The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable Edward J. Markey, a Senator from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal God, who transforms common days into transfiguring and redemptive moments, hallowed be Your Name. Make our lawmakers great enough for these momentous times as they seek to live worthy of Your great Name. Lord, cleanse the fountains of their hearts from all that defiles, so that they may be fit vessels to be used for Your glory. Let Your peace be within them as Your spirit inspires them to glorify You in their thoughts, words, and actions.

We pray in Your sacred Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer 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.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication from the President pro tempore (Mr. Leahy).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. Senate
President pro tempore
Washington, DC, April 9, 2014.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable Edward J. Markey, a Senator from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, to perform the duties of the Chair. Patrick J. Leahy, President pro tempore.

Mr. MARKEY thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The Acting President pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—S. 2223

Mr. Reid. Mr. President, I am told S. 2223 is due for a second reading; is that right?

The Acting President pro tempore. The clerk will read the title of the bill for a second time.

The legislative clerk read the bill by title 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, I would object to any further proceedings with respect to this legislation at this time.

The Acting President pro tempore. Objection is heard. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

PAYCHECK FAIRNESS ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. Reid. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 345, S. 2199, the Paycheck Fairness Act.

The Acting President pro tempore. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to S. 2199, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes.

SCHEDULE

Mr. Reid. Mr. President, following my remarks and those of Senator McConnell, the time will be equally divided and controlled until 11 a.m., and at that time there will be a cloture vote on the motion to proceed with the legislation now before us.

Additional votes are expected today on confirmation of nominations. Floor staff is working to come up with convenient times for everyone in that regard and will notify Senators when we have those votes scheduled.

Mr. President, today the Senate will vote on whether to end debate on the paycheck fairness legislation. This much needed legislation provides important protections for women. It addresses wage disparity, helping women negotiate for equal pay, and it empowers workers to fight back against wage discrimination—women in particular.

It is a good and important bill, and it helps American women in many different ways, but for reasons known only to them, Senate Republicans don't appear to be interested in closing the wage gap for working women, such as my daughter and my grandchildren, the Presiding Officer's wife and daughter, friends and neighbors.

Four years ago the Republicans filibustered this exact same legislation. Two years later the Republicans filibustered this legislation. Now for a third time the Paycheck Fairness Act is before us and it appears it is going to be filibustered again. They have indicated that they will likely not let us begin work on this important piece of legislation or this debate.

If they are ideologically opposed to equal pay for equal work, they are free to vote against paycheck fairness, come down here and give speeches as to why it is such a bad idea, but we haven't heard any.

Today's vote is simply to begin debate on the bill. Are they so repulsed by equal pay for hard-working American women they again will not debate equal pay for equal work, but they will obstruct equal pay for equal work?

The Republicans come to the floor and try to offer amendments that have
nothing to do with equal pay—nothing. I am at a loss as to why anyone would decline to debate this important issue or, if you don’t like it, come and tell us why. Debate is what this institution is all about. It is the U.S. Senate.

Hubert Humphrey said once: “Freedom of speech is only on the anvil of discussion, dissent and debate.” That is what he said. So we should debate this bill. Together we can find a solution to this unfair wage disparity that costs average working women $464,324 over a lifetime.

American families want us to debate and hopefully pass this legislation. This legislation overwhelmingly is supported by the American people. People in support of the Paycheck Fairness Act are calling on us to pass this legislation. They are writing letters, they are posting on social media, and they are attending rallies. Our constituents have made their feelings known, but the Republicans have not gotten the message.

Henry David Thoreau said:

It takes two to speak the truth. One to speak and another to listen.

The Senate Democrats have heard the truth about giving women a fair shot at equal pay for equal work. The truth is that working women make an average of 77 cents for every dollar their male colleagues make for doing the exact same work. That is not fair.

Today we will see if Republicans will give working women and their families a fair shot when voting on debate for this important legislation. Millions of American women and men—everyone in America—are hoping that a third time will be the charm for Senate Republicans.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

THE ECONOMY

Mr. MCCONNELL. The Obama economy has had a devastating impact on the people we represent. It has hurt millions in the middle class and people from every region of the country in almost every walk of life. When we consider the debate in the Senate, a few statistics jump out in particular.

Under this President’s watch more than 3.7 million American women have fallen into poverty. The average American woman now makes about $730 less than when the President took office. If she is a college graduate, she has actually seen her income shrink by about 7 percent. In other words, the average middle-class woman has paid more than when the President took office. If you don’t believe me, then ask any woman who has seen her annual paycheck decline by a third of her take-home pay. As one study points out, Nearly two-thirds of those adversely impacted by this arbitrary provision of ObamaCare are women, but Washington Democrats don’t seem to care about that. They don’t seem to care about the ways people we represent are being hurt by their policies.

As I said, they continue to block all the innovative ideas that Republicans have been offering to turn the tide. Just look at what happened on the Senate floor. While working with several other Republican colleagues, offered a series of measures that would not only have helped the jobs picture in our country, it would have provided greater opportunities for men, women, and families. Why? Because they Had Democratic Senators not blocked these ideas, they would have passed.

Why did Senate Democrats object to Senator Collins’ proposal to restore the 40-hour workweek? Do they think it is fair that Obama’s 30-hour workweek discriminates against working women? Do Democrats think it is fair to protect the rules that disproportionately reduce their wages?

Why do they object to the workplace flexibility proposal that Senator Ayotte and I offered? Here is legislation that would have given working moms and dads the option to take time off to help them find a better work-life balance—flexibility that is more critical now that ObamaCare’s 30-hour work rule is forcing people to pick up a second or third job just to scrape by.

Why are Democrats so opposed to a policy that a lot of working women say they want, a policy that is tailored to the needs of the modern workforce and that many government employees already enjoy?

Why do Senate Democrats object to our job creation legislation, which in many ways our $30 billion of so many different policies? Here is a bill that strikes right at the heart of what has ailed our country for 5½ years, a lack of jobs and opportunity. Passing it should have been a no-brainer.

But Senate Democrats blocked all of it, every last one of our proposals, just like they shut down the proworker legislation Senator Paul and I offered last week. The Right to Work Act is smart policy that promises to boost competitiveness while advancing workers’ rights, ensuring they are not limited by the dictates of a union.

It is similar to another bill I am proud to cosponsor: Senator Rubio’s RAISE Act, which would allow workers to get a raise even if union bosses didn’t want them to. Take for instance a worker who outperforms her colleagues and then is told by a union boss to sit down and accept less pay than she deserves—not a dime more than her coworker she is outperforming. It is completely and totally unfair, and workers such as she shouldn’t be penalized by some archaic rule dreamt up before the age of “Mad Men.”

These are the ideas that everyone who claims to stand for workplace fairness should want to help us pass. Yet Washington Democrats always seem to find some excuse not to. Maybe the Big Labor bosses they are answering to are telling them they cannot. Who knows. Or maybe it is the trial lawyers they seem to be so attentive to these days.

It makes sense when we consider what Senate Democrats have been talking about this week, a bill that that Washington Democrats always seem to find some excuse not to. Maybe the Big Labor bosses they are answering to are telling them they cannot. Who knows. Or maybe it is the trial lawyers they seem to be so attentive to these days.

It is time for Washington Democrats to stop talking about protecting trial lawyers and start focusing on actually helping the people we were sent to represent. We have already seen what 5½ years of Washington Democratic control has meant: more poverty and lower wages for women. So they need to stop blocking innovative ideas that would move us further along the path to opportunity because, look, the college graduate who has seen her annual paycheck decline by $1,400 over the past several years is counting on Democrats to change their game plan. The part-time worker who cannot imagine how she is going to make ends meet under ObamaCare’s 30-hour work rule is counting on Democrats to think outside the box.

The American people are tired of Washington Democrats’ 5½ years of failed policies and all the political games that helped us get here in the first place. Americans actually want solutions and they want them now and we owe it to them to start passing the kinds of innovative ideas Republicans are committed to pursuing, no matter how many times the majority tries to shut us down.

I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the time until 11 a.m. will be equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.
The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

HEALTH CARE

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, this week President Obama has been holding what appear to be made-for-TV events to talk about the economy. He has been talking about the policies he wants Congress to enact, policies that he says will finally get America's economy going again.

President Obama has been in the White House now for more than 5 years, so I think it is fair to ask: What has this administration—the Obama administration—been doing for the economy over the past 5 years? We know he has not done anything actually ended almost 5 years ago. Since then, our economy has not bounced back the way it should have or the way it typically does after a deep recession.

The Obama administration has spent a lot of time and money on things such as the so-called stimulus package. Since the recession ended, Washington has racked up more than $6 trillion worth of additional debt, and it has not gotten us nearly the kind of growth we should have had as a result of this spending.

Now the President has come out with a budget in which he has asked for tax increases of over $1.7 trillion—nearly $2 trillion in higher taxes over the next decade. Taxes are already too high. When I go home to talk to my constituents—as I would think most Members of this body hear from their folks at home—they say taxes are already too high.

Americans are now preparing to file their taxes. Income tax day is coming—April 15. As Americans prepare to file their taxes, they are getting a reminder of just how much of their hard-earned money Washington is taking from them. Next Tuesday, April 15, is the deadline for most of us to fill out the forms and send everything off to the Internal Revenue Service, the IRS. According to the Tax Foundation, Americans will spend more on taxes this year than they spend on food, clothing, and housing combined.

We now know how much President Obama is spending, but what kind of effect have his policies been having on our American economy? We know that the economy is still not producing the number of jobs we need for a real recovery. We know if we want to look for the reasons why that seems to be the case, we could talk about the two million jobs Democrats are blocking with their restrictive energy policies.

We could talk about the minimum wage bill that Democrats are pushing right now. The Congressional Budget Office says that would reduce employment in the United States by one-half million jobs—they say maybe as many as 1 million jobs. Yet the majority leader comes here and says it is the best thing we can do for the economy. Again, according to the Congressional Budget Office, it will cost the economy one-half million jobs and maybe up to 1 million jobs.

But probably the largest and most harmful thing the administration has done—not just with regard to the economy, but other things, including the lives of the American public—is the President's health care law. This law is hitting people across the country. There are folks who are seeing their premiums go up, losing access to their doctor, getting cancellation notices from their insurance companies, and it is also having an effect on our economy.

Today we had our usual Wyoming Wednesdays where people from around the State of Wyoming come to Washington and meet with their two Senators from Wyoming so we can talk to people from our communities. Today I heard another horror story related to the President's health care law. A family had insurance that worked for them, and it worked for them for a long time. It fit their budget, and it fit their needs as a family. But, of course, it was canceled as a result of the President's health care law and the mandates where the President believes he has a better idea of what works for their family than they know in terms of their family.

This husband and wife have a couple of young children, and they lost their insurance. They tried and tried again to get reinsured through the exchange. It took them months. They finally went with paper forms to apply. The couple traveling across the area went with paper forms to apply. The couple traveling across the area who supported the law initially have seen the effect of the law on their family and on their premiums. It has been catastrophic. Last week to do something about it. Nicaraguans have had to admit as much about this issue of people having to work more and getting higher wages or choosing to work less so they can collect greater government subsidies.

One liberal columnist wrote in the Washington Post back in February that ObamaCare is "a drag on economic growth." He said it was "a drag on economic growth." It is a drag on economic growth "as more people decide government handouts are more attractive than working more and paying higher taxes." The President wants higher taxes, but he sets into place a health care law that discourages the work and additional income because the government subsidies get greater if you work less because of sickness or other reasons.

That is one way that the President's health care law has been harmful, and there is another way as well. Remember, this law requires employers to pay for insurance for anyone working 30 or more hours per week or more is considered a full-time job. There is bipartisan legislation in an effort to try to actually overturn that and get that back to the 40-hour workweek, which is what most Americans think of as a full-time job.

How do people have to respond to the health care law that is out there? What are towns doing with their town budgets? What are counties doing in States across the country? What are school districts doing? We see what they are doing, and they are talking about it. Towns, communities, counties, school districts, and universities are cutting back on the hours of their part-time bus drivers, librarians, coaches, and mid-class workers. They are cutting back to get them below 30 hours a week so they don't fall into the mandates of the President's expensive health care law.

