

State in the Senate of the United States until the vacancy therein caused by the resignation of Max Sieben Baucus, is filled by election as provided by law.

Witness: His Excellency our governor Steve Bullock, and our seal hereto affixed at Helena, Montana this ninth day of February, in the year of our Lord 2014.

By the governor:

STEVE BULLOCK,
Governor.
LINDA McCULLOCH,
Secretary of State.

[State Seal Affixed]

ADMINISTRATION OF OATH OF OFFICE

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Senator-designee will now present himself at the desk, the Chair will administer the oath of office.

The Senator-designee, escorted by Senator TESTER, advanced to the desk of the Vice President, the oath prescribed by law was administered to him by the Vice President, and he subscribed to the oath in the Official Oath Book.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Congratulations, Senator.

(Applause, Senators rising.)

REPEALING SECTION 403 OF THE BIPARTISAN BUDGET ACT OF 2013—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HEITKAMP). The clerk will call the roll. The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. HIRONO. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Ms. HIRONO. Madam President, there is overwhelming bipartisan support to repeal the COLA reduction for military retirees that was enacted last December in the budget bill. The debate now is whether and how to pay for the cost of this repeal. I agree with my friend Senator MARK BEGICH of Alaska that our veterans have already paid for this repeal with their service to this country. However, there are some Senators who take a different view and have offered what we refer to as pay-for amendments.

Today I rise in strong opposition to the Ayotte pay-for amendment. The bill before us, S. 1963, the Military Retirement Pay Restoration Act, would repeal the COLA reduction for military retirees. This bill is sponsored by Senators PRYOR, HAGAN, and BEGICH, and I applaud their leadership on this issue.

Cutting military pensions was a bad idea. An even worse idea is to set up a contest between providing pensions to veterans and providing antipoverty assistance to children. That is the choice Republicans want us to make. I wish I could honestly say this so-called choice is hard to believe, but I can't. It is like

choosing between cutting off an arm or a leg from the body politic. Vets or poor children—aren't they both in need of fair treatment?

Again, there is bipartisan support to restore the COLA cuts for veterans, but I am told that my Republican colleagues won't allow us to have an up-or-down vote on the Military Retirement Pay Restoration Act unless we also vote on the Ayotte amendment No. 2732.

What does this amendment do? The Ayotte amendment would deny anti-poverty assistance to the children of undocumented immigrants who are working and paying billions of dollars in taxes. It would cut this child poverty program by more than \$18 billion over 10 years to pay for the restoration of COLAs for military retirees, which would cost about \$6 billion over 10 years. In other words, the Ayotte amendment would deny \$3 of anti-poverty assistance to children in order to restore \$1 of retirement pay to our veterans. That is unconscionable. We should not take the benefits we provide to veterans by hurting children in the process. Hurting children does no honor to our veterans' service.

The children targeted by the Ayotte amendment did not decide on their own to come to this country illegally. They were brought here by their parents. These children are DREAMers—our DREAMers. We should not punish them for their parents' decisions. We should help these children to succeed so they can contribute to this great country. Their parents are doing their part by working and paying more than \$16 billion in taxes each year, more than \$160 billion over 10 years. We should not deny them this small measure of help.

Let me acknowledge that it is politically difficult to vote against the offset in the Ayotte amendment. Why? Because the amendment targets people who have no political power. These are children of parents who cannot vote. These are children of parents who are very poor, who themselves live on the edge of poverty or far into the depths of it. Their parents work one, two, or even three jobs and pay the taxes they owe, but they are barely making ends meet. They are far removed from the level of wealth that too often today translates into political power. These are children of parents who came to this country the same way many of our ancestors came to this country 100 or 200 years ago and for the same reasons—to escape poverty, to seek opportunity, and to give their children a better life than they had. Their parents are working and paying billions of dollars in taxes each year, which is extending the lives of the Social Security and Medicare trust funds, as examples. Their parents are working and paying taxes, but they came here illegally, and therefore they must live in the shadows and live in fear.

