is a flat statement, and it is flat wrong. The first group, the DREAM Act group, which will be some 2, 2½ million, maybe 3 million, they will be citizens in 5 years and will

be able to get any of the Federal welfare programs in 5 years. Many of the ag workers will be in that position in 10 years. Any workers who qualify for the earned-income tax credit can get that immediately—now.

Other provisions are put off for 10, 13 years, and that makes the cost score look better. But over the long term, once the group is given legal status and citizenship, they will then qualify for every program. Since overwhelmingly the number of the workers here today are lower skilled who are illegal—they are lower skilled, and you can expect their incomes to be low—they will qualify for the earned-income tax credit, for Medicaid and program after program, food stamps and others.

The score goes up tremendously in the outyears. The Heritage Foundation is the only group who has done an in-depth analysis. They say that over the lifetime of the program, the people who are here illegally—if they are legalized under this bill, it would add \$6.3 trillion to the debt and deficit of the United States. That is a lot of money. That is almost as much as the unfunded liability of Social Security, which is about \$7 trillion. So this will be \$6 trillion. Some say that number is too high, but I have not seen anybody say that number is not in the ballpark. Nobody else has done a study to refute it. It is going to be trillions of dollars in the outyears.

It is not true that there will be no government benefits going to people who are in the country who get legalized under this. It is just not so. Well, this is another point. To me, this is sort of a fundamental point. It sounds so good when you have a political guru like my friend Carl. He says: To renew their temporary status after 6 years, those waiting to become citizens must prove they have been steadily employed, paid all taxes, and are not on welfare.

So let's take what has happened. So we have an individual who has been in the country 3 years. They get the provisional legal status immediately when the bill passes. In 6 years they have to, we are told, show they are steadily employed, paying taxes, and are not on welfare. Well, who is going to investigate that, first? No one.

So they have already been here 3 years. As long as they came before December 31, 2011, they are given legal status. Whether they have a job or not, they are given this legal status. Without a family, without roots in America other than having been here, they claim, before December 31, 2011. But we are not willing to deport them. So now 6 years later, they work intermittently, they are unemployed, and we have a recession, and we do not have enough jobs for people, and we are going to send out the feds and uproot them—their children are now in junior high and high school—and send them back home? Give me a break. That is one of the most bogus claims ever. That will not be enforced. There are

waiver authorities in the bill, so waivers will be issued. Nobody is going out to enforce this. I am just tired of them saying this. They should not even say it to try to get the American people to believe that we are going to actually go out and deport what could be millions of people who are out of work in the 5- or 6-year period when they have to reestablish themselves. That just bothers me.

These individuals, Karl Rove said, “must stand at the back of the line behind everyone who is waiting patiently and legally to immigrate here.” That is not so. Give me a break. Those people are here illegally now. They do not want to be deported, which is understandable. They are going to be given permanent status, a Social Security number, and a right to work anywhere in America. They are not ahead of somebody from Honduras waiting in line to come here, or not ahead of somebody in China or Italy or Spain? Of course they are ahead of them. They are not waiting. I am without words to express my concern about that. We need to be accurate about what the legislation says.

What about this amnesty? Well, people say: You should not call it amnesty.

Well, I think that is a legitimate word. The legislation before us would immediately give legal status, allow people to move to legal permanent residency and citizenship later. You have to pay a few thousand dollars in fines. Well, I think that is amnesty.

Someone said: Well, they pay a \$1,000 fine. They paid a penalty; therefore, you can't call it amnesty.

No, I do not agree. This legislation basically says that everybody here is given legal status and put on a guaranteed path to citizenship; just do not get convicted of a felony. So I really do not think that is a good argument. So that will continue for a bit. But I think the sponsors kind of gave up objecting back in 2007 when the legislation was before us at that time. But I would note that in 2007 the initial fine that people paid had to be paid up front—\$3,000. Under this bill you pay a \$1,000 fine over 6 years. Then to get a green card, the legal permanent residency, you had to pay an additional \$4,000, and an interim review period called for a fine or payment of \$1,500. In total, \$8,500. So in 2007 the payment required for somebody to move forward to citizenship was up to \$8,500. This bill is \$2,000—really \$1,000 to be able to stay here and work here, and that is a payment which is stretched out over time. The bill allows the fine to be paid in installments. So I would have to say it is difficult for me to accept that these people are earning their citizenship and that they are paying a price for it.

Then Mr. Rove mentions they have to pay their taxes. But one of our watchful publications, *Politico*, did an article about that on June 3. They said with regard to tax payments:

After all, it was one of the Gang of Eight's main talking points when it unveiled the im-

migration blueprint in January. Sponsors vowed that their proposal would include a back tax requirement to ward off critics' claims that their bill would be amnesty. Citizenship would come at a price, they said.

But the gang has all but dropped that talking point. The immigration legislation currently moving through the Senate includes a scaled-back provision that relies almost entirely on immigrants coming forward to the Internal Revenue Service voluntarily. Critics call it “toothless.”

It is toothless. There is no back tax. My friend, Karl Rove, is still out here spinning, claiming you have some great advantage. We are going to collect all these back taxes.

Nobody is going to investigate these cases, even if the law is clear. We don't have the money and the ability to do so, and it is not going to happen. That is just a fact.

Let's talk about in general some of the other issues that will come before us. I know my colleague, Senator LEE, will be joining us on the floor in a little bit, and I will yield to him if and when he comes, but I wanted to talk about these promises we were given by the people who wrote the bill, a promise that the path to citizenship would be “contingent upon securing our border and tracking whether legal immigrants have left the country when required.”

Now, that is fundamentally correct. That was the promise. That is one of the Gang of 8 principles they published. Our bill, they say, does that. I wish that were so. A path to citizenship would be “contingent upon securing our borders and tracking whether legal immigrants have left the country when required.” But in truth, the bill is amnesty first and a promise of enforcement later.

With regard to tracking immigrants who leave the country when they are required to, it devastates and weakens current law, so that can never happen, effectively. It is unbelievable to me they would directly pass a bill that directly contradicts current law.

On “Meet the Press” not too long ago, Senator SCHUMER—and one of the Gang of 8—said it flatout. He acknowledged that promise of enforcement first is not going to happen. He said, “First, people will be legalized. . . . Then we will make sure the border is secure.”

Instead of enforcement first, it is legalization first. That is as plain as day. It is not even disputed in any law. The illegal immigrants would be legalized immediately, and not a single border or interior enforcement measure has to be in place then or ever.

All Secretary Napolitano needs to do is submit two reports to Congress. Illegal immigrants will then begin receiving legal status, work permits, Social Security accounts, driver's licenses, travel documents, and other State benefits, financial benefits, that come from the States. Nothing requires that any border security be in place, any fence be built, before this amnesty is ever accomplished.

We were told we were going to have a trigger. Until the fences were built, until other enforcement mechanisms were undertaken, until that happened, you weren't going to have amnesty. But it is not so. All the Secretary needs to do is submit a report. She has already said we have better enforcement than ever before in history and indicated she does not believe we need more fencing. The contention from the Gang of 8 that we are going to have major fencing at the border has not been proven.

The Secretary of Homeland Security is merely supposed to develop a plan. Frank Sharry, the head of the pro-amnesty group, as I noted, said the following:

The triggers are based on developing plans and spending money, not on reaching that effectiveness, which is really quite clever.

Mr. Sharry let the cat out of the bag. He said it is a faux trigger, an apparent trigger that is not real. He said it was "quite clever"—and indeed it is—but it is now becoming clear that what has been promised is not happening. You could say to the American people: Don't be taken in on this. We can see it now, make your voices heard, follow this debate. If the promises for this bill are not followed, then let your voice be heard in Congress. Tell your Congressmen you are not happy. Tell your Senator you have to do better.

The whole crux of it is that if we have an amnesty, if we have a very generous, compassionate treatment of people who violated our laws and come here, shouldn't we have a policy that ends the illegality in the future?

That is what the American people have demanded for 30 years. They are good and decent people. That is an absolutely proper thing for them to demand of Congress, and we are not doing it. It is heartbreaking to me that we are here going through this process with a bill as flawed as this one. As times goes by we will talk more about it.

I see my friend, the Senator from Utah, Mr. LEE, who is a fabulous new addition to the Senate Judiciary Committee, where this legislation moved. He contributed in many able ways to the discussion, offering excellent amendments. He is a skilled lawyer and a man who is deeply committed to the principles of law that made our country great.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, today I rise in favor of immigration reform. The current immigration system is a travesty. It is inefficient, it is uncompassionate, and it is dangerous. It doesn't serve America's economic or social interests, and it undermines respect for the rule of law while simultaneously undermining respect for our democratic institutions. Comprehensive reform is both badly needed and long overdue.

The comprehensive immigration reform I envision includes real border se-

curity, visa modernization, employment verification, robust programs for both high- and low-skilled workers, and a compassionate approach to addressing the needs of those currently in the country illegally. But I believe each of these vital components must be addressed incrementally and sequentially in order to ensure meaningful results. I understand our reluctance to admit it, but Congress is simply very bad at overhauling and creating massive bureaucratic systems all at once.

Every new law, no matter how big, carries with it some unintended consequences. The bigger the law, the more accidental problems we tend to create. History teaches us that trying to fix lots of problems all at once is the surest way to avoid fixing any of them very well. ObamaCare is and will continue to make our health care system worse, not better. It promised to lower health insurance premiums. Yet they are exploding all across the country. The Dodd-Frank financial reform measure was supposed to end too-big-to-fail and prevent another financial meltdown. Yet Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac are still on the taxpayers' books, and today the very biggest banks on Wall Street are bigger than ever.

Do the American people have any idea that the PATRIOT Act would empower the National Security Agency to spy on all Americans through their cell phones and their computers? What makes any of us, least of all any conservative, believe this immigration bill is going to work out any better?

The lesson we should be taking from our recent mistakes is not that we need to pass better, huge, sweeping new laws, but that we should, instead, undertake major necessary reforms incrementally, one step at a time, and in the proper sequence. We need to face the fact that 1,000-page bureaucratic overhauls simply do not achieve their desired goals, and they create far more problems than they tend to solve. We can achieve comprehensive immigration reform without having to pass another 1,000-page bill full of loopholes, carveouts, and unintended consequences.

Therefore, from my perspective there is no one amendment that can fix this bill. Indeed, there is no series of tinkering changes that will turn this mess of a bill into the reform the country needs and that Americans deserve.

The only way to guarantee successful reform of the entire system is through a series of incremental reforms that ensure the foundational pieces, like the border security pieces and an effective entry and exit system, are done first and done directly. Such a common-sense process will allow Congress—and, more importantly, will allow the American people—to monitor policy changes as they are implemented with each step. That way we can isolate and fix unintended consequences before they grow out of control and before we move on to the next phase.

A step-by-step approach would also allow Congress to move quickly on

those measures on which Republicans and Democrats both tend to agree. We ought not hold commonsense and essential measures hostage to unavoidably contentious ones, and that is what this bill does. Both sides largely agree on many essential elements. These measures are relatively uncontroversial and could pass incrementally with broad bipartisan support in Congress.

Indeed, the only reason immigration reform is controversial is that Congress refuses to adopt the incremental approach. That is why true immigration reform must be pursued step by step, with individual reform measures implemented and verified in the proper sequence.

Happily for immigration reformers like me, this appears to be the approach being pursued by the House of Representatives. It is the only one that makes sense.

First of all, let's secure the border. Let's set up a workable entry-exit system and create a reliable employment verification system that protects immigrants, protects citizens, and protects businesses from bureaucratic mistakes. Then let's fix our legal immigration system to make sure we are letting in the immigrants our economy needs in numbers that make sense for our country. There is no good reason why we must, or even why we should, try to do it all at once, all in one bill, all in the same legislative package.

Once these and other tasks, which are plenty big in and of themselves, are completed to the American people's satisfaction, then we can address the needs of current undocumented workers with justice, compassion, and sensitivity. Since the beginning of this year, more than 40 immigration-related bills have been introduced in the House and the Senate. By a rough count, I could support more than half of them. Eight of them have Republican and Democratic cosponsors.

We should not risk progress on these and other bipartisan reforms simply because we are unable to iron out each and every one of the more contentious issues. This is not the bill to fix our immigration system.

I want to pass immigration reform. I want to debate immigration reform. That is exactly why we should not proceed to the Gang of 8 bill. We are being presented with a choice between the Gang of 8 bill or nothing. Common sense, recent history, and the ongoing legislative process of the House of Representatives confirmed that is a false choice. There is another way. It is a more sensible and a more successful way.

We can do better than another 1,000-page mistake. Haven't we learned our lesson in this regard? Isn't it time that we try?

Rather than fix our current immigration problems, the Gang of 8 bill will make many of them worse. It is not immigration reform, it is big government dysfunction. All advocates of

true immigration reform on the left and on the right should oppose it.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to engage in a colloquy with Senator LEE.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his comments and insight and contribution to the debate, as well as his clear mind and thinking that causes us to analyze how to handle things.

The problem we have today, at the most fundamental level, is that in 1987, as Senator GRASSLEY has been so passionate and so clear about, we voted for the 1987 amnesty, and amnesty occurred immediately with the promise of enforcement in the future. So in the view of Senator GRASSLEY, and the view of the American people by a 4-to-1 margin in a recent poll, we should have the enforcement first and then we will talk about amnesty. All right?

Senator LEE offered an amendment that dealt with this process. Under the legislation we have here, the question of enforcement is almost entirely given to the Secretary of Homeland Security, who has basically said enforcement is good now and we don't need any more enforcement and that she would basically certify or establish whether we have an effective border and enforcement system, and if not she would issue a report and would turn it over to a commission that had no power and they could review it. But that absolves Congress of their responsibility.

With that as background, the Senator offered a very interesting amendment that I think places the responsibility for enforcement where it should be. Would the Senator explain his thinking on that?

Mr. LEE. I certainly would. I would be happy to.

In the Judiciary Committee, on which the Senator from Alabama and I both sit, during the markup session on this bill we were able to propose a number of amendments. One of the amendments I proposed—Lee amendment No. 4—addressed this very problem, the problem inherent in the fact that much of what this bill accomplishes is to outsource and delegate many of the delicate tasks. Many of the delicate decisions that have to be made along the way in the implementation of this bill are outsourced to the Secretary of Homeland Security—the task of coming up with a border security plan and a border fencing plan. Once those plans are in place, and once the Secretary makes the necessary

findings under the bill, which she has basically complete discretion to do, then the RPI status begins—the pathway to citizenship commences. And citizenship from that moment forward, for those who meet the basic eligibility standards, becomes more or less a virtual certainty or becomes, at the very least, very likely.

So my concern was Congress would have no subsequent input in this decision. Each of us has been elected to this body, and each of our colleagues in the House of Representatives has been elected to that body, to make decisions, to make law, and not simply to make outside lawmakers who will make incremental pieces of law on the outside. Each of us will stand accountable at regular 6-year intervals in this body and 2-year incremental periods in the other body to the voters who placed us here. Each of us should have the opportunity to decide whether and to what extent the border has adequately been secured and whether and to what extent we have enough fencing along the border in order for us to begin this legalization process and the pathway to citizenship.

So Lee amendment No. 4 to this bill would have said simply the RPI status, this pathway, would not have commenced until such time as Congress had the chance to vote on whether we had made sufficient progress toward securing the border and fencing the border before the period of legalization started.

It is a very simple question, and it is the question that lies at the heart of the concerns surrounding this very bill. It is the question that lies at the heart of the lingering concerns regarding what we did back in 1986. I was only 14 years old at the time that debate commenced, so it was not at the forefront of my mind, although perhaps it should have been. But the lingering concerns surrounding what happened in 1986 relate to the fact that Congress said, in effect, we are going to go ahead and legalize the several million people who are here illegally right now, and then, once and for all, we are going to secure the border. We are going to stop the flow of illegal immigration once and for all. Well, that didn't happen because they sort of put it off and said at some unknown point in the future the border will in fact be secured. That would have solved that problem. At the very least it would have kept Members of Congress on the hook for finding the border was adequately secured by a subsequent vote before a pathway to legalization commenced.

To my surprise, to my dismay, and to my frustration my amendment was rejected, and it was rejected along the lines of a particularly odd argument. The argument went something like this, from those who professed their undying loyalty to the Gang of 8 bill as it was originally drafted. The argument said, in essence: We cannot adopt Lee amendment No. 4 because we can't trust Congress to do the right thing.

We can't trust Congress to do what we want Congress to do. In particular, the argument was made that we can't be certain the House of Representatives, currently under the control of the Republican Party, will in fact vote to commence the legalization process.

Well, if that is the case, aren't we saying we can't trust the democratic process? If that is the case, aren't we saying the American people aren't yet comfortable with that?

So I would ask my colleague from Alabama, why should we not trust the elected representatives of the American people to make critical decisions such as these? And why should we, instead, outsource them to someone having been appointed by the President and confirmed by the President, who doesn't respond, at least not directly, to the people at regular intervals in elections?

Mr. SESSIONS. I would say this is a very important amendment and I think it reveals a lot, as the Senator indicated. When we vote on an amnesty bill, and if that were to pass, the Senators voting for it are basically promising the American people, giving assurances to the American people they will end the illegality in the future. Because as I noted, the polls are 4 to 1 that we should have the enforcement before we give amnesty. And the reason is due to a lack of confidence.

So I think if the Senator's amendment had been passed, it would have placed some burden on us, a moral obligation to stand before the world at a point in time in the future and declare whether we have accomplished what we promised the American people we would do. Is that part of the Senator's thinking?

Mr. LEE. Yes, that is exactly why I introduced Lee amendment No. 4 in the committee and why I think it should have been passed. Because the whole reason we entrust the legislative power only to people who are elected at regular intervals and stand accountable to their electors at regular intervals is because of the fact it is perhaps the most dangerous power of government. We can do a lot of damage when we make law. And as a result of that potential for damage, that potential for harm we can inflict on the people, we have to stand accountable in incremental time periods of either 6 or 2 years to make sure we don't abuse that power. That is why it is so harmful when we take that very dangerous, potentially destructive power and we outsource it.

To some extent, in different ways, this has been going on for many decades. It started more or less during the New Deal era, when Congress discovered as the Federal Government was dramatically expanding Congress physically couldn't come up with the immense and steadily building task of legislating—of doing all the lawmaking and all the rulemaking it needed to do. So it started passing broader pieces of legislation, setting out very broad objectives, and then outsourcing to some

outside body—sometimes a Cabinet-level official, other times a so-called independent commission to do the real lawmaking.

During this time period, Congress discovered an interesting and important tool. During this time period it discovered sometimes we, as Members of Congress, are not going to like the way the outside body or the outside official within the executive branch might exercise this delegated lawmaking authority. So they reserved to themselves, they reserved for Congress an out—a legislative veto, as it became known. In some instances, this legislative veto allowed Congress, either the House or the Senate, to undo a rulemaking or an important decision made by an executive branch official or entity. In other cases it required both Houses to act in unison. But these legislative veto provisions did not require subsequent presentment to the President who could then sign or veto that legislative veto.