What does that mean? It means it hurts people's take-home pay. If someone is working 32 or 33 hours a week and finds that their hours have been cut to 29 hours—regardless of what the majority leader wants to do with minimum-wage—paycheck is going to get smaller. Their paycheck is going to be smaller because of the health care law. Their paycheck will be smaller because of policies that Democrats have voted for—many of whom never read it in the first place.

Is this just a Republican versus a Democratic idea? Not necessarily, because a group of labor union leaders who supported the law initially have said that this health care law will "destroy the foundation of the 40-hour workweek that is the backbone of the American middle class.''

The House of Representatives voted last week to do something about it. They passed—in a bipartisan vote—a
The bill that would change the definition of full-time work under the health care law from 30 hours to 40 hours.

Senator SUSAN COLLINS introduced a bill to do the same thing here in the Senate. So what has happened with it? Well, the Democratic majority leader isn’t allowing a vote on that bill.

This is a commonsense way to reverse some of the harm the President’s health care law is doing to hard-working Americans—how it is impacting their pocketbooks, how they are seeing smaller paychecks and impacting their quality of life. But the Senate majority leader has blocked the vote. So the health care law hurts patients, it hurts health care providers, and is hurting the economy.

It is interesting, because the President said all he wanted to do was insure the people who didn’t have insurance. So we have an exchange. We have turned the whole health care system upside down. We have impacted one-sixth of the economy. And they say the whole purpose: to take people who didn’t have insurance and get them insured.

What does the Wall Street Journal say about it today in the headline talking about the newest statistics in the RAND study? They say most who bought policies through the new exchanges—most who bought policies through the new exchanges—already had insurance. They weren’t uninsured. These are people already insured.

Many lost their insurance because of the President’s health care law. Yet we have turned upside down one-sixth of the economy in an effort to help some but have hurt so many in the process. That is one of the fundamental flaws and problems of a health care law where the President promised, if you like your coverage, you can keep it; if you like your doctor, you can keep him or her. Now we have millions of people whose coverage has been canceled. We have millions who can’t keep their doctor, can’t go to their hospital. They are seeing higher premiums, higher copays, higher deductibles, more pain because of what the President and the Democrats have forced through the Congress, forced through the House, forced through the Senate.

The American people wanted to change the health care system in this country and they knew what they wanted. They wanted the care they need from a doctor or they choose at lower cost. They didn’t get that in this health care law. Many Americans have seen their costs go up—their initial out-of-pocket costs—to buy the insurance on the exchange. They have seen their copays go up. They have seen their deductibles go up. And they can’t keep the doctor of their choice. So they know what they wanted, and this is not what they wanted, but it is what they have gotten instead. People understand that.

That is why this health care law is still so very unpopular across the country. People see how bad this health care law is in terms of their own lives and how bad it is for the American economy. They see how 5 years of this administration and the policies have held back our economic recovery.

Tax day, April 15, coming next week, will be another opportunity for Americans to reflect on how much of their money they are taking from them and what they have gotten in return. I would say, as they reflect upon that, will continue to say they are not getting value for their money. They are not getting value for their money.

Polling shows that—and I hear this at home in Wyoming—for every dollar people send to the government, they think they are getting less than 50 cents on the dollar in value. They don’t like it because it means when the government takes more, they have less to spend.

The government is deciding where the money is spent, not families. And it is families who want to make decisions about their freedoms, about their health care, about their financial choices—what they want, what they need, and what works best for them.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor to suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Ms. MIKULSKI. What is now the pending business on the floor?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion to proceed to S. 2199.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I ask unanimous consent that the number of that bill refers to the paycheck fairness bill; is that correct?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, what is one of the best ways to make more money? Do we know what is one of the best ways to make more money? Pay women equal pay for equal work. Also, enforce the law, the Equal Pay Act, that was passed in 1963. But we haven’t been able to do it for several reasons. This is about the paycheck fairness bill deals with.

Right now, there is a veil of secrecy in businesses all over America—a veil of secrecy about the fact that an employee cannot ask a fellow employee what they are making. This is not supposed to talk about their salary. They can talk about anything, but they can’t talk about what the person next to them is making.

The second issue is if an employee in any way, particularly if that employee is a woman, tries to speak up for their rights to get equal pay for the same job—same pay, same job—an employee is often retaliated against. Then, businesses come up with lots of loopholes, which are bad. They use business explanations as bad excuses to avoid paying equal pay for equal work.

We want to pass this legislation to end the retaliation, close the loopholes, and lift the veil of secrecy. This, in many ways, will give American women not a raise but what justice demands.

I am here this morning to keep up the momentum which we have been able to maintain in this Senate. I am very proud of the fact that in 2009 we passed Lilly Ledbetter, which opened the courthouse doors to women. Now, as we continue 5 years later, we are listening to stories—terrible stories—about what has happened. There was Kerri Sleeman—a mechanical engineer in Michigan—who was told that men had to be paid more in her company because they were breadwinners. She was a mechanical engineer doing the same job.

Latoya Weaver, a Marylander who worked in the mailroom, learned the number of women at the hotel where she worked were being paid $2 more an hour than she was, which meant a total of several hundred dollars a year.

We want to end that discrimination—no retaliation, no loopholes, no veil of secrecy.

This has been going on a long time. In 1964, President Lyndon Johnson, as part of the great civil rights movement that was sweeping our country, wanted to pass three civil rights bills: the Civil Rights Act, the Equal Pay Act, the Civil Rights Act, and the Voting Rights Act.

He started with the Equal Pay Act because he thought it would be the easiest to pass and the easiest to enforce. Fifty years later, we are still fighting the battles over three of those pieces of legislation, and today we are talking about equal pay.

(Ms. HEITKAMP assumed the Chair.)

Right now women are an emerging force in the workplace. Way back in the 1960s, only a little over half of women were in the workplace, although many had been there during World War II as Rosie’s and kept our economy going.
Now they are the breadwinners in 40 percent of households. Women make up 40 percent of the households in which she is the head of the house or the prime or the breadwinner, and it is time to make the labor market reflect that. The pay gap has not been eliminated. Making it harder to uncover pay differences—pay equality is a fundamental justice issue. And we will change the Federal lawbooks so as to say: Tell me about the pay. It is a family pocketbook issue. This is why they have spoken up for dads. They want to make sure if you feel you have damages, you will be able to seek redress through punitive damages. And no longer will women be on their own.

The consequences of the pay gap are significant. It is a family's dream. If they want the same, that when you work the same, you want the same pay. American women need a fair shot at equal pay for equal work—the same pay for the same job. We need to pass this legislation today.

Let us adopt the motion to proceed so we can get actually on the bill to discuss it, offer amendments. There are those, I know, who have other ideas and suggestions. We look forward to that. And then, at the end of the day and the end of the week, let's pass it.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, you and I have talked about this. Whether it is in North Dakota or north Baltimore, we feel the same, that when you work hard, play by the rules, do the same job, you want the same pay. American women need a fair shot at equal pay for equal work—the same pay for the same job. We need to pass this legislation today.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRASSLEY. 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. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I would like to take a few minutes to speak on the bill being considered today, the Paycheck Fairness Act. The proponents of the Paycheck Fairness Act argue that many women continue to earn significantly less pay than men for doing the same work. I would like to consider this bill is nothing more than election-year politics aimed at scoring political points.
Equally unfortunate, the bill will do nothing to address our Nation’s anemic economic growth. It will not create a single job for the more than 10 million unemployed Americans. This bill does nothing for the millions of Americans who have become so discouraged with this economy that they have completely given up on looking for work. This political show-vote will not help the millions of women who have lost their jobs or who are now living in poverty as a result of the Obama economy.

Let me be clear: I strongly support equal pay for equal work. I support equal employment opportunities. I abhor discrimination of any kind. Discrimination in the workplace is unacceptable, and must not be tolerated. Workers have been protected against sex-based pay discrimination since the passage of the Equal Pay Act in 1963. Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 provides additional protections and remedies for discrimination.

Many Republicans believe that the Paycheck Fairness Act would undermine a business’s defense even when the pay disparity is legitimate. The bill would allow unlimited punitive and compensatory damages, while also automatically allowing employees in a class action lawsuit unless they specifically choose to opt out. This bill would be a boon to trial lawyers at the expense of job creators and job seekers.

A Washington Post Editorial from September 28, 2010, stated, “the proposal, which builds on the existing Equal Pay Act, would allow employees and courts to intrude too far into core business decisions.” It further stated, “Discrimination is abhorrent, but the Paycheck Fairness Act is not the right fix.”

Rather than consider a politically motivated measure, we should be working together to create good-paying jobs and grow the economy. Instead, the Democratic majority has chosen to disregard the welfare of struggling Americans and pursue messaging bills. If the majority in the Senate truly cared about helping the middle class, they would allow consideration of Republican amendments that would actually help workers, help the unemployed find work, and grow the economy.

But just like consideration of the unemployment insurance extension bill, the Senate majority has no interest in considering amendments that would actually grow the economy and create jobs. During consideration of that bill, Republicans offered a job-creating amendment that would have repealed provisions of ObamaCare that are proven job killers. It would have spurred job creation through energy development, including authorizing the construction of the Keystone XL Pipeline. It would have provided small businesses, who are responsible for creating 70 percent of jobs in our economy, with permanent tax relief and incentivizing new investments. A version of this amendment has been filed to this bill. Unfortunately, the majority leader is again blocking consideration of any amendments.

While the majority leader pushes ahead with his political agenda, Republicans continue to propose measures that will create jobs and grow the economy. Senator McConnell and Senator Ayotte have proposed an amendment to allow voluntary flexible workplace arrangements such as compensatory time and flexible credit hour agreements for hourly workers. This amendment would provide much needed flexibility for employers, but was immediately blocked by the majority leader. Why would the majority leader block consideration of such a reasonable proposal?

Senator Alexander has also proposed an amendment that seeks to provide working parents more flexibility in the workplace. Senator Rubio has proposed an amendment to allow employees to seek fair wage increases and remove obstacles for employees to earn pay raises. In addition, Senators Fischer, Collins and Ayotte have filed an amendment to reaffirm existing laws prohibiting pay discrimination and would prohibit retaliation against employees who inquire about, discuss or disclose wages.

Sadly, none of these reasonable, thoughtful amendments to address job creation and workplace flexibility will be considered because the majority leader has already signaled that this debate is not about legislating. It’s about political messaging. For these reasons, I must vote against the procedural motion to proceed.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam President, today we will decide whether to begin debate on the Paycheck Fairness Act. I am an original cosponsor of this bill. I strongly support it and the ideals that motivate it, and I hope that someday we can pass this legislation. But today’s vote is not on final passage. It is not even the beginning of debate on this measure. It is a vote on whether to begin the debate. Those who vote against cloture on this motion to proceed are not just saying they oppose equal pay for women; they are saying they do not even want to discuss it.

But a refusal to debate this measure will not make this issue go away. The fact remains that in our country today, women make 77 cents for every dollar men earn. Some of our Republican colleagues suggest there’s nothing we can do about it.

As a Democrat I believe that our prosperity rests on a principle—the idea that if you work hard and play by the rules, you should have a fair shot to provide for your family, your future and your children’s future. The promise of that better future is part of what gets us up every morning, gets us on the bus or in the car, and gets us to the office or the shop or the factory floor. It is the promise that our work will be rewarded.

The obvious and persistent pay gap between men and women does violence to that promise. Under current conditions, the message we send to women is this: “Work hard, play by the rules, and you’ll get three quarters for every dollar’s worth of work you do.” Democrats believe that is unfair—unfair to the women it shortchanges and the families they support. And because we believe that even those who are not working women lose something when we do not live up to the principles of fairness and opportunity that give all of us hope for that better future.