Put simply, these are children of families who have no political power—none. They are the easiest to go after,

and that is what this Ayotte amendment does. But we should help these families. We should help these DREAMers. It is an ancient and universal principle that we should help the least among us. To paraphrase the Book of Matthew, we should treat the least among us as we would treat the mightiest among us. That is why the U.S. Council of Catholic Bishops opposes the Ayotte amendment. We should not hurt the least among us in order to help our veterans.

How much money would the Ayotte amendment deny to these children? The maximum child tax credit is \$1,000 per child, which is about \$2.74 per day per child. To many of us, \$2.74 per day seems like a small amount, but to a child in poverty it is literally the difference between eating and not eating.

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, in 2011 the average cost of one meal for one person was \$2.67. That was the average cost, which means that a lot of people spent less than \$2.67 on each meal. By way of comparison, SNAP benefits average about \$4 per person per day—\$4 for three meals, not just one. So our own food program is less than what our own Bureau of Labor Statistics says is the average cost of a meal.

So for a low-income child, the \$2.74 per day she gets from the child tax credit is equivalent to about one meal. If a child is very poor, it probably means two meals. Put simply, if she gets the child tax credit, she eats. If she doesn't, she doesn't.

Of course, not every child receives the maximum refundable credit. The amount of the refund is determined, in part, on a family's income, so poor families receive even less. The average income for the families who would be affected by the Ayotte amendment is about \$21,000 per year. They have to be working and paying taxes to get even one dime from the child tax credit program. Their average child tax credit refund is about \$1,800, which is about \$5 a day. That may not be much money to the Senators in this body, but that \$5 pays for a meal for the whole family. It is about 8 percent of their income.

We should not be denying this basic level of assistance to any child in this country, no matter who their parents are or how they came here. We should not deny children this assistance when their parents—and I am going to repeat it—will pay over \$160 billion in taxes in the 10 years during which this provision is cutting \$18 billion. The way the child tax credit is structured, only working families who are paying these kinds of taxes can claim the refundable portion. It is not fair that families work and pay taxes but are then denied help—\$2.74 per day per child.

We should not deny children this assistance under the guise of combating fraud. Imposing a Social Security number requirement on qualifying children will not end the fraud the proponents of this amendment have cited. We should go after the fraud, but it should

be obvious that any criminal willing to commit the fraud described by the proponents will not be deterred by having to fill in a 9-digit Social Security number. This does not solve the fraud problem.

The fraud we have heard about involves undocumented immigrants who are falsifying where they live and where their children live in order to claim their tax credit. We are told about four immigrants using a single address, and yet we hear nothing about the 18,000 corporations that use one address in the Cayman Islands to avoid paying their fair share of corporate tax. Instead of going after working families who are paying taxes, we should close the loophole that allows these corporations to evade their taxes.

How many groups in this country is this Congress going to hurt? We hurt women when we don't raise the minimum wage. We hurt people who are out of work through no fault of their own when we don't extend unemployment benefits. Now we are hurting DREAMers. We should not do this. I urge my colleagues to oppose the Ayotte amendment.

I yield the floor.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:33 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Ms. BALDWIN).

REPEALING SECTION 403 OF THE BIPARTISAN BUDGET ACT OF 2013—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as if in morning business.

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

REMEMBERING WILLARD HACKERMAN

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, there is an epitaph on the wall above where Sir Christopher Wren—one of England's greatest architects—is buried. The epitaph reads in part:

Here . . . lies . . . Christopher Wren, who lived beyond ninety years, not for his own profit but for the public good. Reader, if you seek his monument, look around you.

A similar epitaph would be entirely suitable for my dear friend, the great businessman, engineer, philanthropist, and devoted Baltimorean Willard Hackerman, who died yesterday at the age of 95.

In 1938, Willard was a 19-year-old civil engineer who had just graduated from Johns Hopkins University. He went to work for the Whiting-Turner Contracting Company in his native Baltimore. G.W.C. Whiting and LeBaron Turner had started the con-

struction firm in 1909. In 1955, Whiting promoted Willard to be the president and chief executive officer of the firm, and he served in that capacity until his recent death.