This went on for several decades. It went on until the mid-1980s when the Supreme Court intervened in a case called *INS v. Chada*, occurring, interestingly enough, in the immigration context; occurring, interestingly enough, in the specific context of a decision by the Attorney General to exercise delegated authority from Congress to issue a discretionary waiver of deportability to an otherwise removable alien.

The Supreme Court said this legislative veto was itself unconstitutional because it amounted, in essence, to a subsequent enactment by Congress that was not subject to the presentment requirement of article I, section 7 of the Constitution. Thus, the Supreme Court concluded in *INS v. Chada* the legislative veto provision, as it had been used for many decades, was itself unconstitutional, it was invalid, and was stricken.

Some might have predicted that, as of the moment of the issuance of this decision in *INS v. Chada*, Congress would say: That is it, we are not going to delegate this much authority anymore because we can't trust these outside officials, these outside entities within the executive branch of government to do the lawmaking. That is our job.

But that is not what happened. Shockingly, in the eyes of some, Congress continued to delegate its lawmaking authority left and right. If anything, it has accelerated its delegation of lawmaking authority. In part because Members of Congress, first and foremost, like to wash their hands of things, in the grand tradition of Pontius Pilate we are sometimes inclined to wash our hands of things and push important decisions off to someone else to make them, someone else who can take accountability for those decisions. It makes it easier for us. And in some ways that is what is happening here. In some ways that is what we are doing here by pushing off to the Sec-

retary of Homeland Security the decision to make a decision we ourselves ought to be making. That decision ought to rest here so we ourselves can be held accountable. We are not sovereigns unto ourselves. We certainly ought not be making sovereigns out of others who do not stand accountable to the people.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the Senator. I think that is very wise insight.

On the question of immigration, Congress has been irresponsible. The American people have pleaded with us to end the illegality and create a lawful system that serves the national interest—a system we can be proud of. And for 30 years Congress has failed.

The Senator's amendment requiring that vote by Congress to assure we do what we have promised to do reminds me of what happened in 2007—another bill that was a comprehensive immigration bill on the floor. I opposed that bill. It was stronger than this bill, considerably, in a lot of different ways, but it failed because we didn't have confidence about the future.

In the course of that debate, I think maybe shortly after the bill failed, we had an amendment to build a certain amount of fencing on the border. I offered that amendment, and it passed overwhelmingly.

Republicans and Democrats, virtually everybody, voted to build more fencing at the border—700 miles out of about a 1,700-mile border. Everybody was for that. But that was just the first vote, as our colleagues know. The second vote was whether anybody would appropriate any money to build the fence. So not long afterwards up comes an appropriations bill for homeland security and it had no money for the fence in it. Our colleagues, going back home: I voted to build a fence. But here we have a bill on the floor that doesn't have any money to build a fence. The fence wasn't going to get built.

I raised Cain about it and fussed and fussed and sort of mocked the Congress for one moment, saying: You are going to do something and not step up to the plate a little later. And they put money in for the fence. But you know what happened. Of the double-layered fencing that was required, 700 miles of it, only 36 were built. They came up with this idea of a virtual fence—airplanes and computers and radar. I guess. It was a total failure. We spent \$1 billion. It was abandoned. There are only 36 miles of double-fencing and 100 or so miles of automobile barriers. It was never built.

If we had to vote again to affirm what we did in the year, I think that would make it more likely—from my experience here about how this body works—that what we promised would get done. Does the Senator agree?

Mr. LEE. I certainly do. I think that would make a big difference. If we had to vote on it, it would have a couple of effects. First of all, the fact that we would have to vote on it would have an impact on the executive branch of gov-

ernment whose job it is to implement laws that we pass. The executive branch of government would normally have a duty—a duty that we would be following up on not just in some amorphous oversight committee hearing context, but we would be exercising oversight in a very real way in the sense that we would have to vote on whether they had done something adequately within a specified period of time. There would be consequences, real consequences, if we were to refuse to exercise that vote.

This vote would go through the normal process. It would be debated, discussed, and acted upon in both Houses of Congress and then submitted to the President for signature or veto and would therefore be wholly consistent with the presentment clause of the Constitution.

Some have suggested this might be a bad idea because it would perhaps get held up through some procedural mechanism or another, but the way the amendment was written, that would not, in fact, be the effect. This would be a privileged motion through which it could come on the floor. It would go through the Senate on a 51-vote threshold and would therefore be able to move through quite quickly. That is why it is important for this kind of mechanism to be in a bill such as this.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank my colleague because the dangerous problem is so very real. As Senator GRASSLEY has so eloquently discussed, it is one thing to grant amnesty today, it is another to see in the future that we follow through on a system that will end illegality in America.

Senator LEE, you are a good lawyer. You have been involved in a number of these issues. It is very clear that the American Immigration Lawyers Association was involved in the drafting of this legislation. I do not say it was all done just for their personal gain, but did the Senator notice quite a number of alterations in current law that gave more flexibility, and resulted in more uncertainty; where the law says thus and so, but it can be waived for hardship or family problems or other matters?

As a lawyer, consider what at first glance would be an open-and-shut case where your client is in the country illegally and due to be deported, but now under the bill, the client can demand a trial and perhaps overload the system. Everybody claims hardship; everybody claims some other exception to the rule. Is there a danger that our whole enforcement system would be bogged down in litigation we never had before?

Mr. LEE. Yes, it certainly could be and it certainly would be if at the end of the day you have literally hundreds of instances of Secretarial discretion built into the bill. If every one of these important decisions that have to be made along the way, or through the process, on legal immigration—if any of the critical decisions that have to be made along the way are subject to certain rules but those rules can be

waived by the Secretary at the Secretary's unfettered discretion, it is not much of a law. It becomes something else. It becomes a set of guidelines with ultimate discretionary decisionmaking vested in the Secretary. That is something very different than a law.

I do not doubt that there were lots of people who had input on this bill, nor do I necessarily blame any one group for being involved. They have every right to give their input into a law. But at the end of the day we have to ask the question: Whose job is it to legislate? It is not their decision to legislate. The accountability to legislate or the accountability for flaws in this bill therefore must not rest with any outside group, any group of lawyers or activists of any stripe or at either end of the political spectrum. The accountability for the legislation that moves through this body must rest ultimately with us, and that includes legislation that gives someone else the effective power to legislate, as this one does, in literally hundreds of instances.

If at the end of the day this bill—assuming it is passed out of this body and passed by the House of Representatives and signed into law by the President—if this bill at the end of the day says, for instance, that the Secretary may at her discretion waive certain exclusions, waive exclusions that would otherwise prevent somebody from entering onto the pathway to citizenship on grounds that they had reentered the country after previously being deported, that is a pretty big issue. At that moment somebody who has reentered the country after previously being deported has committed a felony.

The point has been made many times that it is not necessarily a crime to enter this country illegally. It is considered by most to be a civil violation. But that changes when you have been previously deported. A previously deported illegal alien who reenters following deportation has committed a felony offense. So if the legislation we are considering now becomes law and if at the end of the day it is enacted, it allows for those people to enter onto a pathway to citizenship, and I think that is cause for concern. It is one of many areas in which we need to be very cautious in granting this much discretion to the Secretary of Homeland Security.

I got a letter from a woman in my home State of Utah, a woman who is a schoolteacher in American Fork, UT. She is an immigrant to this country. She is here on a nonimmigrant visa. She sent me a letter saying: I spent years of my life and thousands of dollars immigrating to this country legally, the right way. I have a job. It is a good job, a job that I love, a job teaching school. But I am here on a visa, and that visa expires in a few years. I know when that visa expires unless somehow I am able to get that visa extended or able to get another visa, I will be sent home. I will have to leave this country. And it breaks my

heart, she wrote, that at the same time that I am going to have to leave this country, there will be lots of people—in fact, 11 million or more—who are currently here illegally, who have broken the law coming here, many of whom have been working here illegally, who will not only be allowed to stay, not only allowed to stay in their current job, but put on a pathway to citizenship.

She said: This seems like a profound unfairness, that we are rewarding those who have broken the law while we are punishing people who, like me, a schoolteacher, came here on a non-immigrant visa and have spent years of their lives and thousands of dollars trying to do it the right way.

Does the Senator think that is cause for concern that relates to this excessive granting of discretion?

Mr. SESSIONS. I couldn't agree more. When you, as I had the honor to do, prosecute violations of Federal law for over 14 years, you feel a deep, abiding sense that fairness has to occur. You are putting somebody in jail for a period of time. You are saying "you don't get this money" if they submit a claim you cannot give them, even though they might benefit but they do not qualify. When you do these things day after day, you have to believe that the system works.

With regard to immigration, it is so deeply important that people who wait in line and who do things the right way, believe others are not getting away with it and are not beating the system. Otherwise, they feel like chumps. They feel as though they have been had by the system.

It is such a deep moral responsibility, not just for the Federal prosecutors. The ones I know feel deeply about this. They really feel that sense because you cannot do your job every day and go to bed and sleep if you do not believe that everybody is equal and the system works.

You do a tough job one day: You don't qualify for disability; you don't qualify for money; you have to go to jail. The guidelines say you go. And then the next guy comes along and the guidelines don't apply to him. The next guy files a claim and he gets some money and you didn't. It is so critical for the magnificent legal heritage of our country that the law be followed equally. Anybody who suggests that this amnesty that will occur has no moral consequences does not understand the depth of the question involved.

If we do it and if we do something very compassionate for people who are here illegally, the American people are correct to say: Do not let it happen again. Do not let this happen again. The way the law should work in America: You come legally—OK. You don't come legally, you get deported. That is what the law is. That is what it should be. Anything less than that cannot be defended morally. It cannot be defended constitutionally. It cannot be

defended legally. It cannot be defended as a matter of policy.

People blithely suggest we can just reward an American who came into this country illegally, 18 months ago, and never had a job, but because they were not caught and deported in the interim, they get to stay here legally forever and be on a guaranteed path to citizenship. Whereas your friend who came here legally and followed the rules, the lady who wrote you, has to go back home? We cannot treat this lightly.

If we do this—and I am prepared to work on it and try to do it in a good way—we absolutely have to do it in a way that does not damage, too much, the rule of law. It will damage the rule of law because it is a violation of the rule of law to reward somebody who came illegally by giving them the benefit of their act. If people rob a bank and you catch them, they have to give the money back. They don't get to keep the money. They don't get to keep the benefits of their activity, normally.

We are willing to reconsider that. We are willing, as a nation, to compassionately reconsider that. I think the American people are willing to do this. But I ask my colleague Senator LEE whether he believes people feel uneasy about this. They don't like it that this is a thing they believe they must do, but they know it is not a good thing and should be avoided in the future?

Mr. LEE. The American people are a compassionate people. They are a people who welcome immigrants because we are a nation of immigrants and we always have been. I think most of us hope we always will be. We want people to continue to come to this country. It is this sense of compassion that causes many of us to have some sense of concern about this particular legislation. This legislation goes far beyond simply showing compassion. This legislation in some ways is the opposite of compassion when you consider it from the perspective of those who, like this woman who wrote this letter to me, have come here legally. And those who, unlike her, have waited—in some cases for years outside the United States. There are many people who have spent a lot of money and time hoping and praying that one day they too will get to immigrate to this country legally. We do them a great disservice when we say the effort, time, blood, sweat, and tears they devoted to this process is all for naught, because all they had to do was come here illegally, and not only were they put on a pathway to legalization but on a pathway to citizenship.

One of the more enlightening moments in the Senate Judiciary Committee during the markup of this bill was when our friend and colleague, the junior Senator from Texas, introduced an amendment which would have done one simple thing to adjust that process. All hell broke loose.

Senator CRUZ introduced an amendment which would have left everything

else about the bill intact and kept everything else in the bill identical to what it says now with only one change. It would have said those people who entered into RPI status—entered into the pathway of legalization—would not ultimately become citizens. They could ultimately become lawful, permanent residents or the functional equivalent thereof, but they would not become citizens under the bill. Everything else would be left intact. They still would be allowed to come out of the shadows, stay here, work here, and we could have a separate debate and discussion over whether that would be the right approach in and of itself.

This particular amendment focused simply on the citizenship aspect of it, and yet one would have thought by the reaction that it was offering up something horrible and Draconian. The proponents of this bill could not even handle the change that would have said: Let's have there be some consequence, at least, for the fact that this group of people entered here illegally. At least at this point let's not put them on a pathway to citizenship so they can vote and all the other rights which accompany citizenship to this great country.

Yes, I do think this is strange. I do think the American people—not in spite of the fact they are compassionate, but because of the fact they are compassionate—deserve more than to have the rule of law turned on its head and deserve more than to have those who have taken the time and expended the energy and financial resources to immigrate here legally, to have their sacrifice denigrated to the point that it means nothing or less than nothing.

Mr. SESSIONS. That is a very interesting insight the Senator made. I believe Senator SCHUMER was particularly hostile to that amendment and said: Without citizenship, there is no reform. In other words, we will not agree to anything; that is absolutely nonnegotiable.

I thought about that bill a lot since 2007 and have been thinking about it ever since. I believe after 1986 we gave amnesty and citizenship with the promise of enforcement, and that didn't happen. We promised it wouldn't happen again and that we wouldn't do another amnesty.

This was supposed to be a one-time amnesty which wouldn't happen again. It was supposed to be the clear policy of the United States that if someone entered the country illegally, that person would not get every single thing America could provide, and we would not provide such benefits as would be provided to people who entered lawfully. I don't believe we should—and certainly are not required—to provide citizenship to somebody who entered the country unlawfully. It is just not required.

I thought attacking Senator CRUZ's amendment was odd and revealing as the junior Senator from Utah did. It

was a surprise to me as far as the intensity of their pushback on that. I don't believe it should happen. I don't think it is the right thing.

So the person would be able to get permanent, legal, resident status; participate in America; and, of course, their children would be citizens; but they can't get everything if they come illegally.

I read a brilliant piece recently by a Yale graduate lawyer, a marine, and he talked about the military. We act as though, if somebody comes into this country illegally, it would be unthinkable that they would be required to move themselves back to where they came from. We tell our military guys all the time to move their families. They get orders to go to west Texas, Alabama, Germany, Japan, and Korea. They spend 18 months in Iraq with their lives on the line. They have to leave their families, and they do it all the time.

So they come to this country under the lawful condition that they can come for so many months—and they volunteer, they sign up. I come in, I get to stay so many years, and I am supposed to go home.

Is this somehow unkind? Is it immoral to expect those people—when their time is up—to go home?

Some of the thinking, which came up in the committee, seemed to be totally oblivious to this fundamental concept. There are certain requirements. They are not allowed to pay a guide to come across the border illegally and 18 months later demand a pathway to citizenship in the United States. It is just not law. I don't know what that is, but it is not law. It is not the way principled policies should be executed.

We are willing to consider and work through a process. For some time I have said we want to be compassionate to those people who have been here a long time and have done well. We can work through it. But when they come through this system, they need to have no doubt that in the future, if they overstay their visa or come into the country illegally, and they are apprehended, they will be deported. If we don't make that commitment intellectually, morally, and legally, then we have guaranteed we will have another amnesty, or fight, and the integrity of our immigration law will be further degraded.

Mr. LEE. As surely as past is prologue, this will happen again if we do it in the wrong sequence. Sequencing matters.

When I was 6 or 7 years old, my mother pointed out to me that you don't try to butter the toast before you toast it. You toast it first and then put the butter on top.

There are all kinds of examples where we need to follow the right sequence. If they don't follow the right sequence, they don't get the results they want. This is another area where sequence matters.

I am convinced we can treat those 11 million people who are currently here

illegally with the dignity, respect, and compassion we want to treat them with as Americans. I am convinced we can find a way to do that. I am convinced we can find a broad-based bipartisan solution to do that. I am less convinced that it makes any sense to do that now before we fix the underlying problem.

Again, it is a matter of simple sequencing. We have to first stop the flow of illegal immigration. After that, we will be in a better position to ascertain the needs of those who are currently here illegally. It is only in that circumstance that we will know best how to address that.

Along those lines, I would like to address an issue which sometimes comes up. Sometimes arguments are made by the proponents of this bill that if we don't support this bill—not just if we don't support immigration reform generally, but if we don't support this particular bill—we are somehow anti-immigrant or uncategorically uncompassionate people. If we don't support the bill, our hearts are made of stone, our ribs are made of concrete, and we have no heart. I think that is a reckless argument and an argument beneath the dignity of this august body.

During the markup, one of my colleagues—I think the junior Senator from Texas—introduced another amendment. It was an amendment which would have in some way limited the ability of those currently illegally in the country to participate in certain entitlement benefits, certain anti-poverty benefits that would otherwise be available to them. Perhaps it was the earned-income tax credit. I don't remember the exact information, but it would have had some broad application to make sure that those who are currently here illegally would not—during this RPI period—be able to benefit from federally funded entitlements.

To my great dismay, one of our colleagues on that committee—who was a devout supporter of this bill—personally attacked the junior Senator from Texas simply for having introduced that amendment. It wasn't enough for him to say: I disagree with this amendment or that this amendment is bad policy. He attacked with something like this: You don't care about these people. You don't care about their children. You are willing to let their children remain hungry and uneducated. You don't care about them. You are not compassionate.

With respect, I think that kind of comment has no place here. It is not helpful. It is not productive, and it is something that completely clouds the issue. It is because we are compassionate that we do need to ask these questions.

Look, we are in a difficult spot as a country. We are trying to do everything we can to make those programs solvent which are designed specifically to alleviate some of the needs of the most vulnerable in our society. Unless we make sure we are in a position economically to be able to sustain those

programs, we are going to run out of money. And when we run out of money, it will be the poor and the vulnerable who suffer most as a result of our inability to pay for those programs.

So with respect, I advise all of my colleagues—particularly those who have made comments like that one—to resist the temptation that some of them have succumbed to in recent weeks to say that anyone who opposes this bill is somehow uncompassionate. It is because we are compassionate that we have to ask these difficult questions. It is because we are compassionate that we have to propose amendments we think are necessary in order to make the programs upon which our society's most vulnerable have come to depend on more sustainable.

Mr. SESSIONS. I am glad Senator LEE mentioned that because we have to have an honest debate. We have to have an honest discussion about what is in the national interest of the United States and how immigration fits into that. First and foremost, do we want to have a lawful system or not? Do we want to allow lawlessness to continue in the future? It is not unkind to talk about that.

Prime Minister Cameron, of the UK in London, recently made this remark—they are wrestling with immigration and how to do it the right way in the United Kingdom. He says:

There are those who say you can't have a sensible debate because it is somehow wrong to express concerns about immigration. Now I think that is nonsense.

I think we can have a sensible discussion about it when we ask about how many people will come, what skills they should possess, and what America would benefit from most with the immigrants we have coming to our country; what immigrants would be most likely to be successful, flourish, and do well.