And we Democrats want to do something about it. What about it, what we want to do should not be that controversial. Here is all this bill does: It requires employers to ensure that when men and women are paid differently, that the difference is related to factors such as education, training and experience, and not merely based on gender; and it strengthens protections against retaliation by employers for women who file discrimination complaints.

Surely we can all agree that pay differences should be limited to factors that truly reflect qualification and performance, and not determined by gender. Surely we can all agree that when an employee believes she or he is being treated unfairly, or that their employer has violated the law, they have the right to seek redress without fear of retribution.

Those who care about the 60 percent of American households that depend partly or entirely on a woman’s income should support this bill. Those who care about the 6.9 million women trying to raise a family on what is now three-quarters of what they have worked for should support this bill.

Those who care about making this a society that lives up to our professed goals of equal opportunity should support this bill.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, 5 years ago, the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act was signed into law by President Obama. That bill—necessary because of a divided decision by the Supreme Court to strike a blow to the rights of working families—was a first step in closing the still-existing gender wage gap. Today, one day after commemorating Equal Pay Day, Senators will once again have the opportunity to stand with working families and support equal pay for equal work, regardless of gender.

I am proud to cosponsor the Paycheck Fairness Act, which Senator Mikulski—a trailblazer herself—has once again introduced to close loopholes that allow employers to unfairly discriminate workers based on gender. Thanks to the hard work and perseverance of earlier generations, working women today have career and business opportunities never before available. Yet, despite the gains we have made, millions of women continue to earn less than men. According to the Census Bureau, women still only earn 77 cents for
every dollar a man earns. This disparity has real-world, financial consequences: on average, women are paid more than $11,000 per year less than men. And of American households with children under the age of 18, 40 percent/list is because of their role or primary earners. The wage gap based on gender is hurting low- and middle-income families who, in today’s economy, still wrestle with putting food on the table, heating their homes, paying the mortgage, and saving for college. 

Venida, a national leader in addressing equal pay for equal work. In 2002, Vermont adopted its own Equal Pay Act, making it illegal for employers to offer anything less than equal pay for equal work. Still, in Vermont, where 22,000 households are headed by women, the yearly gender pay gap is nearly $6,000. More needs to be done, and we can do better. 

Our national march toward equality continues. The Paycheck Fairness Act builds on efforts that date back more than 50 years to ensure a balanced and equal playing field in the workplace for both men and women. The Paycheck Fairness Act will require employers to show a difference in pay is truly linked to job performance and not to gender. It will protect employees from being retaliated against by their employers for discussing salaries with colleagues, and remove obstacles to challenging pay discrimination in a court of law. It will provide employers with assistance to create equal pay practices and recognize those who already adhere to such practices. These are commonsense provisions we can all support. 

The Paycheck Fairness Act has twice before been filibustered in the Senate. Meanwhile, hard-working families across the country, anchored by the incomes of hard-working women, continue to struggle. Equal pay for equal work is a matter of simple fairness, and the Paycheck Fairness Act is an important step towards just that. I urge all Senators to support this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On any vote to proceed to the Paycheck Fairness Act back to the well-reasoned and prudent course of action. I ask you to join me in voting yes to this cloture motion.

The majority leader.

Mr. REID. I am ready to continue that fight. We are ready to turn our biggest noes into our biggest yeses. We will continue the war against the wage gap and wage discrimination against women.

Women of America, I say to you, join us in this fight. Make your voices heard if you want to change the Federal labor laws so we can make a change in our family checkbook.

We are going to finish what we started with Lilly Ledbetter and bring the Paycheck Fairness Act back to the
floor. When Senator REID voted no, it was so that he could bring up another vote on the motion to proceed. But this is not about parliamentary procedure; this is about how we will press the fight.

When we lost Lilly Ledbetter, I came to the floor then, and I come to the floor now, to say that when we continue this fight, I will remind my colleagues about what Abigail Adams once said to her husband: As you are making those laws down there, she said, “do not forget the ladies. For we will foment a revolution of our own.”

So women of America—and the good men who support us—keep the revolution going. I said then, as I say now, let’s suit up, let’s square our shoulders. For the women, put on your lipstick and let’s fight on. We will be back another day for another vote.

Madam President, I yield the floor. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, I applaud my colleague Senator MIKULSKI for her great work, in spite of the result today.

CONGRATULATING THE UCONN HUSKIES

I am here on this floor, however, to congratulate UConn Huskies for a double national championship. It has only been done once before in the history of college basketball—the men winning a national championship and the women winning a national championship in the same year—and the last time it was too us, in 2004 and now in 2014. So, very briefly, I wish to add my time today.

The women winning a national championship and only been done once before in the history of college basketball. It has been a very emotional guy, but he very rarely breaks down in tears—which he did, talking about a couple of his players’ presentations, and also Bria Hartley. He has a love for those players.

We saw Kevin Ollie’s love for his players, especially the guys who stuck it out who could have transferred to other programs but decided to stay with him and stay with the program.

What Geno said after the game is he is flattered: “I’m flattered and grateful, and all the things that have come with this kind of accomplishment . . .”

But he also said, “I’m more proud of the legacy that exists and what Connecticut basketball is as opposed to the number of championships.”

When we watch these championship games that now add up for both the men and the women, we see throughout the stands former players by the dozens—maybe even by the hundreds—who come back because of the legacy that has been created in 20 years of national championships for the women and four national championships for the men.

Even though, as Kevin Ollie said, UConn got there the hard way. We don’t have the 100-year legacy of basketball such as Kansas or Kentucky has. We have built this over the past couple of decades. Just as Kevin Ollie has done over the last 2 years, UConn over the course of the last the 2 decades, in registering 13 national championships, has always taken the stairs rather than the elevator.

Congratulations, as a diehard Husky fan, to our twin national championship teams.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

CONGRATULATING UCONN

Mr. COATS. Madam President, this is not easy for me to do, but I am going to do it in good grace here. I congratulate my colleague from Connecticut on the University of Connecticut’s victory over the University of Notre Dame last night.

He watched in joy and exuberance, and I watched in dismay. But I do want to congratulate the Senator and those from Connecticut for the singular achievement of having both men’s and women’s basketball championships.

Those of us in Indiana are deeply immersed in the basketball culture. Statewide, we didn’t have the best year or the kind of year we would have liked. But we were very proud of the University of Notre Dame women and the accomplishments they made—in an undefeated season until last evening.

It probably is not politic for me to say this, but it is unfortunate that our all-American center, who was one of the keys to the success of the team, unfortunately had a knee injury which prevented her from playing. I am not saying we would have won had she played because I don’t want to take anything away from the Huskies. On the other hand, I think it could have been a more contested contest had she been able to be a part of that.

Either way, both teams deserve congratulations for the phenomenal seasons they had. It was a joy to watch from Indiana our Notre Dame women do so well, just as it was a joy for Senator MURPHY to watch his men and women do so well. So I congratulate him for that.

RUSSIAN AGGRESSION

Madam President, I rise for something obviously far more serious and threatening to us than basketball contests, and that is our response to Russia’s recent unlawful takeover of Crimea. I urge, and continue to urge, the President as well as our colleagues in the Senate to take more vigorous action to deter further Russian aggression.

I speak anxieties are building that Vladimir Putin’s first big bite out of Ukraine has not satisfied him and he hungered for more. Many signs indicate Russian aggression threatens further incursions into Eastern Ukraine and perhaps beyond.

Troops are positioned on the border, logistics for an invasion are arranged, and the Russian propaganda machine is once again ginning up the excuses needed to justify unjustifiable actions. The only thing I can conclude is that the lack of an effective, forceful response by the United States and by our allies—particularly our European allies—has given President Putin reason to expect that further aggression will not be punished. Despite all the rhetoric, despite all the tough talk, very little has been done, and—with what little has been done—there has been no effect to deter and to condemn what has taken place and deter further aggression.

From the beginning of this blatant act, I have waited for the administration to impose real costs on Russia for its illegal territorial aggression. So far, I have waited in vain.

In the past month I have sent two separate resolutions which I have offered on the floor, several speeches, and numerous opinion columns I have written in the media, I have consistently attempted to make the case for hard-hitting sanctions on Russia. I joined Senator DURBIN, my colleague from Illinois, to achieve a unanimous bipartisan passage of an initial list of sanctions which would signal to Putin that the Senate was unified in condemning and sanctioning Russia for its blatant take-over of Crimea.

I stated at the time that this was an initial list and much tougher sanctions needed to come. But I wanted to give
the administration time to fashion those, to work with our allies across the ocean and to stand strong for the type of hard-hitting, hard-biting economic sanctions which would make Russia pay a real price, as we had said we would have to do to respond to meekness. The American response must be much greater if we want Putin to understand that his actions in Ukraine are unacceptable and will not be tolerated. At a minimum, I would suggest, Congress must refuse to recognize Russian sovereignty over Crimea by passing my legislation. I have proposed a number of sanctions which were added to other measures I have introduced and hopefully will convince this administration and our European allies to take a much tougher stance and provide much more of a penalty to Russia over the actions it has taken. I urge my colleagues to join me in this effort.

More needs to be done—and more needs to be done now. With Russian troops mounting their vehicles on the Ukraine, the United States should be using every means available to press for firm measures, and our European allies should be joining us in this cause. Those measures should include imposing serious costs so such behavior is not repeated.

Further, we should defend our allies and reassure them that we have their backs. We need to isolate Russia and prevent it from participating in organizations that give Putin credibility and strength. We should impose obstacles to prevent Russia from taking material advantage of their conquest, and we should convince other nations, businesses, and individuals to follow our lead.

I think recent history shows that in conflict issues around the world, if the United States does not take a firm and a strong lead, other nations simply do not feel they have the strength or the backing to take that lead. So it is imperative the United States takes that lead, steered by our President, and supported by a bipartisan Congress to send a unified message that we are willing to address egregious breaches of international law and lead the way in doing so.

The first task, as I see it, is to make sure we and others do not accept this aggression and annexation—what some others are already calling a fait accompli. Since the United States' refusal to recognize Soviet annexation of the three Baltic states 74 years ago, we have firmly and consistently refused to recognize such annexations. We must do the same in this case.

Unfortunately, words and actions from this administration and from many of our European allies continue to focus on threatening consequences for future Russian incursions, rather than speaking clearly and firmly in opposition to annexation that has already taken place. It is exactly this reluctance to impose costs for the annexation of a portion of the Ukraine that paves the way for further Russian aggression.

I sadly note that some of our best European friends are downplaying the importance of the invasion and annexation which have already taken place.

Just as Chancellor Merkel from Germany was showing signs of a more forceful German foreign policy in defense of European territorial integrity, it now appears Germany is showing more interest in dialogue and restraint, backing down from the tough talk about imposing economic sanctions for the actions it has taken. I am convinced there is very little reason to believe that further aggression will be adequately discouraged or punished.

In this policy vacuum, if we don't find leadership at home or from the Europeans, I believe it is imperative that Congress act—and act now. So today, I am introducing yet another response in addition to those I have previously introduced addressing this situation in Ukraine.

I will be introducing to the Senate the Crimea Annexation Non-Recognition Act—legislation which would mandate an official policy of not recognizing Russian sovereignty over Crimea, its land, airspace, waters, and resources.

The purpose of this act is to ensure the United States will not recognize Russian sovereignty over Crimea nor take any action which would imply such recognition. Further, my bill imposes obstacles to Russian exploitation of Crimean resources by taking greater legal certainty about investing in Crimea, and it restricts foreign aid to countries which recognize Russian sovereignty over Crimea.

I will illustrate some of the specific proposals I have introduced.

First, establish firm policy that the United States Government does not recognize Russian sovereignty over Crimea, its territory, airspace, and territorial waters, and may take no action that implies any recognition of Russian sovereignty.

Second, prohibit the United States from financing or guaranteeing investment in Crimea with Russia as an intermediary.

Third, oppose international financial institutions' assistance programs for Crimea that go through Russia as an intermediary.

Fourth, require the Department of Justice to affirm this nonrecognition policy upon request, in order to create greater legal uncertainty for those who hope to contract with Russia for exploitation of Crimean resources.

