

On page 3, line 3, strike “by the United States Government”.

The resolution (S. Res. 361), as amended, was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 361

Whereas, in its 2013 World Press Freedom Index, Reporters Without Borders ranked China 173rd out of 179 countries in terms of press freedoms;

Whereas China’s media regulator, the State Administration of Press, Publication, Radio, Film and Television, enforces a system of strict controls, including an extensive licensing system and government supervision by the Chinese Communist Party;

Whereas domestic radio and television broadcast journalists in China must pass a government-sponsored exam that tests their basic knowledge of Marxist views of news and Communist Party principles;

Whereas this state supervision of the media distorts and blocks free and open coverage of key issues including Tibet, political unrest, and corruption by government officials, as well as Chinese foreign policy;

Whereas China’s media regulator officially bans journalists from using foreign media reports without authorization and forbids news editors from reporting information online that has not been verified through official channels;

Whereas the Congressional-Executive Commission on China (CECC) has documented several instances of reprisals against and harassment of independent journalists and newspaper staff by the Government of the People’s Republic of China, including Chinese journalists working for foreign-based websites and newspapers;

Whereas the Foreign Correspondents’ Club of China has noted that foreign journalists continue to face challenging work conditions, visa denials or delays, and various forms of harassment, and 70 percent of journalists surveyed in the FCCC’s 2013 annual survey stated that “conditions have worsened or stayed the same as the year before”;

Whereas, according to the CECC, authorities in China appeared to maintain or enhance policies to block and filter online content, particularly sensitive information about rights activists, official corruption, or collective organizing;

Whereas China is the world’s second largest economy and the United States second largest trading partner and has been a member of the World Trade Organization since 2001;

Whereas China’s growing economic importance increases the need for the Government of the People’s Republic of China to act transparently and respect international trading regulations; and

Whereas official government censorship denies the people of China, including nearly 600,000,000 Internet users, their freedom of expression, undermines confidence in China’s safety standards, and causes increasingly serious economic harm to private firms that rely on unfettered access to social media as a business model: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) reaffirms the importance of freedom of the press to efforts to support democracy, mitigate conflict, and promote good governance domestically and around the world;

(2) expresses concern about the threats to freedom of the press and expression in the People’s Republic of China;

(3) condemns actions taken by the Government of the People’s Republic of China to suppress freedom of the press, including the increased harassment of Chinese and inter-

national journalists through denial of visas, harassment of sources, physical threats, and other methods; and

(4) urges the President to use all appropriate instruments of United States influence to support, promote, and strengthen principles, practices, and values that promote the free flow of information to the people of China without interference or discrimination, including through the Internet and other electronic media.

#### AUTHORIZING USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H. Con. Res. 90.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 90) authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for a ceremony as part of the commemoration of the days of remembrance of victims of the Holocaust.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

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

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 90) was agreed to.

#### MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 2223

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I am told that S. 2223 is at the desk and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title for the first time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2223) to provide for an increase in the Federal minimum wage and to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend increased expensing limitations and the treatment of certain real property as section 179 property.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, this legislation is sponsored by Senators HARKIN and MERKLEY.

I ask for its second reading and object to my own request.

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

#### APPOINTMENTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, in accordance with Public Law 93-618, as amended by Public Law 100-418, on behalf of the President pro tempore and upon the recommendation of the Chairman of the Committee on Finance, appoints the following members of the Finance Committee as congressional advisers on trade policy and negotiations to international conferences, meetings and negotiation ses-

sions relating to trade agreements: the Senator from Oregon, Mr. WYDEN; the Senator from West Virginia, Mr. ROCKEFELLER; the Senator from New York, Mr. SCHUMER; the Senator from Utah, Mr. HATCH; and the Senator from Iowa, Mr. GRASSLEY.

#### ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, APRIL 9, 2014

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Wednesday, April 9, 2014; that following the prayer and 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. 2199, the equal pay bill, with the time until 11 a.m. equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees prior to the cloture vote on the motion to proceed to S. 2199.