We have had statistics established that people who come with about 2 years of college and speak English almost always do very well, but people who come without high school diplomas don't do as well. If we cannot accept everybody, we ought to think about and try to develop a system which allows people who can be the most successful to take advantage of America. That would be helpful.

Prime Minister Cameron goes on to say:

While I've always believed in the benefits of migration and immigration, I've also always believed that immigration has to be properly controlled. Without proper controls, community confidence is sapped, resources are stretched and the benefits that immigration can bring are lost or forgotten.

I think that is somewhat in line with the points the Senator from Utah was making.

I see the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Senator LEAHY, who has wrestled with these issues longer than I have. He conducted a markup which allowed a large number of amendments. Unfortunately, some of the

members, even though they liked their amendments, wouldn't agree to vote for them. We have a process that allowed some airing of the details of the bill, and a lot of amendments were offered.

I thank Senator LEE for participating in this discussion and coming to the Senate with fresh ideas, enthusiasm, and passion for America, the rule of law, the proper functioning of our branches of government, and the classical constitutional heritage of this Nation. I am honored to serve with my distinguished colleague.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HIRONO). The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, it is good to see the Presiding Officer here as a member of the Senate Judiciary Committee.

As the Presiding Officer knows, the Senate Judiciary Committee held lengthy and extensive public markup sessions on the Border Security, Economic Opportunity and Immigration Modernization Act, S. 744. We worked late into the evenings—we also started pretty early in the morning—debating the bill. We considered hundreds of amendments.

The public saw our consideration firsthand. We streamed everything we did on the Internet and it was broadcast on television. We took all the proposed amendments, Republican and Democratic alike, and put them on our Web site. We updated the Committee's Web site to include adopted amendments in real time. I heard from people all over the country that they felt they actually had involvement in what we were doing, which is what I want.

I appreciate the fact that members from both sides of the aisle, Republicans and Democrats, praised the transparent process and also praised the significant improvements to the bill made by the Judiciary Committee. In fact, the markup process followed three additional hearings on the bill—on top of all the others we had—with 26 witnesses, and the bill, as amended, was supported by a bipartisan two-thirds majority of the committee.

I have sent that bill, S. 744, to the Senate on behalf of the Judiciary Committee and am filing an extensive committee report as well. I hope the report is going to be a valuable resource for Senators. It explains not only the underlying provisions in the legislation and its history, but it also summarizes all the amendments that were adopted and also those that were rejected.

In order for all Senators to be able to file amendments and work on this bill, of course the Senate first needs to proceed to the bill. I had hoped that what has become all too typical obstruction would not infect the proceedings. Senators from both sides of the aisle worked together to develop this legislation. Senators from both sides of the aisle had amendments adopted by the Judiciary Committee. Almost none of the more than 135 amendments adopted

by the Judiciary Committee were adopted along party-line votes, unlike this week's vote in the House in which nearly every member of the Republican conference stood together to prevent DREAMers from being able to stay in our country. The one thing that ought to unite all of us is the DREAM Act.

These young people are here through no fault of their own. They have enriched our Nation. They have enriched this debate. I am proud that we in the Senate are considering inclusive legislation that supports them, and I hope a fair process in the Senate finally prompts action in the other Chamber.

I don't know how anybody who professes to care about family values, who professes to care about other people, can sit down with these young people—the DREAMers—and not be moved and not want them to have the same advantages our children and our grandchildren have.

The dysfunction in our current immigration system affects all of us. It is long past time for reform. As members of the Senate Judiciary Committee from both parties said at the conclusion of our proceedings, this is a matter of great significance to the American people, and the Senate should debate it. But the Senate is being delayed from doing so by a small minority of opponents. This is not the time to have a tiny handful stop a debate.

There are only 99 Senators now, with the loss of our dear friend Frank Lautenberg. But take a Senate of 100 people, we represent over 300 million Americans, and they are counting on us not to use stalling tactics, but to stand—vote for or vote against, but stand up and vote.

When one stalls and refuses to let votes come in, it is an easy way to say: I am voting maybe. Then you can go back home and you can be on everybody's side, for the people for it or people against it. "I am on your side," because nobody can point that you voted one way or the other. That is not what we were elected for. We were elected to stand and take a position, yes or no, not maybe.

The legislation we seek to bring before the Senate was the result of Senators from both sides of the aisle who came together and made an agreement. What was initially a proposal from the so-called Gang of 8 became, through the committee process, the product of a group of 18. Now let's have a product of a group of 100 representing all States in this country.

Amendments offered by 17 of those 18 members were adopted into the bill. Seventeen of the eighteen members of the Senate Judiciary Committee had amendments adopted into the bill. A bipartisan majority of more than two-thirds of the Senate Judiciary Committee voted for the bill the Senate is being called upon to consider.

I am honored to serve as both the chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee and the President pro tempore of the Senate, an office established in

article 1, section 3 of the Constitution of the United States. I have been privileged to serve the people of Vermont for more than 45 years, the last 38 as their Senator. But one thing I learned many years ago, taught to me by the distinguished majority leader at that time when I came to the Senate, Senator Mike Mansfield, is how important it is for Senators to keep their commitments, keep their word, to stay true to their agreements. If Senators who have come together to help develop this bill do those things, I have no doubt we will be able to end this filibuster, stop voting maybe, and actually vote up or down and pass this fair but tough legislation on comprehensive immigration reform.

Our history, our values, and our decency can inspire us finally to take action without the prolonged partisanship that often paralyzes this Chamber. We need an immigration system that lives up to American values. This is a time when we are called upon to come together. Few topics are more fundamental to who we are as a nation than immigration.

The Statue of Liberty has long proclaimed America's welcome:

Give us your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free. . . . Send these, the homeless, tempest-tost to me.

That is what America stood for. That is what we should continue to represent. That is the America that attracted my maternal grandparents from Italy to Vermont and my paternal great-grandparents from Ireland to Vermont. Immigration through our history has been an ongoing source of renewal of our spirit, our creativity, and our economic strength.

Our bipartisan legislation establishes a path to earned citizenship for the 11 million undocumented immigrants in this country. It addresses the lengthy backlogs in our current immigration system—backlogs that have kept families apart sometimes for decades. It grants a faster track to the DREAMers brought to this country as children through no fault of their own, and to agricultural workers who provide our Nation's critical food supply. It makes important changes to the visas used by dairy farmers and the tourists and by immigrant investors who are creating jobs in our communities.

It addresses the needs of law enforcement, which requires the help of immigrants who witness crime or are victims of domestic violence and human trafficking. It improves the treatment of refugees and asylum seekers so the United States will remain the beacon of hope in the world. This is going to make us all safer.

This is a measure the Senate should come together, consider, and pass. We should do what is right, what is fair, and what is just. Immigration reform is an important economic issue, a civil rights issue, and a fairness issue. If a majority of us stand together and we stay true to our values and our agreements, I believe we can pass legislation

to write the next great chapter in the American history of immigration.

Those of us serving in the Senate who are immigrants understand that. Those of us who are children or grandchildren of immigrants understand that. Just as my wife's family came to this country and created a better State of Vermont, they understood it, similar to so many who come.

The distinguished Presiding Officer knows better than anybody in here what it is to come and become part of this great country. One can come as an immigrant and then become a Senator of the United States. As President pro tempore, I am delighted to see the Presiding Officer in the chair.

I suggest the absence of a quorum, and I ask unanimous consent that the time be divided equally.

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

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

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

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

Mr. NELSON. Madam President, I wish to address the issue being debated in front of the Senate. I thank the chairman of the Judiciary Committee for the leadership he has offered. The chairman has a strong and firm but fair hand. He has allowed the bill to be here and has been assisted by very able lieutenants on the Judiciary Committee, not the least of whom is Senator SCHUMER of New York who, as the subcommittee chairman, has been absolutely key.

I also wish to compliment our colleague from Florida Senator RUBIO. People in this highly charged partisan atmosphere say, How can a Democrat or a Republican, or vice versa, say good things about each other; and, of course, I am not only willing to do so but do so at the drop of a hat, to give credit where credit is due. It is too bad so much of the discussion is based on ideological philosophies and is so partisan-charged and tinged. We seem to be looking for that slight little advantage in the next election so that we get to the point where we can't come together.

I think what we are going to see on display in the Senate over the course of the next several weeks is that the Senate can function and it can function in a bipartisan way. I give no small amount of credit to the bipartisan group in the Gang of 8. They have arrived on the scene at the right place at the right time.

A number of us have been trying in this Chamber, and previously when I was a Member of the House of Representatives, going back to when I was a young Congressman, to get comprehensive immigration reform. I voted on it in the 1980s. We actually passed a

bill. It is instructive to know at that time, in the 1980s, there were less than 3 million illegal aliens or undocumented individuals, however we wish to refer to them, in the country. That attempt at immigration reform failed because there were no safeguards to make sure the law was followed—especially among employers—to make sure the people they were hiring were legal. As a result, over the ensuing decades, the law wasn't followed. So what happened? The amount of undocumented individuals in the country rose from less than 3 million in the 1980s all the way to where it is now, which is about 11.5 million.

So the time and the place has arisen to do something about it. It is too bad it hasn't been done, but what is done is done. Now we have a chance to change that.

If one happens to come from a State such as my beloved State of Florida that has such a rich mixture in the fabric of our society of so many different peoples from so many different parts of the world, then, of course, a person ought to be a little more sensitive to the broken system we have. Thus, it was not unusual that when it came time that suddenly a case exploded in the newspapers of a child, a DREAMer who had come here as a child with parents who were undocumented, the child never even knew he or she was not American and it gets down to the end of their graduation in high school and they want to go off to college or they want to go into the military and, lo and behold, they are now under the order of deportation.

Of course, this Senator, similar to many other Senators, has had to try to intervene in these very egregious cases. I wish to mention one, and it illustrates the ridiculousness of the present system that is so broken.

A child brought at age 6 months from the Bahamas now grows up in America thinking he is American. He is a Floridian. He goes into the Army. How he missed the checks there that he was undocumented I do not know. But he goes into the Army. He serves two tours in Iraq. He has a top secret rating.

When he comes back, after the two tours, going into the private sector, he enlists in the Naval Reserves, and because of his top secret clearance, this particular now Navy reservist on Active Duty is sent to the very sensitive position—because of his top secret clearance—of being a photographer at the Guantanamo detention facility for the detainees, and he serves in that position admirably.

Somehow in the process after this, back in civilian life, this particular former Army, now Navy, reservist, in applying for an application for a passport, answers something incorrectly on the passport application—because he does not know he is not an American—and he gets arrested and he is thrown in jail and is in jail for 3 going on 4 months, until this Senator finds out

about this case—because I am reading it in the newspaper—and, of course, once we blew this up to the attention of the public at large, even the Federal judge asked the prosecutor: Why in the world are you prosecuting this case? That shows the ridiculousness of existing law because it is so broken.

That, of course, had a good outcome. It did not have a good outcome while somebody who had a top secret clearance is sitting in jail for over 3 months, but it is illustrative, again, that we have to do something about the existing system.

Thus, we have in front of us a compromise. Remember, the art of legislating is respecting the other fellow's point of view, reaching out, trying to bridge the differences, with the goal that we want to achieve a result.

There are some here who do not want to achieve that result, and they are going to try to torpedo it. They are going to try to put poison pills that are so seductive as amendments that will kill the bill. They are going to make a lot of the Senators on both sides of the aisle take tough votes on things they would ordinarily support, but they are going to have to reject them to keep the integrity of the compromise in order, at the end of the day, to pass an immigration reform bill and then hope we get a big enough vote so that there is such a momentum—and with all the different advocacy groups, including businesses, farmers, the immigration community, pro-immigration reform community, all of them—to start to lean heavily on the House of Representatives, and maybe at that point we can get the bill passed.

As we consider this bill to fix this broken immigration system, many of us are going to disagree about details, but we have to remember what is the goal at the end of the day. This bill includes important things to secure the borders. You think the borders are secure now? By the way, they are a lot more secure now than they were just a few years ago. They are catching some 60 percent of all the people who are coming across the border now, but that is not good enough. Forty percent is still coming across. This bill is going to try to take it up to 90 percent.

They are going to reform the visa program. They are going to make it easier, at the end of the day, because of the technology we have, where you can swipe the passport. Some countries desperately have wanted to get into a visa waiver instead of having families come hundreds of miles to the consulate. Because of the information that is going to be contained on that passport—biometric information—we are going to be able to streamline that process.

Certainly, at the end of the day, we are going to be able to supply the workforce needs of the country if the employers will follow the law. So now this reform bill is going to make it mandatory upon those employers to follow the law so they can have a legal

workforce instead of what is the case now: Do not look. I have to have them for my business or my farm, my agriculture—whatever the business is, I have to have them—but do not look because I know they are illegal. That is going to be changed.

Then there is another component. What about those people who came here on a legal visa, but now they have overstayed the visa. We are going to be able to check because now, with that biometric information, they are going to swipe as they leave the country that information so it matches with the information we got when they came into the country on a legal visa. Now we are going to know who is staying behind.

By the way, those countries that want to be in the visa waiver program, such as Chile or Brazil, they have to keep those defaults under 3 percent of the total visas. Lo and behold, now those countries that want to keep the visa waiver to make it easier on their citizens to travel to the United States—how about all those Brazilians who want to come to Disney World—now they have an incentive to help their own people by keeping those defaults under 3 percent of the total visas for that country. This reform of the visa program is very important.

What about the people who are here? Does anybody think the solution to the problem is to deport 11 million people? We cannot do that. But if we could, what would happen to this national economy? It would collapse. So we are going to make a very lengthy path to getting a green card, of which they are going to have to pay fines, they are going to have to pay the taxes, they are going to have to learn English, and they are going to have to go to the end of the line, but they are going to be here legally so they can be employed, and they have to stay employed. If they do not stay employed, they are out.

Anybody who does not abide by all of that presently—we do not have a requirement that they have to learn English. Now they are going to have to learn English. So anybody who does not make all of those requirements is going to have to leave.

I have just scratched the surface of the bill. But I think we can see it is a good-faith attempt to bring together all of the interests, using a little common sense to try to reform what is a broken system. I hope we will get a huge vote out of the Senate. I hope this vote exceeds three-quarters of the Senate. That will send a real message to the House.

I yield the floor and 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. SESSIONS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, as we begin to discuss this legislation, the immigration bill that is before us, a lot of people have not realized it is coming up. A lot of people do not realize the breadth of it and a lot of people are concerned about it. We have gotten a lot of phone calls in my office. People are wondering who is speaking up about the bill and they want to know what is in the bill. So I think that is a big part of what we should be doing in the days to come—going over the bill in a careful way concerning any progress the bill makes and any deficiencies the legislation has.

As I noted previously, the fundamental challenge we must recognize—based on the way Congress works and the difficulty it has had with these issues over the last number of years—is that we have to be sure that once the amnesty is granted that there is enforcement in the future.

In 1986, that bill, as Senator GRASSLEY has so passionately delineated—he voted for it. Amnesty was given to 3 million people, but the enforcement never occurred, and now we have 11 million people here illegally. This cannot happen again. If we allow this to happen again, we will have eviscerated any ability we have to ask people to comply with the law because people who do not comply with the law are not held to account.

There is nothing wrong with saying a person can come to America under certain conditions for certain periods of time and then they must leave. If they do not leave, and they are apprehended, they should be deported. We are in a condition today where nobody is being deported.

Ask your law officers in whatever city and county you are in—and this has been going on since before President Obama took office—if they catch somebody who was speeding in their town in Alabama or Indiana or Colorado and they discover they are here illegally what happens. Isn't this a fundamental question?

What happens is they turn them loose—you ask them, your law officers—because nobody will come and get them. The Federal Government has reached a point now where virtually no one is being deported except those convicted of serious crimes.

It has led to the ICE union—the Immigration and Customs Enforcement officers who deal with deportations and arrests—these officers voting no confidence in the head of the ICE Department, John Morton—the head man, John Morton, no confidence.

I never heard of it. Then, in addition, they have opposed the bill. They said it makes things worse. It will diminish America's national security. And it will not make the law better. So we have the association, the union for customs—Citizenship and Immigration Services, which deals with the citizenship processing—they have opposed the bill. They say it will make the situation worse than present law, which is not being enforced today.

That is what we are wrestling with here overall. I know the American people need to get alerted to this.

We have been told by the supporters of the legislation: Do not worry—we are going to have the toughest enforcement legislation in history. Senator SCHUMER said: “Tough as nails.” “The toughest ever.” Well, this is not in the bill.

So what happened in 1987 was that once the amnesty was given, everybody forgot in the future to worry about enforcement. Enforcement just did not happen. It is going to happen again. That is exactly what is going to happen again.

The people who are concerned about the legislation and are objecting to this legislation are not against immigration. We allow 1 million people to come into the country legally every year—more than any other country in the world. We are not trying to stop that. What we are trying to say is that you need a good future now for immigration, and you need to be sure it is enforceable.

More people want to come to this great land than can come here. I do not blame them for wanting to come here. If somebody convinces them that the American people or the American Government does not care if they come illegally and stay here and eventually they will be given citizenship, why should they not come illegally?

So we have to have a national consensus that as we treat compassionately people who have been here a long time and have been good people and we try to be generous there, that we do not create a further flow of illegal immigration. We have been warned of what will happen by governmental experts. We have to have a national consensus that we tighten up the enforcement mechanisms that are so clearly broken today. So that is the fundamental principle of what we are about. I am going to mention some of that now. We will talk about more of those problems in the future.

The whole fundamental principle is that we need to create a lawful system of immigration that works in the future as well as today. Our sponsors, the Gang of 8, have said that is what they have. They have told us their bill does that. They say: Our bill will end the illegality at the border. They say they are going to have strong enforcement on visa violations, which is really not true. They say they have guaranteed enforcement at the workplace. That one has some benefits, but the way they have done it, it delays it longer than it should be. It creates some changes there. But good workforce enforcement would be a step forward. Then they claim they have mechanisms that lead to removal of dangerous people from the country—all of which I have to say is fundamentally not accurate. So they acknowledge what needs to be done.

So the Members of the Senate and the Members of Congress and the

American people need to be asking: Does this bill do what has been promised? If it does, we may be on the track to doing something good. But if it does not, it needs to be rejected.

We cannot go down the path of amnesty now and another massive illegality in the future. We cannot do that. We have to do the right thing. Isn't that the right thing? Our sponsors of the bill say it. They promised this is going to be “as tough as nails,” “the toughest bill ever.”

Well, I can tell you with absolute confidence that it is not as strong as the bill in 2007 that was voted down and rejected. It is weaker than that was. It is weaker than current law in so many important areas.

You say: Well, you can say that, JEFF. It is not true.