Fifth, prohibit vessels sailing from Crimea with Russian customs documentation.

Sixth, prohibit U.S. ships and aircraft from taking action that imply Russian sovereignty over Crimea, its airspace or territorial waters.

And, seventh, prohibit some forms of foreign assistance to countries that recognize Russian sovereignty over Crimea.

There are very few precedents in postwar international law so such a bold and aggressively used force against a neighbor for the purpose of territorial acquisition. What has happened in Crimea is a crime left over from an earlier age. We, together with our European friends, must move aggressively to oppose it before it becomes repetitive.

At a time when so much depends on Vladimir Putin's unpredictable plans, it is time for us to begin to speak with one voice and to make clear to Mr. Putin that his actions will not be tolerated. At a minimum, I would suggest, Congress must refuse to recognize Russian sovereignty over Crimea by passing my legislation. I have proposed a number of sanctions which were added to other measures I have introduced and hopefully will convince this administration and our European allies to take a much tougher stance and provide much more of a penalty to Russia over the actions it has taken. I urge my colleagues to join me in this effort.

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

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

HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.
notice that the President, as with most of the people I work for, in his announcing the numbers the other day, referred to the plan as ObamaCare again. I noticed he quit doing that since the election. He said he kind of liked “ObamaCare”—in one of the Presidential debates in 2012 he said he liked the term—and then he pretty well quit using it. But with the signup numbers, he said some people call it ObamaCare, in his announcement the other day. So I guess if he can call it that, the people I work for can call it that as well.

So we have premiums rising, deductibles going up, and hospitals seeing, in many cases, their fastest growing column of unpaid debt is people with insurance. Not too long ago, we said: That doesn’t make any sense. How did people with insurance wind up in the fastest growing column of unpaid debt? It is because people’s deductibles are, for many families now, well beyond what they can pay. If a person had a $500 deductible a few years ago and they have a $3,000 deductible today—if they had a hospital bill, they might be able to put $500 together and think that gets this bill paid. Because to call all of it. I am not going to get this repeated notice. But if a person has a $3,000 deductible, they might decide: I can never pay that, so I am going to let them do whatever they are going to have to do because food, medical bills, insurance company pays enough of the bill that the hospital decides they are not going to bother me. But that is the fastest growing debt in many hospital accounting offices right now—people who have insurance, who aren’t paying their part of the bill.

But whether it is increases in premiums or increases in deductibles or they can’t see their doctor, the people I work for in Missouri tell me every week about stories that I absolutely believe are true. I basically verify with people before I come to the floor, before pulling a few of these stories out: Do you mind, Timothy from Kirksville, if I mention that you have a small business, and even though they don’t have to provide health insurance for their employees, they have done so and they have chosen to pay 100 percent of the cost up until now. Actually, most employers did. Eighty-five percent of everybody who had insurance got insurance at work. Ninety percent of them thought that the health insurance was great for what they needed to have for themselves and their family. We had a system that was working pretty good. Where almost everybody did it. Instead of figuring out how to expand that system so that people’s health care costs get lower. I am afraid we have made it more difficult for everybody involved.

Lisa, the business owner, says her premiums went up 35 percent last year, and she and her husband have already told their employees that they will go up even higher next year. She says if the premiums continue to increase, they will soon not be able to cover their employees. Carol from Cameron, MO, says her coverage went up and her out-of-pocket costs have increased significantly. Her deductible is now $3,500 and she has to pay $65 every time she goes to see a doctor. She worries she will never be able to use the coverage she is paying for because the out-of-pocket costs are too high, and if she ever actually got sick or had to go to the hospital or had a significant condition, she is worried she can’t pay the deductible, even though she is paying every month to have insurance and feel as though the coverage is not truly insurance for her at all.

Meri and his wife in Cape Girardeau, MO, are in their late sixties. They have Medicare supplemental policy, but their copays have increased. One of their primary doctors has stopped taking Medicare. He and his wife are concerned they can’t see the doctor they would like to see, that their copays have increased, and their doctor left the program. By the way, the administration, I guess the day before yesterday, announced we weren’t going to have the reductions in Medicare Advantage next year that we had this year. We will still have this year’s increase, but we will not have next year’s increase. Whoever thought that paying for a new healthcare program out of Medicare was a good idea anyway? So $500 billion out of Medicare, which has bigger and bigger problems all the time as more and more people enter Medicare—$500 billion out of Medicare to pay for yet another system is absurd. Even the administration, at least between now and the election, doesn’t think that is a good idea because they just suspended one of the pay-fors. They said: We did that once, and that was in the Bush administration because people could see what was going to happen to their Medicare Advantage, so we don’t want to do that between now and election day—although I think in fairness they didn’t mention election day in the rule, the Bush administration didn’t mention it—so it is going to happen in this even-numbered year.

Mike from Kansas City, MO, says his premiums went from $600 a month to $700 for him and his wife. The deductible for insurance. Not too long ago, we thought that paying for a new health care plan limiting his ability to provide quality care to his patients. Unfortunately, now that his doctor is part of a private network, Mike is no longer able to afford him—or to afford to see him. I am not helpful because people could see what was going to happen to their Medicare Advantage, so we don’t want to do that between now and election day—although I think in fairness they didn’t mention election day in the rule, the Bush administration didn’t mention it—so it is going to happen in this even-numbered year.

All kinds of unintended consequences appear to be happening when the government decides not only can it begin to involve itself in 17 percent of the economy of the country but in virtually everybody’s health care decision making process. This would be a big job for a very efficient government in a very small country. In a federalist system where we have 50 States and territories to deal with, in a big country, this is very hard to do. It is unfortunate that all of the warnings about the unintended consequences about people in the workplace will begin to have part-time jobs instead of full-time jobs or people who had less than 50 employees wouldn’t want to go to 51 because they would then be covered by a law they were not initially covered by—all of those warnings have turned out to be at least as bad as those people saying this could happen were saying they could be.

John in Overly, MO, went to healthcare.gov to find a plan. The cheapest quote he could find for his family of four was $500 a month, and in John’s case that is almost 30 percent of his income. He has looked at the numbers and has decided it would be more affordable to go uninsured. He said: I am self-employed, married, and have two children, and though I am self-employed, I never had any trouble affording health insurance for me and my family (until now).
Richard is from Stoutsville, MO. His wife’s premium last year was $359 a month, with a $5,000 deductible. This year it is $800 a month, and since they are on a fixed income, they have just decided they can no longer afford to pay these high premium insurance because they have to buy it as individuals. I would just say that we need to look at these cases. Surely somebody out there has benefited from the system. There are people who were able to stay on their family policies longer. A piece of legislation I wrote when I was a Member of the House— it was 3¼ pages long—apparently it would have added about as many people as any other single thing did, and it would have added those people whether you had the rest of this health care bill or not, at no cost to any taxpayer anywhere and no disruption of anybody else’s insurance coverage.

Those are the kinds of things we should have looked at. But we need to look at the issues now to be sure we have a system that is not measured by whether the Web site works and not measured by an argument about whether someone who signed up paid but is measured by whether this really does provide care.

Health care is critical to families.

Somebody told me one time: When everybody in your family is well, you have lots of problems; when somebody in your family is sick, you have one problem. That is how important health care is. We need to be sure that this is a system that does not meet some numerical or technical “check the box” but really does provide access to what was the greatest health care system in the world.

There are ways to encourage more access to that system and more choices, not fewer choices and less access and more people who feel as though they are paying a premium every month but if they ever really get sick, they really will not have insurance.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. MORAN. 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. MORAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate in the morning hour.

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

ALZHEIMER’S DISEASE

Mr. MORAN. I thank the Chair.

Madam President, nearly every minute someone in America develops Alzheimer’s disease. More than 5 million Americans suffer from this disease and more than 5 million individuals worldwide. If trends continue, the number of individuals diagnosed with Alzheimer’s disease after the age of 65 is expected to double every 5 years, while the number of people 85 years and older with this disease will triple by 2050.

Alzheimer’s is the sixth leading cause of death in the United States, and there is currently no cure, no diagnostic test, and no treatment for this terrible disease.

As a nation, we must remain committed to defeating one of the greatest health threats to the health and well-being of all Americans. Caring for those with Alzheimer’s and other dementia is expected to cost $214 billion this year—$214 billion this year alone, with $150 billion covered by the Federal Government through Medicare and Medicaid.

A recent study outlined that the cost of care for those struggling with dementia is projected to double over the next 30 years, surpassing health care expenses for both heart disease and the flu. To add insult to injury, when you're sick, the cost, or effectively treat Alzheimer’s, costs will only continue to climb.

Alzheimer’s has become a disease to define our generation. But if we focus and prioritize our research capabilities, we can do what we need to do as a part of our health care system.

There is reason for newfound hope. Over the last 5 years, significant strides have been made in understanding how Alzheimer’s disease affects the brain child. This new understanding has the potential to lead to new research opportunities and to better management of the disease.

In February, the Senate Appropriations health subcommittee held a hearing on the impact of Alzheimer’s—both economic and personal—and the state of these current research initiatives. I am the ranking member of that subcommittee. Chairman HARKIN and I held this hearing to raise awareness of the threat to America’s health, the impact on the financial well-being of our country, and to highlight the groundbreaking research initiatives currently taking place.

For example, until 2009, only one genetic variant was known to increase the risk of late-onset Alzheimer’s disease. However, through advances in genome studies and other technologies, the list of known gene risk factors has grown substantially. Now researchers have identified 11 genetic risk factors.

The National Institutes of Health is supporting research that has established methods and standards for testing for biomarkers for Alzheimer’s disease. These tests may now to be sure we have a system that is not measured by whether the Web site works and not measured by an argument about whether someone who signed up paid but is measured by whether this really does provide care.

Health care is critical to families.

Somebody told me one time: When everybody in your family is well, you have lots of problems; when somebody in your family is sick, you have one problem. That is how important health care is. We need to be sure that this is a system that does not meet some numerical or technical “check the box” but really does provide access to what was the greatest health care system in the world.

There are ways to encourage more access to that system and more choices, not fewer choices and less access and more people who feel as though they are paying a premium every month but if they ever really get sick, they really will not have insurance.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. SANDERS. 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. SANDERS. Madam President, I hear more and more people in my own State of Vermont and from people, in fact, all over the country via email, through my Web site, who are wondering whether this great country is evolving into an oligarchic society.

Historically, as I think most people know, the United States was the envy of the world for so many reasons. But one of the reasons, economically, is that in our country there was always the belief that regardless of your income level, how you made it, you could move up the economic ladder. There was the reality—not just the belief—that we had a great and expanding middle class; that if your dad and your mom didn’t go to college which, in fact, was the case for many families—you would have that opportunity to go to college and move up the educational ladder or the business ladder or professional field. There was the feeling that economically what America was about, and indeed we were celebrated, was the great middle class. People today, both from an economic perspective and from a political perspective, are beginning in a...
very serious way to question that reality.

What they are looking at is that today in our country we have the most unequal distribution of wealth and income of any major country on Earth. I think lots of younger people say, well, how could that be? In England you have the Queen of England, all the lords, all the royalty all over Europe, and we don't have that in the United States.

Yet the truth is that over the years we have moved to a situation where in terms of wealth and income, we are now the most unequal society of any major industrialized nation on Earth.

I keep mentioning one statistic, because I don't hear too many other people talking about it, but we need to talk about it. That is, in terms of wealth. Wealth is what we own. Wealth is what we have accumulated over a lifetime of work. In terms of wealth, the top 1 percent in our Nation owns 39 percent of the financial wealth of America.

I would ask those people back home who might be listening, what does the bottom 60 percent own? The top 1 percent owns 39 percent of the wealth. What do you think the bottom 60 percent owns? They own 25 percent, 20 percent, 10 percent? What do they own? The answer is they own all of 2.3 percent—all of 2.3 percent is what the bottom 60 percent of Americans owns in terms of wealth.