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

#### PROGRAM

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the first rollcall vote will be at 11 a.m. tomorrow. Additional rollcall votes are expected during tomorrow’s session.

#### ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order, following the remarks of, first, Senator BENNET and then those of Senator CASEY.

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

The Senator from Colorado.

#### IMMIGRATION REFORM

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I want to return today to the subject of immigration. Today marks the 285th day since the immigration bill passed right here in the Senate with almost 70 votes, and 285 days later we are still waiting for the House of Representatives to act on that bipartisan piece of legislation.

Every single day the House drags its feet on immigration, our borders remain less secure, our visa system keeps us less competitive, our economy suffers, and millions of families remain in the shadows.

Hard-working immigrants who came here to live the American dream and who are part of the fabric of our communities all over the State of Colorado and all over the United States of America are suffering because Congress has not passed a bill, families such as Dulce Saenz’s family from Hudson, CO.

When Dulce's father was deported, she and one of her sisters stayed in Colorado to start college while her mom and younger sister moved to Mexico to be with their dad. It was a heart-breaking decision for the family to separate, but that is what they needed to do. Now all three sisters have gone to the University of Denver in Colorado. They have started careers in public service. But they rarely see their parents. They worry about their safety.

It is clear to everybody I talk to here and at home that our current immigration system is broken. It is also clear to me and I think to many people that separating families does not reflect our history and it does not do honor to the values that shape that history. So while the House stalls, the Secretary of Homeland Security is reviewing our deportation policy and exploring other ways we can help keep families together. It is a good step in the absence of a bill. We should prioritize deportation in a way that reflects our values as a country, upholds the rule of law, and keeps families together. But in the end, the only way to come to a full and permanent solution is to pass this immigration reform bill.

Of course, this is not unusual in Washington these days when we have become so used to getting the bare minimum accomplished, keeping the lights on for another week or for another month. But what is so frustrating on this issue is that we have bipartisan agreement that the current immigration system is broken and that it is doing no favors to this country.

The coalition we built in favor of reform is unprecedented. I was not surprised. When we started this in Colorado, first I would travel around the State and I would hear peach growers in Palisade say one thing about what they hoped for in an immigration bill, I would hear the cattle ranchers say something else, the ski resorts say something else, our high-tech community, our immigrant rights community—everybody coming together to say: You know what, it is long past time to get this fixed.

When we brought this to the national level, working together with the so-called group or gang of 8 on immigration, we were able to build a coalition that really is unprecedented. In the 5 years I have been here, I have not seen universal agreement on anything like we have seen on the immigration bill.

In June of last year, right here in the Senate, we passed a strong bipartisan bill—a bill that strengthens our economy and reduces our debt, a bill that keeps families together, protects our borders and our communities, and gives families who came to this country for a better life a chance to earn citizenship and contribute to our economy and to our society.

As I mentioned, I was part of that Gang of 8 who negotiated the bill. For those who despair about the lack of leadership in Congress—and I hear about this all the time, as I know all of

my colleagues do—I tell them that for my part, as one American, the greatest sign or signal of legislative leadership that I have seen in the past 5 years was the leadership provided by JOHN MCCAIN, LINDSEY GRAHAM, MARCO RUBIO, and JEFF FLAKE, the four Republicans who sat at that table for 7 or 8 months and negotiated the immigration bill. It was a lot harder for them to stay there than it was for the Democrats. But those four Republicans sat at the table for 8 months and negotiated a bill because they knew it was the right thing to do for the country and, parenthetically, the right thing to do for their party in that order.

Yet here we are. After all that bipartisan agreement, after all that bipartisan work, after a great bipartisan vote on the floor of the Senate on one of the most immediate issues facing this country, 9 months after our bill passed the Senate we still do not have a bill at the President's desk.

