(Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1862, a bill to grant the Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the Monuments Men, in recognition of their heroic role in the preservation, protection, and restitution of monuments, works of art, and artifacts of cultural importance during and following World War II.

S. 1923

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1923, a bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to exempt from registration broker-dealers performing services in connection with the transfer of ownership of smaller privately held companies.

S. 1860

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1860, a bill to amend titles XIX and XXI of the Social Security Act to provide for 12-month continuous enrollment under the Medicaid program and Children's Health Insurance Program and to promote quality care.

S. 2026

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2026, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income any prizes or awards won in competition in the Olympic Games or the Paralympic Games.

S. 2037

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2037, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to remove the 96-hour physician certification requirement for inpatient critical access hospital services.

S. CON. RES. 6

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CAMP) was added as a cosponsor of S. CON. RES. 6, a concurrent resolution supporting the Local Radio Freedom Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 2752

At the request of Mr. BURR, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOVEN) and the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 2752 intended to be proposed to S. 1862, a bill to improve the provision of medical services and benefits to veterans, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2760

At the request of Mr. COBURN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2760 intended to be proposed to S. 1862, a bill to improve the provision of medical services and benefits to veterans, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2762

At the request of Mr. COBURN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2762 intended to be proposed to S. 1862, a bill to improve the provision of medical services and benefits to veterans, and for other purposes.

Statements on introduced bills and joint resolutions

By Mr. ROBERTS:

S. 2064. A bill to provide for the repeal of certain provisions of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act that have the effect of rationing health care; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to discuss ObamaCare provisions that should be kept from my colleagues and all Americans up at night. Obviously, my views are very different from my colleagues who have just propounded their views on the same subject.

Unfortunately, since the implementation of ObamaCare began, the stories and reports have only confirmed the many warnings that I and many of my colleagues made during the debate. Most of the stories I have heard or read tell me now involve many hundreds of dollars in increases in monthly premiums or people simply losing their coverage. These are real stories from real Kansans, and they are not lies. Compounding the problem, this administration has made it a routine practice to do what we call a regulations dump on Friday. This is a deliberate postponing of sometimes thousands of pages of regulations during the time when the American public and the press is least likely to be paying attention.

Most recent reports from the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services—what we call CMS—are that millions of small businesses will face increased premium rates under ObamaCare. The President promised to make it easier for small businesses to offer coverage and, lo and behold, it may even become impossible for them to do so.

Then there are the cuts our seniors are about to face to their Medicare plans. We can’t forget that the President promised—this is a good word, promised—$1 trillion from Medicare to pay for ObamaCare. These cuts have been delayed, but the most recent regulation on Part D and Medicare Advantage will be extremely detrimental to seniors across the country. The—and I mean this—Medicare plans. And because of this, for once—for once—I wish to speak about a subject where we get ahead of the curve, get in front of the next disaster, and repeal specific provisions of this law that I think will be most harmful to patients.

I have talked before about how this law comes between patients and doctors, but I think we need to bring more attention to the specter of what I call rationing—yes, rationing. In the absence of complete repeal, I urge my colleagues that these provisions must be repealed.

During the health care reform debate, and many times since then, I have spoken at length about rationing. Specifically, I want people to know about what I refer to as the four rationing questions that are included in ObamaCare. Yes, this is a very real threat. And, yes, they will ration care.

Let me start with something called the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services Innovation Center. That is a pretty big, fancy government name. The Center has an enormous budget to match, aimed at finding innovative ways to reform payment and the delivery of health care. That sounds very good, but what this means is that the innovation center can now use taxpayer dollars to invest in ways to reduce patient access to care.

Let me say that again. The government can now use taxpayer dollars to invest in ways to reduce patient access to care. It gives the government new powers to cut payments to Medicare beneficiaries with the goal to reduce program expenditures. The reality is that governments are going to reduce patients’ ability to access the care they want and need—all hidden under the cloak of innovation. And that is not innovation at all. Even if they did give it a fancy title, folks, it is smoke and mirrors. This outfit is already pushing out all of the regulations to implement ObamaCare that are now hurting patients—all the regulations we hear about from our health care providers.