If you had a big pizza with 100 slices in it, 1 person would get 38 percent of those pieces of pizza if we looked at wealth, and the bottom 60 percent of the people would have to share 2.3 percent of the pizza. I don't think that is what America is supposed to be about and that situation is getting even worse.

In terms of income now—all right, everybody goes out and works—we have millions of people today who are working longer hours and their income is going down. Their wages are going down. Maybe they are paying more for health care. Their pensions are going down.

But in terms of all new income—new income generated in this country—from the last statistics we saw, which were from 2009 to 2012, in terms of all new income, 95 percent of all new income went to the top 1 percent. So more and more of what is going to the millionaires and billionaires while millions of people are working longer hours for lower wages, and while we have the highest rate of childhood poverty, at 22 percent, of any major country on Earth.

Since 1999, the typical middle-class family has seen its income go down by more than $5,000. Do you want to know why people are angry, why people are concerned, and why people are worried what is going to happen to their kids? It is because the median family income has gone down by $5,000 since 1999.

Let me break it down even further. The typical male worker, that guy right in the middle, made $283 less last year than he did 44 years ago. Imagine that. In the last 44 years, with all of the increase in productivity, with all of the robotics, with all of the space technology, all of the iPhones, iPads, and everything else where people are now producing, the typical male worker made $283 less last year than he did 44 years ago. The typical female worker earned $1,775 less last year than she did in 2007.

Today in America we have more people living in poverty than ever before, and that is 46.5 million people. Here is a fact that should frighten everybody: that is, half of Americans have less than $10,000 in their savings account right now. Can you imagine that? That means if your car breaks down and you need that car to get to work or you have a serious health problem and you don't have particularly good health insurance, there it goes. It goes.

Then you talk about people who are older. Who is going to retire with dignity if you have less than $10,000 in the bank? Well, you are going to get Social Security. Thank God, you, I, and other Members have fought hard to make sure there were cuts in Social Security. Look at the people that many people own. But is Social Security alone enough? No. The answer is it is not.

What is happening in this country is that while the middle class shrinks, there is a wave of oligarchs. The people on top are doing phenom- enally well. Today we see a situation in which some of the wealthiest families in America—the Koch brothers come to mind, and I will talk about them in another context. They are now worth $80 billion. In the last year alone their wealth went from $68 billion to $80 billion—in 1 year a $12 billion increase in their wealth.

Sheldon Adelson—another billionaire who has had his name in the paper a whole lot recently by bringing prospective Republican candidates for the Presidency to Las Vegas to talk to them and see what they have to offer him and how much money he will contribute to their campaign—also saw a huge increase in his wealth over the last year.

What is the face of oligarchy? The face of oligarchy is what we see in Russia. When many people refer to oligarchy, they think of Russia. After the collapse of the Soviet Union, a small number of bureaucrats were able to steal a lot of public property, and they became multibillionaires. They controlled oil companies, banks, gold mines, aluminum companies, television stations, and radio stations—state-owned companies, and that is how they became oligarchs.

By 2001 5 oligarchs controlled 95 percent of Russia's aluminum production, 40 percent of its copper, and on and on. Imagine what Russia has to do with Russia; what does it have to do with the United States of America? Well, it has everything to do with the United States of America because that is the direction in which we are moving.

Now, let me cite some examples of what oligarchs do. When we think of oligarchies we might want to think of a gentleman named Sudler, Jr., who was the CEO of Pfizer—a major drug company—from 2001 to 2006. When he retired, he received a $188 million golden parachute—$188 million—at the same time as the people in our country are paying the highest prices in the world for prescription drugs. That is oligarchy.

When we think about oligarchy, we may want to think about a gentleman named Lee Raymond who served as the CEO of ExxonMobil from 1993 to 2005. When he retired—and remember, this is at a time when the vast majority of the American people did not have the resources to retire with a shred of dignity—Mr. Raymond received from ExxonMobil a golden parachute, retirement benefits of $80 million—$320 million. That is at the same time as people in Vermont and all over this country are finding it harder and harder to pay for gas at the pump.

What oligarchy is also about is that in America, maybe the most profitable corporation in the history of America, did not pay any Federal income taxes, even though in that year it earned $19 billion in profits. When we talk about oligarchy we might want to think about somebody like Jamie Dimon, who is the CEO of JPMorgan Chase. He recently received a 74 percent increase in pay—more than $20 million in total compensation. Interestingly enough, that is a pretty big salary—$20 million—but what did he do to earn it? During that same period, over the last year, the bank he runs, JPMorgan Chase, paid out over $20 billion in penalties to the Federal Government for financial fraud. So after paying out $20 billion to the Federal Government in penalties for financial fraud, he still got a $20 million compensation package. That is called oligarchy. No matter what you do, if you are at the head of a large financial institution, you are going to get rewarded for that.

Oligarchy has a lot to do with a gentleman named William McGuire, the CEO of UnitedHealth Group from 1991 to 2006. Everybody knows of the crisis we are facing in health care. Everybody knows that tens of millions of Americans today, despite the Affordable Care Act, are still uninsured. Everybody knows we spend more per capita on health care than do the people of any other nation. Yet when this gentleman retired from UnitedHealth Group in 2006, he received a $285 million golden parachute. So here we have the most dysfunctional health care system in the world, the most expensive health care system, with tens of millions of people uninsured. Yet a CEO of one of the major insurance companies gets $285 million in retirement benefits. That is called oligarchy.
Let me take oligarchy away from the economic realm and turn it into an area that I am—and many Americans are—very concerned about. Recently, we saw an interesting spectacle relating to politics that took place in Las Vegas. The name is Sheldon Adelson—who is worth some $38 billion, and who is maybe the world’s largest casino magnate not only in Las Vegas but off the shores of China as well—held a meeting in Las Vegas in which he brought forth Republican candidates who were in the race for President. Now, here is the point. In the last Presidential election, both President Obama and Mitt Romney spent a little over $1 billion in their campaigns. Sheldon Adelson, if he provided more money into a campaign than both Obama and Romney spent, would still have $9 billion more in wealth than he did in 2013.

What am I saying? What I am saying is that we are moving toward a situation in which such as the Koch brothers and Sheldon Adelson have so much money it would hardly matter to them to write a check for more than both Obama and Romney spent in the last Presidential election. They could write a $2 billion, and it would be insignificant, a fraction of their increase in wealth over a 1-year period.

As bad as that situation is, because of the dubious Citizens United Supreme Court decision, which makes me have seen the worst yet. Judge Thomas, of the Supreme Court, the most conservative member of a very conservative Supreme Court, wrote an opinion which said: Maybe we should look at the Supreme Court, the most conservative, and listen to their comments and with people, regardless of their income, there are other occupations that have a handful of billionaires increasingly are able to determine the nature of politics in America and who is elected and who is defeated, I think we as a nation have a lot of hard thinking in front of us. We have to ask ourselves: Are we going to fight for our democracy and an expanded middle class? Are we going to fight for a democracy where one person has one vote and billionaires cannot fight elections? To my mind, that is the most important issue we face as a nation.

I hope the American people become engaged in that struggle and are prepared to take on the billionaires, who, apparently, are not content to have $10 billion in wealth. They feel the need to have more and more and more and to take that money out of the hides of working families, the elderly, the children, the sick, and the poor. They want more tax breaks for billionaires, and then they want to cut Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, education, and every other program that is of importance to working families.

So we need a very serious debate about whether this is what America is and what it means. Do we want to fight for American democracy and to stop this country from evolving into an oligarchic form of society.

With that, I yield the floor. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, I come to the floor about an hour or so after a vote on a motion to proceed to take up the Paycheck Fairness Act. I stripped my speech down as to whether to move to this measure that I felt was flawed in terms of its approach to a solution or to recognize that perhaps this measure was more of an exercise in political messaging rather than an effort to resolve what I believe is an issue of great importance.

In sorting through all aspects of not only the merits of the legislation, but also the facts as they exist back home, the facts as they exist around this country, where we see pay disparity because of gender, I had a lot on my mind. I had a lot to weigh. I did not come to the floor yesterday to speak with the many who rose to either offer proposed amendments to the Paycheck Fairness Act or those who rose to speak to defend the act. I don’t want my silence yesterday to be construed that I don’t think there is an issue here; that I don’t think this is something that needs to be the subject.

Yesterday was national Equal Pay Day, the day when, according to the Department of Labor, women’s wages supposedly catch up to men’s wages. We can argue and we can debate what this gap is—whether it is 77 cents, whether those statistics are outdated, whether it is closer to 82 cents or what the raw statistics are. We can debate that. But the fact is—and I think the Presiding Officer and I would agree—if there is any discrepancy there, it is worth looking at. Why does a discrepancy exist? Is there disparity that stems from discrimination? Because if it stems from discrimination, it should not be allowed—pretty simply.

As an Alaskan, the story of women’s earnings is a little bit different than what we have on the national level. In my State, Equal Pay Day is not going to occur until May 5. As an Alaskan, a woman, and as one who has been here the Alaska job market, I want to know: Why the greater disparity in my State?

We had a women’s summit in Anchorage, AK, last October. I worked with a former colleague in the Alaska State legislature to host a summit designed to look at many of the issues women face in Alaska, whether it is pay disparity, childcare affordability, access to health care—so many of the issues that concern women all over the country deal with day to day. We relied on a study from the state Legislative Research Services. A portion of the research tried to drill down into some of the pay disparities we have in the State.

In 2010 our State Department of Labor reported a wage gap of 67 cents or 33 percent. This statistic is different from the overall national averages because that review conducted by Legislative Research found that part-time as well as full-time workers and part-time workers generally receive lower salaries. That may be one reason for the disparity.

But when we look at some of the areas where there are discrepancies, it really does cause one to say: Wait a minute. In areas where occupations are significantly male-dominated—crab fishermen, for instance, welders on the pipeline—occupations as to whether those statistics are outdated, that gap is—whether it is 77 cents, supposedly catch up to men’s wages. Day is not going to occur until May 5. As an Alaskan, a woman, and as one who has been in the Alaska job market, I want to know: Why the greater disparity in my State?

We had a women’s summit in Anchorage, AK, last October. I worked with a former colleague in the Alaska State legislature to host a summit designed to look at many of the issues women face in Alaska, whether it is pay disparity, childcare affordability, access to health care—so many of the issues that concern women all over the country deal with day to day. We relied on a study from the state Legislative Research Services. A portion of the research tried to drill down into some of the pay disparities we have in the State.

In 2010 our State Department of Labor reported a wage gap of 67 cents or 33 percent. This statistic is different from the overall national averages because that review conducted by Legislative Research found that part-time as well as full-time workers and part-time workers generally receive lower salaries. That may be one reason for the disparity.

But when we look at some of the areas where there are discrepancies, it really does cause one to say: Wait a minute. In areas where occupations are significantly male-dominated—crab fishermen, for instance, welders on the pipeline—occupations as to whether those statistics are outdated, that gap is—whether it is 77 cents, supposedly catch up to men’s wages. Day is not going to occur until May 5. As an Alaskan, a woman, and as one who has been in the Alaska job market, I want to know: Why the greater disparity in my State?
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In 2010 our State Department of Labor reported a wage gap of 67 cents or 33 percent. This statistic is different from the overall national averages because that review conducted by Legislative Research found that part-time as well as full-time workers and part-time workers generally receive lower salaries. That may be one reason for the disparity.

But when we look at some of the areas where there are discrepancies, it really does cause one to say: Wait a minute. In areas where occupations are significantly male-dominated—crab fishermen, for instance, welders on the pipeline—occupations as to whether those statistics are outdated, that gap is—whether it is 77 cents, supposedly catch up to men’s wages. Day is not going to occur until May 5. As an Alaskan, a woman, and as one who has been in the Alaska job market, I want to know: Why the greater disparity in my State?
For teachers, the ratio of women’s to men’s earnings is 123 percent.

We need to peel back the onion to understand what we are dealing with—is this a situation where it is the difference in the career choice that has made the disparity or is it something that needs to be considered. When we talk about a wage disparity, a pay disparity, I think we need to look very critically at whether there are other factors that come into play. Is it a career choice? Is it the need or desire for flexibility?