The House of Representatives is privileged to have the opportunity to rise above politics as usual and to do something big, something real, something consequential that will last for this country. The House of Representatives has the privilege to show that stalemate does not have to be standard operating procedure in Washington, DC.

This issue is completely bipartisan at home. I hear about this as much from Republicans—maybe even more from Republicans in farm country than I do from Democrats, the chance to do something important for our Nation and for our future. But until the House acts, families, farmers, and businesses all across my State and all across the United States will continue to suffer, farmers such as Eric Hanagan and Michael Hirakata outside of Rocky Ford, who cannot get the seasonal workers they need and are forced to watch crops—in their case, melons—die in the field.

Colorado's high-tech companies on the front range—ranging from bio-science, engineering, and aerospace—cannot always find the employees they need. In fact, they often cannot find the employees, which introduces an entirely different subject that relates to our K-12 education system, but that is not the topic of the speech today.

We know that almost one-quarter of STEM graduates from Colorado's STEM—math and science graduates from Colorado's leading universities are immigrants who are graduating in the United States, many of whose education has been subsidized by us. Instead of saying to them, "Please stay here; build our business here; go work for one of our high-tech companies here," we are saying to them, "Go home. We would much rather have you compete with us from India. Go home. We would much rather have you compete with us from China." It is ridiculous. It makes no sense.

The Senate bill, the bill we passed, changes that. The bill we passed says: If you are a STEM graduate from an-

other country and you graduate from an American university and you have a job offer in the United States of America, we will staple the green card to your diploma.

That is what we need in this country. That is what the high-tech industry in Colorado needs out of the House of Representatives.

I mentioned tourism at our ski resorts. They will continue to suffer. This is Colorado's second largest industry.

There are a lot of reasons to act, there are a lot of economic reasons to act, but I think there are also fundamental reasons that have to do with who we are as a country. It is often said that America is a nation of immigrants. Of course that is true. There is literally no other country in the world for which immigration is so central to its history and to its identity.

I have heard enough speeches in this Chamber to know that for a lot of us, for a lot of the 100 of us, it is very personal as well. I am a first-generation American. I know there are many others who are here. There is not a person in this Chamber who does not have immigration as part of their family's history.

But this is not just a theoretical idea, that we are a nation of immigrants. I want to take a moment to reflect on what this really means. This is a photo I am proud to say I actually managed to take with my cell phone. My daughters would be shocked to know that I was able not only to get the picture taken, but it is not even blurry.

I had an occasion—I hope the Presiding Officer has had the opportunity to do it—to do something I never imagined I would ever have the chance to do. I attended a naturalization ceremony held for Active-Duty service-members at Fort Carson, CO. Let's be clear. These are men and women who are serving the United States of America in uniform. On that day they became citizens of the United States. Until that day they were not citizens but still they were serving and are serving in our Armed Forces. The 13 soldiers and spouses who became U.S. citizens that day represented 12 different countries. This is a picture of them—12 different countries among the 13.

I am going to read the list. I was so blown away by the list that I asked one of the people from the INS who was there to give me what is called the oath ceremony nationality report from which they read the names of the countries. It is an astonishing list. Here are the countries these folks are from: China, the People's Republic of China, Colombia, Haiti, Jamaica, Malaysia, Mexico, Nicaragua, the Philippines, South Korea, Togo, Ukraine, and the United Kingdom—12 different countries.

Every single one of them came here in pursuit of the American dream, just as generations of people from around

the world have sought out the United States to build their future. These are the people—and people just like them all across the United States of America—who are going to determine our future, just as every generation of immigrants has helped us to determine our future. Whether it is refugees fleeing persecution, whether it is parents seeking opportunity for their children, it is those stepping forward to sacrifice for our shared values, as all of these young men and women are, who make America the country we love. There is no way to argue that our current immigration policies reflect that history or our values.

Let me paint a picture of what our country would look like if this immigration bill were passed. Just to be clear, again, it is not imaginary; we passed the bill in the Senate.