Let me move to the second ration. It grants new authorities to the U.S. Preventive Services Task Force—that is another nice-sounding entity with a long title. This Preventive Services Task Force is a body that was scientific and academic, that reviewed treatment, testing, and prevention information, and made recommendations for primary doctors. Nothing is wrong with that. It used to be an academic body that made recommendations, not a body pushing through mandates and regulations. More would argue that is still what they do today. However, the effect of their recommendations is the recommendations are significantly more costly and burdensome. Because of ObamaCare, the task force can now decide what should and, more importantly, should not be covered by health plans. That is not prevention, that is rationing. If the task force doesn’t recommend it, then it can’t be covered by Medicare and patients bear the cost of the procedure. We are seeing this already with things such as prostate exams and mammograms for breast cancer which have been so helpful to so many people—saved their lives.

The third rationer is the Patient Centered Outcomes Research Institute. Yes, that is another mouthful. This is the outfit that was given millions and millions of dollars to do comparative effectiveness research. I am not opposed to research. I don’t know anyone in this body who is opposed to research, especially when it is used to inform the conversation between doctors.
and their patients. But there is a reason this was formerly called cost-effectiv-

re new. There is a very fine line be-

between providing information to doc-

tors and patients to determine the best
course of care and using that informa-
tion to decide whether the care or treat-
ment should be given. I have long been concerned that instead this
research will be abused to arbitrarily
deny patients access to potentially
lifesaving treatments or services. That
simply should not happen. The re-
search should be used to help the doc-
tor and the patient to make the best
health care decision.

Finally, the fourth rater—my per-

sonal nemesis—the Independent Pay-

ment Advisory Board—IPAD. This is a
board made up of 15 unelected bureau-
cracy who will decide what gets to stay
and what gets to go in Medicare cov-
erage. They will decide which treat-
ments and services will be covered and
which will not, with no accountability
whatsoever.

When proposed, supporters of the
health care law told me: We are too
close to our constituents. It is too dif-
cult to make the hard decisions.

Then they said: Let’s have somebody
else do it.

That was during the debate with re-
gard to IPAD.

I couldn’t believe it. I believe we are
elected to make the hard decisions and
take care of the hard voters, and I be-
lieve that is the way virtually everybody in every other State wants
it. This board diminishes our constitu-
tional responsibility.

Even worse is the fine print of the
Independent Payment Advisory Board,
or IPAD. If Kansans or any Americans
determine they do not like the direc-
tion the board is taking and they call
my office and, down the road, any
other office of any other distinguished
Senator to do something about it—which is what you get when you go back home on any regulation
today: what are you going to do about it?—it will take 60 votes in the Senate
to overturn their decision—60.

On the surface this sounds OK until
you realize that the President doubt-
lessly will never support Congress over-
turning the recommendation of this
board made up of his bureaucrats. So
he will veto it, and overriding a veto,
obviously, takes a two-thirds vote.
That is 60 votes to overturn a decision by the payment board.

My colleagues have been changing
the rules around here because they
think 60 votes is too high a threshold.
What are the chances of reaching new
stundard. But what they are is even more. If the Secretary appoints a board unable to make recommendations for cuts to
Medicare—tough decisions, albeit—
then she gets the authority to make the
decision of what to cut, one person.

This President has already cut 51
trillion from Medicare to pay for
ObamaCare and gave himself the ability
to go after even more Medicare dol-

ars and have no accountability. This,
my friends, is frightening; it is ridicu-
lous; it is irresponsible; but it is not
new.

I have been talking about the four ra-
tioners for a long time and what it
means to patients, especially senior pa-
tients.

What upsets me, scares me, as I
watch all the other warnings and bro-
ken promises come true, is what is
going to happen to Kansans and all the
folks back home when the warnings
about the future come true.