It is true. Fundamentally, we will show that the legislation is not where it needs to be. Even Senator RUBIO is saying he will not vote for the bill itself. He is one of the Gang of 8 who wrote it, but he says there are enough loopholes that he would not vote for it now. It has to be reformed. It absolutely has to be reformed, there is no doubt about that. But the problem is, except for Senator RUBIO, I guess the Gang of 8 agreed to stick together and had no real amendments passed. They did that in the committee. We had a committee process. We had a lot of amendments offered. They stuck together and voted down all of the amendments that were significant. A lot of smaller amendments were passed. But, you know, Senator SCHUMER apparently said: Well, the Republicans have a pass on this vote. That means, did the Republicans on the Gang of 8, those Members—were they allowed to vote their conscience or were they still expected to be voting like the Gang of 8, who signed in blood to vote? They gave them a pass on a few votes. So this is not a way to do the public's business. It is just not.

One thing I think I do believe is important for us to understand—and I have been wrestling with this for a long time. I have been a Federal prosecutor. I will tell you that we can make the system work. A lot of people think it is just hopeless, that we cannot make the system work. Not so. We have made some progress at the border. If we had really strong leadership, were really effective in identifying where the gaps are, in moving resources and stepping up our fencing and our equipment, we could see real progress at the border—real progress.

A lot of it is math. I would say from my law enforcement experience. If you add more police officers and crime rates are going down, then you have more police officers per criminal, per crime. You have more ability to drive down crime in a virtual cycle. So we added, after 2007, a number of Border Patrol officers. President Obama claims credit for it, but he did not have credit. It happened before he took office. They were hiring into his term, I

am sure, but it was passed before he took office. So we have more people there. We have fewer illegal immigrants for a whole lot of reasons. And then if you have more officers per illegal immigrant, you can do better at the border.

Secondly, biometrics. Entry-exit visas have been required by six different pieces of congressional legislation. It was recommended by the 9/11 Commission.

When people come into the country, they have a fingerprint taken and they are admitted into the country. What we are not doing is verifying that they ever leave the country. We know that most of the 9/11 attackers came on a visa. People do not know if they are legal or overstaying or have ever left.

It is easy. They said it is going to cost billions of dollars—\$25 billion to do this. One of our Gang of 8 said that in the committee. It is not going to cost \$25 billion. We discovered, I believe, a 2009 report issued by the Department of Homeland Security. That report discovered that you could easily identify people when they depart the country. One of the complaints is that we have to build all of these new buildings and structures and so forth. But when you leave, all you have to do is put your finger on a fingerprint-recording machine and it leaves your fingerprint. It identifies you. What they found was that in Atlanta when they were doing this, like 20,000 or 25,000, I believe, were exiting, and over 100 were hits from the watch list. Some of them had felony warrants out. Some of them were on the terrorist list. That is a large number. It did not cost much money and was not hard to do. So that could be done.

We can absolutely make the workplace secure by using an E-Verify system at all employment places. That is the key.

So there are things we do. Fundamentally, we can make the system work. Unfortunately, the promises made in this legislation do not do it. What would happen under this bill is that Secretary Napolitano, after the enforcement officially stopped, must give two reports to Congress within 6 months—two reports. Not do anything—two reports. Then all the people here illegally will be given provisional status, be legal, get a Social Security card, and have the ability to work. So there are no real actions that have to occur at the border or anyplace else. That is the fundamental flaw we have to deal with. But the American people are saying it: First deal with the illegality and then let's talk about how to be compassionate for people who have been here for a long time. But the more troubling issue that has not been fully discussed, the other half of the immigration equation, is interior enforcement. The bill further weakens an already decimated interior enforcement system.

Immigration reform will never work. This bill will never work unless the

U.S. immigration and customs officers are given the resources and the authority they need to do their job. It will not work. Their morale has plummeted because their leadership has blocked them from enforcing plain law. They have virtually the lowest morale rating of any agency in government. Over a year ago, I asked Secretary Napolitano was she not concerned about it and would she meet with the ICE agents and determine what the problem was? So she came back. I asked her had she met with them. No. They voted no confidence in their supervisor, John Morton. They have written us a long letter detailing the failures in this bill, saying it will make it worse than current law and will leave this country more insecure than we are.

It is really remarkable. But they have to be allowed to be a part of the game. It cannot be the policy of the United States of America that if someone gets into the country illegally, they are home free; if they get past the Border Patrol at the border, nobody will ever deport them. That is what we are doing now unless they are convicted of a serious felony. Nobody is being deported.

So you say: Well, people have been here a long time. We do not want to start deporting people. We are about to give them amnesty. But the bill, if passed, assumes everybody has been given amnesty. The bill assumes that everybody has been given permanent legal status or legal status, which is basically a guaranteed permanent status in the country. They will be given a Social Security card, identification, and the right to work anywhere.

So what about people who come illegally after that? Are we never going to enforce the law again if other people come illegally, overstay visas, come through the border, stow away on ships? We have to know that it is going to be fixed.

It cannot be that if somebody gets past the border, nobody will ever apprehend them and make them be deported because they shouldn't be here. You are not entitled to come to America illegally and then protest when you are apprehended: Oh, no, I have a right to be here. I have been here for 18 months. You cannot deport me.

Once this amnesty occurs, we have to know that we have the mechanism in place to do the job that immigration enforcement at a minimum requires. I think that is so important.

Chris Crane, the president of the ICE officers union, an ICE officer himself, and a former marine, explained the situation in his testimony before the House of Representatives recently.

Agents report that if they encounter suspected illegal aliens in public—

I am talking about Federal agents, ICE agents, immigration agents—they cannot arrest them.

They cannot arrest them.

The day-to-day duties of ICE agents and officers often seem in conflict with the law as

ICE officers are prohibited from enforcing many laws enacted by Congress; laws they took an oath to enforce. . . . ICE is now guided in large part by influences of powerful special interest groups that advocate on behalf of illegal aliens.

Does that not cause any concern? We have to deal with this. We have to get our ICE people off the mat and into the game.

He also testified:

Morale is at an all-time low as criminal aliens are released to the streets.

Criminal aliens. He is not talking about people who violate the immigration law; he is talking about aliens who committed crimes such as drug offenses and assault.

Continuing:

Criminal aliens are released to the streets and ICE instead takes disciplinary—

He is talking about his supervisors—actions against its own officers for making lawful arrests. . . . It appears clear that Federal law enforcement officers are the enemy and not those who break our Nation's laws.

He is saying that the supervisors are punishing the ICE officers who actually go out and arrest people because they have set a policy not to enforce the law of the United States. People may not think that is true, but it is absolutely a fact that we have basically made it impossible to enforce the law, and that has come from Secretary Napolitano right on down. That is why she doesn't want to meet with them—because she doesn't have an answer. She is telling them and her deputy is telling them not to enforce the law.

Mr. Crane further testified:

If an alien is arrested by local police and placed in jail, again, ICE agents may not arrest them for illegal entry or VISA overstay. . . . New policies require that illegal aliens have a felony arrest or conviction or be convicted of three or more misdemeanors. . . . So, many illegal aliens with criminal convictions are also now untouchable.

That is the reality of law enforcement in this country. It is very, very serious. This is a sad state of affairs, no doubt about it.

Were these officers consulted when the Gang of 8 wrote the bill? They tell us they have a bill that is going to work to end the lawlessness in America in the future, but did they ever consult with the people who are out there trying to enforce the law now to get their ideas about how to make the system work better in the future? Do they have new provisions in the bill that give our ICE agents, Border Patrol agents, and citizen immigration officers more authority to do their job? No.

The bill actually gives more discretion to the Secretary to eviscerate enforcement by not having to enforce plain law. There are a number of provisions in the Code that say that if somebody is arrested and they are due to be deported, they shall be deported. That is the law. Well, they are not doing that.

I don't think this is, frankly, just loophole or failure of attention. I don't

think the Gang of 8 was really on top of all of the details of the legislation. I think they spent most of their time consulting with Mr. Trumka at the AFL-CIO, Mr. Donohue at the chamber of commerce, La Raza, the immigration lawyers association, the meat packers, and the grocery folks or the big agribusinesses. That is whom they have been talking with, the computer gurus demanding more and more. They didn't focus on this.

The people who are actually in there writing it—the immigration lawyers, the chamber of commerce, the union lawyers, and all who have been working on this bill—they knew what they were doing. These scribes, these drafters of the legislation I believe fully understood what it meant. Under this bill, amnesty will occur at once, just as it did in 1987, and like then, we get a mere promise of enforcement in the future—a mere promise. Far from making our laws tougher, as the Gang of 8 has promised and as we need to do, the enforcement of laws is greatly weakened in a whole number of significant areas.

Ladies and gentlemen, the drafters of the bill will have received what they want. They will have received amnesty for the 11 million. They will get a dramatic increase in the flow of workers and low-skilled workers into America. That is what they want. They are not interested in future enforcement. In fact, many of them felt as though the big increases in immigration in the future aren't enough, so they have no objection to illegal immigration, it seems, or they would have put a lot more intention in drafting a legislation that would have improved the illegal system.

This bill fails. We will go into more detail about it as time goes by. This bill still fails as a matter of law enforcement. That is going to be clear.

I am looking at a new piece of legislation introduced by TREY GOWDY, who is the chairman of the House subcommittee. He is a former prosecutor, a Federal prosecutor, 6 years as assistant U.S. attorney. He is a real prosecutor who understands how the system works. Mr. GOWDY has put together a good bill. He says this: "robust internal immigration enforcement." That is what the ICE agents do in Denver, in Memphis, and in Indianapolis.

Robust internal immigration enforcement, paired with border security, is our safeguard against repeating the mistakes of 1986. The SAFE Act is a critical step in our efforts to fix our broken immigration system and ensures we will not be having this conversation again in 10, 20, or 30 years.

It ensures we won't be back here with another amnesty demand because we have enforced the law.

He has put together some good principles that are not in this bill. First, it grants states and localities the authority to enforce immigration laws. The Supreme Court says: You can't do that, it is unconstitutional. Not so. The Supreme Court says the U.S. Congress, by

the way it passed this legislation, preempted local enforcement in a lot of areas. They couldn't participate because when Attorney General Holder tells the Federal agents not to enforce the laws, State people can't enforce them either, basically. Attorney General Holder says we are not enforcing these laws. Secretary Napolitano: We are not enforcing these laws. Then the State can't do it because it is totally preempted, essentially, by the Federal Government, except for peripheral areas, like a business can't get a business license if it knowingly hires illegal workers. That is probably a State issue.

Well, it is just a matter of Congress's actions. Mr. GOWDY would explicitly allow help from State and local officers.

Now, let's get this straight. If a police officer in Alabama arrests somebody who is in the country illegally, they cannot prosecute them. They can only hold them for a short period of time. All they can do is turn them over to Federal officials. That is clear. Mr. GOWDY doesn't change that, really. The fundamental thing is that they could do that. That is the way the system works.

What we need to be thinking about is, don't we have to have local law enforcement to be participants in any system that guarantees legality? There are 600,000 State and local law enforcement officers. There are 5,000 interior Federal immigration officers, 5,000 ICE officers, and many of them have other duties. It is our local police and sheriffs who are out on the highways and State troopers who are out there every day coming in touch with thousands of people, and they are the ones who identify people here illegally.

When the Attorney General and the Secretary of Homeland Security rejected agreements for State and Federal officers to have their assistance in identifying people here, they knew what they were doing. They were effectively eliminating the identification of many of the people here illegally. That was a deliberate, calculated act. People need to know it, and it was wrong.

For a good system of immigration for America in the future—remember now, we are talking about after people have been given the amnesty under the bill—the bill should welcome the assistance of State and Federal officers and make up policies that will help with that.

The Gowdy bill would protect American communities from dangerous criminals by facilitating and expediting the removal of criminal aliens. This has been delayed. It is not working effectively. It is costing us a lot of money. If someone is here illegally and has been convicted a felony, they ought to be removed and there ought not to be a big deal about it. How much trouble is that? His bill would speed that up and make the system work better.

It improves visa security.

It helps the ICE agents do a better job. It assists the ICE officers in car-

rying out their jobs by enforcing Federal immigration laws, by allowing them to make arrests. They basically are being prohibited from making arrests today—can you believe it—for Federal felonies, for Federal criminal offenses, for bringing in and harboring unlawful aliens. The officers need to be able to enforce those laws.

It strengthens border security in a number of ways.

It reviews the prosecutorial authority that basically is a directive not to follow the law, not to enforce the law that is out there.

It strengthens national security in quite a number of ways.

This is a good piece of legislation. He knew what he was doing. He drafted something that will make a difference. It will make the law stronger. I would ask my colleagues, why wouldn't you put something like that in the legislation? You say want to have a tough bill. You say your bill is tough.

This will be called to the attention of the bill's sponsors. We will ask for legislation like this to be passed as an amendment to the bill, and we will see if it passes. If it doesn't pass, then we can draw a conclusion that the sponsors of the bill and the people who are promoting the bill don't really want to see the law enforced better in the future than it is today. That would be a sad admission, it seems to me.

To wrap up, this is a great institution, the Senate. I am glad Senator REID acquiesced to my insistence to at least have the opportunity to begin our discussion today. It is just the beginning. We will begin to talk about the legislation, talk about how to make our system work better, talk about the American people's desire—good and decent people that they are—to be compassionate to the people who have been here for a long time but their insistence that in the process we create a system of lawful immigration in the future so we are not back here.

Again, as I indicated earlier, a poll shows 88 percent of the people said they are angry with their elected officials about failure to enforce the law, whereas only 12 percent said they were angry at people who entered the country illegally. The American people are willing to create a legal status for people who come here illegally. But we need to do it in a way that works. They are demanding we create a system of lawfulness that will work, and we can do it. It is absolutely possible, and that will be demonstrated as we go forward.

We are going to have to change this bill, however, and put some teeth in it and give some real power to our dedicated law officers whose lives are at risk every day out there on the streets. We must give them the backing and the mechanisms in law that allow them to be effective. If we do it right, the whole world will say: Uh-oh, the United States has gotten their act together. The United States is serious about their immigration system being lawful. If you try to enter, they are liable to

catch you. If you try to enter, you won't be able to get a job legally. And if you enter and get past the border and hide out in Minneapolis and you get caught, you are going to be deported. So don't try to go there illegally. Apply to go there legally.

We could see a rather dramatic drop in the attempts to enter illegally if we do that. That is what a system of integrity requires. First, people need to know they shouldn't do it, that the United States will enforce this law. They need to know if they come into the country illegally, they will be deported.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I take the floor today in strong support of comprehensive immigration reform. The action that was taken yesterday by the House of Representatives underscores how critical the work we will do in the next few weeks is to the future of our Nation.

What did the House Republicans do yesterday? They voted to deport hundreds of thousands of young people whom we refer to as DREAMers. These young people were brought to this country through no fault of their own, and they are contributing greatly to our society and our economy. Some of these young people were brought here at 2 years old, 4 years old. They had no idea they were doing anything wrong.

Senator DURBIN has been working for years to pass the DREAM Act. President Obama implemented the DREAM Act to put a stop to deporting these people if they met certain requirements, and those requirements are pretty clear. They have to be truly good people, they have to be people who are getting their education, serving in the military, and being responsible. But yesterday, the House Republicans said: No. They said: Deport these DREAMers.

That is not what the American people want. In poll after poll the American people say: If someone is brought here through no fault of their own at a young age, this is their country. Yet the House Republicans would say we should deport them.

Now, I never say I speak for the American people. I am just talking about polls. And the polls I have seen—and, Madam President, the polls you have seen—show the people know we need immigration reform, comprehensive reform, that will take people out of the shadows, that will make sure they are not afraid to be part of society. If we do that, they will buy homes and start businesses. They will create jobs, they will lift our economy, they

will lift their families out of poverty, and they will strengthen our country. The American people get this.

Like so many Americans, I am proud of my immigrant roots. My mother came here from Austria as an infant. She never finished high school because she had to work to support her family. My dad was from an immigrant family too, the only one of nine children to be born in America and the only one to graduate from college. Then, when I was a little girl, he graduated from law school.

When my mother passed away, I remember going through her memorabilia and I discovered a certificate that was wrapped in plastic. She stored it with other valuables in her jewelry box. It was the only document she protected in that fashion because it meant so much to my mother. It was her certificate of citizenship. That is what the dream of citizenship means to the millions of Californians and to the millions of Americans who are now forced to live in the shadows.

For immigration reform to be truly comprehensive it must include a path to citizenship for all 11 million undocumented immigrants in our country today, and it must include the DREAM Act. We can't have two classes of citizens in America: one with full citizenship and one with half citizenship. That is not the promise of our Nation. The bill we will debate next week addresses this problem, and it provides a tough but fair path to citizenship.

It is also crucial we pass reforms that protect workers and their families from exploitation and abuse. Too many immigrants, especially women, face sexual harassment in the workplace, violence and discrimination. The Judiciary Committee bill includes critical protections for women, including U visas, to keep women safe from domestic violence.

A strong reform bill must also include a fair and effective guest worker program which provides workers with livable wages and strong labor protections, and this bill meets many of these tests. Would I have made it even stronger? Yes. Would my friend in the Chair have made it even stronger in many ways? Absolutely. But the bill is a real step forward.

When we pass comprehensive immigration reform, we don't just help immigrant families, we help all Americans. I would like to see family reunification be made stronger in this bill.

I commend those who worked on this bill. I know they had to hammer out these compromises. Having brought a successful highway bill to passage, a successful WRDA bill to passage on the Senate floor, I know I didn't get everything I wanted, so I am sympathetic to the fact this is not a perfect bill. But I know the Presiding Officer and I will support making this bill better, making this bill stronger, and maybe we will persuade colleagues to go along with us. We have to remember this bill isn't the be-all and end-all. We can

make it stronger over the coming months and years.

According to a 2010 USC study—University of Southern California—when we create a path to citizenship, it will result in 25,000 new jobs and \$3 billion in direct and indirect spending in California alone every single year. Nationwide, our immigration bill will increase our GDP, our gross domestic product, by \$1.5 trillion over 10 years. It will increase wages for workers.

That is what happens when workers come out of the shadows. It will lead to between 750,000 and 900,000 new jobs, according to the Center for American Progress. When workers come out of the shadows their wages rise, they open bank accounts, they buy homes, they spend money in their communities, and they are known to find new businesses.

Businesses will benefit by having access to talented workers in fields ranging from manufacturing to health care to agriculture to high tech. And taxpayers are going to benefit. We will hear horror stories about how expensive this is, but the fact is studies show—that is, studies that don't have a bias—that taxpayers will benefit from an estimated \$5 billion in new revenues in the first 3 years alone, including \$310 million a year in State income taxes, which will help support education and other important services just in my home State of California.

So will we see workers benefiting? Yes, from higher wages, but also better working conditions. And they will get respect and they will get dignity. What that means is they will be proud members of our communities. Families and children will benefit when we lift the fear of being deported and separated from their loved ones. I know the DREAM Act that Senator DURBIN has worked on for so many years does impact the families of the DREAMers, and it will help them, because we don't want to separate families.

I am going to be working on many amendments and offering some to improve this bill—amendments to provide a fair and reasonable path to citizenship, amendments to ensure we treat immigrants with dignity and respect, amendments that are friendly to family reunification, amendments that are friendly to workers. Workers are the backbone of this country.