Starting out as a young lawyer in Anchorage, I was making what the young men in the firm were making. But when my husband and I decided that I wanted to spend more time at home, I negotiated for that level of flexibility. That put me behind my male counterparts in the firm. I was good with that. That was a choice I made. I wanted that flexibility.

Are there other nonmonetary forms of compensation that perhaps the wage gap statistics don’t necessarily respect? We don’t know. So this is where I came down in my decision process as to which direction to take on the Paycheck Fairness Act vote that was just this morning. Do we want to try to address what I believe is an issue in that we do have a disparity but how we understand what causes that disparity and, then, what we do with that going forward is an important consideration.

We have the Equal Pay Act of 1963 that imposes strict liability for wage disparity based on gender. It is in law. We have title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 that protects against all forms of employment discrimination, including on the basis of sex. But maybe we are not enforcing these federal laws as we need to. If after all these years we are still seeing areas of disparity that we cannot reconcile based on occupation or based on desire for flexibility, does there continue to be discrimination? That is what we need to do.

That is why I and many of my colleagues supported some of the amendments that were presented today and I think were important to present—to make sure there is no retaliation for a woman when she inquires as to what others are making to determine whether there is discrimination, so making sure we are able to access that information. However, when we take a proposal like the Paycheck Fairness Act that has an initial presumption that the employer has unlawfully discriminated against an employee if there is a difference in pay if we have a presumption of discrimination, it is pretty hard for an employer—particularly a small employer—to deal with that, to defend that, to present the case, to really work through this issue.

The solution should not be more litigation as the Paycheck Fairness Act response is here. The solution needs to be more all-encompassing because we have laws on the books that already exist, and we are still seeing instances of discrimination—and, again, let’s figure out where and why and how—then let’s honestly try to address that rather than through messaging efforts that are designed to deflect.”

The Fact Checker took a deep dive in the details. The White House spokesman Jay Carney presented an unsatisfactory result in a press conference only a Pinocchio, largely because he is citing Census Bureau data, but have wondered since then if we were too generous.

I also called out the president when he used this fact in the 2013 State of the Union address. And in the 2014 State of the Union address. And yet he keeps using it. So now it’s time for a reassessment.

The Truth Teller video above also goes through the details.

THE FACTS

Few experts dispute that there is a wage gap, but differences in the life choices of men and women—such as women tending to leave the workforce when they have children—make it difficult to make simple comparisons. Obama is using a figure (annual wages, from the Census Bureau) that makes the disparity appear the greatest—23 cents. But the Labor Department’s Bureau of Labor Statistics shows that the gap is 19 cents when looking at weekly wages. The gap is even smaller when you look at hourly wages—it is 14 cents—but then not every wage earner is paid on an hourly basis so that statistic excludes salaried workers.

In other words, since women in general work fewer hours than men in a year, the statistics used to make this point may be less reliable for examining the key focus of the proposed Paycheck Fairness Act—wage disparity. For instance, annual wage figures are not designed to account the fact that teachers—many of whom are women—have a primary job that fills nine months out of the year. The weekly wage is more of an apples-to-apples comparison, but it does not include as many income categories.

June O’Neill, a former director of the Congressional Budget Office, has noted that the wage gap factors in other statistics, including that the average woman has less work experience than the average man and that more of the weeks worked by women are part-time rather than full-time. Women also tend to leave the work force for periods in order to raise children, seek jobs that may offer more familial flexibility for pay and choose careers that tend to have lower pay.

Indeed, BLS data show that women who do not get married have virtually no wage gap, while they earn 96 cents for every dollar a man makes.

Economists at the Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis surveyed economic literature and concluded that “research suggests that the actual gender wage gap (when female workers are compared with male workers who have similar characteristics) is much lower than the raw wage gap.” They cited one survey, prepared in 2009 for the Labor Department, which concluded that when such differences were accounted for, much of the hourly wage gap dwindled, to about 5 cents on the dollar.

“This study leads to the unambiguous conclusion that the compensation of men and women are the result of a multitude of factors and that the raw wage gap should not be used as the basis to justify counterintuitive action. Indeed, doing nothing to correct,” the report for the Labor Department said. “The differences in raw wages may be almost entirely the result of the individual choices being made by both male and female workers.”


The White House discovered this week that the calculations using average wages can yield misleading results. The White House asserted that the same standards that generated the 77-cent figure were applied to White House salaries, women overall at the White House make 91 cents for every dollar men make. White House spokesman Jay Carney protested the test that “looked at the aggregate of everyone on staff that includes from the most junior levels to the most senior.” But that’s exactly what the Census Department does.

Leslie Stevens, a member of the White House Council of Economic Advisers, acknowledged to reporters that the 77-cent figure did not reflect equal pay for equal work. Stevens noted that the weekly figures factored in the annual earnings of full-time, full-year women divided by the annual earnings of full-time, full-year men.
full-year men,” she said. “There are a lot of things that go into that 77-cent figure. There are a lot of things that contribute and no one’s trying to say that it’s all about discrimination, but I don’t think there’s a better figure.”

Carney noted that the White House wage gap was narrower than the national average, but the actually lagging state district average calculated by the BLS: 95 cents.

**TINOCCHIO TEST**

From a political perspective, the Census Department’s recent figure is golden. Unless women stop getting married and having children, and start abandoning careers in child- 

hood education for naval architecture, this huge gap is almost certainly going to persist. Democrats thus can keep bringing it up every two years.

There appears to be some sort of wage gap and closing it is certainly a worthy goal. But it’s a bit rich for the president to repeatedly cite this statistic as an “embarrassment.” (His line in the April 6 speech was almost word for word what he said in the 2014 State of the Union address.) The president must begin to acknowledge that average annual wages does not begin to capture what is actually happening in the work force and society.

Thus we are boosting the rating on this factoid from Two Pinocchios. The president is relying on an official government statistic—and there are problems and limitations with the other calculations as well.

**TWO PINOCCHIOS**

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Included in this article is the following quote referencing a study by the Census Bureau:

> This study leads to the unambiguous conclusion that the differences in the compensation of men and women are the result of a multitude of factors and that the raw wage gap should not be used as the basis to justify corrective action. Indeed, there may be nothing to correct.

I don’t know that. There indeed may be more that we can correct. I am willing to look to see, to continue to peel back this onion to see if we can do more than we did with the Equal Pay Act of 1963, do more than we did with the Lilly Ledbetter Act that I supported several years ago. If there is more that needs to be done, I am willing to work on it because I don’t want to be in a State where men are viewed as being paid $1 to the 67 cents that a woman is being paid. I don’t want those statistics to be valid.

I don’t want them to play out in my State. I want to understand how we ensure a level of fairness. I think we need to make sure we look keenly to the issue of whether there is discrimination at play or whether, in fact, there are a host of other issues we need to consider as well. I am willing to work in good faith with my colleagues to get that.

I see the chairman of the Judiciary Committee is with us.

(Mr. MARKEY assumed the Chair.)

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished senior Senator from Alaska for yielding. I was interested in hearing her speech too.

**LANDMINES**

The Presiding Officer represents the beautiful Commonwealth of Massachusetts. But consider if 15 percent of the land area of Massachusetts was littered with landmines, as Vermont, with a slightly larger land area, was littered with landmines. Each one a tiny explosive buried a few inches beneath the surface of the ground, and it explodes when an unsuspecting person steps on. Each one capable of killing a child or blowing the legs off an adult.

This may sound far-fetched, but it is not. It is the reality today for many countries—from Vietnam to Angola to Colombia. But if that were the reality in our States, I think we would all agree that these inherently indiscriminate weapons—designed to be triggered by the victim regardless of whether it is a civilian or combatant—do not belong in the arsenal of a civilized country.

In fact, 161 nations have already agreed, and they have joined together in an international treaty banning antipersonnel mines. They include every member of NATO except one—the United States. They include every country in this hemisphere except two—the United States and Cuba.

We condemn the use of IED’s against our soldiers and civilians in Afghanistan, and of course we should. But why not condemn antipersonnel landmines? There is really no appreciable difference.

I am hoping some will be listening to me at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue because I ask this: If landmines were littering this country—in schoolyards, along roads, in cornfields, in our National Parks—and hundreds of American children were being crippled like this Cambodian girl who lost her foot, how much talk before the white house sent the Mine Ban Treaty to the Senate for ratification? Two days? Two weeks? It wouldn’t take any longer than that. I am sure. Yet we hear the same excuses year after year.

I look at my five beautiful grand-children and I ask, what if they were living in a country where simply by walking across a field, going to a playground, or walking down a road, they might lose their lives? They are not combatants. It is usually civilians who are injured and killed by these landmines. We hear the same excuses year after year—why the most powerful Nation on earth cannot join its NATO allies in an international treaty banning antipersonnel mines or that any President, Democratic or Republican, has ever told them to do so.

The U.S. Government deserves credit for spending hundreds of millions of dollars to clear mines and help mine survivors, and the Leathay Victims Fund has been an important part of this. Including the $20 million we got through appropriations to clear land mines.

But this girl—and there are countless more like her—we are told there are thousands of new mine victims each year, show the other tragic side of the story.

I mentioned on the floor the other day about talking to a young teenager in the hospital about the Bosnia war. She had been sent away by her parents to a safe place during the fighting. The war ended. She could come home. She was running down the road calling out to her parents and stepped on a land mine and lost both her legs. She wasn’t a combatant. She became a victim. There are so many innocent victims.

Americans overwhelmingly condemn the use of landmines, and they expect more than they are getting from their government, and so do I, and so, too, should every Member of Congress.

It has been 20 years since President Bill Clinton at the United Nations called for the elimination of antipersonnel landmines. I cheered him when he did. Two years later in 1998 he said: “Today I am launching an interna- 

tional effort to ban landmines.” And I cheered that. But 18 years later we are still waiting. We are waiting for action, not words. We haven’t signed the landmine treaty. We didn’t sign it during the Clinton administration or the George W. Bush administration or this administration.

I have spoken to President Obama about this. I was encouraged when, in accepting the Nobel Peace Prize, he said:

> I am convinced that adhering to standards, international standards, strengthens those who do and isolates and weakens those who don’t.

I told the President how much I agreed with his words. Coincidentally, when he received the Nobel Prize it was a decade after the Nobel committee awarded the prize to the International Campaign to Ban Landmines. How fitting it would be after all these years if my friend, President Obama, gave real meaning to the words he said when accepting the Nobel Peace Prize by putting the United States on a path to join the Mine Ban Treaty, and joining our NATO allies. This is what the American people need and more importantly, it is what America and the world needs.

I will speak further about this on another occasion, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro temper. The Senator from Pennsylvania.
Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I rise to speak on S. 1596, the Protecting Students from Sexual and Violent Predators Act.

Before I do that, though, I want to say a few words about a terrible event that occurred this morning in Pennsylvania. The students at Franklin Regional High School in Murrysville, PA, suffered a terrible, devastating tragedy this morning. A person—and this person is believed to be a fellow student—took out a knife and attacked his fellow students before the start of the school day. It appears that as many as 20 people were injured, some severely. Our thanks go out to the first responders who did respond as rapidly as they could, and our prayers go out to those who were injured and their families at Franklin Regional High School.

PROTECTING STUDENTS FROM SEXUAL AND VIOLENT PREDATORS ACT

Mr. President, I want to turn to this bill that I introduced, the Protecting Students from Sexual and Violent Predators Act, S. 1596. I want to thank my cosponsors, Senator JOE MANCHIN and Senator MITCH MCCONNELL.

The inspiration for this bill begins with a story of a boy named Jeremy Bell. The story begins in Delaware County, PA. One of the school teachers in the school in Delaware County was found to have molested several boys and men. Prosecutors decided there was not enough evidence to bring a case. The school knew about what was happening and decided to dismiss the teacher for this appalling behavior. What was so amazing and disturbing is the school also helped this predator land a job at another school in West Virginia, even passing on a letter of recommendation so they could move their problem somewhere else.