If people on the other side have issues with the bill, what I say is we have no monopoly on wisdom. Bring your ideas; improve the bill. I can think of some things I would do to improve that bill, but you can't just do nothing. You can't do nothing, because if we pass the bill in the House, those who come to this country for a better life, including young people—whose parents brought them here as children, and they are here through no fault of their own—would have the opportunity to enter a tough but fair path to citizenship. With a path in place we would then see higher wages, more consumption of goods and increased taxes.

It would reduce our debt. This bill—and this is not me talking, MICHAEL BENNET from Colorado, this is the Congressional Budget Office—would reduce our debt by nearly \$1 trillion over 20 years. I am unaware of any other piece of legislation that has passed with a bipartisan majority in the Congress that reduces our debt by \$1 trillion but this would. It wouldn't do it in across-the-board cuts. It would do it because of the growth it would create in our economy, the incremental economic growth. In fact, the Congressional Budget Office has said that if we pass this bill, we would see an increase of almost 6 percent of incremental GDP growth over this 20-year period, 3 percent in the first 10 years and 5 percent in the second 10 years.

Second, our bill would put into place an efficient and flexible visa system that would catapult our competitiveness in a changing 21st century economy. Canada, our neighbor to the North, is figuring out how to attract the world's talent to its shores. That is what they are spending their time doing. We, a historic nation of immigrants, are saying please go home and compete with us from someplace else or maybe go to Canada and compete with us from there. Talented entrepreneurs and innovators from around the world would have the opportunity to stay if we passed this bill and create jobs to fuel our economy. It is well-documented how many Fortune 500 companies were started by immigrants, but

millions of small businesses across the United States have been started by immigrants as well. High-skilled workers in science, technology, engineering, and math and lower skilled workers in industries such as hospitality and tourism would come into the country to fill jobs where there are no available U.S. workers. This was a bill that labor and the chamber endorsed. That is the first time that has happened. It was a difficult and painful negotiation, but we were able to get it done, and they agreed we ought to get it done.

It is very important for Colorado and a lot of other States. We would stabilize the challenges facing our agricultural industry with a new streamlined program for agricultural guest workers that is more usable for employees and protects our workers.

Again, this is the first bill ever. We call this portion the AgJOBS bill, the first one—first one—to be endorsed by the growers and the farm workers. That has never happened before, but working with Senator RUBIO, Senator HATCH, and Senator FEINSTEIN, we were able to get that done.

Finally, and more importantly, our borders would be more secure with new fencing, double the number of border agents, and increased spending on new technology. We have what they call full situational awareness on the border to allow us to interdict threats rapidly and successfully—and, very importantly, with a mandatory employment verification system and more effective entry-exit system, we would prevent future waves in illegal immigration so we don't end back up in the problem we are facing today. Then our small businesses all across the country can stop being the INS and concentrate on building their businesses. These are all changes our Nation urgently needs, and there are more.

I am not here to argue for some partisan piece of legislation that didn't attract votes on both sides. This bill was entirely bipartisan from beginning to end. I have heard a laundry list of excuses out of people in the House why they haven't addressed immigration reform, but at some point it is time for those excuses to stop and for the stalling to stop. If they want to show the country they are serious about growing our economy and keeping families together, then they need to show us they are serious about immigration reform.

I actually think the Speaker wants to pass a bill. In fact, I think he could pass a bill if he put it on the floor tomorrow and let the House work its will. But it is not my job, obviously, to try to tell him how to do his job. It is no one's job in the Senate to tell him how to do his job, but I suppose it is our job to give him encouragement, to say we will be there to support you if you can find a way to get this bill passed.

If they want to show the country they are serious about growing our economy and keeping families together, then they need to show us they

are serious about immigration reform. It doesn't have to be a carbon copy of what we passed, although if they look at it, what they will find is the elements that are in there hang very well together.