I want to close with a quote from President John F. Kennedy. Back in 1958, he wrote a book entitled, "A Nation of Immigrants." In that book he eloquently described how immigrants have strengthened our Nation. I already talked about my own immigrant roots. This is what John Kennedy wrote:

This was the secret of America: a Nation of people with the fresh memory of old traditions who dared to explore new frontiers, people eager to build lives for themselves in a spacious society that did not restrict their freedom of choice and their action.

He added:

Every ethnic minority, in seeking its own freedom, helped to strengthen the fabric of liberty in American life.

Those words were true back in 1958 and they are just as true today. Americans are ready and they are waiting for comprehensive immigration reform.

I thank our colleagues who worked so hard on this bill, including my own colleague, Senator FEINSTEIN, who worked so hard on the ag jobs title. We have to protect that title. There are those who would weaken it, and we can't weaken it. It is put together in such a way that we have the growers and workers supporting it. That is pretty good when we can get those two sides together.

The President has said the time is now. I agree. The time is past now. We need to get this done. I think Senator LEAHY has handled this bill beautifully. I believe 150 amendments were adopted in the committee, and also many others were offered. The system has been fair. Senator REID has given us plenty of time to offer amendments, to debate these issues.

I am excited about it. My State is waiting with bated breath for this. It is so overdue. Let's get to work. Let's make comprehensive immigration reform a reality. I am pleased to say to the President, I leave this floor with great hopes that we can get it done.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

MORNING BUSINESS

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

TRIBUTE TO BOB CONLON

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I would like to take a moment to recognize Bob Conlon, a coowner of Leunig's Bistro, a fixture on Burlington's historic Church Street for decades. Bob was recently honored by the Burlington Business Association, BBA, for his contributions not only to the local economy through the success of Leunig's but also because of his commitment to community service.

Originally from Waterbury, CT, Bob has been a resident of Chittenden County for over 45 years, first arriving in the area to attend my own alma mater, St. Michael's College. Bob first came to Leunig's as a bartender, rose to the post of manager, and today is a coowner of one of Church Street's most successful restaurants. Marcelle and I enjoy seeing and talking with Bob when we are in Burlington.

Bob's contributions to the greater Burlington community are not limited

to providing great cuisine at Leunig's; he has been engaged in the community for decades, hosting regular fundraisers that support a wide range of services, from monthly dinners with proceeds that benefit various local support programs to hosting an annual fashion show to benefit the Breast Care Center at Fletcher Allen Hospital. Bob has been an exemplary model of what good business really is: economically successfully, and community-minded.

Bob's dedication to the Burlington community is well documented, and the honor bestowed upon him by the BBA is wholly merited. In recognition of his work, I ask that an article published in the Burlington Free Press on April 4, 2013, "Leunig's co-owner honored," be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

[From The Burlington Free Press, Apr. 4, 2013]

LEUNIG'S CO-OWNER HONORED

Bob Conlon has spent half his life at Leunig's Bistro—from substitute bartender to co-owner. A certain sensibility, and a couple of tasks, follow him through every position.

"We're all in the service industry," Conlon, 63, said. "We feed people, we cheer them up. Plunge the toilets and mop the floors."

Conlon will be honored tonight by the Burlington Business Association. The BBA's 35th dinner and annual meeting will be held at the Hilton Burlington.

The honoree, a fixture on Church Street for more than 30 years, will be attending his first BBA dinner, Conlon said Monday morning over coffee in the bistro's dining room.

"I always thought of that dinner as for the important people," he said. "My social life is working."

Conlon's work at Leunig's includes a variety of community service efforts, including an annual fashion show/fundraiser for the Breast Care Center at Fletcher Allen Health Care, and monthly dinners with a portion of proceeds to benefit local social service groups.

"They have long tradition of doing good for a broad range of community groups," said Rita Markley, executive director of COTS.

Tim Halvorson is a past recipient of the award Conlon will receive; indeed, the award is named for Halvorson. He is a board member of the Burlington Business Association who will introduce Conlon at the dinner. Conlon follows in a line of honorees who are committed to helping and enriching the greater community, Halvorson said.

"We thought that Bob represents, through the way they handle things at Leunig's, a great example of a small business that gives back," Halvorson said. "Between breast cancer and City Arts and COTS, they give tens of thousands of dollars back to the community. It's a business that uses its popularity and location as a vehicle for good."

Conlon arrived in Chittenden County 45 years ago from Waterbury, Conn., the son of a restaurant waiter who worked as a busboy as a kid. He was a theater major at St. Michael's College. These days, his acting takes place at the Leunig's bar—his costume is well-dressed restaurateur—and on the Church Street Marketplace.

Last summer, Conlon's costume came to include hard hats, worn by him and his staff

(and sometimes customers) as a nod to marketplace construction.

"You have a role to play," Conlon said, a part in which his social life plays out at work. "You have brief conversations with people—cheerful and fun."

He tries always to be in a good mood, Conlon said. If he's feeling bad he steers away from the question, What do I want? and asks instead, What does my wife want? What does my daughter want? What do my staff and customers want? Conlon said.

"If you can make other people happy, you end up being happy," he said.

Conlon started working at Leunig's when he was 32, after a short stint as co-owner of a failed restaurant. The business, Carbur's Rib-it Room, was in the space now occupied by Marilyn's, a clothing store.

"If everything were perfect, it would've taken us 20 years to get up to zero," Conlon said of the failed business.

He got out after two years and joined Leunig's as a substitute bartender. "I always liked waiting on customers," he said. "I got to hang out with a lot of good people—artists, business people, college professors, students, cops."

He tended bar until about 10 years ago, when he became manager. The move to manager from bartender came about, in part, because managers came and went with frequency, Conlon said.

"Every time you get a new boss it's very insecure," Conlon said. "Your employment is dependent on the sanity of your supervisor. So be the supervisor."

He started as well to purchase ownership shares in the business from Leunig's owner, Robert Fuller, intending with his business partner, chef Donnell Collins, to become a 50-50 owner of the restaurant. Conlon expects the deal will be finalized May 1, he said.

"Isn't that America?" Conlon said. "Isn't that what everybody should do? Get a job, do your best at it, and don't pass up opportunities. It's an honorable profession. If you're good at it, you can live a good life."

RICHMOND ROUND CHURCH 200TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, Vermont boasts a number of historical treasures, and among them is the Round Church in Richmond, which this year celebrates its 200th anniversary.

The Old Round Church earned a national historic landmark distinction from the National Park Service in 1996. Because of the church's history and its long-held status as meeting place and community center, it has come to be recognized as a symbol of the rich history woven through so many Vermont towns.

This year the Richmond Round Church, known to many as the Old Round Church, will celebrate its bicentennial with a series of concerts and community events. The sense of community boasted by the Old Round Church is rooted partially in the history of the church's establishment. Initially conceived by settlers seeking a local meeting place, their plan to erect the Round Church faltered with reluctance from the town of Richmond to supply the land need to construct the building. Two local men, however, volunteered the land, and in 1813 construction of the church was completed. It has since grown to become a renowned

symbol for its historical significance but also for its representation of the community values that are so cherished across Vermont.

Over the past two centuries, it has served as a meeting place, a venue for local activities, and even a popular location for weddings. Generations of Vermonters have visited the Old Round Church, and as a young boy growing up in Montpelier, I remember visiting the church with my parents, and brother and sister. Today, volunteers routinely help preserve the church's history by volunteering to help clean, maintain, and repair its structure. It remains as central to the community as it ever has in its 200 year history.

In honor of the 200th anniversary of the Richmond Round Church, I ask that an article published in the Burlington Free Press on May 26, 2013, "Richmond Round Church Turns 200, Celebrations Aboard," be printed into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

[From The Burlington Free Press, May 26, 2013]

RICHMOND ROUND CHURCH TURNS 200, CELEBRATIONS ABOARD

RICHMOND—It started with an argument. In 1796 settlers of this small town in the foothills of the Green Mountains wanted to build a local meeting house, or at least some of them did. Then as now, democracy did not always come easily. The committees tasked with finding a location found it difficult to agree and fickle townspeople voted down the whole idea in 1811.

Absent the good will of two local men who offered to donate land to the cause, free and clear, the foundation for Richmond's iconic Round Church might never have been laid.

But donate they did, and this year the white clapboard building that sits serenely in the heart of Richmond turns 200. The birthday is being celebrated all summer with concerts and special events culminating the weekend of Aug. 9, 10 and 11.

Fans of the church say it symbolizes the spirit of the town.

"Well, I think this represents what's best about Richmond," said Fran Thomas, president of the Richmond Historical Society. "It was built as a community church and meeting house. To me it's what's best about Richmond, that community aspect."

The shape of the 16-sided church and meeting house is believed to be unique in the United States. It has survived floods, blizzards and other onslaughts—attacks by powder post beetles, dry rot and restless youths who carved their initials into the wooden box pews as early as 1912.

BUILT TO LAST

According to "The Richmond Round Church, 1813-2013," a history written by Harriet W. Riggs and Martha Turner and published by the Richmond Historical Society, the box pews were designed to help retain heat. Families brought heated soap stones or small metal boxes of burning coals to help stay warm inside. A stone and box are on display at the back of the church, along with other artifacts.

Miraculously, the church never burned down despite considerable threat from wood stoves that were added to the building at some point and according to local lore stuffed full starting several days before gatherings and then left unattended as the structure heated up. Pipes from the stoves snaked

precariouly aloft the pews, posing another hazard.

The stoves are idle now and the piping was pulled down decades ago. These days the Richmond Historical Society manages and maintains the town-owned structure under a 40-year agreement that expires in 2016.

Town meeting ceased to be held at the church in 1974 on the advice of the fire marshal and structural engineers who advised the roof could cave under a heavy snow storm. (Town meeting now takes place at Camels Hump Middle School.) The five Protestant denominations that sold pew space to fund the construction 200 years ago no longer hold Sunday services at the church.

But the structure and its surrounding green continue to serve as a visual centerpiece and active venue for weddings, tours, concerts and other events.

MAINTAINING HISTORY

Volunteers do everything from washing the 12-over-12 mullioned windows to writing grants to booking weddings to monitoring the steady stream of repairs needed to keep the church upright. Major structural work took place in the late 1970s and early 1980s, with the historical society leading the charge. More recently, workers have restored the foundation and replaced rotting beams and clapboard at the back of the church. Some day friends of the church would like to build in a bathroom, but for now a lilac-landscaped port-o-let out back serves the purpose.

Repairing broken panes of glass is a regular task and in this as in other work, effort is made to stay historically accurate. Glass from old windows donated to the church is used whenever possible.

"We have a stockpile of wavy glass to repair the broken windows," Thomas explained.

All the effort to maintain the church is well worth it, said Thomas as she showed a reporter around the space recently.

The building today is unheated and there are no plans to add a modern heat source. That means use of the Round Church is seasonal, with events taking place from April to October, with a few exceptions such as an annual December carol sing.

Occasionally a wedding is scheduled in November or December. "But we have to make sure the bride and groom realize how cold it's going to be," said Thomas.

One couple literally got cold feet and moved their wedding on a few days notice after visiting the church and realizing how chilly their vows would be.

The shape of the church has long been a subject of speculation. Some say the circular shape was chosen to ward off the devil because he could not hide in the corners of the church.

Thomas doubts the devil drove the architectural plans. The more likely story is that head carpenter William Rhodes appreciated the circular design of an addition to the meeting house in his hometown of Claremont, N.H. and wanted to copy the idea.

"To me, that makes the most sense," Thomas said. "It's not the most interesting, but it makes the most sense."

Snatches of the surrounding scenery can be viewed from inside the church—green mountainside, sloping lawn, flood plain field and the red metal truss bridge spanning the Winooski River. The church sits slightly uphill, which saved it from the great flood of 1927 and Tropical Storm Irene, although the latter turned the lower green into a lake.

Taking care of the building is much more involved than some people might guess, said Thomas. But Richmond would not be Richmond without it, she said.

"It's our claim to fame, I guess."

TRIBUTE TO RANDALL H. WALKER

Mr. REID. Madam President, I rise today to recognize Randy Walker for his leadership as Director of Aviation for Clark County. Randy is the consummate public servant, having served the people of Nevada in various positions since 1979, culminating in his appointment as Director of Aviation for Clark County in May 1997. For the past 16 years, Randy has transformed McCarran International Airport into one of the premier airports in the world, and he has greatly expanded the airport's reach to all corners of the globe.

Randy became Director of Aviation at an exciting time in southern Nevada. Clark County was the fastest growing county in the Nation, with tens of thousands of new people moving to Las Vegas each year. Tourist numbers hit record levels and new resorts were changing the face of the world famous Strip. Las Vegas was becoming a global destination with new markets in Europe, South America, and Asia fueling southern Nevada's economy. Randy recognized this potential for growth and he played a key role in expanding the airport.

During Randy's first year on the job, McCarran International Airport added 26 new gates; more were added in 2005 and again in 2008, which increased the D Concourse's size to 45 gates today. Randy oversaw the construction of a new rental car terminal, which improved the visitor experience for tourists. He also kept airport operations running smoothly at the airport during the construction of a tunnel for Interstate 215 under the runways.

Randy has also made McCarran International Airport one of the most technically advanced airports in the Nation. It is the only major airport in the U.S. to use Common Use Terminal Equipment, allowing for seamless integration of airlines' computer systems. In addition, he installed SpeedCheck kiosks, allowing customers to get their boarding passes without having to go to a specific airline counter. The airport also implemented a baggage-tracking system that uses radio-frequency identification so that baggage can be accurately tracked.

In 2010, McCarran opened a USO Lounge to serve servicemembers from Nevada and those flying through Nevada. The rest and relaxation lounge serves tens of thousands of our military personnel each year as they travel to Nevada and through Nevada. I worked with Randy, Wayne Newton, and the USO since 2007 to create this lounge.

Randy has changed the face of aviation in southern Nevada, but the most important project during Randy's tenure was the opening of Terminal 3, or T3. Building a new \$2.4 billion terminal was the largest expansion project in McCarran's history, and one of the

largest public works projects in Nevada history. McCarran began this ambitious expansion project before the recession hit my State. When the economy worsened, I worked with Randy to keep T3 on track by having Congress provide tax relief to local governments and their bondholders in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. Randy's steady leadership during the challenging economy was critical to the completion of the project.

Last year, McCarran International Airport was ranked 24th in the world for passenger traffic, hosting nearly 41.7 million passengers. Under Randy's tenure, the airport saw a 33 percent increase in Las Vegas visitor volume that resulted in a 50 percent increase in revenues for Clark County. This has been extremely beneficial to the economy of southern Nevada.

After playing an important role in shaping the future of Las Vegas and southern Nevada for decades, Randy recently stepped down as the Director of Aviation to enter a well-deserved retirement. I am pleased to recognize Randy's extraordinary service to the people of Clark County before the Senate today and I wish him all the best in his retirement or, knowing Randy, in his next phase of remarkable achievement.

TRIBUTE TO DR. AL BOWMAN

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I would like to take a few moments to thank Dr. Al Bowman for all he has done to keep the doors of educational opportunity open for young people in my State of Illinois.

After nearly 10 years as President of Illinois State University, and a total of 35 years of service to ISU, Dr. Bowman is retiring. But the mark he leaves will continue to benefit ISU and the people of Illinois for years to come.

The ISU Dr. Bowman is leaving is more financially stable and more attractive to top talent. Its student body is more diverse.

Under Dr. Bowman's leadership, Illinois State University has ranked as one of America's top 100 public universities for 7 straight years.

A hallmark of Dr. Bowman's presidency at ISU has been his determination to make sure that students graduate with the best possible education and the lowest possible debt.

Illinois State University has done much more than any school I know of to make sure its students are able to make informed choices about student loans. The university asks each student to meet with financial counselors. Those counselors push students to borrow the minimum they need—not the most they can get. As a result, ISU's students graduate with an average student debt of \$22,720—a sizable debt, to be sure, but well below the national average for 4-year, public institutions.

And the quality of education is unquestioned. ISU's graduates are finding work in their field and paying down

their loans. The university's student loan default rate is only 3 percent—again, well below the national average.

Dr. Bowman's first career was working as a speech pathologist at the Veterans Administration Hospital in Danville, IL.

He joined the ISU faculty in 1978 as a professor in the Department of Speech Pathology and Audiology. He was appointed department chairperson in 1994 and served in that position for 8 years. Even as department chair, Dr. Bowman continued to teach and to serve as director of ISU's Down Syndrome Speech-Language Clinic.

During Dr. Bowman's tenure as director, the department flourished. He doubled the faculty and the scholarly production of the staff. The department won accreditation by the Council on Academic Accreditation of the American Speech-Language Hearing Association and its master's program was ranked for the first time as the top speech and audiology master's program in Illinois.

In 2002, Dr. Bowman was promoted to Illinois State's interim provost where he served until he was named president in 2004.

As president, Dr. Bowman was a driving force behind Illinois State University's first comprehensive campaign, which raised more than \$96 million. He also helped secure \$49 million for a new student fitness and recreation center and \$17.5 million for the renovation of Schroeder Hall, the university's home to the Criminal Justice Sciences, History, Politics and Government, Social Work and Sociology-Anthropology departments.

I congratulate Dr. Al Bowman on his many accomplishments throughout his long and distinguished career.

I thank him for his service and wish him all the best.

REMEMBERING FRANK R. LAUTENBERG

Mr. NELSON. Madam President, I was greatly saddened to learn about the passing of Senator Lautenberg on Monday. I was fortunate to serve with Senator Lautenberg on the Commerce Committee. His life was about public service, plain and simple.

Frank was a great example of the American Dream. Over the past few days we have all heard Frank's story of being born into a Russian and Polish immigrant family, and working his way from humble beginnings to a prosperous career as a chief executive in the private sector. But Frank's true calling was public service and giving back to his community, his State, and our Nation throughout his life. As a young man, he served our country in the U.S. Army in WWII and went to Columbia University on the GI bill.

In Congress, Frank fought to create economic opportunity for all Americans by supporting our public infrastructure. He was a staunch advocate for passenger rail and Amtrak. Frank's

achievements on transportation issues were not only concerned with promoting commerce, but also public safety. His work to ban smoking on domestic flights and combat drunk driving has saved countless lives.

Frank also fought side-by-side with me on the Aviation Operations, Safety, and Security Subcommittee of the Senate Commerce Committee to make sure that critical NASA safety research was being shared with the commercial aviation industry to help protect members of the flying public.

Florida and New Jersey are very different States, but they share a coastline. After the Deepwater Horizon spill devastated the Gulf, I worked with him to stop offshore drilling until more was known about what caused that tragedy. Frank was also a trusted ally in securing essential funding to keep our beaches clean and water safe for people to enjoy.

Frank was a crucial supporter of many other important environmental causes. He fought to keep our oceans clean by pushing for a "double-hull" standard for oil tankers, banning ocean dumping, and taking other steps to promote better water quality. He also sponsored legislation to crackdown on companies that release dangerous toxins into the air and water, and make polluters pay for their toxic mess. Frank was a great champion for the environment.