The story ended in 1997 when that teacher, school principal, raped and murdered 12-year-old Jeremy Bell in West Virginia. Justice finally caught up with that teacher who is now in jail serving a life sentence for that murder. But for Jeremy Bell justice came way too late. Roy Bell, Jeremy’s father, worked with the state and the school to hold them accountable. Peterson approached me and said I would fail him if he ever told. He also hit me and made threats against me and my family. So I didn’t tell. I held it in for a year and a half. But again, you cannot keep it in for a year and a half. You have to deal with it.

So the question before us is what are we going to do about this? What can we do? What are we going to do? My bill, the Protecting Students from Sexual and Violent Predators Act is a sensible first step in protecting these kids. It would require a mandatory background check for existing and perspective employees, and the checks would have to be periodically repeated.

The damage that these predators do is just enormous. It is damage far beyond what any number can convey. Over the past few months I have had a chance to visit a number of child advocacy centers around Pennsylvania, meeting with the men and women who work with abused children. I can’t be carefree. It is damage far beyond what any number can convey. Every moment that we delay we are merely waiting out some of these problems.

The other number is 73, and 73 is the number that comes from the Government Accountability Office. GAO says that the average pedophile molests 73 children over the course of that pedophile’s lifetime. These predators actively seek out the environments where they can find victims. That is what they do. The other number is PA, the number of states that will be impacted by the predator land a job at another school district to school district, sometimes from State to State, methodically looking for victims. Every moment we delay we let a predator move on to the next of his 73 victims.

The damage that the average pedophile, predator does is just enormous. It is damage far beyond what any number can convey. Over the past few months I have had a chance to visit a number of child advocacy centers around Pennsylvania, meeting with the men and women who work with abused children, whether it is helping them through the criminal justice system or just helping them to start the healing process. These folks do some incredibly important and very, very good work. But again, you cannot visit one of these centers without being profoundly impacted by how devastating the abuse is.

I cannot come up with the words to convey how devastating this is. But I can let some of the children speak for themselves. I am going to quote from two students who were victims. Shannon was raped by a teacher. The teacher was later convicted of sexual assault and sentenced to life in prison. Nine years later here is what Shannon wrote:

When I was a senior in high school, Mr. Peterson approached me and said I would fail him, and he would fail me if I ever told. He also hit me and made threats against me and my family. So I didn’t tell. I held it in for a year and a half. But again, you cannot keep it in for a year and a half. You have to deal with it.

The damage that these predators do is just enormous. It is damage far beyond what any number can convey. Over the past few months I have had a chance to visit a number of child advocacy centers around Pennsylvania, meeting with the men and women who work with abused children, whether it is helping them through the criminal justice system or just helping them to start the healing process. These folks do some incredibly important and very, very good work. But again, you cannot visit one of these centers without being profoundly impacted by how devastating the abuse is.

I cannot come up with the words to convey how devastating this is. But I can let some of the children speak for themselves. I am going to quote from two students who were victims. Shannon was raped by a teacher. The teacher was later convicted of sexual assault and sentenced to life in prison. Nine years later here is what Shannon wrote:

When I was a senior in high school, Mr. Peterson approached me and said I would fail him if I ever told. He also hit me and made threats against me and my family. So I didn’t tell. I held it in for a year and a half. But again, you cannot keep it in for a year and a half. You have to deal with it.

The damage that these predators do is just enormous. It is damage far beyond what any number can convey. Over the past few months I have had a chance to visit a number of child advocacy centers around Pennsylvania, meeting with the men and women who work with abused children, whether it is helping them through the criminal justice system or just helping them to start the healing process. These folks do some incredibly important and very, very good work. But again, you cannot visit one of these centers without being profoundly impacted by how devastating the abuse is.

I cannot come up with the words to convey how devastating this is. But I can let some of the children speak for themselves. I am going to quote from two students who were victims. Shannon was raped by a teacher. The teacher was later convicted of sexual assault and sentenced to life in prison. Nine years later here is what Shannon wrote:

When I was a senior in high school, Mr. Peterson approached me and said I would fail him if I ever told. He also hit me and made threats against me and my family. So I didn’t tell. I held it in for a year and a half. But again, you cannot keep it in for a year and a half. You have to deal with it.
The fifth thing that my legislation does is it would stipulate that schools cannot hire a person who has ever been convicted of any violent or sexual crime against a child. I think that is a very reasonable first step. In many of these fields these are so egregious that I would want to make sure that person is excluded from working with children.

And a similar standard would be to prohibit hiring of a number of specific felonies—not all felonies, but felonies such as homicide, child abuse or neglect, crimes against a child including pornography, spousal abuse, rape, sexual assault, and kidnapping. And if these felonies are so egregious we would want to keep a person excluded from working with children.

In addition, anyone convicted of a felony physical assault or battery or a felony drug-related offense would be prohibited for 5 years, couldn’t be hired for 5 years. The enforcement of all of this would be that if a State refused to adopt these very commonsense measures to protect kids, then they would get no Federal funding from the EASA. I think the States would adopt these reforms.

I would point out there is nothing the least bit radical about these proposals. In addition to having passed the House of Representatives unanimously, we in the Senate just passed virtually an identical background check requirement on the Child Care and Development Block Grant legislation we adopted last week or perhaps the week before—very recently. That bill essentially had identical background check provisions for daycare workers, and that is very sensible. That is an important and good step. It makes sense to protect children in daycare, but it makes no sense whatsoever to protect kids in daycare and then leave them defenseless when they move on to an ordinary school.

Finally, I want to emphasize that this bill has broad bipartisan support manifested in the House and here in the Senate. More than that, I think it is a moral imperative. Our children deserve to be protected now. If that is not a responsibility we have, I don’t know what is. The protection didn’t come soon enough for Jeremy Bell or Shannon or Gary, but we don’t have to fail other children by delay.

I ask any of my colleagues who object to this legislation that passed unanimously in the House—legislation that is completely consistent with what we passed a couple of weeks ago—to please work with their counterparts or issues. I welcome hearing any objections, if there are any, but I want to see a very speedy passage of this legislation.

It is my intention tomorrow to come down here to the Senate floor and ask for unanimous consent from my colleagues to pass this legislation here on the Senate floor. That will expedite the process and will assure we put this important safeguard in place as soon as we possibly can.

EX-IM BANK

I have one other issue I want to address briefly before I yield the floor, and that is about the Ex-Im Bank. I believe this afternoon we will be considering a nominee to a very senior post at the Ex-Im bank. My focus is not principally on this particular candidate, but I think we need to ask ourselves some important questions about the Ex-Im Bank’s responsibilities and what it does, and how it does it. I hope we will make some very significant changes when we get to the reauthorization debate in the fall.

First of all, I should point out this is an institution—the Ex-Im Bank—that that taxpayers help support substantial taxpayer risk, and it is large and growing. In 2007, Ex-Im Bank’s total exposure was $57 billion. Today it is almost precisely twice that amount. It is $113 billion, and the Ex-Im Bank wishes to increase that exposure further.

In 2013, the GAO, after doing an audit, found multiple weaknesses in Ex-Im’s risk management processes, failures to account for changing environments that could lead to higher losses, lapses that would not be acceptable in fully private institutions.

Another point I wish to make is—I hope we don’t kid ourselves about this: I know sometimes people suggest to the contrary—taxpayers are systematically and intentionally subsidized export entries. While we will get the advantageous funding. Yet we are direct competitors, but they don’t play by the rules.
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There is another concern I have, and that is the nature of the activity, the financial subsidization it provides for certain oversea sales. There is no reason this country should subsidize American exports. The nature of this process inevitably creates winners and losers back here in the United States.

The Ex-Im Bank effectively subsidizes—and I will give one example. Indian Airlines gets a subsidy to purchase Boeing jets, and that is very nice, except that Indian Airlines competes directly with some American airlines. They are direct competitors, but they don’t get the advantage of funding. Yet their foreign competitor does. How can that possibly be fair? How can that possibly make sense?

My final point is that one of the most predictable things in the world is that when we create a government entity to engage in an economic activity, that entity will be politicized. It is a creature of Congress and the government. It is going to be affected. Sure enough, it didn’t take long for that to happen. It already happened in the Ex-Im Bank. In addition, I have a feeling that some overseas buyers of some American exports. This has everything to do with market forces or general reform. I think the States would adopt these reforms.
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Our entire delegation, Democrats and Republicans, has been fighting on their behalf vigorously. We have written letters, made phone calls, and made multiple visits to the region. Contrary to the testimony by the junior Senator from Louisiana, the fact is everybody has been working well together.

Congressman Boustany got to pass this piece of legislation out of the House that basically says: Yes, let’s go forward and build these clinics and not require an offset. I wish to thank Senator Landrieu that there needs to be this. I don’t agree with Senator Coburn’s thoughts about the bill and the politics is controlled by the Republican leadership in the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is here on behalf of Senator Coburn, who has been more involved, and so I will give the history of it. Some folks in the Senate had concerns about the bill and the fact that, in their view, it was not paid for. I met with them and talked through all of these concerns. I could not convince them to drop those concerns completely, so instead we found a solution, which is the Vitter amendment that is at the desk. That amendment has been cleared within its four corners. Nobody was going to agree to the double amendment—opposes the amendment. We found that solution in order to pass the bill through the Senate, and that addressed Senator Coburn’s objections to the bill alone. That is the solution we worked on.

I can’t fully walk through all of Senator Coburn’s thoughts about the bill on its own and whether it was paid for. I can just tell the Senator that I met with him exhaustively, was not able to get him to completely drop his objection, but was able to agree on this compromise—this solution to the pay-for issue. So that is why the amendment, which is at the desk, was proposed, which removes the Coburn objection and thereby fixes the problem.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. Lee. Mr. President, on behalf of Senator Coburn, who is not here today, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

Mr. Lee. My understanding is that Senator Coburn’s objection is based on the lack of a pay-for in this proposal. There is, however, an amendment that has been introduced by Senator Vitter that addresses this concern and fills this gap.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Veterans’ Affairs Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 3521, the bill read three times and passed, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. Vitter. Mr. President, I don’t mean to cut my colleague off, but Senator Lee is here on behalf of Senator Coburn, who has been more involved, and so I will give the history of it. Some folks in the Senate had concerns about the bill and the fact that, in their view, it was not paid for. I met with them and talked through all of these concerns. I could not convince them to drop those concerns completely, so instead we found a solution, which is the Vitter amendment that is at the desk. That amendment has been cleared within its four corners. Nobody was going to agree to the double amendment—opposes the amendment. We found that solution in order to pass the bill through the Senate, and that addressed Senator Coburn’s objections to the bill alone. That is the solution we worked on.

I can’t fully walk through all of Senator Coburn’s thoughts about the bill on its own and whether it was paid for. I can just tell the Senator that I met with him exhaustively, was not able to get him to completely drop his objection, but was able to agree on this compromise—this solution to the pay-for issue. So that is why the amendment, which is at the desk, was proposed, which removes the Coburn objection and thereby fixes the problem.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Utah?

Mr. Sanders. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont, objection is heard.

The Senator from Vermont, objection is heard.

Mr. Sanders. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana has the floor.

Ms. Landrieu. Mr. President, that is very good to know that Senator Coburn is objecting—or not objecting—to an offset that is not a real offset. The reason there is some objection from our side, and I think from Senator Sanders as well, is because the Vitter offset is not real. It doesn’t generate $1.6 billion in savings. So I think we should go forward with no offset because the $1.6 billion is not a real offset.

The CBO analysis of this offset basically says, from our preliminary estimate of the amendment, based on information from the Department of Defense, there are no savings—there are no savings—for drug-related purchases to the current law. The preliminary estimate is zero.

With that, I wish to reiterate my unanimous consent request—please don’t interrupt—I would like unanimous consent for my amendment, which has no offset—and the bill does not have to go back to the House of Representatives. The bill can go straight to the President’s desk.

I yield the floor.