We need to protect the all-important
doctor-patient relationship, which the
four raters put at risk. That is why
today I come to the floor to introduce
the Four Rationers Repeal Act of 2014.

For once, look beyond the current
to determine the best care for patients.

This legislation is relatively simple.
It should be supported by all of my col-
leagues to address some of the egre-
gious changes from ObamaCare that
Kansans and all Americans.

However, in the meantime we can
come together to do something about it—which is what you get when
you go back home on any rule today:
what are you going to do about it?
will take 60 votes in the Senate
to overturn their decision—60.

By Mr. INHOFE (for himself and
Mr. LEVIN).

S. 2065. A bill to create incentives for
the development of alternative fuel ve-
cicles; to the Committee on Commer-
ence, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, today
I join with Senator INHOFE to introduce
a bill that is intended to promote and
use of alternative fuel vehicles, includ-
ing natural gas vehicles, NGVs, and
plug-in-electric hybrids. Encouraging
the development of alternative fuel vehi-
ciles will help to diversify our fuel mix,
and drive reductions on im-
ported oil and also reducing carbon
emissions. In the U.S. alone, NGVs off-
set the use of nearly 360 million gallons
of gasoline in 2011. We hope our bill
will help increase that number.

The moment is right to capitalize
on the abundance of domestically pro-
duced natural gas. Already, American manufac-
turers have benefited from the availability of domestically produced
natural gas, reducing the cost of US-
based production and contributing to
the return of manufacturing to the
United States. If we can expand the use
of natural gas to fuel our vehicles, then
American consumers can also benefit
from this cleaner and cheaper domestic fuel.

Michigan has become a leading inno-
vator in advanced alternative fuel ve-
cicles and is revolutionizing our trans-
portation sector. As automakers in
Michigan and elsewhere manufacture
NGVs they face the dilemma often en-
countered when introducing an alter-
native fueled vehicle: what will come
first, the NGV infrastructure or the ve-
cile itself? This is the classic chicken
and egg question. Ethanol, Diesel and
electric vehicles all faced this chal-
lenge when first introduced. Our bill
will allow Michigan to continue to in-
novate and harness the power and ben-
efits that domestically sourced alter-
native fuels have to offer this country.

The benefits of expanding the number
of natural gas and alternative fuel ve-
hicles on our roads are numerous. Up
to 90 percent of the natural gas used
in the United States comes from the
United States. We need to tap into this
definite resource to meet our transpor-
tation needs and take an aggressive ap-
proach to reducing our dependence on
foreign oil. Consumers should also have
more choice and flexibility when it
comes to fueling their vehicles. This
approach to reducing our dependence
natural gas is about half the price of
gasoline. Consumers should be able
to benefit from these reduced prices.

Moreover, vehicles running on natural
gas have 20–30 percent less CO2, tailpipe
emissions than gasoline fueled vehi-
cles. Because natural gas burns clean-
er, it increases the life of the car.
It has no lead or benzene or other chemi-
cals that break down auto parts or di-
lute lubricants.

There are all desirable reasons to en-
courage more NGV production. The use
of natural gas vehicles is expanding
among private fleets used by airports and
transit agencies where refueling infrastructure is available. However, the
chicken and egg dilemma is slow-
ing the adoption of both dedicated and
bi-fuel natural gas vehicles among
light-duty passenger vehicles.

Our legislation would incentivize
both production and consumer demand
for alternative fuel vehicles such as
natural gas vehicles and plug-in elec-
tric hybrids by expanding regulatory
incentives. It would also provide con-
sumers with an added incentive to
drive natural gas vehicles by giving
them access to high occupancy vehicle,
HOV, lanes. Giving consumers an addi-
tional benefit such as HOV access could
help increase demand for these vehicles
and the fueling stations that are nec-
essary to support them.