Whiting-Turner issued a press release which stated:

Mr. Hackerman led Whiting-Turner from a modest-sized local and regional contractor to a highly-ranked nationwide construction manager and general contractor working in all major commercial, industrial, and institutional sectors.

Last year—Willard's 75th year with the firm—it reported \$5 billion in revenue. The firm, which has 33 regional offices and more than 2,100 employees, is ranked fourth in domestic general building by Engineering News Record and ranked 117th on the list of America's largest private companies.

As the Baltimore Sun noted, Whiting-Turner Contracting Company built the new University of Baltimore School of Law last year, the Joseph Meyerhoff Symphony Hall, the National Aquarium, and the M&T Bank Stadium. The firm's clients included Yale and Stanford universities, the Cleveland Clinic, Target, IBM, and Unilever, and the Hippodrome Theater. If you seek his monument, look around you.

Through Whiting-Turner, Willard teamed with then-mayor William Donald Schaefer to help transform Baltimore by building the Convention Center, Harborplace, and the Aquarium. These statistics and lists attest to Willard's incredible skills as an engineer and businessman, but they don't begin to capture the magnitude of his accomplishments, his charitable contributions, or his generous spirit.

Willard and his beloved wife Lillian have been lifelong supporters of Johns Hopkins University. He helped to reestablish the university's stand-alone engineering school in 1979, and secured the school-naming gift from the estate of his mentor, G.W.C. Whiting.

Other activities include funding the Willard and Lillian Hackerman Chair in Radiation Oncology at the Johns Hopkins School of Medicine, construction of the Hackerman-Patz Patient and Family Pavilion, and the Hackerman Research Laboratories at the Sidney Kimmel Comprehensive Cancer Center. He and his wife also provided major support for the Robert H. and Clarice Smith Building at the Wilmer Eye Institute.

In 1984, Willard and Lillian donated a mansion on Mount Vernon Place adjacent to the Walters Art Gallery to the city of Baltimore, which in turn entrusted the property to the gallery—now known as the Walters Art Museum—to house its collection of Asian art.

In December 2001, Mr. Hackerman gave the largest gift in the history of the Baltimore City Community College Foundation to establish the Lillian and Willard Hackerman Student Emergency Loan Program, which provides no-interest loans to BCCC students. If

you seek his monument, look around you.

Timothy Regan, the Whiting-Turner executive vice president who will succeed Willard as the firm's third president in its 105-year history, noted:

He is a legend for his good works, and the irony is that most of his good works are not even known.

The Sun recounted a story Baltimore architect Adam Gross told about accompanying Willard through a newly completed project at the Bryn Mawr School. According to Mr. Gross, Willard asked the school's headmistress how many women were graduating with engineering degrees. Then, a few days later, he sent a sizable check to the school to provide scholarships for women in engineering. "He was like that. He did deeds that nobody knew about," Mr. Gross said.

Willard was a man of quiet strength who professionally and charitably enriched his beloved Baltimore. He was an active alumnus of Johns Hopkins University who gave back to the school and its hospital in countless ways. He was a humble man and rarely stood still to take credit for his many successes because he had already begun to tackle the next challenge. Despite being at the helm of one of the largest general building companies in America, Willard never outgrew his city or his fellow citizens. The Meyerhoff, the National Aquarium, and M&T Bank Stadium all stand as enduring monuments to a great man. His benevolent legacy extended to the synagogue where my family and I worship, Beth Tfiloh Congregation, where he will be missed as a man of great faith. Willard Hackerman was a true son of Baltimore.

My thoughts and prayers go out to his wife Lillian, their daughter Nancy, their son Steven Mordecai, their five grandchildren and 23 great-grandchildren, and his extended family at Whiting-Turner, all of whom loved him deeply.

I encourage my fellow colleagues, my fellow Baltimoreans and Marylanders, and all Americans to celebrate Willard Hackerman "who lived beyond ninety years, not for his own profit but for the public good. If you seek his monument, look around you."

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. 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. BARRASSO. I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 10 minutes as if in morning business.

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

HEALTH CARE

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I come to the floor week after week and talk about the President's health care