Mr. Vitter. Mr. President, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state his inquiry.

Mr. Vitter. I would like to ask through the Chair, because this is significant information, whether Senator Sanders would object to passing the bill without amendment, because in all previous discussions to date, I understood he would object to that. But that is very significant information, so I would ask that of Senator Sanders through the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is not a parliamentary inquiry. However, if the Senator chooses to respond, he may.

Mr. Sanders. I will respond later.

Mr. Vitter. Mr. President, reclaiming the floor and reclaiming my time, that is very significant information that I think it is good to know. So I would like to know from the Senator whether he would or would not object to a UC to pass the bill without this amendment.

Mr. Sanders. Mr. President, that is a fair question. Let me ask my colleague from Louisiana—as he knows, I will be speaking more to this in a moment. I wish to thank Senator Landrieu for her strong support of legislation I introduced and for her support not only for veterans in Louisiana but for every veteran in this country. This legislation is supported by virtually every veterans organization in the United States of America.

I will respond at this point to my colleague from Louisiana to say that if I were prepared to support the Landrieu amendment, which has no offsets—and she makes a good point, that veterans have paid for this legislation in their blood already—would the Senator from Louisiana object to an amendment I offered for the comprehensive bill that had no offset as well?

Mr. Vitter. If I could address the Chair, I am happy to answer the question.

As a Senator Sanders knows, I have serious concerns with his much broader bill. So I am not agreeing to his far broader bill. He knows that. We have talked about that. We have talked about those concerns. I am happy to restate that.

Having answered his question, I would like to reask through the Chair if Senator Sanders is objecting or would object to a UC request to pass this veterans clinics bill without the amendment at this time.

Mr. Sanders. Reserving the right to object, let me again thank Senator Landrieu, who has raised this issue with me on numerous occasions. The
issue we are talking about—I think Senator VITTER referred to it—is clearly not just an issue for Louisiana, it is an issue which addresses the need to see built 27 major medical facilities in 18 States and Puerto Rico. To my mind, this is a very important issue, and why I put it in a very prominent place in my legislation.

What I would say to my friend from Louisiana is that as important as that provision in the bill is, there are many other aspects of equal or greater importance. What I would say to my friend from Louisiana is that organizations—and, again, virtually every veteran organization in America, representing millions and millions of veterans, wants this body and Members of the Senate to not just give speeches on Veterans Day or Memorial Day about their concerns for veterans, they want this body to start acting on behalf of the veterans in this country.

What we want us to do, among many other things, is an advanced appropriations. I know my friend from Louisiana isn’t a member of the Veterans’ Affairs Committee, and maybe he does not know that in the last government shutdown we were 10 days away from veterans—disabled veterans—not getting the checks they live on. This bill I have introduced addresses that.

Maybe the Senator from Louisiana does not know we have a major backlog problem: that while the VA is making good progress and significantly reducing that backlog, I, as chairman of the Senate Veterans’ Affairs Committee, want to make absolutely certain that when a veteran applies for a benefit, that benefit is adjudicated in a rapid, efficient, and accurate way, and my legislation deals with that issue.

I don’t know if the junior Senator from Louisiana knows we have a real problem for veterans in Louisiana and across the country who are trying to take advantage of the post-9/11 education bill. Over 1 million veterans and their families are taking advantage of it but suddenly find themselves, if they move from Vermont to Louisiana or Louisiana to Vermont, they may not be able to take advantage of instate tuition. Our bill addresses that issue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senators are advised that subject to a previous order, the Senate was to proceed to executive session at 2:50. Mr. VITTER. I ask unanimous consent that the previous order be postponed for an additional 10 minutes so we can simply round out this very important discussion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SANDERS. None whatsoever. Mr. VITTER addressed the Chair. Mr. SANDERS. I think I have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection.

Mr. VITTER. I believe I made an inquiry through the Chair, so I believe I have the floor and I would like to reframe it if that is appropriate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont currently has the floor.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, the point I am making is this: moreover, not only are we dealing with the instate tuition issue, which impacts veterans from Louisiana and Vermont and every other State, we are dealing with another issue in that we are extending for 10 years, because unfettered access to VA health care for recently separated veterans. At a time when real unemployment in this country is close to 12 percent and many veterans are coming home from Iraq and Afghanistan and they are looking for work and work is hard to find, this legislation renews our vow to hire heroes because we believe it is important that veterans get back to work and take care of their families.

Mr. VITTER addressed the Chair. Mr. VITTER. I apologize for interrupting, but I just want to ensure that of the additional 10 minutes that were granted, I will have five minutes. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is dividing the time equally.

Mr. VITTER. I apologize for interrupting.

Mr. SANDERS. Not at all. I wanted to continue my colleague from Louisiana, which he may or may not know, that we have a very serious problem in the military regarding sexual assault, and it is terribly important that the men and women who were sexually assaulted get to find help and the treatment they need in a VA facility and we address that issue.

The Senator from Louisiana may or may not know that 2,300 veterans—these are men and women who suffered injuries in Iraq and Afghanistan and came home unable because of their wounds, to have babies, and this legislation is going to help them start the families they want.

The Senator from Louisiana may or may not know—and I know the Senator from Vermont Mr. DUBUS does know—that in this legislation we deal with the caregivers act; that right now we have 70-year-old women who have taken care of their husbands who lost their legs in Vietnam or in Korea or whatever war, and they are crying out for us to give them a modest degree of help.

What I say to my friend from Louisiana: Now is the time to stand with the veterans of this country. If he thinks it is too expensive, then don’t send them off to war. Don’t send them off to war. Taking care of veterans is a cost of war. They paid for it. I am very proud, again, that this legislation has the support of the American Legion, VFW, DAV, Gold Star Wives, veterans organizations in Iraq, Afghan-istan veterans organizations, and all the others—virtually all of the other ones.

I implore my friend from Louisiana to do the right thing and support this comprehensive legislation which addresses his concerns in this provision, but it does a lot more.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I think this discussion has been very important and very instructive because it underscores that not only does the distinguished Senator from Vermont object to my efforts to pass the veterans clinics bills with the amendment at the desk by unanimous consent, but he also objects to Senator LANDRIEU’s efforts to pass the same veterans clinics bill, in her case, without the amendment, without the offset. I asked him that direct question. He made it very clear that he continues to demand that we pass his entire much broader bill and will not let this hostage go.

I think that is very sad and very inappropriate for him to object to my efforts to pass the clinics bill. It is not 1 Senator objecting to this, it is 43. We do have agreement about these clinics issues. No one objecting, except the amendment at the desk by unanimous consent, to pass the clinics bill, the focused clinics bill. He is objecting to that as well.

Mr. VITTER. It is also completely contrary to what Senator Sanders has said before, working on these and related issues. In another instance in late 2013, November, Senator Sanders himself, talking about our colleagues, said: I’m happy to tell you that I think that was a concern of his.

Another colleague—

Where we have agreement, let’s move it. We do not have agreement about the significant details of the much broader Sanders bill. It is not 1 Senator objecting about that, it is 43, but we do have agreement about this clinics issue. No one objecting to pass the clinics bill, objects to the substance of the clinics bill. We have worked out every issue, including through my discussions with Senator COBURN, about the pay-fors. The amendment at the desk solves that.

So when we take that bill and the amendment, no one objects to that substance. No one objects to it within the four corners of that material. The only objection constantly on the floor for the last several weeks—today again towards including Senator SANDERS, objection to the substance of the clinics bill. We have worked out every issue, including through my discussions with Senator Coburn, about the pay-fors. The amendment at the desk solves that.

We will continue to discuss those important issues and disagreements, but 43 Senators disagree with Senator Sanders. Sixty are needed to move forward. In the meantime, can we at least agree what we agree on and not hold veterans hostage? They have had guns pointed at them before, but they don’t expect U.S. Senators to hold guns to their head and hold them hostage over veterans clinics.

So where we have agreement, let’s move it. We have agreement about the
veterans clinics. Let’s move it. That is my effort. That is Senator Lандриев’s effort, which again is being objected to, moving this focused clinics bill, by the Senator from Vermont. I find that very unfortunate, but I will certainly continue to discuss that. I will pass this and continue to talk concerning all of the other important veterans’ issues.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, we talk about holding hostages. The distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana pointed out that 43 Senators voted against comprehensive legislation that is supported by virtually every veterans organization in this country. The arithmetic is 43 voted against it, that is true. How many voted for it? Fifty-six voted for it and 1 was absent who would have voted for it. Fifty-seven voted for comprehensive legislation, 43 voted against it.

So when the Senator talks about holding veterans hostage, I would suggest to my friend from Louisiana that maybe instead of filibustering this bill and requiring an undemocratic 60 votes, let the majority rule.

These people want us to pass this legislation. If you choose not to vote for it, that is your right. But I do urge you not to hold us hostage by demanding 60 votes when a very strong majority wants to see it passed.

With that, Mr. President, I would object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, can you tell me the order of business we are in now?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 40 seconds remaining on the current issue, following which we will proceed to executive session.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I yield back that time.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF WANDA FELTON TO BE FIRST VICE PRESIDENT OF THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Wanda Felton, of New York, to be First Vice President of the Export-Import Bank of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The remaining time until 3:30 p.m. will be for debate on the Felton nomination.

The Senator from Illinois.

AMERICAN CURES ACT

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, a generation ago, if a person had AIDS, it meant a sure and agonizing death. It was 23 years ago, when I was in the House of Representatives, when I was walking to the Chamber for a vote when I saw a colleague and friend, Tom McMillen, a Congressman from Maryland, coming my way. You would not miss Tom McMillen. He played in the NBA. He was tall. As he passed by on the sidewalk, he stopped and said, Tom, I have AIDS. It was still astonishing announcement that Magic Johnson had been diagnosed with AIDS. The reality is that was 23 years ago. At the time we felt this was a death verdict, there was no way to escape it.

Last month American researchers revealed that a second American baby born with HIV has apparently been cured of the virus with drugs delivered just minutes after birth.

How far we have come in 23 years—from an AIDS diagnosis meaning certain death to being able to cure for the second time a baby born with HIV with drugs delivered minutes after birth.

These two doctors are part of an effort called the Clinical Islet Transplantation Consortium. Islets are a group of beta cells in the pancreas that produce insulin. Type 1 diabetes destroys them. Transplanting healthy beta cells into the liver of someone with type 1 diabetes can enable the person’s body to start producing insulin on its own—a functional cure for type 1 diabetes.

Do you know anyone with type 1 diabetes? I do. To think that we are close enough to even consider the possibility of a cure should spur us all on to want more research in this area done as quickly as possible.

These two doctors are part of a four-year effort to put into the National Institutes of Health a research program at the National Institutes of Health. Their apparent success could have many implications. It is not the only happening when it comes to medical research, by a long shot.

In my home State of Illinois, Dr. Jose Oberholzer from the University of Illinois-Chicago and Dr. Xunrong Luo from Northwestern University are among scores of researchers throughout the country on an NIH-sponsored project to find a cure for Type 1 diabetes.

There are many other important veterans’ issues. Let’s move it. That is Senator Sanders’ commitment to American medical research.

Here is the commitment: Over the next 10 years, I want a commitment from both Chambers, to make a commitment to American medical research, to American cures.

What is the cost of that? The cost of that is $150 billion over 10 years—to make a commitment to go forward on medical research. It is a lot of money. It is a lot of money until you consider what the cost is each year of Alzheimer’s—$200 billion—not to mention the cost of diabetes, arthritis, and so many other illnesses and diseases that call for huge investments when it comes to medical care.

Where in the world can we get $150 billion over 10 years? Where could we possibly find it? Let me give you a starting place. Increase the Federal tax on tobacco products by 95 cents. I am for that. I will tell you why I am for it. I have been fighting tobacco as long as I have been in Congress—the House and Senate—and what I have discovered is, if you want to discourage young people from smoking, taking up tobacco addiction that will ultimately cost them their lives, raise the price of the product. They stop buying it.

In my lifetime, we have seen the percentage of Americans smoking cut in