The President has already cut $1.
trillion from Medicare to pay for
ObamaCare and gave himself the ability
to go after even more Medicare dol-

ars and have no accountability. This,
my friends, is frightening; it is ridicu-
lous; it is irresponsible; but it is not
new.

I have been talking about the four ra-
tioners for a long time and what it
means to patients, especially senior pa-
tients.

What upsets me, scares me, as I
watch all the other warnings and bro-
ken promises come true, is what is
going to happen to Kansans and all the
folks back home when the warnings
about the future come true.

We need to protect the all-important
doctor-patient relationship, which the
four raters put at risk. That is why
today I come to the floor to introduce
the Four Rationers Repeal Act of 2014.

For once, look beyond the current
to determine the best care for patients.

This legislation is relatively simple.
It should be supported by all of my col-
leagues to address some of the egre-
gious changes from ObamaCare that
Kansans and all Americans.

However, in the meantime we can
come together to do something about it—which is what you get when
you go back home on any rule today:
what are you going to do about it?
will take 60 votes in the Senate
to overturn their decision—60.

On the surface this sounds OK until
you realize that the President doubt-
lessly will never support Congress over-
turning the recommendation of this
board made up of his bureaucrats. So
he will veto it, and overriding a veto,
obviously, takes a two-thirds vote.
That is 60 votes to overturn a decision by the payment board.

My colleagues have been changing
the rules around here because they
think 60 votes is too high a threshold.
What are the chances of reaching new
stundard. But what they are is even more. If the Secretary appoints a board unable to make recommendations for cuts to
Medicare—tough decisions, albeit—
then she gets the authority to make the
decision of what to cut, one person.

This President has already cut 51
trillion from Medicare to pay for
ObamaCare and gave himself the ability
to go after even more Medicare dol-

ars and have no accountability. This,
my friends, is frightening; it is ridicu-
lous; it is irresponsible; but it is not
new.

I have been talking about the four ra-
tioners for a long time and what it
means to patients, especially senior pa-
tients.

What upsets me, scares me, as I
watch all the other warnings and bro-
ken promises come true, is what is
going to happen to Kansans and all the
folks back home when the warnings
about the future come true.

We need to protect the all-important
doctor-patient relationship, which the
four raters put at risk. That is why
today I come to the floor to introduce
the Four Rationers Repeal Act of 2014.

For once, look beyond the current
to determine the best care for patients.

This legislation is relatively simple.
It should be supported by all of my col-
leagues to address some of the egre-
gious changes from ObamaCare that
Kansans and all Americans.

However, in the meantime we can
come together to do something about it—which is what you get when
you go back home on any rule today:
what are you going to do about it?
will take 60 votes in the Senate
to overturn their decision—60.

On the surface this sounds OK until
you realize that the President doubt-
lessly will never support Congress over-
turning the recommendation of this
board made up of his bureaucrats. So
he will veto it, and overriding a veto,
obviously, takes a two-thirds vote.
That is 60 votes to overturn a decision by the payment board.

My colleagues have been changing
the rules around here because they
think 60 votes is too high a threshold.
What are the chances of reaching new
stundard. But what they are is even more. If the Secretary appoints a board unable to make recommendations for cuts to
Medicare—tough decisions, albeit—
then she gets the authority to make the
decision of what to cut, one person.

This President has already cut 51
trillion from Medicare to pay for
ObamaCare and gave himself the ability
to go after even more Medicare dol-

ars and have no accountability. This,
my friends, is frightening; it is ridicu-
lous; it is irresponsible; but it is not
new.
grow our economy, create jobs for the middle class, and reduce carbon pollution. I am pleased to introduce legislation today that takes a step toward meeting that goal.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 365—EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE INTERNAL REBUILDING, RESETTLEMENT, AND RECONCILIATION WITHIN SRI LANKA THAT ARE NECESSARY TO ENSURE A LASTING PEACE