Look at this photo. Again, this is what America looks like. This is what Colorado looks like. This is what America looks like. It is what it is all about. These are faces of people who want to contribute. This diversity is how we thrive as a country, and it is how we are going to thrive in the future. It has always been our strength, and it is what sets us apart in many ways from countries all over the world.

These new citizens want to contribute to our economy and to our communities. They want to serve our country, they want to pay taxes and abide by the law, and they want to build a better life here for themselves and their families.

This picture is exactly why we need reform. These brave men and women say it all. They say it much better than I do.

I see my colleague from Pennsylvania is in the Chamber, so I will wrap up.

Let me say that two of the things that set us apart from countries all over the world, two of the essential components that make us the United States of America, are our commitment to the rule of law and our understanding of ourselves as being a nation of immigrants. Almost no other country in the world can say what we can say about that. I can tell you no other country in the world was having that naturalization ceremony the day we were having it at Fort Carson.

This bill gives us a chance to reaffirm those two ideas that we are a nation committed to the rule of law and that we are a nation of immigrants.

I had the chance this weekend to spend some time in my wife's hometown in the Mississippi Delta. It is one of the poorer parts of the country, and it has been for a very long time. It is a tough place in a lot of ways. We have a lot of great family there. After we finished, we went to Memphis to visit the civil rights museum, which has just reopened. If anybody has the chance to go, they should go to visit it, because what you see is the history of a struggle from the 1600s forward—generation upon generation—trying to perfect this country and keep it true to the idea that in this case we are all created equal.

For a long time we weren't able to perfect that. We still are having to perfect it. We are making progress, and that is what we are meant to do. Today we have that chance. The House has that chance tomorrow or next week or next month to make sure that we honor our commitment, this generation's commitment to a generation of immigrants and to the generations that are coming after them. I hope they will take up that challenge.

I thank my colleague from Pennsylvania and the Presiding Officer as well for his patience.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CASEY. I wish to say a word of commendation for the remarks the Senator from Colorado just made about a very important issue, and that photograph he took is, indeed, an inspiration to all Americans. Each of us can be inspired by that photograph, what it represents, by the sacrifice that undergirds that photograph, and also for his reminding us about those sacrifices and those commitments, so we want to thank him.

#### PAYCHECK FAIRNESS ACT

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, this legislation on equal pay is about justice, in a word. We could almost say that equal pay equals justice. There is probably no simpler way to say it. It is really, when you consider what this means, a very simple concept: If a woman does the same job, the same work, does all of that in the same way a man does and is hired by a company, she should be paid the same wage.

It seems so simple, so elementary, but unfortunately we have had more than one generation now where that has not been the case. Depending on what study or what year we are talking about, women make, on average, 76 cents for every dollar a man makes, or 77 cents. It has always been in that band of similar numbers.

I think for a lot of families it is disturbing. How do I tell, in my case, my four daughters to just do well in school and work hard, as they have, and get good grades, and once you are on a career path, you will be fairly compensated for your work because of all that hard work you did and the good work you do for an employer. What can I say if they come to me—I hope this never happens—10 or 20 years from now and say: You know, what you told me isn't true. I did well in school, I worked hard, I got hired and worked hard in the job I have had, and I am getting paid 76 cents for the \$1 a man makes doing the same work in the same place at the same time. It makes no sense.

So really, in essence, it is about whether we are going to be true to our words and true to the values of this country, and it is about giving people a fair shot on something as fundamental as the wages they are paid for their labor—to use an expression from the Bible, laboring in the vineyards; laboring at a job and being paid in a fair manner.

There was a report not too long ago—not this year but a few years ago—that looked at a State-by-State weekly pay comparison. In that report, Pennsylvania women made, on average, \$694 a week, while men in Pennsylvania were paid \$849 a week—an 18.3-percent differential. But that is not the end of the story. It gets worse. For people 50 years

and older, just looking at that age category, for women workers 50 years and older in Pennsylvania at that time, just a few years ago, the differential was \$732 and \$984 for men—almost \$250 a week above in that age category—and for all women at that time, about \$150 of difference each and every week. Imagine what that does to someone's sense of achievement or sense of dignity when they know they are doing the same work every day and they are being underpaid over and over every week, every month, every year, and in some cases decade after decade. So when we say this is a matter of justice, in some ways that might be an understatement.