As the last WW II veteran in the Senate, we lost a true hero on Monday and one of this body's last members of the Greatest Generation.

CONFIRMATION OF WILLIAM H. PRYOR, JR.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, I would like to take a brief moment to commend the Senate on the confirmation of Judge William H. Pryor, Jr., to the United States Sentencing Commission. Judge Pryor is superbly qualified and has the requisite background and experience to serve and contribute greatly to the U.S. Sentencing Commission. I am grateful to the President for acknowledging Judge Pryor's qualifications and nominating him to this important position.

Judge Pryor succeeded me as Attorney General of Alabama. I was proud of him then and I was also proud when he was confirmed to serve on the Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals. Judge Pryor is a man of character and his actions both on and off the bench reflect that. He is committed to equal justice, without prejudice. As Bill Baxley, a mutual friend, a Democrat, and another former attorney general of Alabama said, "In every difficult decision he has made, Judge Pryor's actions were supported by his interpretation of the law, without race, gender, age, political power, wealth, community standing, or any other competing interest affecting his judgment."

That was certainly the case when he carried the banner for sentencing re-

form in Alabama. Judge Pryor insisted that the legislature address critical problems in Alabama's system of sentencing. He has always been in favor of "truth in sentencing." Advocates of sentencing reform have applauded Judge Pryor's efforts in Alabama, as before we had a sentencing commission and sentencing guidelines, criminal defendants often received different sentences for the same crime based on their race, their sex, or where they lived. Judge Pryor was instrumental in changing that.

Advocates of stricter law enforcement also supported Judge Pryor in his efforts to effect reform in Alabama, because "truth in sentencing" also meant that a convicted criminal would be more likely to serve the sentence imposed by the judge rather than just a fraction of the sentence based on the discretion of a parole officer. He has stated that when a court enters a sentence of imprisonment, there should be a reliable expectation that the offender will serve a substantial majority of that term of imprisonment. Judge Pryor is reasonable and rational, acknowledging the Nation's overburdened and overcrowded correctional facilities and the need for more community-based programs for first-time or non-violent offenders.

Although the Federal guidelines themselves have been completed for many years now, the members of the commission are tasked with ensuring that the guidelines do not result in the same disparity or injustice that they were designed to prevent. The guidelines perform an invaluable function, one which I think Judge Pryor's background and experience have made him uniquely well-suited to oversee.

Judge Pryor is a life-long public servant who will certainly be an asset to the U.S. Sentencing Commission as he represents the highest quality of leadership. I appreciate the support of my colleagues in Judge Pryor's confirmation.

EQUAL PAY ACT ANNIVERSARY

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, I come to the floor today to recognize an important anniversary. Fifty years ago Congress passed the Equal Pay Act, a law that was to ensure pay equity for women in the workplace. This landmark legislation was signed into law by President Kennedy on June 10, 1963, and prohibited discrimination on the basis of sex in the payment of wages by employers. The goals of the legislation were groundbreaking. It was the first time Congress acted on this issue, addressing a real and growing problem as more women entered the workforce. Congress stepped up to the plate and took the first attempt at fixing outright discrimination that was bound to have an impact on working families across America.

Today we find ourselves in a similar place, in need of a solution because the Equal Pay Act is in need of fixing. It

recently made big headlines when a Pew research study was released saying that women are the primary earner in 4 of 10 households today, many of these women being the sole earners. But what was missed in this discussion is the impact that the pay gap is continuing to have on these households who are dependent on the salaries of women.

The pay gap results in \$4,000 less per year for working families and \$434,000 less over a lifetime. Think of what these families could accomplish if they got simply what they were owed. With rising costs for childcare, medical care, and filling up the family car, these families are held down by unfair and unjust pay policies.

While these are the day to day impacts, there are also real consequences to the pay gap over a lifetime. The pay gap affects your income, affects your pension, and affects your Social Security. Women's Social Security benefits are 71 percent of men's benefits. The average income from private pension based on women's earnings was only 48 percent of men's earnings. The consequences of our inaction on pay equity are following women out of the workplace, further impacting their lives down the line. For years I have fought a solution to this.

Under the Paycheck Fairness Act, no longer will employers be able to retaliate against workers for sharing information about wages. Right now, if you ask someone what they get paid you can get fired. For years, Lilly Ledbetter was humiliated and harassed because she tried to find out what she was making.

No longer will women be able to seek only back pay when they are discriminated against. Under this pay they can seek punitive damages. No longer will employers be able to use almost any reason to justify paying a woman less than a man. Excuses such as "oh, they do harder jobs," "oh, they do dangerous jobs," or "oh, they have a better education than you" will no longer be tolerated. Women do hard and dangerous jobs. Ask anyone who runs a daycare center or is a firefighter. No longer will women be on their own in fighting for equal pay for equal work or education and training.

In this country, they say work hard, play by the rules, and you will get ahead. We work hard every day, but we find the rules are different for women and men. In 1963 women made 59 cents for every dollar made by men. Almost 49 years later we have made an 18-cent gain. Women now make 77 cents for every dollar earned by men. Forty-nine years and 18 cents. That is not rewarding hard work, and it is certainly not playing by the rules.

In March, during the Budget debate, the Senate agreed with us and unanimously voted that it was time to do something about the pay gap. Well, now it is time to step up to the plate on this 50th anniversary. Let's end pay inequity and end the policies that keep

women uneducated and unequipped to fight for their fair share. It is not just for our pocketbooks. It is about the family checkbooks and getting it right in the law books. And it is also about the generations of women to come. Let's not make it another 50 years without giving the Equal Pay Act the tools it needs to finally fulfill its promise.

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

MEDIC SPECIALIST CODY TOWSE

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, today I wish to pay tribute to one of Utah's great soldiers, Army Medic Cody Towse who was killed by an improvised explosive device in Afghanistan on May 14, 2013. He was coming to the aid of a fellow soldier when he was hit by one of four blasts that day.

Specialist Towse was assigned to the 3rd Battalion, 41st Infantry Regiment, 1st Brigade Combat Team, 1st Armored Division from Fort Bliss, TX. He was deployed to the Kandahar region of Afghanistan in December 2012 and has served courageously there. While in Afghanistan, Towse was instrumental in training Afghan medics in emergency procedures; and became known as the candy doctor because he loved to give candy to the Afghan children. In fact, I think it speaks volumes about the character and love of this young man when, for his 21st birthday, he asked his parents to send him candy that he could give the children.

Specialist Towse's love for service began at an early age as he trained and worked as a volunteer firefighter and EMT for Elk Ridge City. He took great pride in his work and in helping others.

Sadly Specialist Towse's body returned home to Elk Ridge, UT last week encased in a silver, flag-draped coffin met by family and hundreds of admirers and friends wanting to pay tribute to this fallen soldier. Neighbors and friends lined the streets and quietly waved flags of respect, giving a special tribute to one of Utah's own.

Our Founding Fathers declared the United States a freedom-loving people—a declaration on which they risked everything—their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor. Throughout our Nation's history, our liberty and our freedoms have been protected and cherished by our military. And so as we lay to rest this courageous hero, I pay tribute to Specialist Towse who has helped pave the road to freedom.

I love the following passage that so poignantly describes the peace and comfort I take from the examples and lives of our nation's soldiers. It states:

They died for liberty—they died for us. They are at rest. They sleep in the land they made free, under the flag they rendered stainless, under the solemn pines, the sad hemlocks, the tearful willows, the embracing vines. They sleep beneath the shadow of the clouds, careless alike of sunshine or storm, each in the windowless palace of rest . . . they are at peace.

I am humbled by this young man's life and sacrifice. May God bless his

family and all those he left behind with peace and comfort from their memories of this wonderful man and soldier.

REMEMBERING BEVERLEY TAYLOR SORENSON

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, today I wish to pay tribute to a wonderful woman, generous philanthropist, and tireless advocate for arts and education—Beverley Taylor Sorenson. Sadly, Utah and our Nation lost a truly delightful and influential woman this past week as she quietly passed away at the age of 89 surrounded by her loved ones.

I have known and worked closely with Beverley and her late husband James "Jim" Sorenson for many years and have always admired her work ethic, her commitment to serving others, and of course her love for and appreciation of the arts and the influence it can have in the lives of many.

Her love of the arts began at an early age as she fondly remembers music always playing in her childhood home. She grew into an accomplished dancer and pianist; in fact she would later earn money accompanying dance classes in Salt Lake City to help put herself through college.

Perhaps it was her own childhood experiences of personal arts education that later led to her passion for providing generations of children with the opportunity to learn and grow through the study of art and the many disciplines it entails. She witnessed firsthand the positive effects of arts education in many young lives and schools throughout the valley and set about trying to bring it to every corner of our State.

She was the driving impetus in the creation of Art Works for Kids, a program integrating arts based concepts into traditional core education subjects with wonderful results. She believed in this program greatly and felt that children would learn and retain more knowledge when coupled with art activities.

Because of her tireless efforts, the Beverley Taylor Sorenson Arts Learning Program, BTS Program, will serve tens of thousands of students during the upcoming school year at approximately 130 Utah elementary schools.

Beverley and Jim also created the Sorenson Legacy Foundation to support programs and projects that would benefit the lives of people throughout the world, giving generously and supporting vigorously. Together they built a lasting legacy of humanitarian service and philanthropy that has benefitted thousands and will continue to help generations to come.

Not only did Beverley dedicate herself to community efforts, she was a wonderful wife and mother, raising 2 sons, 6 daughters, and loving and mentoring 49 grandchildren and 65 great-grandchildren. She truly leaves behind a wonderful posterity who can build upon their mother and grandmother's example of a life well lived.

The impact and contributions Beverly Taylor Sorenson made to her family, our State, and our Nation will be felt for years to come. She was truly a magnificent lady who deeply cared about others and set about to do good throughout her life. Elaine and I send our deepest sympathies to her family and hope that they will find peace and comfort in the memories they share of this remarkable person.

TRIBUTE TO TERRY SCHOW

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, today I wish to pay tribute to an extraordinary man, dedicated public servant and tireless advocate for our Nation's veterans—Mr. Terry Schow. Terry will be retiring after more than 25 years of service to Utah's veterans.

Terry has been a long-time advocate, tireless worker, and public face for veterans causes in our State for almost three decades, and has served in top-level positions under three Utah Governors. I have had the pleasure of working with Terry for many years as Utah's Senator and I can attest to this man's dedication and love for our Nation's veterans and their needs. No one has worked harder, or cared more about the issues affecting veteran's lives and futures than Terry. He has approached so many important issues with dogged determination and never, ever let up until problems have been solved.

Through Terry's tireless leadership three veterans homes were opened, and medical services in our State for veterans have greatly expanded and improved. He has written articles in newspapers throughout our State to bring attention to the issues he has worked on daily for veterans, and has attended literally hundreds if not thousands of events in support of veterans and their sacrifices.

Terry has first hand knowledge of the service and sacrifices veterans make for our country. He is a U.S. Army veteran who volunteered to serve in 1967, and served in the 5th and 10th Special Forces Groups and the 25th Infantry Division in Southeast Asia. He has walked the path of soldiers and has been able to personally relate to the many men and women he has served.

His accomplishments in Utah have not gone unnoticed. He was tapped to serve as the president of the National Association of State Directors of Veterans Affairs for a time and was able to share his wealth of knowledge in this prestigious position with people throughout America all working to help our Nation's veterans. In addition he has served on dozens of boards and organizations committed to veterans issues.

Terry was born and raised in Ogden, UT and is the proud father of two children, and grandfather to three.

Utah's veterans have been well served by this man. He has truly been an extraordinary leader of veterans affairs and I know that many will great-

ly miss his advocacy and leadership on issues of great importance to this population. However, I am certain that retirement will not stop Terry's work and advocacy on behalf of veterans. He truly respects, and loves the men and women in uniform who have sacrificed so greatly for the freedoms we enjoy. I want to sincerely thank Terry for his dedication, his commitment and his tireless service to veterans. He has accomplished great things and paved the way for continued success and assistance for Utah's beloved veterans.

REMEMBERING LIEUTENANT PAUL MICHEL DEMEO

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, I rise to honor the life and service of 1LT Paul Michel DeMeo, who died on May 14 while stationed at Fort Bragg in North Carolina. Lieutenant DeMeo was a rifle platoon leader assigned to Company B, 2nd Battalion, 505th Parachute Infantry Regiment, 3rd Brigade Combat Team of the 82nd Airborne Division.

Born at the U.S. Army Kwajalein Atoll in the Marshall Islands on October 1, 1989, the son of an American physicist at the base, Paul grew up around service members and knew that he wanted to join the military from a very young age. After his family moved to Derry, NH, when he was 13 years old, Paul attended high school at Pinkerton Academy, where he eventually became the school's first Air Force Junior Reserve Officer Training Corps participant to attend a military academy.

Paul completed his undergraduate education at West Point in 2011 and went on to graduate from the infantry officer leadership basic course, the U.S. Army Ranger School, and the U.S. Army Airborne School. As a rifle platoon leader, Paul was responsible for training, material support, and readiness of 38 paratroopers. He was awarded a number of honors for his service, including the Army Commendation Medal, the National Defense Service Medal, the Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, the Army Service Ribbon, the Air Assault Badge, the Parachutist Badge, and the Ranger Tab.

Paul was an avid swimmer who joined the swim team in Kwajalein at the age of 4. He also showed tremendous promise on the tennis court at a very early age. In fact, when he was only 8 years old, the Government of the Republic of the Marshall Islands invited him to represent the country in tennis at the 2000 Olympic games. However, Paul wisely declined the offer, considering himself just a bit too young for the competition.

Paul will be remembered for his exceptional leadership ability, his confident smile, and his strong loyalty to his fellow soldiers, especially paratroopers under his command. Paul dedicated his life to the service and protection of our country. He worked to make himself the best he could be and to answer the call of duty to de-

fend our way of life. For this, we are forever grateful.

Paul is survived by his parents, Paul and Lucienne DeMeo; his brothers, Nathen A. and Pascal J. DeMeo; his sister, Danya Aleesa DeMeo; and his maternal grandmother, Amonia Valbrun. He also leaves behind his girlfriend, Hannah Farmer of Charlotte, NC and his paternal grandfather, Paul J. DeMeo. I ask my colleagues and all Americans to join me in honoring the life and service of Lieutenant Paul Michel DeMeo.

VOTE EXPLANATION

• Mrs. MCCASKILL. Madam President, on Thursday morning, the Senate took cloture votes in relation to motions to proceed to S. 953 and S. 1003, which represent a Democratic and Republican proposal, respectively, to address the interest rate offered on subsidized Federal Stafford loans, a form of Federal student loan available to many who are pursuing a postsecondary education. I was unable to be present for these votes, due to a prescheduled commitment; before the timing of these votes was envisioned, my attendance was confirmed at a women's conference. Because my presence would not have changed the outcome of either vote, I honored my previous commitment. Had I been present I would have voted in support of S. 953 and opposed S. 1003.

In my State, over 150,000 students will borrow subsidized Stafford loans next school year. These are need-based loans given to kids who have studied hard and families who have made financial sacrifices and plan to borrow what they need to cover the rising costs of higher education. Rather than reward their efforts, the government plans to add to their burden unless action is taken. On July 1, the interest rate on new subsidized Stafford student loans is scheduled to double from 3.4 to 6.8 percent.

We are facing a crisis. Already, officials at the Federal Reserve, the Department of the Treasury, and the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau have all warned that student borrowing threatens to dampen consumption, depress the economy, limit credit creation, and pose a threat to our Nation's financial stability. Students and graduates in my State are already heavily in student loan debt. Two out of every three Missouri students will leave college with student loan debt. If we fail to take action, students with subsidized Stafford loans will have to pay over \$1,000 more than they would under current interest rates on their loans. At a time when a higher education is vital to expanded opportunity for so many young people and with a 21st century economy that increasingly demands workers with the skills learned as part of a college education, we cannot be making it even more difficult for young people to financially achieve a college education. We need to act.

There are several proposals to address this impending crisis. I am a

proud cosponsor of two bills that would provide needed relief and give Congress the opportunity to address a long-term solution to exploding student loan debt when it reauthorizes the Higher Education Act.

The first, S. 953, the Student Loan Affordability Act, introduced by Senator REED of Rhode Island, would lock in the current 3.4% rate for subsidized Stafford loans for 2 years while Congress works on a long-term solution to slow the rapid accumulation of student loan debt. This bill would be fully paid for by closing tax loopholes enjoyed by companies that move American jobs offshore, big oil companies, and the wealthiest Americans.

I am also a cosponsor of Senator WARREN's Bank on Students Loan Fairness Act which would give students the same deal we give to the big banks by allowing those who are eligible for subsidized Stafford loans to borrow at the same rate offered to banks through the Federal Reserve discount window. This is commonsense, and it is fair.

Unfortunately, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle believe the solution to this current uncertainty is even more uncertainty. Their solution, S. 1003, would produce variable, uncapped interest rates that would hit low-income students the hardest.

Today's votes leave us in the same situation we were in: we need to act to prevent student loan interest rate increases that would additionally burden our students. I will continue to work with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to achieve meaningful legislation that preserves the availability of student loans and the economic opportunities they afford as an option for future generations of Americans.●

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR OBJECTION

● Mrs. MCCASKILL. Madam President, I rise to express my intent to sustain my objection to the nomination of Lt. Gen. Susan Helms to be deputy commander of U.S. Space Command, Calendar No. 70. I have met with Lieutenant General Helms and discussed my objection with leaders in the Air Force and my colleagues here in the Senate.

Lieutenant General Helms has a record of more than 30 years of distinguished military service, in which she became the first American military woman in space, among other significant achievements. Her career is to be celebrated. However, I continue to have deep concerns with Lieutenant General Helms' decision, while a commander and courts-martial convening authority, to overturn the jury verdict of a military court-martial in which the jury found an Air Force officer guilty of sexual assault. She made this decision against the advice of her staff judge advocate.

With her action, Lieutenant General Helms sent a damaging message to survivors of sexual assault who are seeking justice in the military justice system: They can take the difficult and

painful step of reporting the crime, they can endure the agony involved in being subjected to intense questioning often aimed at putting the blame on them, and they can experience a momentary sense of justice in knowing that they were believed when their attacker is convicted and sentenced, only to have that justice ripped away with the stroke of a pen by an individual who was never in the courtroom for the trial and who never heard the testimony. In overturning the conviction in this case, Lieutenant General Helms supplanted her opinion for that of a jury, the appropriate adjudicators of fact who observe an entire court-martial proceeding. And she did not take the advice of her staff judge advocate, who recommended she affirm the conviction in this case. At a time when the military is facing a crisis of sexual assault, making a decision that sends a message which dissuades reporting of sexual assaults, supplants the finding of a jury, contradicts the advice of counsel, and further victimizes a survivor of sexual assault is unacceptable.