Mr. INHOPE (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. CRAPO, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. ENZI) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Whereas May 19, 2014, marks the five-year anniversary of the end of the 26 year civil war between the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE) and the Government of Sri Lanka;

Whereas the people of Sri Lanka suffered greatly as a result of this conflict, the impact and aftermath of which has been felt by all, especially by women, children, and families;

Whereas the Government of Sri Lanka established a “Lessons Learnt and Reconciliation Commission” (LLRC) to report whether any person, group, or institution directly or indirectly bears responsibility for incidents that occurred between February 2002 and May 19, 2009, and made recommendatory recommendations on a wide range of issues, including the need to credibly investigate widespread allegations of extra-judicial killings; enforced disappearances; intentional targeting of civilians and noncombatants; demilitarizing the north and the country to become one of the most violent in the world, with the per capita homicide rate in the city of Colombo exceeding 115 per 100,000 people;

Whereas the Government of Sri Lanka has taken continued steps to remove checks and balances on the executive, politicize the judiciary, undermine the independence of the legislature through use of executive decree powers, persecute and prosecute its political opponents, curtail freedom of the press, and limit the free expression of its citizens;

Whereas, on January 23, 2014, National Representative Maria Corina Machado and Mr. Leopoldo López, leader of the political party “Popular Will”, among others, called on the Venezuelan people to gather in street assemblies and debate a popular, democratic and constitutional “way out” of Venezuela’s crisis of governability;

Whereas, since February 4, 2014, the people of Venezuela—responding to ongoing economic hardship, high levels of crime and violence, and the lack of basic political rights and individual freedoms—have turned out in demonstrations in Caracas and throughout the country to protest the Government of Venezuela’s inability to ensure the political and economic well-being of its citizens;

Whereas the government of Nicolas Maduro responded to the mass demonstrations by ordering the arrest without evidence of senior opposition leaders, including Mr. Leopoldo López, Carlos Vecchio, and Antonio Rivero, and by violently repressing peaceful demonstrators with the help of the Venezuelan National Guard and groups of armed, government-affiliated civilians, known as “colectivos”;

Whereas, on February 18, 2014, opposition leader Leopoldo López turned himself in to authorities in Venezuela, was arrested, and is currently with criminal incitement, arson, and intent to damage property;

Whereas the Maduro government has systematically conspired in the violent crackdown by blocking online images and threatening the few remaining uncensored domestic media outlets;

Whereas President Maduro threatened to expel the United States news network CNN from Venezuela and has taken off the air the Colombian news channel NTN 24, which transmits in Venezuela, after news outlets reported on the nation-wide protests;

Whereas the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights released a statement on February 14, 2014, which “expresses its concern over the serious incidents of violence that have taken place in the context of protests and demonstrations in Venezuela as well as other complaints concerning acts of censorship against media outlets, attacks on organizations that defend human rights, and acts of alleged political persecution”;

Whereas, as of February 27, 2014, there have been 13 people killed, over 100 injured, and dozens have been unjustly detained due to government harassment and intimidation throughout Venezuela: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) calls upon the President to develop a comprehensive and well balanced policy toward the Government of Venezuela that reflects United States interests, including respect for human rights, democracy, and the rule of law, as well as economic and security interests;

(2) calls on the United States Government and the international community to assist the Government of Sri Lanka, with due regard to its sovereignty, stability, and security, in establishing domestic mechanisms to deal with any grievances arising from actions committed by both sides during and after the civil war in Sri Lanka;

(3) encourages the Government of Sri Lanka to put in place a truth and reconciliation commission similar to the one adopted by South Africa, to ensure an end to the violence, and taking into account the unique characteristics of the conflict and its aftermath; and

(4) urges the Government of Sri Lanka to improve religious and media freedoms and to bring to justice those responsible for attacks on journalists and newspaper offices as well as places of worship, regardless of religion.