We have a chance to remedy that, and it is very simple. Are we going to take steps to remedy that or are we going to reject the steps it will take to bring a measure of justice, a fair shot for women? They are not asking for anything that a man wouldn't ask for or demand. They are just asking for basic fairness—to be treated the same for the same work.

I won't go into all the elements of the legislation, but some of them involve what happens in the event of a conflict—if a woman is discriminated against based upon her pay and she brings an action in a court, what will be the rules that govern that case. I think we should do everything possible to make sure that if an employer has a defense, they have to earn that defense, especially in this kind of litigation.

One part of the legislation prohibits retaliation for employee complaints. In other words, if a woman is inquiring about or discussing or disclosing the wages of herself or some other employee, she is not retaliated against. It is hard to believe we have to legislate and make that the subject of debate. One would think that if a woman is working in a company for years and she is aggrieved and has a claim to make and is asked what the foundation of her claim is, her questions, her inquiries, her comparisons between and among different sets of data, what she makes, what a man who does the same work has been paid—that those basic questions should never, ever be the subject of retaliation by an employer, but too often they are. So we have to legislate. We have to specifically prohibit that kind of conduct by an employer, as maddening and as frustrating as that is.

One would think that employers would want to make things right; that they would want to make sure that if a man is paid a buck for his work, a woman doing the same work is paid the same amount. She shouldn't have to ask. She shouldn't have to be worried about any kind of reprisal or retaliation or punishment. But the state of the law today is such that retaliation goes without sanction in the United States of America. It is very insulting to women and insulting to families.

So there is lots we can do, but the most important thing we can do is to

get a favorable vote on the Paycheck Fairness Act before us. I hope we get a bipartisan vote. This shouldn't be the subject of support of just one party. This should be bipartisan. The people who are asking for this help, who have been asking for it for decades, aren't members of just one party. They happen to represent one-half or more of the American people, when women have asked for that.

If any of my colleagues think for whatever reason that this is not the right thing to do for today, they should do it for future generations. Do it for your own daughters, your own granddaughters, maybe your great-granddaughters. But to forgo the opportunity to do something about this at long last—President Kennedy signed the original legislation. A lot of people in the United States weren't even born then. Yet here we are still debating, still striving to get a basic measure of justice in place. So I do believe equal pay equals justice.

#### AFGHANISTAN ELECTIONS

Mr. President, I will turn to another subject this evening. I know we have to wrap up, and I am the last speaker of the evening, but this is a topic that doesn't get enough attention even though it was the subject of a lot of coverage and attention in the last couple of weeks and especially the last couple of days; that is, the elections in Afghanistan.

Many people know that some of the reporting indicated that the results were good in terms of turnout. There are a lot of questions to review, but we don't know the results of the elections. It is, however, remarkable how the Afghan people turned out to choose their second democratically elected President. About 60 percent of the 12 million eligible voters defied Taliban threats to cast their votes. I am hopeful these elections are a step toward a smoother transfer of power later this year.

By the way, that voter turnout number in terms of eligible voters is a little higher than we had in the United States of America in 2012. Secretary Kerry said last week that this election has been “Afghan owned from the start.”

The Afghan government security forces and civil society worked together to make these elections happen despite concerted efforts by the Taliban to sow fear and destroy democratic progress.

The service of our men and women in uniform set the stage for this progress. U.S. training and mentoring helped the Afghan National Security Forces get to the point where it could secure polling centers and allow these elections to happen.

We know in 2009 the international security forces bore the brunt of the election's security efforts, including, of course, American fighting men and women—our soldiers, at that time.

The State Department, USAID, and NGOs also put a tremendous amount of work in supporting Afghan institutions