Given these circumstances, I will continue to object to any unanimous consent request to approve Lieutenant General Helms' nomination. I will continue to give great scrutiny to any future nomination of any member of the armed services who has, while serving in his or her capacity as a convening authority of a military court-martial, overturned a jury conviction against the advice of legal counsel.●

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO ALAN CAMERON

● Mr. CRAPO. Madam President, I rise today to recognize the outstanding work of Alan Cameron, who is retiring from serving as president and chief executive officer of the Idaho Credit Union League.

Alan has skillfully led the Idaho Credit Union League since 2000. Prior to serving as president and CEO for the Idaho Credit Union League and its wholly owned subsidiary League Services, Inc., he devoted more than 20 years to serving as the league's retained legal counsel and lobbyist. Before joining the Idaho Credit Union League, he graduated from the University of Idaho's College of Law, served as deputy prosecuting attorney with the Ada County Prosecuting Attorney's Office, and had a private practice.

Alan has given considerable time as an indispensable part of the community and represented the interests of Idahoans at the State and national levels. This includes his service on committees and task forces for the Credit Union National Association and his service as a member of the Federal Reserve Board's Consumer Advisory Council. He also served as treasurer of the Hispanic Financial Education Coalition, treasurer of the Consumer Information Council, and as a board member

for the Consumer Credit Counseling Service of Idaho. We are fortunate to count Alan as a fellow Idahoan.

Throughout his career, Alan has been a widely respected and thoughtful leader. I have greatly valued his input and advocacy on behalf of Idaho's credit unions as we have worked together over the years. I especially appreciated the considerable amount of input and hard work that Alan invested into helping me craft and move my regulatory relief legislation. The Idaho Credit Union's release about his retirement included a fitting recognition of Alan's exemplary work:

The League's Board and staff have thrived under Cameron's leadership. His passion for credit unions and their members have been a beacon during a time of increasing regulatory burden and financial upheaval. He is a trusted friend and voice of reason to state government, business owners, regulators and credit union leaders.

Thank you, Alan, for your remarkable service to Idaho and our Nation. I hope that your retirement will provide you with well-earned time to travel with your wife Janet and many good times with your family and friends. Congratulations on your retirement. I thank you for your hard work and wish you a very happy retirement.●

UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL FLORIDA

● Mr. NELSON. Madam President, today I wish to congratulate the University of Central Florida as the school celebrates its 50th anniversary this year.

It has been impressive to watch UCF over the years grow into what is now the Nation's second largest university. The school—one of 12 public universities in Florida—is second in size only to Arizona State.

It is educating nearly 60,000 undergraduate and graduate students this year from all around the world at what is now a sprawling campus located in Orlando, FL. Throughout the years, UCF has increasingly become an integral part of the Sunshine State—and a nationally recognized hub for research.

Located adjacent to the university is Central Florida's Research Park—a 1,000-acre, high-tech complex that fosters innovation through its collaboration of UCF students, private-sector researchers and government agencies all working together in the same location. Together these researchers and students are working on projects in the sciences, engineering, photonics and optics, as well as a variety of health-related fields.

The facilities they use also are home to some of the most state-of-the-art modeling and simulation equipment in the country.

Just 2 months ago, NASA awarded UCF a \$55 million grant to build a satellite that will enhance our ability to study the Earth's atmosphere.

Not only is this award the largest grant in UCF's history, it also makes it

the first university in Florida to lead a NASA mission—which is a fitting honor for a university located in the shadow of Kennedy Space Center.

It was President Kennedy's historic call for a manned mission to the moon that prompted the Florida Legislature to authorize the creation of Florida Technological University—the original name of UCF—in 1963. Five years later, NASA awarded UCF its first research grant. And, as evidenced by this most recent one, the partnership continues to this day.

So, I want to congratulate the University of Central Florida for the tremendous progress it has made in its first five decades.

I have no doubt the university will continue to build on its many successes for many decades to come.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 9:50 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2217. An act making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 2217. An act making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bills were read the first time:

H.R. 126. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to enter into an agreement to provide for management of the free-roaming wild horses in and around the Currituck National Wildlife Refuge.

S. 1121. A bill to stop the National Security Agency from spying on citizens of the United States and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on June 6, 2013, she had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bill:

S. 622. An act to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to reauthorize user fee programs relating to new animal drugs and generic new animal drugs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. LEAHY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Report to accompany S. 744, A bill to provide for comprehensive immigration reform and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113-40).

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF COMMITTEE

The following executive report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, for the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

*Fred P. Hochberg, of New York, to be President of the Export-Import Bank of the United States for a term expiring January 20, 2017.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Ms. LANDRIEU:

S. 1112. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to require the establishment of teacher evaluation programs; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself, Mr. BEGICH, and Mr. BENNET):

S. 1113. A bill to provide professional development for elementary school principals in early childhood education and development; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. GRAHAM, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. BURR, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. CASEY):

S. 1114. A bill to provide for identification of misaligned currency, require action to correct the misalignment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. SCHUMER:

S. 1115. A bill to treat payments by charitable organizations with respect to certain firefighters as exempt payments; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. COONS, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 1116. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to equalize the exclusion from gross income of parking and transportation fringe benefits and to provide for a common cost-of-living adjustment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. STABENOW:

S. 1117. A bill to prepare disconnected youth for a competitive future; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. KIRK, and Mr. BENNET):

S. 1118. A bill to amend part E of title IV of the Social Security Act to better enable State child welfare agencies to prevent sex trafficking of children and serve the needs of children who are victims of sex trafficking, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Ms. MIKULSKI):

S. 1119. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for integration of mental health services and mental health treatment outreach teams, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself and Mr. UDALL of Colorado):

S. 1120. A bill to provide authorities for the appropriate conversion of temporary seasonal wildland firefighters and other temporary seasonal employees in Federal land management agencies who perform regularly recurring seasonal work to permanent seasonal positions; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. PAUL:

S. 1121. A bill to stop the National Security Agency from spying on citizens of the United States and for other purposes; read the first time.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. GRAHAM (for himself and Mr. RUBIO):

S. Res. 163. A resolution calling for more accountable foreign assistance for Cambodia; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 113

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) and the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 113, a bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act and the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require certain creditors to obtain certifications from institutions of higher education, and for other purposes.

S. 114

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 114, a bill to amend title 11, United States Code, with respect to certain exceptions to discharge in bankruptcy.

S. 403

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 403, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to address and take action to prevent bullying and harassment of students.

S. 462

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) were added as cosponsors of S. 462, a bill to enhance the strategic partnership between the United States and Israel.

S. 521

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 521, a bill to require the Secretary of Defense to award grants to fund research on orthotics and prosthetics.

S. 522

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 522, a bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to award grants to establish, or expand upon, master's degree or doctoral degree programs in orthotics and prosthetics, and for other purposes.

S. 526

At the request of Mr. BAUCUS, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 526, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the special rule for contributions of qualified conservation contributions, and for other purposes.

S. 623

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 623, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure the continued access of Medicare beneficiaries to diagnostic imaging services.

S. 701

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 701, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the definition of full-time employee for purposes of the individual mandate in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

S. 709

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 709, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to increase diagnosis of Alzheimer's disease and related dementias, leading to better care and outcomes for Americans living with Alzheimer's disease and related dementias.

S. 731

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. HAGAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 731, a bill to require the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency to conduct an empirical impact study on proposed rules relating to the International Basel III agreement on gen-

eral risk-based capital requirements, as they apply to community banks.

S. 734

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 734, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to repeal the requirement for reduction of survivor annuities under the Survivor Benefit Plan by veterans' dependency and indemnity compensation.

S. 789

At the request of Mr. BAUCUS, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 789, a bill to grant the Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the First Special Service Force, in recognition of its superior service during World War II.

S. 815

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) was added as a cosponsor of S. 815, a bill to prohibit the employment discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity.

S. 992

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. JOHANNIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 992, a bill to provide for offices on sexual assault prevention and response under the Chiefs of Staff of the Armed Forces, to require reports on additional offices and selection of sexual assault prevention and response personnel, and for other purposes.

S. 1028

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1028, a bill to reauthorize and improve the Older Americans Act of 1965, and for other purposes.

S. 1046

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1046, a bill to clarify certain provisions of the Native American Veterans' Memorial Establishment Act of 1994.

S. 1097

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1097, a bill to prohibit a Federal agency from establishing or implementing a policy that discourages or prohibits the selection of a resort or vacation destination as the location for a conference or event, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 26

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) and the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 26, a resolution recognizing that access to hospitals and other health care providers for patients in rural areas of the United States is essential to the survival and success of communities in the United States.

S. RES. 154

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. JOHANNIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 154, a resolution supporting political reform in Iran and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 956

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. COWAN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 956 intended to be proposed to S. 954, an original bill to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018.

AMENDMENT NO. 1105

At the request of Mr. CHAMBLISS, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1105 intended to be proposed to S. 954, an original bill to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018.

AMENDMENT NO. 1166

At the request of Mr. CHAMBLISS, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1166 intended to be proposed to S. 954, an original bill to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. KIRK, and Mr. BENNET):

S. 1118. A bill to amend part E of title IV of the Social Security Act to better enable State child welfare agencies to prevent sex trafficking of children and serve the needs of children who are victims of sex trafficking, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, today I am pleased to join Senators PORTMAN, BLUMENTHAL, CANTWELL, BROWN, and KIRK to introduce the Child Sex Trafficking Data and Response Act of 2013. This bipartisan legislation will help us to better understand and combat the unforgivable and fast-growing criminal enterprise of trafficking children for sex right here in the U.S.

We cannot bury our heads in the sand and ignore this terrible problem. Child victims of sex trafficking need and deserve the full range of coordinated assistance and care required to help them recover from this trauma.

Unfortunately, some people still refuse to acknowledge that American children are being bought and sold for sex and they criticize the few estimates surrounding trafficking rates that do exist. As a policymaker, it is hard to advance an issue when there are critics who deny its very existence. For those of us who have spoken to law enforcement officers, child welfare workers

and judges who work with these victims every day, we know that denying that the problem exists will not make it go away.

I became engaged in efforts to address child trafficking a few years ago when I had the opportunity to accompany police officers along 82nd Avenue in my hometown of Portland. I will never forget a 15-year-old girl working out there with the tools of the trade—a cell phone to stay in constant contact with her pimp and report how much money she had made; a 15-inch butcher knife to try to protect herself; and, a purse full of condoms.

This problem does exist, but we still do not know its full scope—we do not know how many children in the U.S. are victimized by pimps, Johns and traffickers every year. Quantifying the problem, as simple a step as that may seem, is truly the first step in bringing these children out of the shadows to help them progress from victims to survivors.

The Child Sex Trafficking Data and Response Act of 2013 provides a framework for systematically identifying and tracking the number of child trafficking victims who are in our Nation's foster care system. It would further require child welfare agencies to promptly report information on missing and abducted children to law enforcement and would require law enforcement authorities to notify the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, NCMEC, when a child is missing from State care.

The bill would also take steps to ensure children who are sex trafficked or exploited are treated as victims, not criminals. The protections, services and protocols established for abused and neglected children within the child welfare system are rarely extended to trafficked children and youth, and in most States, such children aren't even categorized as victims. Instead, they are often sent to the juvenile justice system and criminalized for being raped and trafficked.

The Child Sex Trafficking Data and Response Act would amend Federal law to say all child victims of sex trafficking are victims of abuse and neglect. It would require state plans, under the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act, designed to improve child protection services contain: provisions and procedures requiring identification and assessment of all reports involving children known or suspected to be victims of sex trafficking; provisions and procedures for training child protective services workers to identify and provide comprehensive services for children who are victims of sex trafficking; a description of efforts to coordinate with State law enforcement, juvenile justice, and social service agencies such as runaway and homeless youth shelters to serve these victims; and an annual State data report on the number of children identified as known

or suspected to be victims of trafficking.

These steps alone will not solve the problem before us. These are still some very daunting problems that need to be overcome, and the current fiscal climate alone presents a significant barrier to providing resources needed by victims, child welfare workers, law enforcement and service providers. Still, this is an important step toward making sure that vulnerable foster children are protected from pimps, Johns and traffickers.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Ms. MIKULSKI):

S. 1119. A bill to amend the Public Health Services Act to provide for integration of mental health services and mental health treatment outreach teams, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I am pleased to be joined by my colleague from Maryland, Senator MIKULSKI, in introducing the Positive Aging Act of 2013, which will help to increase older Americans' access to quality mental health screening and treatment services in community-based settings.

The legislation we are introducing today is particularly important for States like Maine that have a disproportionate number of older persons. Sixteen percent of Maine's population is 65 or older, and, with the highest median age, Maine is the "oldest" State in the Nation. Moreover, our percentage of older adults is increasing; by 2030, more than one in five Mainers will be over the age of 65.

One of the most daunting public health challenges facing our Nation today is how to increase access to quality mental health services for the more than 46 million American adults living with severe, disabling mental disorders that can devastate their lives and the lives of the people around them.

What is often overlooked is the prevalence of mental illness among our Nation's elderly. Nearly one in five older adults in America have one or more mental health conditions. Moreover, older white males age 85 and older have the highest rate of suicide of any group in the country. Particularly disturbing is the fact that the mental health needs of older Americans are often overlooked or not recognized because of the mistaken belief that they are a normal part of aging and therefore cannot be treated.

While effective treatments exist for mental health disorders, it is estimated that nearly two-thirds of older adults with a mental health problem do not receive the services they need. Older adults with evidence of a mental disorder are generally less likely than younger and middle-aged adults to receive mental health services and, when they do, they are less likely to receive care from a mental health specialist.

Failure to treat mental disorders leads to poorer health outcomes for other medical conditions, higher rates of institutionalization, and increased health care costs.

Fortunately, important research is being done that is developing innovative approaches to improve the delivery of mental health care for older adults by integrating it into primary care settings. This research demonstrates that older adults are more likely to receive appropriate mental health care if there is a mental health professional on the primary care team, rather than simply referring them to a mental health specialist outside the primary care setting. Multiple appointments with multiple providers in multiple settings simply don't work for older patients who must also cope with concurrent chronic illnesses, mobility problems, and limited transportation options. The research also shows that there is less stigma associated with psychiatric services when they are integrated into general medical care.

The Positive Aging Act builds upon this research and authorizes funding for projects that integrate mental health screening and treatment services into community sites and primary care settings. Specifically, the Positive Aging Act of 2013 would authorize the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration to fund demonstration projects to support integration of mental health services in primary care settings. It would also support grants for community-based mental health treatment outreach teams to fund demonstration projects to support integration of mental health services in primary care settings. To ensure that these geriatric mental health programs have proper attention and oversight, it would mandate the designation of a Deputy Director for Older Adult Mental Health Services in the Center for Mental Health Services, and it would also include representatives of older Americans or their families and geriatric mental health professionals on the Advisory Council for the Center for Mental Health Services. Finally, it would require State plans under Community Mental Health Services Block Grants to include descriptions of the States' outreach to and services for older individuals.

We are fortunate today to have a variety of effective treatments to address the mental health needs of American seniors. The Positive Aging Act will help to ensure that older Americans have access to these important services. I therefore urge my colleagues to sign on as cosponsors of the legislation, which has been endorsed by numerous mental health, aging, and health care organizations, including the American Psychological Association, the American Association for Geriatric Psychiatry, the American Geriatrics Society, and the National Association of Social Workers.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 163—CALLING FOR MORE ACCOUNTABLE FOREIGN ASSISTANCE FOR CAMBODIA

Mr. GRAHAM (for himself and Mr. RUBIO) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 163

Whereas, according to the United States Agency for International Development, from 1993 to 2011 the United States provided Cambodia with over \$1,247,000,000 in economic and military assistance;

Whereas Cambodia is ranked 138 (out of 187) in the United Nations Development Program's Human Development Report 2013, a rank shared by the Lao People's Democratic Republic;

Whereas Cambodia is ranked 157 (out of 174) in Transparency International's Corruption Perceptions Index 2012, a rank below Yemen and one shared with Angola and Tajikistan;

Whereas Cambodia is ranked "Not Free" in Freedom House's Freedom in the World 2013 report, which further states, "Cambodia is not an electoral democracy. Elections are conducted under often repressive conditions, and the opposition is hampered by serious legal and physical harassment.";

Whereas the Department of State's Country Reports on Human Rights Practices for 2011 notes that "a leading human rights problem" in Cambodia is "a weak judiciary. . . subject to corruption and political influence";

Whereas Human Rights Watch noted in a May 31, 2012, New York Times op-ed that Prime Minister Hun Sen has remained in power in Cambodia for 10,000 days "through politically motivated violence, control of the security forces, massive corruption, and the tacit support of foreign powers";

Whereas the July 16, 2012, Report of the United Nations Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Cambodia (A/HRC/21/63) notes that "there are major flaws in the administration of elections in Cambodia and urgent and long-term reforms are needed to give Cambodians confidence in the electoral process and in the workings of the National Election Committee";

Whereas the July 16, 2012, report includes 18 specific recommendations for improving the election framework and environment in Cambodia to ensure greater transparency, accountability, and political association and expression, including the full participation of opposition leader Sam Rainsy in upcoming parliamentary elections; and

Whereas Sam Rainsy and other opposition members and activists continue to be the target of official harassment through politically motivated accusations and charges, denied due process of law, and excluded from participating in upcoming national elections in Cambodia: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That—

(1) in order to be considered credible and competitive, the July 2013 parliamentary elections in Cambodia must implement the recommendations contained in the July 16, 2012, Report of the United Nations Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Cambodia (A/HRC/21/63), and must include the full and unfettered participation of all political parties leaders, specifically Sam Rainsy;

(2) the United States Department of State and the United States Agency for International Development should refrain from supporting national or local elections in

Cambodia, or deploying election monitors to the July 2013 parliamentary elections, if such United Nations recommendations are ignored, and if political parties and opposition leaders are excluded or otherwise hampered from fully and freely participating in electoral processes, including during the campaign period and on election day;

(3) any election in Cambodia that the Secretary of State determines is not credible and competitive should be deemed as an illegitimate expression of the Cambodian peoples' will, and an impediment to the democratic development of Cambodia; and

(4) a Cambodian government formed as a result of such illegitimate elections should not be eligible for direct United States Government assistance, including for the military and police, and the Department of State and United States Agency for International Development should jointly reassess and reduce assistance for Cambodia in subsequent fiscal years, and urge international financial institutions to do the same.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, the resolution I submit today with my colleague from Florida is straight forward. Credible and competitive parliamentary elections in Cambodia next month will be the measure or U.S. foreign assistance provided to the central government of that country in the future.

According to the United States Agency for International Development, from 1993 to 2011 the United States provided Cambodia with over \$1.2 billion in economic and military assistance. The President's fiscal year 2014 budget request to Congress includes a total of \$73.5 million in aid for Cambodia. America's investment in that Southeast Asian country has been anything but insignificant.