SENATE RESOLUTION 365—DEPLORING THE VIOLENT REPRESSSION OF PEACEFUL DEMONSTRATORS IN VENEZUELA, CALLING FOR FULL ACCOUNTABILITY FOR HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS TAKING PLACE IN VENEZUELA, AND SUPPORTING THE RIGHT OF THE VENEZUELAN PEOPLE TO THE FREE AND PEACEFUL EXERCISE OF REPRESENTATIVE DEMOCRACY

Whereas the Government of Venezuela’s chronic mismanagement of its economy has produced inflation that exceeds 50 percent annually, currency shortages, economic distortions, and thedtine absence of basic goods and foodstuffs;

Whereas the Government of Venezuela’s failure to guarantee minimal standards of public security for its citizens and the country to become one of the most violent in the world, with the per capita homicide rate in the city of Caracas exceeding 115 per 100,000 people;

Whereas the elections allowed the people of Caracas and throughout the country to protest the Government of Venezuela’s inability to ensure the political and economic well-being of its citizens;

Whereas May 19, 2014, marks the five-year anniversary of the end of the 26 year civil war between the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE) and the Government of Sri Lanka;

Whereas the Government of Sri Lanka is of great strategic importance to the United States due to its location and the world’s biggest shipping lanes, an important noticed and pursued by other significant powers;

Whereas the elections allowed the people of the North of Sri Lanka to exercise their political rights that had been withheld from them for more than 20 years by the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE) and resulted in a clear victory for the provincial wing of the Tamil National Alliance;

Whereas Sri Lanka is enjoying rapid economic growth as an important hub for shipping transport, technology, and tourism in the South Asia region;

Whereas Sri Lanka is undergoing a rapid economic transformation as a result of the country’s newfound stability, and is enjoying rapid economic growth as an important hub for shipping transport, technology, and tourism in the South Asia region;

Whereas Sri Lanka is of great strategic importance to the United States due to its location and the world’s biggest shipping lanes, an important noticed and pursued by other significant powers;

Whereas, on January 23, 2014, National Representative Maria Corina Machado and Mr. Leopoldo López, leader of the political party “Popular Will”, among others, called on the Venezuelan people to gather in street assemblies and debate a popular, democratic and constitutional “way out” of Venezuela’s crisis of governability;

Whereas, since February 4, 2014, the people of Venezuela—responding to ongoing economic hardship, high levels of crime and violence, and the lack of basic political rights and individual freedoms—have turned out in demonstrations in Caracas and throughout the country to protest the Government of Venezuela’s inability to ensure the political and economic well-being of its citizens;

Whereas the government of Nicolas Maduro responded to the mass demonstrations by ordering the arrest without evidence of senior opposition leaders, including Mr. Leopoldo López, Carlos Vecchio, and Antonio Rivero, and by violently repressing peaceful demonstrators with the help of the Venezuelan National Guard and groups of armed, government-affiliated civilians, known as “colectivos”;

Whereas, on February 18, 2014, opposition leader Leopoldo López turned himself in to authorities in Venezuela, was arrested, and is currently with criminal incitement, arson, and intent to damage property;

Whereas the Maduro government has systematically conspired in the violent crackdown by blocking online images and threatening the few remaining uncensored domestic media outlets;

Whereas President Maduro threatened to expel the United States news network CNN from Venezuela and has taken off the air the Colombian news channel NTN 24, which transmits in Venezuela, after news outlets reported on the nation-wide protests;

Whereas the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights released a statement on February 14, 2014, which “expresses its concern over the serious incidents of violence that have taken place in the context of protests and demonstrations in Venezuela as well as other complaints concerning acts of censorship against media outlets, attacks on organizations that defend human rights, and acts of alleged political persecution”;

Whereas, as of February 27, 2014, there have been 13 people killed, over 100 injured, and dozens have been unjustly detained due to government harassment and intimidation throughout Venezuela: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) reaffirms United States support for the people of Venezuela in their efforts to ensure the free and peaceful exercise of representative democracy as guaranteed by the Venezuelan constitution;