Unfortunately, we are not getting a return on this investment when it comes to the advancement of the rule of law, democracy, and human rights. A chorus of concern with the upcoming elections has been expressed by the United Nations, Cambodian civil society, and opposition political party leaders, including Sam Rainsy who is prohibited from participating in the polls by the actions of courts controlled by the ruling Cambodian People's Party, CPP. Given recent comments by CPP Prime Minister Hun Sen that he intends to remain in power until 2026, one wonders whether the CPP has already decided the outcome of the elections.

Less than credible and competitive polls subverts the will of the Cambodian people and perpetuates a level of corruption that ranks that country below Yemen in Transparency International's Corruption Perception Index, 2012. Equally troubling, Hun Sen's close ties with Beijing may further draw Cambodia into the People's Republic of China's sphere of influence—to the detriment of security and stability in the region.

I encourage the State Department to pay close attention to events in Cambodia and embrace the actions called for by this resolution should illegitimate elections be held next month. For many Asia-watchers, the response

of the administration to these elections will help define the proposed United States pivot toward Asia.

NOTICE OF HEARING

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions will meet in executive session on Tuesday, June 11, 2013, at 10 a.m. in room 430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building to mark-up S. Strengthening America's Schools Act and any nominations cleared for action.

For further information regarding this meeting, please contact the Committee at (202) 224-5375.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Michael London, a law clerk with the Finance Committee, and Kate Glazebrook and Johnathan Diem, interns with the Finance Committee, be granted the privilege of the floor for the remainder of the 2013 calendar year.

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

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 1121 AND H.R. 126

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I understand there are two bills at the desk, and I ask for their first reading en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bills will be read for the first time by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1121) to stop the National Security Agency from spying on citizens of the United States and for other purposes.

A bill (H.R. 126) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to enter into an agreement to provide for management of the free-roaming wild horses in and around the Currituck National Wildlife Refuge.

Mrs. BOXER. I now ask for a second reading en bloc and object to my own request en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bills will be read for a second time on the next legislative day.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, JUNE 10, 2013

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 2 p.m. on Monday, June 10, 2013; that following the prayer and the pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 744, the comprehensive immigration reform bill, under the previous order.

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

PROGRAM

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, we expect to swear in Senator-designate Cheisa during Monday's session. At 5:30 p.m. on Monday there will be a rollcall vote on passage of the farm bill.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY,
JUNE 10, 2013, AT 2 P.M.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 1:06 p.m., adjourned until Monday, June 10, 2013, at 2 p.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

THE JUDICIARY

TIMOTHY L. BROOKS, OF ARKANSAS, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS, VICE JIMM LARRY HENDREN, RETIRED.
JEFFREY ALKER MEYER, OF CONNECTICUT, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT, VICE MARK R. KRAVITZ, DECEASED.

AMTRAK BOARD OF DIRECTORS

THOMAS C. CARPER, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE A DIRECTOR OF THE AMTRAK BOARD OF DIRECTORS FOR A TERM OF FIVE YEARS. (REAPPOINTMENT)

CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING

HOWARD ABEL HUSOCK, OF NEW YORK, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 31, 2018, VICE CHRIS BOSKIN, TERM EXPIRED.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

AVI GARBOW, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY, VICE COLIN SCOTT COLE FULTON, RESIGNED.

ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION

THOMAS HICKS, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 12, 2013, VICE GRACIA M. HILLMAN, TERM EXPIRED.

THOMAS HICKS, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 12, 2017. (REAPPOINTMENT)

MYRNA PEREZ, OF TEXAS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 12, 2015, VICE ROSEMARY E. RODRIQUEZ, TERM EXPIRED.

LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION

LAURIE I. MIKVA, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION FOR A TERM EXPIRING JULY 13, 2013. (REAPPOINTMENT)

LAURIE I. MIKVA, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION FOR A TERM EXPIRING JULY 13, 2016. (REAPPOINTMENT)

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be brigadier general

COL. JOHN W. LATHROP

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S3997–S4025

Measures Introduced: Ten bills and one resolution were introduced, as follows: S. 1112–1121, and S. Res. 163. **Page S4021**

Measures Reported:

Report to accompany S. 744, to provide for comprehensive immigration reform and for other purposes. (S. Rept. No. 113–40) **Page S4021**

Measures Considered:

Border Security, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Modernization Act—Agreement: Senate continued consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 744, to provide for comprehensive immigration reform. **Pages S3998–S4014**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that at approximately 2 p.m., on Monday, June 10, 2013, Senate resume consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill, under the order of Thursday, June 6, 2013. **Page S4024**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Timothy L. Brooks, of Arkansas, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Arkansas.

Jeffrey Alker Meyer, of Connecticut, to be United States District Judge for the District of Connecticut.

Thomas C. Carper, of Illinois, to be a Director of the Amtrak Board of Directors for a term of five years.

Howard Abel Husock, of New York, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting for a term expiring January 31, 2018.

Avi Garbow, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

Thomas Hicks, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Election Assistance Commission for a term expiring December 12, 2013.

Thomas Hicks, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Election Assistance Commission for a term expiring December 12, 2017.

Myrna Perez, of Texas, to be a Member of the Election Assistance Commission for a term expiring December 12, 2015.

Laurie I. Mikva, of Illinois, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Legal Services Corporation for a term expiring July 13, 2013.

Laurie I. Mikva, of Illinois, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Legal Services Corporation for a term expiring July 13, 2016.

1 Army nomination in the rank of general.

Page S4025

Messages from the House:

Page S4021

Measures Referred:

Page S4021

Measures Read the First Time: **Pages S4021, S4024**

Enrolled Bills Presented:

Page S4021

Executive Reports of Committees:

Page S4021

Additional Cosponsors:

Pages S4021–22

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions:

Pages S4022–23

Additional Statements:

Pages S4020–21

Notices of Hearings/Meetings:

Page S4024

Privileges of the Floor:

Page S4024

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:30 a.m. and adjourned at 1:06 p.m., until 2 p.m. on Monday, June 10, 2013. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S4024.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

No committee meetings were held.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

The House was not in session today. The House is scheduled to meet at 3 p.m. on Monday, June 10, 2013 in pro forma session.

Committee Meetings

No hearings were held.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR MONDAY, JUNE 10, 2013

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: business meeting to consider the nominations of Anthony Renard Foxx, of North Carolina, to be Secretary of Transportation, Penny Pritzker, of Illinois, to be Secretary of Commerce, and nominations for promotion in the U.S. Coast Guard, Time to be announced, S-216, Capitol.

CONGRESSIONAL PROGRAM AHEAD

Week of June 10 through June 14, 2013

Senate Chamber

On *Monday*, at approximately 2:00 p.m., Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 744, Border Security, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Modernization Act.

On *Monday*, at 5:00 p.m., Senate will resume consideration of S. 954, the Farm bill, with votes on or in relation to Stabenow (for Leahy) Amendment No. 998, and passage of the bill at approximately 5:30 p.m.

Following disposition of S. 954, the Farm bill, Senate will continue consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 744, Border Security, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Modernization Act.

On *Tuesday*, at 2:15 p.m., Senate will vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 744, Border Security, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Modernization Act, and at 4:00 p.m., Senate will vote on the adoption of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 744.

During the balance of the week, Senate may consider any cleared legislative and executive business.

Senate Committees

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Committee on Appropriations: June 11, Subcommittee on Department of Defense, to hold hearings to examine department leadership, 10 a.m., SD-192.

June 12, Subcommittee on Department of Defense, to hold hearings to examine voluntary military education programs, 10 a.m., SD-192.

June 12, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine cybersecurity, focusing on preparing for and responding to the enduring threat; to be immediately followed by a closed briefing in SVC-217, 2 p.m., SD-G50.

June 13, Subcommittee on Transportation and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies, to hold hearings to examine crumbling infrastructure, focusing on outdated and overburdened highways and bridges, 10 a.m., SD-124.

Committee on Armed Services: June 11, Subcommittee on Airland, business meeting to markup those provisions which fall under the subcommittee's jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2014, 9:30 a.m., SD-G50.

June 11, Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support, business meeting to markup those provisions which fall under the subcommittee's jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2014, 11 a.m., SD-G50.

June 11, Subcommittee on Personnel, business meeting to markup those provisions which fall under the subcommittee's jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2014, 2 p.m., SD-G50.

June 11, Subcommittee on Strategic Forces, closed business meeting to markup those provisions which fall under the subcommittee's jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2014, 3:30 p.m., SR-232A.

June 11, Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities, closed business meeting to markup those provisions which fall under the subcommittee's jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2014, 6 p.m., SR-232A.

June 12, Subcommittee on SeaPower, closed business meeting to markup those provisions which fall under the subcommittee's jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2014, 9:30 a.m., SR-222.

June 12, Full Committee, closed business meeting to markup the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2014, 2:30 p.m., SR-222.

June 13, Full Committee, closed business meeting to continue to markup the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2014, 9:30 a.m., SR-222.

June 14, Full Committee, closed business meeting to continue to markup the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2014, 9:30 a.m., SR-222.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: June 13, to hold hearings to examine lessons learned from the financial crisis regarding community banks, 10 a.m., SD-538.

Committee on the Budget: June 12, To hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2014 for Defense, 10:30 a.m., SD-608.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: June 10, business meeting to consider the nominations of Anthony Renard Foxx, of North Carolina, to be Secretary of Transportation, Penny Pritzker, of Illinois, to be Secretary of Commerce, and nominations for promotion in the U.S. Coast Guard, Time to be announced, S-216, Capitol.

June 11, Subcommittee on Oceans, Atmosphere, Fisheries, and Coast Guard, to hold hearings to examine deep sea challenge, focusing on innovative partnerships in ocean observations, 2:30 p.m., SR-253.

Committee on Finance: June 11, to hold hearings to examine sex trafficking and exploitation in America, focusing on child welfare's role in prevention and intervention, 10 a.m., SD-215.

Committee on Foreign Relations: June 13, Subcommittee on European Affairs, with the Subcommittee on International Operations and Organizations, Human Rights, Democracy, and Global Women's Issues, to hold a joint hearing to examine Russia's human rights situation, 10 a.m., SD-419.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: June 11, business meeting to consider S. 1094, to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, and any pending nominations, 10 a.m., SH-216.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: June 11, to hold hearings to examine reducing duplication and improving outcomes in Federal information technology, 10:30 a.m., SD-342.

June 12, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine the nomination of Howard A. Shelanski, of Pennsylvania, to be Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, 10 a.m., SD-342.

Committee on Indian Affairs: June 12, to hold hearings to examine the nomination of Yvette Roubideaux, of Maryland, to be Director of the Indian Health Service, Department of Health and Human Services, 2:30 p.m., SD-628.

Committee on the Judiciary: June 11, to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Byron Todd Jones, of Minnesota, to be Director, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives, and Stuart F. Delery, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Attorney General, both of the Department of Justice, 9:30 a.m., SD-226.

June 13, Full Committee, business meeting to consider S. 394, to prohibit and deter the theft of metal, S. 162, to reauthorize and improve the Mentally Ill Offender Treatment and Crime Reduction Act of 2004, and the nominations of Derek Anthony West, of California, to be Associate Attorney General, Department of Justice, and Valerie E. Caproni, of the District of Columbia, and

Vernon S. Broderick, of New York, both to be a United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York, 10 a.m., SD-226.

Committee on Rules and Administration: June 12, to hold hearings to examine the nomination of Davita Vance-Cooks, of Virginia, to be Public Printer, Government Printing Office, 10 a.m., SR-301.

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship: June 13, business meeting to consider S. 511, to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 to enhance the Small Business Investment Company Program, S. 289, to extend the low-interest refinancing provisions under the Local Development Business Loan Program of the Small Business Administration, S. 537, to require the Small Business Administration to make information relating to lenders making covered loans publicly available, and S. 415, to clarify the collateral requirement for certain loans under section 7(d) of the Small Business Act, to address assistance to out-of-State small business concerns, 10 a.m., SR-428A.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: June 12, to hold hearings to examine pending benefits legislation, 10 a.m., SR-418.

Select Committee on Intelligence: June 11, to hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters, 2:30 p.m., SH-219.

June 13, Full Committee, to hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters, 2:30 p.m., SH-219.

House Committees

Committee on Appropriations, June 12, Full Committee, markup on Defense Appropriations Bill, Fiscal Year 2104, 10 a.m., 2359 Rayburn.

Committee on the Budget, June 12, Full Committee, hearing on the Department of Defense and the Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Request, 1 p.m., 210 Cannon.

Committee on Education and the Workforce, June 12, Subcommittee on Health, Employment, Labor, Pension, hearing entitled "Strengthening the Multiemployer Pension System: What Reforms Should Policymakers Consider?", 10 a.m. 2175 Rayburn.

June 13, Subcommittee on Higher Education and Workforce Training, hearing entitled "Keeping College Within Reach: Discussing Program Quality through Accreditation", 10 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, June 12, Subcommittee on Health, hearing entitled "The Need for Medicaid Reform: A State Perspective", 10 a.m., 2322 Rayburn.

June 12, Subcommittee on Communications and Technology, hearing entitled "The Satellite Television Law: Repeal, Reauthorize, or Revise?", 10:30 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

June 13, Subcommittee on Energy and Commerce, hearing entitled "The Fiscal Year 2014 U.S. Department of Energy Budget", 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

June 13, Subcommittee on Environment and the Economy, hearing entitled "Title I of the Toxic Substance Control Act: Understanding its History and Reviewing its Impact", 10:15 a.m., 2322 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, June 12, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Beyond GSEs” Examples of Successful Housing Finance Models without Explicit Government Guarantees”, 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

June 12, Subcommittee on Capital Markets and Government Sponsored Enterprises, hearing entitled “Reducing Barriers to Capital Formation”, 2 p.m., 2128 Rayburn.

June 13, Subcommittee on Monetary Policy and Trade, hearing entitled “Assessing Reform at the Export-Import Bank”, 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

June 13, Subcommittee on Housing and Insurance, hearing entitled “The Impact of International Regulatory Standards on the Competitiveness of U.S. Insurers”, 1 p.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, June 12, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Modernizing U.S. International Food Aid: Reaching More for Less”, 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

June 12, Subcommittee on the Middle East and North Africa, hearing entitled “American NGOs Under Attack in Morsi's Egypt”, 1 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security, June 12, Subcommittee on Counterterrorism, hearing entitled “Protecting the Homeland Against Mumbai-Style Attacks and the Threat from Lashkar-e-Taiba”, 10 a.m., 311 Cannon.

June 14, Subcommittee on Oversight and Management Efficiency, hearing entitled “Why Can't DHS Better Communicate with the American People?”, 9 a.m., 311 Cannon.

Committee on the Judiciary, June 13, Full Committee, hearing on Federal Bureau of Investigation, 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

June 13, Full Committee, hearing on H.R. 2278, the “Strengthen and Fortify Enforcement Act”, 2 p.m., 2141 Rayburn.

June 14, Task Force, hearing on Defining the Problem and Scope of Over-criminalization and Over-federalization, 9 a.m., 2237 Rayburn.

Committee on Natural Resources, June 11, Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources, hearing on H.R. 2231, the “OffShore Energy and Jobs Act”, 11 a.m., 1324 Longworth. This hearing is a continuation from Thursday, June 6, 2013.

June 13, Subcommittee on Fisheries, Wildlife, Oceans and Insular Affairs, hearing on H.R. 553, to designate the exclusive economic zone of the United States as the “Ronald Wilson Reagan Exclusive Economic Zone of the United States”; H.R. 1308, the “Endangered Salmon and Fisheries Predation Prevention Act”; H.R. 1399, the “Hydrographic Services Improvement Amendments Act of 2013”; H.R. 1425, the “Marine Debris Emergency Act of 2013”; H.R. 1491, to authorize the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to provide certain funds to eligible entities for activities undertaken to address the marine debris impacts of the March 2011 Tohoku earthquake and subsequent tsunami, and for other purposes; and H.R. 2219, to reauthorize the Integrated Coastal and Ocean Observation System Act of 2009, 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

June 13, Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources, hearing entitled “Mining in America: The Ad-

ministration's Use of Claim Maintenance Fees and Clean-up of Abandoned Mine Lands”, 10 a.m., 1334 Longworth.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, June 12, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Protecting Taxpayer Dollars: Is the Government Using Suspension and Debarment Effectively?”, 9:30 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

June 13, Subcommittee on National Security, hearing entitled “Examining the Government's Record on Implementing the International Religious Freedom Act”, 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Rules, June 11, Full Committee, hearing on H.R. 1960, the “National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014”; and H.R. 1256, the “Swap Jurisdiction Certainty Act”, 5 p.m., H-313 Capitol.

June 12, Full Committee, hearing on H.R. 1960, the “National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014” (amendment consideration), 2 p.m., H-313 Capitol.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, June 12, Subcommittee on Environment, hearing entitled “Background Check: Achievability of New Ozone Standards”, 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business, June 12, Subcommittee on Economic Growth, Tax and Capital Access, hearing entitled “The Seasonal Employment Needs of Small Tourism Businesses and H-2B Visa Policy”, 1 p.m., 2360 Rayburn.

June 13, Subcommittee on Contracting and Workforce, hearing entitled “Putting the Strategy in sourcing: Challenges and Opportunities for Small Business Contractors”, 10 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, June 12, Subcommittee on Aviation, hearing entitled “Lessons Learned from the Boeing 787 Incidents”, 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Ways and Means, June 12, Subcommittee on Trade, hearing entitled “U.S.-Brazil Trade and Investment Relationship: Opportunities and Challenges”, 10 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

June 13, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Tax Reform: Haven, Base Erosion and Profit Shifting”, 10 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, June 13, Full Committee, markup on the “Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014”, 10 a.m., HVC-304. This is a closed hearing.

June 13, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Ongoing Intelligence Activities”, 2 p.m., HVC-304. This is a closed hearing.

June 14, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Ongoing Intelligence Activities”, 9 a.m., HVC-304. This is a closed hearing.

Joint Meetings

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe: June 13, to hold hearings to examine Syrian refugees in the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) region, focusing on the United States and international response to the humanitarian crisis that threatens to destabilize the entire region, 2 p.m., SD-562.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

2 p.m., Monday, June 10

Senate Chamber

Program for Monday: Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 744, Border Security, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Modernization Act.

At 5 p.m., Senate will resume consideration of S. 954, the Farm bill, with votes on or in relation to Stabenow (for Leahy) Amendment No. 998, and passage of the bill at approximately 5:30 p.m.

Following disposition of S. 954, the Farm bill, Senate will continue consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 744, Border Security, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Modernization Act.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

3 p.m., Monday, June 10

House Chamber

Program for Monday: The House is scheduled to meet at 3 p.m. on Monday, June 10, 2013, in pro forma session.



Congressional Record

printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Printing Office, at www.fdsys.gov, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Printing Office. Phone 202-512-1800, or 866-512-1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, contactcenter@gpo.gov. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197-9000, or phone orders to 866-512-1800 (toll-free), 202-512-1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202-512-2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.